Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

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

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

☑ Additional comments / Commentaires supplémentaires:

Pagination is as follows: [1], [811]-1727, [i]-lxxx p.

Pages 1493 & 1498 are incorrectly numbered pages 1487 & 498.

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA.

THIRD SESSION—SIXTH PARLIAMENT.

52° VICTORIÆ, 1889

VOL. XXVIII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-SIXTH DAY OF MARCH TO THE SECOND DAY OF MAY, INCLUSIVE, 1889.

OTTAWA:
PRINTED BY BROWN CHAMBERLIN, PRINTER TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.
1889.

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.-52 VIC.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 26th March, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 121) to amend the Summary Trials Act (from the Senate).—(Sir John Thompson.)

Bill (No. 122) respecting collection of certain tolls and dues mentioned therein (from the Senate).—(Sir John Thompson.)

THE *MODUS VIVENDI.*

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the leader of the Government whether the report is true which we see in the newspapers, that the Government have agreed to the *modus vivendi* for the coming year; and, if so, whether the Orders in Council and further instructions relating thereto will be laid on the Table of the House? This is a very important question, and one in which the people take so much interest that I think the decision arrived at by the Government should be given in a formal way to this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can answer the hon. gentleman, "Yes." We have been in communication with the Government of Newfoundland on this matter with a view to have joint action, as I have mentioned before. On Friday or Saturday, I forget which, but I think it was Saturday last, we received a communication from the Government of Newfoundland to the effect that they decided to allow the *modus vivendi* to go into operation for the coming season, and this Government acted accordingly. The papers will be brought down.

BEHRING'S SEA FISHERIES.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if he has noticed the published report, or departmental order of the American Government, in relation to the Behring's Sea, and whether any correspondence has taken place in relation to that question which is likely to create so much dispute. I may state that I have heard a very great many opinions as to what the effect of that order of the American Government is, but my own impression is that the order is much more limited in extent than the general public seem to believe it is. I think it would be well if the Government should make some explanation on the subject so as to ease the public mind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has been no correspondence with the American Government on this subject. I can quite understand the hon. gentleman asking the question, because there is a great deal of misapprehension existing with regard to the matter. An Act was passed by Congress some years ago respecting the Behring's Sea, and it is a clause or provision of that Act of Congress that every year there shall be a proclamation issued warning the people as to the provisions of that statute. The present is only the ordinary proclamation which was issued last year, and probably the year before and for some years past. There is nothing in it to cause any alarm.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is there any new feature in it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no new feature.

SUPPLY—THE JESUITS' ESTATES ACT.

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

Mr. O'BRIEN. I beg, Sir, to move in amendment:

That all after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted in lieu thereof: Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved, that an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, setting forth: 1. That this House regards the power of disallowing the Acts of the Legislative Assemblies of the Provinces, vested in His Excellency in Council, as a prerogative essential to the national existence of the Dominion; 2. That this great power, while it should never be wantonly exercised, should be fearlessly used for the protection of the rights of a minority, for the preservation of the fundamental principles of the Constitution, and for safeguarding the general interests of the people; 3. That in the opinion of this House, the passage by the Legislature of the Province of Quebec of the Act intituled "An Act respecting the settlement of the Jesuits' Estates" is beyond the power of that Legislature. Firstly, because it endows from public funds a religious organisation, thereby violating the undoubted constitutional principle of the complete separation of Church and State and of the absolute equality of all denominations before the law. Secondly, because it recognises the usurpation of a right by a foreign authority, namely, His Holiness the Pope of Rome, to claim that his consent was necessary to empower the Provincial Legislature to dispose of a portion of the public domain, and also because the Act is made to depend upon the will, and the appropriation of the grant thereby made as subject to the control of the same authority. And, thirdly, because the endowment of the Society of Jesus, an alien, secret and politico-religious body, the expulsion of which from every Christian community wherein it has had a footing has been rendered necessary by its intolerant and mischievous intermeddling with the functions of civil government, is fraught with danger to the civil and religious liberties of the people of Canada. And this House, therefore, prays that His Excellency will be graciously pleased to disallow the said Act.

I should like to say, in the first place, that, in addressing the House upon this question, which I shall do as briefly as possible, I desire to avoid as far as may be what may be called its religious side, and to confine myself to its constitutional and political aspect. I would further say that I would not have undertaken the serious responsibility of bringing before the House a subject of so delicate a nature, attended with so many difficulties, and so likely to give rise to angry

feelings, and possibly to acrimonious discussion, were it not for the very strong sense which I have of what is due to my own convictions on the subject, as well as to the convictions of those whom I represent in this House, and, I will venture to say, to the convictions of the majority of the people of Canada. Now, Sir, one word with regard to my own position in the matter. Had the resolution or any resolutions by my hon. friend the member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) come before this House in such a shape as to meet the wishes of those who think as I do on this subject, or had they come at such a period in the Session as to have given reason for the probability of a discussion, I should not have interfered. I wish to say further, Sir, that though I was elected as a supporter of the present Administration, and a supporter of their policy so far as that policy could be known, yet, at the same time, during my election contest, and on several subsequent occasions, I said, with the full approbation of my supporters, and I think with the approbation of a great many who did not support me as well, speaking in anticipation of such an Act as that now under review, and speaking in anticipation —because, as we know, coming events cast their shadows before, and we had had on many occasions indications from various sources and in various quarters, of an attempt to do what I think is inconsistent with the rights and privileges of the people of this country—I said that in my place in Parliament I should, regardless of consequences, and regardless of whom it might make or whom it might mar, I should oppose any attempt on the part of any nationality, or any party, or any race, or any religion, to exercise powers, or claim privileges, not guaranteed by treaty, or not secured by subsequent legislation. I am, therefore, acting perfectly consistently in moving this resolution and in taking this step, and not only so, but I would be recreant to my own principles, and recreant to the pledge I gave to those who sent me here, were I to fail in doing so. This resolution which I am about to place in your hands, Mr. Speaker, is, I think, sufficiently explicit, and sufficiently comprehensive, to leave no doubts in the minds of everyone as to what it means. It declares in, I think, reasonable terms, the limit to which the power of disallowance on the part of the Dominion Government should go, and I think, in view of the history of the last twenty years, it ought to meet the approbation of the House by the declaration that without a full and fearless exercise of the prerogative vested in His Excellency the Governor General, by the British North America Act, it is impossible that this country can maintain anything like a national existence. I contend, Sir, that while it may be possibly true that an Act may even be within the four corners of the British North America Act, and although it may be within the literal interpretation of that Act, yet, that if it violates a fundamental principle of the Constitution—a supposition which is quite possible—or if it in any way interferes with the general interests of the Dominion, if it brings a principle to bear upon the public welfare which the majority of the people consider to be detrimental, even though the Act may originate within that Province, then, Sir, I say this Government has a right and ought to interfere. I say that this House has the right, as the grand inquest of the nation, to discuss any question of great, national importance, and especially a question like this which has created a degree of attention on the part of the people of this country, which certainly calls for legislative notice. In the resolution, Sir, I have endeavored, in brief terms, to point out how we consider that Act violates the Constitution, how it interferes with the rights and privileges of the people, and why it justifies interference as being an Act prejudicial to the general interests of the people. Were I not to say a single word in support of the resolution, I think it would stand before the House as a sufficient manifesto of the sentiment which I and others in this House entertain in regard to the Bill which we are now about to discuss. Now, Sir, we shall, of course, be met with the contention that the Act passed by the Legislature of Quebec is one entirely within the purview of that Assembly—one with which neither this Parliament nor the Government of the Dominion has anything to do. Before entering into a consideration of that question, it would be well briefly to review the history of the subject. We find, then, at the time of the Conquest the Society of Jesuits established and carrying on active operations in all that part of the American continent which was under the jurisdiction of His Most Christian Majesty the King of France; and far be it from me to say one word derogatory to the manner in which that society performed those great functions. We found them here in possession of estates derived from three sources—chiefly from grants direct from the Crown, from private individuals, and from purchases by funds out of their own resources; but all were held by them, and necessarily held by them, according to the constitution of the society, for the promotion of the objects they had in hand—these two, I think, mainly: the conversion of the heathen Indians, and the education of the people of New France. Far be it from me, Sir, to say anything derogatory to the manner in which the first, at any rate, of those works were carried on by the Jesuit missionaries; and I pity the man who can read without emotion of the hardships, the trials and the sufferings endured by the Jesuit missionaries in their efforts to Christianise the heathen. It is hard for us in these days of luxury and comfort to realise what hardships and sufferings those men went through—sufferings which too often met their only reward in a crown of martyrdom, and which would only be endured from the highest and noblest sense of duty. After the Conquest, the

large estates which were possessed by the Jesuit Societies, as well as those possessed by other religious societies, were referred to in the Act of Capitulation; and so far as the terms of that Act go, that property was secured to them. But, Sir, when the Treaty of Paris came to be made, we find that the reservation made by the Act of Capitulation was not carried out. We find, on the contrary, that while all the rights of property of private individuals were reserved and maintained, those of the various religious communities were expressly exempted, and it was held that those properties had by operation of the law passed into the possession of the Crown. We need not pursue further the history of the estates of the other religious bodies, because we know, as a matter of fact, upon enquiry into the character and operations of these various societies—the Sulpicians and others—that their estates were handed back to them, and have remained in their undisturbed possession ever since. But with regard to the Jesuits a different view was taken; and is it surprising that a different view should be taken when we consider who and what the Jesuits of that day were? Although we can only speak in terms of admiration of the operations of those who were carrying on their work in New France; yet the society at large occupied a very different position, and, Mr. Speaker, had the heads of the society, elsewhere than in Canada, been single-minded and single-hearted, devoted men like Brébœuf and L'Allemand, the history of the last century would have been differently written; the name of Jesuit would not have become a bye-word of reproach throughout all the nations of Europe, and the great Gallican Church, once the bulwark of the French nation, renowned for its independence as well as its piety and learning, would not be dependent on the huge pretensions of ultramontane Rome. That sentiment, I dare say, will not meet with approval on the part of many members of this House. But those who have studied with care the history of Europe during the past three centuries, know that what I have stated is the truth, know that no one has ever more violently opposed the pretensions of the Jesuits than writers of the Roman Catholic Church itself; and in reference to that, I would say that one of the original grounds on which the society was subsequently suppressed was the fact of its interference with various other religious communities belonging to the Catholic Church. Well, Sir, we find that the Jesuits' Estates were not restored; and it is not surprising when we consider the position of the society. From the time of Queen Elizabeth downwards the Jesuits had been proscribed in the British realm, and why? Because it was found that they were enemies of the public peace, that they were determined by every possible means—means which I will not characterise here, because it is not essential to the argument to do so—to overthrow the Protestant succession as established in England; that they would lose no opportunity and hesitate at no means to accomplish that object. Fortunately for the liberties of Europe and the peace of the world their efforts were unsuccessful. At the same moment, if they had not been actually expelled, they were on the point of being expelled from every country in Europe, just at the time when the question of the legality of their estates came before the law officers of the Crown;—from Spain, the country where they had their origin, by the Government of His Most Catholic Majesty, the King of Spain; from Naples, under the very shadow of the Pontifical chair. In France, they were brought before the High Court of Paris, the highest tribunal in France, one might almost say in Europe, and there their transactions were a matter of judicial investigation, and the result of that investigation was, that they were suppressed and expelled from France; and, only a few years later, as everyone knows, in 1773, Pope Clement XIV, pronounced their supppression and abolition in terms which can leave no possible doubt as to his intention to do away with and abolish the society entirely. I say, considering all these things, considering the odor in which the society stood with regard to the Church of Rome itself, considering its actions with regard to the realm of England in times past, it is not surprising that the British Government felt mistrust towards the body they found established in their own country, and hesitated in giving them the means to carry on operations which they would be censurable if they had not regarded as dangerous to the state. Because, why should they suppose that a Jesuit in Canada would act from different principles or motives from what the same men did when they had access to the shores of England? But they did not confiscate the estates, and the term used in the Act is an improper one. They took the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, as to the title of these estates, and that opinion clearly established that the estates had lapsed to the Crown, and that the Crown of England had a right to do with them as it pleased. In 1865, the question of the title to these estates was referred to Sir James Marriot, Judge Advocate General, and in giving his opinion, he said:

"That the order never had in France any legal establishment as part of the civil and ecclesiastical constitution of the realm, having refused the conditions on which it was admitted, because those terms were radically subvertive of the whole order. Their title, therefore, to estates in Canada had no better qualification than those titles had by the laws and constitution of the realm of France previous to the Conquest. This society differed from other societies in that it had nowhere any corporate existence. All its property was vested in its General living at Rome, who was neither a French nor a British subject, and could not be either, and, therefore, could not avail himself of the 4th article of the Treaty, being neither an inhabitant of Canada nor a subject of the King of France."

Matters appear to have remained in *statu quo* until 1775, the year after the suppression of the society by the Pope, when, in the instructions to the Governor General, Sir Guy Carleton, it was ordered:

"That the society be suppressed and dissolved, and no longer continued as a body corporate or politic, and all their rights, possessions, and property shall be vested in us for such purposes as we may hereafter think fit to direct or appropriate."

Well, at the same time, all the other religious societies were permitted to retain possession of their property, and anyone will easily understand from what I have said the distinction the Government made between these various bodies. They judged the one by its historical record, and they judged, I think the people will say rightly, in assuming that it was not a society to which they could give encouragement or which they could permit to carry on operations such as the society had been carrying on previously. A similar statement was given later on by the Attorney General and the Assisstant Attorney General of Lower Canada, in which they said:

"The nature of their institution prevented them, individually, from taking anything under the capitulation of all Canada, and to their society under one head and domiciled at Rome, nothing was granted or could be legally or reasonably be supposed to be conveyed, but even that head, and with it the whole society, wheresoever dispersed, was finally dissolved and suppressed in 1773, so that the existence of the very few members of the order in this Province can in no shape be construed as forming a body, corporate or politic, capable of any of the powers inherent and enjoyed by communities. * * * As a derelict or vacant estate, His Majesty became vested in it by the clearest of titles, if the right of conquest alone was not sufficient, but even upon the footing of the proceedings in France and the judicial acts of the Sovereign Tribunals of that country, the estates in this Province would naturally fall to His Majesty and be subjected to his unlimited disposal, for, by those decisions, it was established, upon good, legal and constitutional grounds, that from the nature of the first establishment, or admission, of the society into France, being conditional, temporary and probational, they would, at all times, be liable to expulsion, and having never complied with, but rejected the terms of their admission, they were not even entitled to the name of a society; wherefore, and by reason of the abuses and destructive principles of their institution they were stripped of their property and possessions."

However, although the legal title was in His Majesty, as representing the Crown of Great Britain, according to this opinion, the Jesuits certainly had no reason to complain of

harsh treatment, for they were allowed to remain in possession of their estates until 1800, when the last survivor of the Order in Canada died. It was not until after that, the Crown took possession of the property, and when they did take possession of the property, the Crown did not confiscate it for any purpose of their own, but, as far as they could, having the legal title, executed the equitable trusts attached to the title; and after much negotiation and a good deal of dispute, conveyed the title to the Province of Quebec, in trust for educational purposes. In that position the property remained until the passage of the Act we are now discussing. Now, I have rather gone out of the way in referring to the legal title of these estates, because in his correspondence Mr. Mercier expressly admits that the Jesuits have no legal title, that their claim was only a moral one; but I have referred to the legal question and to the action of the Government to show upon what very flimsy foundation even this moral claim rests. I contend there was no claim moral, legal, or equitable, on the part of the Jesuits; I contend that the property had absolutely passed into the possession of the Crown and that the Crown had the power to deal with it as they chose, an dthe disposition made of the property was one eminently consistent with the objects for which the property had been given to the society. Instead of making the property a present to Lord Amherst, as they had been pressed to do, they handed it over to the Province of Quebec for educational purposes, and thus, as far as possible, carried out the trusts which were attached to the title in this property. Having done so, the Crown parted with the interest they had in it, and the property became that of the Province, but only upon trust for educational purposes. That trust the Province accepted in 1831 by its own legislation, and I contend that having taken that trust, the Province have now no right or power to dispose of the property in the way suggested. Now, among the first of the grounds upon which we claim this Act should be disallowed is the ground that it violates a fundamental principle of the Constitution by endowing a religious society. It matters not by what means that endowment is made or how the money is to be divided, the fact remains that, even after the disposition which has been suggested as likely to take place, a portion of this money, at any rate, goes direct to the Jesuits, and forms a practical, distinct, and direct endowment of a religious society. That, I contend, violates a fundamental principle of our constitution, established in this country for years, namely, that all denominations shall be equal before the law, and that there shall be no vestige of a state church in any part of the Dominion. That principle was laid down in unmistakable terms when the Clergy Reserves of Upper Canada were secularized. Not merely did the secularization of the reserves establish that principle, but the Act by which that secularization was accomplished laid down the principle as well. That Act recites the necessity of:

"Removing all semblance of connection between Church and State."

The Rectory Act of 1850 says:

"Whereas the recognition of legal authority among all religious denominations is an admitted principle of colonial legislation, and whereas, in the state and condition of this Province, to which such a principle is peculiarly applicable, it is desirable that the same should receive the sanction of direct legislative authority, recognising and declaring the same as a fundamental principle of our civil policy."

It may be contended that was not an Act binding upon the Dominion, but it was an Act to which Upper and Lower Canada united gave their assent, and those who sat in Parliament then, the predecessors of hon. gentlemen now sitting here, representing the same constituencies, gave their assent to the principle, by their votes upon the Clergy Reserve Bill, that all religious denominations should hereafter cease to be state-supported. Is it a proposition to be tolerated, that while the right to the Clergy Reserves was thus set aside for the sake of an abstract principle, this society should be allowed to stand in a totally different position, and that they should receive compensation for estates to which they have no title, while similar rights are to be denied the other bodies to which I have alluded? Is it to be tolerated that the grants made by George III to the people of the Protestant faith in the Province are to be set aside as contrary to a principle, and yet the grants made to the Jesuits by the King of France are to be held sacred so as to allow compensation to be made to them? I do not think the people of this country will agree to that contention; but that is practically the conclusion to which we are asked to come in regard to this Bill. Another strong point in relation to this Bill is a matter peculiarly affecting the Province of Quebec. I have said that these lands were given to Canada in trust for educational purposes. That trust was accepted and recognised in 1831. The grant was accepted and confirmed by the Legislature at that time, and it was re-affirmed by the United Parliament of Canada in 1856, and again at a later period. The fund was specially set apart for superior education, and the reference which is made to that in the British North America Act clearly establishes that the Province of Ontario has an interest in that fund, and therefore that Province has something to say in regard to the disposition of it, because it is the same estate which is dealt with, and that estate has never been parted with, but has been kept as a separate trust for special purposes; and, by the British North America Act, that trust is accepted and is made a part of the Dominion. The Province of Ontario has a direct interest in that fund, and, therefore, that trust is not one which the Province of Quebec has a right to deal with in any way whatever. It is a direct breach of trust, and a breach of a contract which was entered into by themselves, and was broken without any reason being adduced, any proposition being made, or any ground being shown. On that ground it is claimed that the power of disallowance should be exercised on behalf of the minority, because this grant of $400,000 is taken directly from the funds of the Province to which all contribute alike; and to say that $60,000 is voted as a sort of compromise, or as a bribe to the Educational Board of the Protestants of the Province, does not affect it. They are bribed with their own money to agree to a grant to a religious institution, and, if it is a compromise, it is a compromise of truth and a compromise of principle. One other ground of objection, and a very strong ground of objection, arises from the terms of the Act, in which the leave of His Holiness the Pope of Rome is asked to dispose of the estate which the Province had no right to dispose of. Can they think they could better their right to dispose of that estate by asking the consent of the Pope? Can they imagine, when they have no right to dispose of it, that they can supply the defect in their title by asking the Pope of Rome to make it good? Mr. Mercier says, in his correspondence:

"Under these circumstances, I deem it my duty to ask Your Eminence if you see any serious objection to the Government's selling the property, pending a final settlement of the question of the Jesuits' Estates."

I must say that is a very remarkable sentence to be found coming from the representative of a Government in a British Legislature—

"The Government would look on the proceeds of the sale as a special deposit to be disposed of hereafter, in accordance with the agreements to be entered into between the parties interested, with the sanction of the Holy See."

And this is a sentence which shows that Mr. Mercier was so affected by the atmosphere of Rome, where he was at that time, as absolutely to have lost his head—

"As it will perhaps be necessary upon this matter to consult the Legislature of our Province, which is to be convened very shortly, I respectfully solicit an immediate reply."

It was perhaps necessary to consult the Provincial Legislature, but it was absolutely necessary to consult the Pope of Rome; and this is the answer which is made:

"The Pope allows the Government to retain the proceeds of the sale of the Jesuit Estates as a special deposit to be disposed of hereafter with the sanction of the Holy See."

It is contended, and very likely it will be contended in this House, that the grant of free religious liberty to the Roman Catholics of Quebec at the time of the Conquest carried with it the right of appeal to the Pope, that this is incidental to the right which was granted to them. I say that is untenable, and the British Government took very good care that no such ideas should enter into the minds of the people; because they took such good care to avoid that, that when the Quebec Act was passed in 1791, they made a distinct provision in regard to it. That Act is the charter of the religious as well as the civil liberties of the Roman Catholics of Quebec, and there we find the following words:—

"It is declared that His Majesty's subjects professing the religion of the Church of Rome, of and in the said Province of Quebec, may have, hold and enjoy the free exercise of the religion of the Church of Rome, subject to the King's supremacy declared and established by an Act made in the first year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, over all the dominion and countries which then did or thereafter should belong to the Imperial Crown of this Realm."

It is mere child's play to pretend, in the face of this Act under which the religious liberties of these people are granted, which would not otherwise have existed, this Act which set aside in their favor a great part of the Statute law of England, that they have any right to appeal to the Pope or to pretend that the Queen's supremacy does not exist, or that they have any privilege or any right in this country which is not controlled by the Act of Supremacy. In order still further to render it impossible that these people should entertain any idea that they were not subject to the control of England in regard to these matters, and to prevent any idea that they could appeal to the Pope of Rome in the past, or that they might take any such position at any time, I will quote the instructions given to Governor Murray in 1762, when he received the following admonition:—

"You are not to admit of any ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the See of Rome, or of any other foreign ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the Province under your jurisdiction."

And again, in 1775, Governor Carleton is reminded:

"That all appeals to or correspondence with any foreign ecclesiastical jurisdiction of what nature or kind soever, be absolutely forbidden under very severe penalties."

There can, therefore, be no doubt that the Act of Supremacy was in force, and that the rights and privileges guaranteed were controlled by the Act, and that for some years they were so controlled; because, if I am not mistaken, no appointments were made by the Pope for many years subsequent to the Conquest. Of course, as time went on, the restrictions were relaxed and many things were allowed to be done which were contrary to the Act of Supremacy, but it is quite evident that that was toleration and not a grant. It is quite evident, I think, from these facts, that it cannot be consonant with the religious liberty guaranteed by the Quebec Act, to allow an appeal to the Pope, or to recognise his jurisdiction as being of any authority in the affairs of the Provinces. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is a contention which hardly needs to be made in this House, it is a contention which need hardly more than be stated, that to pass an Act of Parliament by the Lieutenant Governor, the Assembly and the Legislative Council of a Province, and so expressed that the validity of that Act shall be dependent upon any foreign jurisdiction whatever—I say it is almost childish to contend that such an Act can be constitutional. I have heard it said that this correspondence forms no part of the Act. Well, if it is not intended to form part of the Act, what is it put there for? A clause of the Act expressly makes it a part of the Act; it would be a mere legal quibble to contend that it is no part of the Act, because without it the Act would be meaningless and would have no force at all. The agreement set forth in the correspondence is the very essence of the Act. It may be contended as a legal proposition that it is not part of the Act, but that is a proposition which will never commend itself to the common sense of the people at large. I say it is hardly worth while to argue that no Province, no Assembly, no Parliament under the British Crown, much less a Provincial Parliament, which has only a delegated power, can make an Act which is valid by the assent of any other power; because the affirmative implies also the negative, and if assent is necessary to make an Act valid, clearly inaction on the part of the referee would condemn the Act. The Act is made absolutely dependent upon the will of a foreign power. It matters not whether it is Pope or President, Kaiser or King, it does not matter who the authority is, it cannot be constitutional for the Parliament of this country to pass an Act which depends for its validity upon any foreign jurisdiction whatever. I have heard it contended that it would be a precisely analogous case were the Province of Ontario to make a grant to the Synod of the Diocese of Toronto, and that the distribution of the grant was made subject to the control of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Well, I think that such an Act would be absolutely invalid for the same reason, because the Provincial Legislature has no right to delegate its power to a foreign power, or to do anything that would diminish its own power, or the power of the Crown. But, moreover, there is no analogy between the two cases, because the Archbishop of Canterbury would still be a subject of the British Crown, whereas, in other cases, the foreign power is not so. But I do not think that the analogy is needed, because it cannot be contended that an Act is constitutional which depends for its validity upon the exercise of any foreign jurisdiction. But I will leave the constitutional question to be argued by the lawyers, if they think it worth while to spend their time in doing so; but I am very sure of this, that whatever the lawyers may say, the people of this country will be satisfied with the proposition that it is unconstitutional, and that it ought to be unconstitutional, for any Parliament in this country to pass an Act whose validity is made to depend upon the affirmation or the negation of any foreign jurisdiction, no matter what that jurisdiction may be. Now, Sir, in the resolution which I have read, we take another ground as one upon which this Act should be disallowed. We say it should be disallowed, because we contend that the endowment of the Society of Jesus, an alien, secret and politico-religious body, is fraught with danger to the civil and religious liberties of the people of Canada. Why do we say that? Because we find from the history of that society during the last 300 years, that wherever its operations have been known they have in various ways interfered with the functions of civil government, they have interfered with the independence of other religious bodies, and they have taught a system of morality which cannot be inculcated generally without destroying, not only the independence, but also the morality of the people. It may be said, perhaps it will be said, that all these are idle tales. It may be said that the principles and practices of this society are so altered, in conformity with modern usages and modern views, that the ideas which formerly prevailed, no longer have existence. But, unfortunately, there are too many modern writings, too many modern records, which contradict that view of the case, and make it impossible for us to believe that this society has so altered its principles, so departed from its previous practices, that it can now be recognised as a society which can be established and encouraged in this Dominion, or in any other country inhabited by Her

Majesty's subjects. The weapons used by this society may possibly have changed. There may be the same difference between what the society was at the time of the Conquest, at the time when it was in its very worst position, at the time when the English Government were called upon to deal with it, and when the European Governments of Catholic countries, and also the Roman Catholic Church itself, were obliged to suppress it—I say, there is the same difference between the society in those days and the society as it manifests itself to-day, that there is between the muskets used by Wolfe on the Plains of Abraham and the rifles that were used by General Wolseley in Egypt; the weapons may be different, but the power behind them remains the same. If we may contrast the documents that we find in our library, if we may read the statements published within the last fifteen or twenty years, we find the same doctrines inculcated, we find there is no change such as would justify us in giving our assent to the establishment of this order in our country. Sir, a Jesuit is a being abnormal in his conditions; he has no family ties, no home nor country. He is subject absolutely to the will of his superior. I say that such a system, that such an order, being subject to an irresponsible power, must be dangerous, as it always has been dangerous, to every community in which it has existed. I admit there have been in this society men of high attainments, men of high moral worth, but that does not render the society less dangerous. It has not rendered it less dangerous in the past, that wherever that there was work to be done, whether the work was good or bad, there were always the right men to do it. It is because we know from their own writings, from their practice, from their history in times past, that such is the case, that we say that in this free country it is not desirable to allow the existence of a society which inculcates principles more or less repugnant, not only to our civilisation, but to every principle that unites communities in every condition of life. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, and for many others which might be adduced in respect to the constitutionality of the Act, we say it should be repealed; we say the Government should exercise with discretion this power of disallowance, but that it should disallow this Act; we say that the majority of the people of the Dominion desire that this should be done. I know that the vote on my resolution this evening, or to-night, or to-morrow, or whenever it may be taken, will imply a very strong contradiction to this statement; but, nevertheless, I am quite willing that the decision of this question should go from the jury of this House to the jury of the people, and I venture to say that the time has come judging not only by the passage of this Act, which is but one among a number of incidents, but by other events, when we have a right to say to hon. gentlemen in this House and to the people of this country, just as we said to our American cousins with respect to commercial affairs: "Canada is not for sale." So we say to them here, and we will say it elsewhere: "This Dominion must remain British and nothing else, and no power or authority, no jurisdiction, foreign, civil, religious or otherwise, shall be allowed to exercise power which will interfere with its affairs." Mr. Speaker, the resolution is in itself, I think, so comprehensive that it is not necessary I should further occupy the time of the House in enlarging upon it. As I said at the beginning, it is so clear and comprehensive that the country will understand what it means, and members of this House will understand what they are voting for; and such being the case, not desiring to prolong the discussion, not desiring to say one word more than is absolutely necessary to sustain the position I take in reference to this question, I beg to place this motion, Mr. Speaker, in your hands.

Mr. RYKERT. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if the predictions of the hon. gentleman are correct as regards the feelings of the country upon this question, then it is absolutely useless for me to say one word to this House. I entirely dissent from the proposition, or from the assertion of the hon. gentleman, that the great majority of the people of this country are in favor of the disallowance of this Act in question, and I unhesitatingly assert that the majority of the people of this Dominion are not in favor of its disallowance. The hon. gentleman has taken that ground; I cannot tell from what source he gets his information, except from the public press, but I venture to say that if the Province of Ontario were canvassed to-day, without prejudice, without religious bigotry, the people fully understanding the question, the vast majority of the people would dissent from the proposition of the hon. gentleman. We are told outside of this House, and inside of this House, that certain religious bodies and certain bodies in this country are in favor of disallowance. We are threatened, Sir, by the public papers and the public organs throughout this country with decapitation, and with being driven from Parliament if we dare, upon the floor of Parliament, to assert our right to declare that this Act is constitutional. I am told, Sir, and the public press repeats it day after day, that no Orangeman dare stand upon the floor of Parliament and speak in favor of allowing this Bill to go into operation. I, Sir, am an Orangeman, and I will dare so to speak. I speak as an Orangeman and I say: that I fulfil all the tenets of my order, and that I am just and right in supporting the Government in the course it has taken. I speak upon this question because we are told and threatened by papers that if we favor allowance we will be exterminated from the order. Sir, it is one of the first principles of the Orange Order that there should be civil and religious liberty for all. Allow me to quote one portion of the constitution of that order, and, when I do so, I do not think that any person will say that I am not justified in taking the stand I am taking here to-day. It says:

"Disclaiming an intolerant spirit, the Association demands as an indispensable qualification, without which the greatest and the wealthiest may seek admission in vain, that the candidate shall be deemed incapable of persecuting or injuring anyone on account of his religious speeches; the duty of every Orangeman being to aid and defend all loyal subjects of every religious persuasion in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights."

I say, Sir, that I fulfil the precepts of the order, in standing up to defend the action of the Government in refusing to disallow this Bill. I would be sorry to incur the hostility of a large portion of the people of the Province, as my hon. friend (Mr. O'Brien) says, but, Sir, I have upon another occasion had an opportunity of facing public opinion on a similar question, and I am prepared to go back to my constituents on this issue, and when I put the question fairly before them, and when they fully understand it, I have no doubt they will say I was right in supporting the Government, and that the Government was right in pursuing the course it did. I am not prepared to join this crusade, or this unholy alliance against my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen; I am not prepared, Sir, as one professing strong Protestant views and professing the principles of the Protestant religion, to join in this crusade, and, as I said before, this unholy alliance against my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen. Day after day we see the press endeavoring to inflame the public mind on this question; we see them day after day trying to stir up religious animosity and strife in every portion of this community, but that unfortunate spirit I am glad to say, has not yet reached the Orange Order. It has reached the public through a certain class of ministers in this country, who seem determined, at whatever cost, to drive Pope and Popery from this country. That seems to be the groundwork of the whole opposition of this class to which I refer, and I think I will be able to show, before I sit down, that that is their whole aim. I am familiar with the history of the past in this country, I am familiar with what took place

prior to Confederation, when, Sir, in the old Parliament of Canada the great fight was against Lower Canadian domination. What was the cry then? It was: "We are trampled upon by our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen." Fortunately for this country, our people united at the time of Confederation, they threw aside their religious differences and joined together for the common good of their common country. Is it to be said that after twenty-one years of our existence, one section of the people of this country is to be found fighting against a large body of their Roman Catholic fellow-citizens and urging us to throw a stumbling block in the way of the progress of the Confederation. We must remember that in this country we have made great national progress by joining together and throwing aside those religious cries. We have done all that we could do to perpetuate a good feeling upon this continent, and I am happy to say, Sir, that the united action of Catholics and Protestants of Canada has led us to-day to a prosperous and progressing condition. I would like to know if we ought to accept the advice of my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and send the firebrands throughout this country to array one religion against another. What must be the inevitable result of that? The result will be that it will drive every Protestant member of Parliament from the Province of Quebec, and I would not blame the Roman Catholics for that; I think they would be justified in doing so, if the Protestants of Ontario would adopt the same course in that Province and drive out every Roman Catholic member. But I believe that any person who takes a fair view of the question will not say that it is a right course to pursue I say, Sir, that this agitation is an attempt upon the part of a certain portion of the Protestants of Ontario, not to stand by the minority in Lower Canada, but over the heads of the Jesuits to attack the Roman Catholic faith. I am not here to-day to defend the Jesuits, nor am I here to speak of their past history, but I may be permitted, before I sit down, to quote one or two observations in connection with their past history from competent authorities, in opposition to what my hon. friend says. I did hope that upon the discussion of this question nothing of the history of the past would be imported, but that we might be allowed to consider it on its merits, as to whether the Government were right or wrong in refusing to disallow this Bill. The people of the Province of Ontario have been inflamed and fired, as I said before, by enthusiasts and fanatics upon this question. I will take the ground in opposition to them, and I think I will be able to show to the House and to the people of this country the position which those I have referred to occupy on this question. The first paper which seems to have taken up the crusade is the *Mail*. It was said a few days ago that the *Globe* had made a wonderful somersault, but I venture to assert that the *Mail* took a greater somersault on this question than the *Globe*. The *Mail* has occupied several different positions in the matter, and we find that in the wind-up it calls on the people of this country to "prevent the encroachment of the French into the Province of Ontario." Some time ago the *Mail* said, referring to the Provincial Legislature on the Jesuit question:

"They have exceeded their powers."

And it goes on to say:

"We are ready, however, to argue the question on the narrower ground and to maintain that in endowing religious propagandism out of the public taxes, the Legislature of Quebec has exceeded its powers."

Mark you, Sir, the *Mail* says that "the Legislature has exceeded its powers;" and what are we to do then, are we to disallow this Bill? No; you must not disallow it, but you must go to the courts to seek for a remedy. The *Mail* further says:

"Acts done in excess of legal powers do not call for the use of a veto; they are void, and will be declared void by the courts of law. A veto is a political, not a judicial power, and is given as a political safeguard. It is given to the national Government of Canada to guard the nation against action, on the part of any of its members, injurious to its interest as a whole, to its honor, or to its unity."

In this extract this paper takes the ground that the Act is *ultra vires*, that it is beyond the power of the Local Legislature, and as such it should be fought in the courts. Then the *Mail* takes another stand, and on the 22nd of March it says:

"A French Canadian contemporary says: 'The *Mail* rests its whole case against the Jesuits upon the alleged unconstitutionality of the Estates Act.' This is a mistake. The strongest objection to both Acts is that they are contrary to the public interest The prerogative of disallowance is frequently exercised on this high ground against measures that are perfectly constitutional and *intra vires* of the Provincial Legislatures."

Sir, if that be the case I will be prepared to show that it is not in accord with the views taken by those celebrated law journals of the Province of Ontario, which took altogether another ground, and which ground has convinced the *Globe* newspaper that it was wrong in pronouncing in favor of the allowance of the Act. You will see from this that the *Mail* commences by declaring the Act *ultra vires* and unconstitutional, and, in the end, that it demands the disallowance of the Bill upon the ground that it is against public policy. It is hard to tell upon what ground that paper chooses to take its stand upon this question. Day after day we have been favored with the history of the Jesuits and their rascalities and misdeeds in days gone by, of which my hon. friend speaks so feelingly; and the *Mail* newspaper usually winds up by calling on the Protestants of Ontario to put an end to the encroachment of Popery in this country. On the 14th of March, we find this language, which I commend to my friends from Lower Canada:

"If the British and Protestant element in Quebec will not save itself, we must try to save it for our own sakes. That the abandonment of Quebec to the Ultramontane and the Jesuit will be the death of Canadian nationality is clear enough. But Ontario will not be safe. Our eastern gate has already been opened by the perfidious hand of the vote-hunting politician, and French and Roman Catholic invasion is streaming through. The French priest, it is true, cannot formally import into Ontario his Church establishment and his system of tithes. But this matters little if he can thrust out the British population and plant in its room a population which will be under his sway, and from which he can wring practically any payments which he thinks fit. The assessor, moreover, will be his creature, and he will be able to distribute the burden of local taxation between the faithful and the heretic pretty much at his pleasure. He will, to all intents and purposes, detach eastern Ontario from the British and Protestant civilisation, of which it now forms a part, and annex it to the territory of the French race, which is also the dominion of the priest. No distortion of facts by sophistical rhetoric, no hypocritical protests against race feeling, will hide from us either the gravity or the imminence of this result."

After its long labor of the last three or four months in portraying the history and misdeeds of the Jesuits, this paper holds this question up as a sort of bugbear to frighten the people of Ontario into opposition to the Government, and finally winds up by coming out in its true colors and saying that they must prevent the encroachment of the Roman Catholic Church and the French Canadians in Ontario. Now, we find that for a long time the late organ of some hon. gentlemen opposite was very strong on this question. It discussed it from all points of view, both on its merits and on its constitutional aspects, and on several occasions it has taken a very strong stand in favor of the Bill being allowed, and in support of the contention of the present Government. But while this strain runs through all the editorials, you will find in them a strong feeling against the Dominion Government, and a desire to excite against that Government not only the Protestants of Ontario, but the Orangemen as a body. With that object in view it calls attention to the fact that on the 12th of July, which is a famous day in the history of Orangemen, the Tory Lieut. Governor of Quebec allowed the Jesuit Bill. That was done to inflame Orange feeling against this Government. It went on to say:

"These citations clearly show that the Liberals, if they were in office at Ottawa now, could not disallow the Jesuits' Estates Act without enormous inconsistency. With equal clearness these citations show that the Conservatives are not only free to disallow the Act, but are bound in consistency to disallow it if they believe it to be wrong in principle and unjust to the Protestant minority."

Then, on the 4th of March, it pointed out the danger that this country was running into, and that the result must be the breaking up of Confederation. It says:

"Again we ask, Should the Bill be allowed or disallowed? A Protestant of a practical turn of mind may well answer: 'I can't tell—it's six of one and half-a-dozen of the other.' The truth is that the people of Ontario are at the cross-roads where they must decide either to continue with or separate from a Quebec that is ever becoming more thoroughly Roman Catholic. If Ontarians wish to perpetuate the Confederation they will quietly accept Sir John's allowance of the Jesuits' Bill. If they can't stomach that allowance they may as well face the truth like honest men and acknowledge that they really do not think the Confederation worth preserving. The course of the *Globe* has been, and will be, perfectly straightforward. We do not mean to blame Sir John Macdonald——"

Do you believe that? I do not, for one.—

"We do not mean to blame Sir John Macdonald if he stands by his disallowance theories and vetoes the Bill. We will not in any way aid any persons who may endeavor to excite race and creed passions over the affair. If the people of Ontario hold great meetings to press for disallowance, and if they otherwise signify that they are sincerely desirous to enter upon a serious struggle with Quebec, we will advise them that the end can be nothing else than the destruction of the Confederation, and that it would be incomparably better for all concerned that the Federal compact should be quietly dissolved now than dissolved after and in consequence of a long, bitter conflict that would be, at best, a savage verbal struggle, and at worst one marked by riot, bloodshed and civil war."

These were the predictions of the late organ of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, and, if the consequences were to be such as the *Globe* newspaper predicted, one would suppose that the Government of the country were justified in allowing that Bill. But, Sir, on the 16th of March, a day, I suppose, ever memorable in Room No. 6 in this House, we find that the *Globe* newspaper made the somersault, and I venture to assert that no public paper in this country ever made such a somersault. We have also the opinions of other papers. I will only read a few, and I do this, not with the view alone of being heard in this House, but I have to answer to my constituents, and I want to place my case before them should I ever ask them for their suffrages again. The London *Advertiser* of March 14, says:

"From the quotation given by Dr. Grant from Mr. Mercier's speech in moving the Quebec Legislature into Committee on the resolutions, it is clear that the purpose was not to acknowledge any authority in the Pope in the legislative affairs of the Province, but to secure finality in a dispute long pending."

The Hamilton *Times* of October 19, after waking up to the sudden conversion of the *Globe*, deals with the question from the constitutional point of view, and I commend its language to my hon. friend from Muskoka:

"By some it is claimed that the mention of the Pope's name as a party to the Bill renders it unconstitutional. We cannot decide so intricate a question as that, though it appears to us that the Pope stands in the same relation that contractor Onderdonk or any other foreigner would occupy with respect to the payment of public funds. So far as our light goes we should oppose the disallowance of the Bill, though we reserve the right to hear and consider evidence on the point that the Bill is unconstitutional. The idea that Ontario and the rest of the Dominion will have to supply the money to pay the Jesuits should not have weight in the discussion."

I may quote from another organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, the Belleville *Ontario*, of the 19th of March, which gives the *Globe* a certificate of character:

"The vacillating policy of the Toronto *Globe* of late years on almost every public question is without precedent in Canadian journalism. Its latest somersault on the Jesuit Bill is enough to restore the founder of this ever-powerful paper to life again. The *Globe's* flop over has caused a feeling among the Liberals at Ottawa little short of disgust for the men who at present are responsible for its policy, if such it can be called."

Now, Sir, I propose briefly to show—and this is a point my hon. friend has avoided—the feeling in the Province of Quebec on this important question; because, while I appreciate the effort of my hon. friend to defend the rights of the people of Ontario, I think also he might have had something to say with regard to the opinion of the minority in the Province of Quebec. We heard nothing from the hon. gentleman concerning the Bill of 1887. He steadily avoided that question, and confined his argument wholly to the Bill now under consideration. We are here to-day for the purpose of considering whether or not this Bill should be allowed or disallowed; but behind that question is another one. Should the Bill of 1887, incorporating this society, have been allowed or disallowed? The hon. gentleman said nothing about that. No one has spoken about it in Parliament or out of Parliament. It was allowed to pass, and thus we recognised, in not disallowing that measure, the right of the Province of Quebec to incorporate the Jesuits. Having done so, the question arises, is it just and right to go further, and supplement that measure by giving money to this order? What is the opinion of the people of the Province of Quebec on that subject? I can appeal to the leader of the Third party for his views. I find throughout the whole of this controversy on this question, that the newspaper controlled by my hon. friend (Mr. Mitchell), supported the Mercier Government. Although he pointed out that such an Act was inexpedient, he always took the ground that the Bill was a fair one in the interests of the country.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is good authority.

Mr. RYKERT. Very good, but I want to give a better one.

Mr. MITCHELL. Question.

Mr. RYKERT. I will give the authority of the Montreal *Gazette*, which I look upon as a good authority, expressing the opinion of the English-speaking people of the Province of Quebec very fairly. The *Gazette* has had several editorials on the question, from one of which I propose to quote a few observations, in order to satisfy, at any rate, the people of the Province of Ontario, that while they are so exercised about the rights of the minority in Quebec, the minority in that Province, which is well able to take care of itself, has taken no exception to the legislation passed:

"Excepting the Huntingdon *Gleaner*, we are not aware that any newspaper in this or any other Province of the Dominion interested itself in the matter. The Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction silently acquiesced on securing its sixty thousand dollars. There was a slight ruffle as to how to apply the money, but that was all. The Protestant members of the Legislature did not take the trouble to divide the House upon it; the leading spirits of Mr. Mercier's Protestant following thought it a very reasonable measure, and not one word of dissent was heard from anybody, clerical or otherwise. The Bill in its various stages appeared in the telegraphic summaries of the newspapers of the Dominion, with no more emphasis than any bill to incorporate a trading company."

So that you see while this matter was being discussed in the Quebec Legislature, and while the people were made aware of what was going on from day to day, and the minority of Quebec had every opportunity of expressing their dissent and making known their opposition, if there was anything wrong in the Bill, no exception was taken by them either on constitutional grounds or on grounds of public policy. The *Gazette* goes on further to say that:

"They felt that the true claimant for this property was the Roman Catholic Church in general, and that church was represented by its ecclesiastical head, and not by a recently incorporated body of ecclesiastics governed by a foreign general, no matter how estimable they might be."

I commend this to the attention of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien):

"Now, in the face of these threats of extra provincial intervention, Roman Catholics, no matter what they think, must, in self-respect, close their ranks."

That is the opinion of a Protestant paper in the Province of Quebec.—

"If there be one principle clear in a Parliamentary Government, it is the right of the representatives of the people to dispose of the money of the people. It is one of these self-evident principles which, if men's minds were not heated by religious and political passion, no one would dream of disputing."

But there is another authority which I will cite, because I find that persons belonging to the same church are trying to foment discord and religious disturbance in Ontario on this question. I will cite the opinion of the Rev. Dr. Campbell, of the city of Montreal, Presbyterian clergyman, who discussed the question in all its merits. In a letter published some time ago he says:

"That is reason sufficient why we in Canada, Protestants and Roman Catholics alike, should be very slow to afford them any encouragement in our country. But we failed—we who should have vigorously protested against their establishment and endowment—to make our voices heard at the moment when our views might have influenced the situation. The Protestant representatives in the House of Assembly did not oppose the two measures as stoutly as they ought to have done, and the people failed to petition the Legislature against the Bills. Not having availed themselves of their constitutional rights while the measures were under discussion, they virtually put themselves out of court. It is not fair either to the local authorities or to those at Ottawa for us now to make an outcry. Mr. Mercier was justified in concluding, while the Bills were before the Assembly, that there was no very strong sentiment against them in the Province, or else the Legislature would have been flooded with petitions against them, as it always is when there are proposals before it directly affecting the people's pockets. Nor have we any right to feel greatly disappointed that the Federal authorities did not put themselves in an embarrassing position to shield us from the consequences of our own neglect of our interests, when they could urge a constitutional plea to rid themselves of responsibility in the matter."

That is the opinion of a gentleman whose opinion is worth having, and who addressed a letter some time ago to the Montreal *Witness* in which he expresses those views. But let us look at what was done in the Legislature. We find that in the Legislature, when the matter was under discussion, different members spoke upon the question. We find that Hon. Mr. Lynch, a Protestant member, spoke, and I have taken this extract from the paper to show that he who represented the interests of Protestants was fully alive to the importance of the question under discussion and expressed his opinion at the time:

"Notwithstanding what may be thought in some quarters, there is nothing in the Bill alarming in its character. We are living in an age where wisdom prevails, living in an age in which freedom is supposed to exist the world over, and nowhere in the dominions of Her Majesty does liberty prevail more than in the Province of Quebec. * * Is it possible that the intelligent public opinion of the Province of Quebec should deny those Jesuit Fathers the civil rights we have granted to every one else?"

Then we have the opinion of several gentlemen in the Upper House. Among them, Mr. Starnes, who said:

"I approve of the Bill as it is, for that question should have been settled long ago. Protestants and Catholics ought to be satisfied with the manner in which the question is now settled."

The Hon. David Ross also said:

"Some newspapers have shown me up as the friend of the Jesuits and as a bad Protestant, because I lent my assistance to the settlement of this question. I will answer it by saying that I am neither a friend nor an enemy of the Jesuits. We had to deal with a question of justice, and I gave it my support. The Protestants themselves entertain the belief that the Jesuits deserve some compensation for the estates taken away from them. Moreover, the Protestants whom I represent in the Cabinet, are well satisfied with the settlement of this question, as you have heard the hon councillor for Wellington express it, and with the indemnity which falls to their lot."

So that you will see Protestant public opinion to day in Quebec is strongly in favor of the Bill and the settlement made, and against disallowance. I am glad to see also that while the Orange body has seen fit to pass resolutions as a body in favor of disallowance, there are some Lodges in the Province which have had the courage of their convictions, which have stated the question broadly and have not seen fit to endorse the action of the Grand Lodge. I find at a meeting of L.O.L 152, Dorchester township, a strong resolution was passed condemning the Quebec Government for passing the Jesuits' Estates Bill, and expressing the opinion that a number of the Orange lodges had acted unwisely in condemning the Dominion Government for not disallowing the measure, as they firmly believed that if an injustice had been done, redress would be better secured by the various Protestant denominations taking united action in pressing the claims of the Protestant body. The resolution goes on further to express the hope that that course will be followed, so that the legal opinion may be tested. As I said a few minutes ago, an effort has been made to fire the public mind in the Province of Ontario by calling on the people to form organisations with a view of putting down the Roman Catholic religion in that Province and also throughout this country. We find that Mr. Hughes has taken a very active part in this matter. I mention him because, day after day, his name is cited as an authority on the subject, and only last night I find it reported that he addressed a meeting in the Pavilion in Toronto upon this important question. But, after reciting, as my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has done, all the misdeeds of the Jesuits, he winds up by asking the people of this country to establish an organisation similar to one existing in Scotland, and proposes the following as the objects:—

"The objects of the Alliance are:—(*a*) The defence of our common Christianity; (*b*) the exposure of the errors of Popery and Infidelity; (*c*) the instruction of Roman Catholics in Bible truth; and (*d*) the maintenance and promotion of the great Scriptural principles of the Scottish Reformation.

"The membership of the Alliance is composed of persons of all the Protestant denominations, and various political opinions, who are thoroughly agreed that the Papacy is an enemy to national and social prosperity, and to personal freedom, and who are resolved to resist the aggressions in the Empire by every possible means."

So you will see that the sum and substance of the arguments of those people in the Province of Ontario is, first, to inflame the public mind by reciting historical reminiscences, and then to arouse a certain feeling in favor of the Protestant religion. I find, also, that the Rev. Mr. Ross says:

"The Church of Rome in the Province of Quebec is established and endowed in violation of the said principle. We hereby request the Dominion Government to take steps to secure the revision of the British North America Act, so as to lead to the disestablishment and disendowment of said church in said Province."

It is thus evident that nearly all these gentlemen run in the same direction. I am glad, however, to find that, conspicuous among many people in the Province of Ontario, are men of larger minds, men such as the Rev. Principal Grant, who has expressed himself on several occasions in regard to this matter, and has published a letter in the public press which I will do him the justice of quoting. He is as much interested in the welfare of Protestantism as anyone in the Province of Ontario, and he has seen fit to discuss this question on its merits and to publish his views in the press. He says:

"If the matter was to be settled at all, and before giving an opinion on that point, let us remember that the great majority of the people of Quebec are Roman Catholics. I do not see what else Mr. Mercier could have done than require the sanction of the Pope to the bargain. It may seem astonishing to Protestants that Roman Catholics should acknowledge a man living in Rome as the head of their church. But they do. Protestants must accept that fact in the same spirit in which all facts should be accepted."

So it is clear that he has not the same dread of the Pope exercising his clerical powers, as far as this Act is concerned, as some gentlemen have. He goes on:

"The grant of money to the Jesuits. But the money was not awarded, and has not been given to the Jesuits. It has been given to the Roman Catholic Church Doubtless the Jesuits will get some of it. Mr. Mercier, in his speech, quotes a letter, dated 11th October, 1884, from the Secretary of the Propaganda to the General of the Jesuits, promising on the part of the Pope that when the matter was settled they would get a share, the proportion to be subsequently determined."

The House will thus see that there are persons who regard this question from a different standpoint; as also, in this city of Ottawa, the Rev. Mr. Herridge, speaking on the question, stated that it was purely a question of money, and

that he could see no reason why there should be any interference on the part of the Government with a Bill which was not, in his opinion, detrimental to the interests of the country or to the policy of the country. The fact is that the people are not thoroughly informed on this question, and in the papers from day to day the historical references are not correct. In fact, they are just as incorrect as some of those which my hon. friend (Mr. O'Brien) made to-day, as I shall point out later. The Ministerial Association in Toronto is composed of a number of men of all denominations, and they could not find out whether the Jesuit Order had ever been suppressed in this country or not, and, after searching for a week, they could not come to a conclusion. And yet these are the men who pretend to guide public opinion. I deny their right to do so, or I say, at all events, that, before they do so, they should first inform themselves as to the facts. Then I find that a resolution was moved by Dr. McVicar and seconded by Dr. Campbell, and what is asked by that resolution is to have a certified copy of the Bill sent to the Queen, and then they say she will disallow it. Why, they do not seem to understand the constitution of this country, when they think that an Act of the Province of Quebec can be sent to the Queen for disallowance, whereas it is only the Acts of this Parliament which are subject to disallowance by the Queen. They are in absolute ignorance of the provisions of the British North America Act. Now, I do not intend to defend the Jesuits, but I am going to quote a few authorities to show that, in this country, at all events, they are not as bad as my hon. friend (Mr. O'Brien) makes them out to be. In his speech, he said he did not propose to discuss the course of the Jesuits in this country, but only to refer to their misdeeds in the past. I will quote from one or two articles on that subject, because it is just as well to understand what Protestants think in regard to the Jesuits. As I said, I do not pretend to make any elaborate argument on the subject, or to defend the Jesuits or their acts, but I find that public men in this country, persons who have written on this question here and in England, are of one accord that the Jesuits of to-day are not the Jesuits of 100 years ago. That is where my hon. friend goes astray. He refers to their intriguing in Europe, and to their determination to upset every State in Europe, and to various acts of theirs which will not commend themselves to anyone; but he should have also referred to those authorities who took an entirely different view of the subject. In Parkman's work I find this testimony given to the Jesuits:

"The lives of these early Canadian Jesuits attest the earnestness of their faith and the intensity of their zeal; but it was a zeal bridled, curbed, and ruled by a guiding hand. Their marvellous training in equal measure kindled enthusiasm and controlled it, roused into action a mighty power, and made it as subservient as those great material forces which modern science has learned to awaken and to govern. They were drilled to a factitious humility, prone to find utterance in expressions of self-depreciation and self-scorn, which one may often judge unwisely when he condemns them as insincere. They were devoted believers, not only in the fundamental dogmas of Rome, but in those lesser matters of faith which heresy despises as idle and puerile superstitions. One great aim engrossed their lives. For the greater glory of God they would act or wait, dare, suffer or die, yet all in unquestioning subjection to the authority of the Superiors, in whom they recognised the agents of divine authority itself."

Then I find that Macaulay—and I do not suppose many in this House will question his authority—in his "History of England," spoke of these men as follows:—

"No religious community could produce a list of men so variously distinguished; none had extended its operations over so vast a space; yet in none had there been such perfect unity of feeling and action. There was no region of the globe, no walk of speculative or active life in which Jesuits were not to be found. They guided the councils of Kings. They deciphered Latin inscriptions. They observed the motions of Jupiter's satellites. They published whole libraries, controversy, casuistry, history, treatises on optics, alcaic odes, editions of the fathers, madrigals, catechisms and lampoons The liberal education of youth passed almost entirely into their hands, and was conducted by them with conspicuous ability. They appear to have discovered the precise point to which intellectual culture can be carried without the risk of intellectual emancipation. Enmity itself was compelled to own that, in the art of managing and forming the tender mind, they had no equals."

That seems to be entirely in opposition to the views which have been expressed by my hon. friend, and the various assertions as to their practices in the mother country. But we have an authority in this country which I think will also be received in this House. I refer not to the organ of the Third party, but to the Montreal *Gazette*, which, on the 25th June last, speaking of the Jesuits, and knowing well what they are in the Province of Quebec, says:

"There is probably no country in the world in which the Society of Jesus has enjoyed so fair a reputation and so large a share of goodwill from the people generally, without distinction of creed, as have fallen to their lot in Canada. Their piety, humanity and courage are associated with the most heroic and romantic periods in our annals. 'The story of their trials and triumphs on this continent, and especially within the limits of our own land, is one of the most interesting and instructive in the records of missionary labor.' If we except certain works and ambitions which marked some passages in their career, the members of the order in Canada have never forfeited that respect which is due to the faithful prosecution of noble aims."

So you see that we have testimony from the Province of Quebec that at least they have some friends in this country, and that they are not looked upon in the same light as they were in the mother country and on the continent. Now, Sir, one of the arguments of my hon. friend was that the Jesuits are hostile to the Roman Catholic Church. Well, I have read different sermons, that of Father Hand in Toronto and Father Whelan in Ottawa, and I find that they take the view that the Jesuits are in accord with the Church of Rome, as is evidenced by the telegram sent some time ago to Mr. Mercier. He read this telegram at Laprairie, on July 22, from Rome:

"You cannot be called a rebel against the Bishops of the Province of Quebec for having incorporated the Society of Jesus, when the Holy Father allowed its members to seek incorporation."

So you see that is evidence that they are entirely in accord with the Church of Rome, and are not in the same position as they were in 1773 when they were suppressed by the Pope. But there is another evidence which my hon. friend did not refer to. When they were restored in 1814 we find in the Pope's Bull that he does not refer to them in the same terms as my hon. friend. There we read:

"The Catholic world unanimously demands the restoration of the Society of Jesus. We daily receive the most earnest petitions to this effect from our venerable brethren the Archbishops and Bishops, and from other earnest persons."

This shows conclusively that they are in accord with the Roman Catholic Church, they are subservient to it, they are delegates of that Church in missionary works. Now, my hon. friend, in speaking of the Jesuits in England, has not told all that he might have told. It is true that by the Act of Supremacy, (1 Elizabeth) pains and penalties were placed upon them, but it might be a question whether that Act then applied to this country when it was not a portion of the British Empire. But that is set at rest by the Quebec Act of 1774. The next we hear of the Jesuits in England is the Act 10, George IV, to which my hon. friend did not refer. That Act was passed for the purpose of suppressing them gradually. I will presently show how they have been suppressed in England, and whether they are considered in England to be as obnoxious as my hon. friend represents. That Act is entitled an Act for the relief of His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, and was passed on the 13th of April, 1829 The statute says:

"Whereas by various Acts of Parliament certain restraints and disabilities are imposed on the Roman Catholic subjects of His Majesty, to which other subjects of His Majesty are not liable; and whereas it is expedient that such restraints and disabilities shall be from henceforth discontinued;

"And whereas Jesuits and members of other religious orders, communities, or societies of the Church of Rome, bound by monastic or religious vows, are resident within the United Kingdom, and it is expedient to make provision for the gradual suppression and final prohibition of the same therein; be it therefore enacted."

Now, mark you, Mr. Speaker, at that very time, long after the passage of the Quebec Act, we find an English Parliament declaring that it was wise to pass an Act for their gradual suppression. It goes on to say:

"That every Jesuit and every member of any other religious order, community, or society of the Church of Rome, bound by monastic or religious vows, who, at the time of the commencement of this Act, shall be within the United Kingdom, shall within six calendar months after the commencement of this Act, deliver to the Clerk of the Peace of the county or place where such person shall reside, or to his deputy, a notice or statement in the form, and containing the particulars required to be set forth in the schedule to this Act annexed;

"And be it further enacted: That if any Jesuit or member of any such religious order, community, or society as aforesaid, shall, after the commencement of this Act, come into this realm, he shall be deemed and taken to be guilty of misdemeanor, and, being there lawfully convicted, shall be sentenced and ordered to be banished from the United Kingdom for the term of his natural life.

"Provided always, and be it further enacted: That in case any natural-born subject of this realm, being at the time of the commencement of this Act, a Jesuit, or other member of such religious order, community, or society as aforesaid, shall, after the commencement of this Act, be out of the realm, it shall be lawful for such person to return or come into this realm; and upon such his return or coming into the realm he is hereby required, within the space of six calendar months after his first returning or coming into the United Kingdom, to deliver such notice or statement to the Clerk of the Peace of the county or place where he shall reside;

"Provided also, and be it further enacted: That, notwithstanding anything hereinbefore contained, it shall be lawful for any one of His Majesty's principal Secretaries of State, being a Protestant, by a license in writing, signed by him, to grant permission to any Jesuit, or member of any such religious order, community, or society, as aforesaid, to come into the United Kingdom and to remain therein for such period as the said Secretary of State shall think proper, not exceeding in any case the space of six calendar months."

Now, Sir, that Act was passed to show that there was a desire on the part of the English Government to suppress the Jesuits. At this very time there were hundreds of Jesuits in England, and surely the English Parliament is as desirous of protecting the great Protestant religion, surely the Archbishop of Canterbury and the other Bishops of the Church of England are as desirous as my hon. friend, to protect the Protestant religion; and if the Jesuits are as obnoxious as they were a hundred years ago, if their precepts and doctrines are as antagonistic to the best interests of the country as my hon. friend pretends, surely the English Government would say: We will put an end to them, and drive them out of the country. Now, Sir, what do we find? We find that a notorious gentleman who has figured in English parliamentary life, Mr. Whalley, in 1875, in the English House of Commons, brought up the question of suppression of the Jesuits. After they had been barely fifty years in the mother country, after a penal clause had been passed making it a crime for them to remain in the country more than six months, this gentleman declared, on the floor of Parliament, that the Jesuits had increased in number from 447 to 1,967. He called upon the English Parliament to drive them out of the country. And what did members say? They counted out the House, they laughed at him, and they left him there making a speech upon this question. Then, in order not to be outwitted, he placed a notice in the paper asking Mr. Disraeli, at that time at the head of the Government, what he intended to do? Mr. Disraeli said:

"There is no doubt that there are in this country members of the Society of Jesus, commonly called Jesuits, and there is also no doubt that their presence in this country is, under 10 Geo. IV., known as the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act, a misdemeanor. During, however the period which has elapsed since the passing of that Act, now nearly half a century, the Government of this country has, I believe, in no instance—none, at least, known to myself—proceeded against any Jesuit for committing a misdemeanor under its provisions, and, so far as Her Majesty's present advisers are influenced by the circumstances with which they are acquainted, the same policy will continue to prevail. At the same time, I beg it to be understood that the provisions of the Act are not looked upon by Her Majesty's Government as being obsolete, but, on the contrary, are reserved provisions of law which they are prepared to avail themselves of if necessary."

Now, that does not look like the English people being opposed to the Jesuits; it does not look as if they were undermining the State and the Protestant religion in England; on the contrary, they are performing a good work, and they are not the mischievous people that my hon. friend says they are now. But Mr. Whalley was not going to be outgeneralled again. He moved again on July 13, 1875, a motion for a committee, as follows:—

"To enquire into and report to this House as to the residence in this country, in contravention of the Act 10 Geo IV, of any persons being members of the Order of Jesus, commonly called Jesuits, and as to the names, present residence, and ostensible occupation of such persons; also, as to the amount and nature of any property vested in, or at the disposal of such persons for the purpose of promoting the objects of such society or order, and, so far as may be practicable, to enquire into and report as to the doctrine, discipline, canons, laws or usages under which such order is constituted, and by which it is directed and controlled"

What was the result of that motion? It was that he could not get a seconder for it. After making a speech and showing that the number of priests had increased from 447 in 1829 to 1,967 in 1875—these are exactly the figures he used at that time—notwithstanding the violent speech he made on that occasion, the people of England said: We have no fear of the Jesuits. To-day I venture to assert that if anyone will consult history, will look at the Order in England, will visit their colleges at Stoneyhurst and other places, they will find evidence of the fact that the greatest men to-day have been educated there, including Protestants, and men who are as strong in their Protestant faith as is the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). That is all I intend to say with respect to the Jesuits of England. I do not justify the acts of the Jesuits, but I do say that the men to-day are not the men of 100 years ago, that they do not possess the same feelings and intentions in regard to destruction of British power as they did in those days. To-day you will find those men are desirous of pursuing their holy work without the interference of politicians. The hon. gentleman has referred to the history of Canada. He has not, however, placed altogether a proper construction on the Act of 1774, 14 George III, c. 83. The hon. gentleman read section 5, but he might also have read section 8. Section 5, as stated by the hon. gentleman, goes on to say:

"Sec. 5 And for the more perfect security and ease of the minds of the inhabitants of the said Province, it is hereby declared that His Majesty's subjects, professing the religion of the Church of Rome, of and in the said Province of Quebec, may have, hold and enjoy the full exercise of the religion of the Church of Rome, subject to the King's supremacy declared and established by an Act made in the 1st year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, over all the dominions and countries which then did, or thereafter should belong to the Imperial Crown of the realm; and that the clergy of the said church may hold, receive and enjoy the accustomed dues and rights, with respect to such persons only as shall profess the said religion."

Even taking that language as it stands, it appears that the Roman Catholics have a right to carry on their church affairs in the same manner as they had hitherto done, so long as they did nothing contrary to the laws of England. But section 8 goes on to say:

"Sec. 8 That His Majesty's Canadian subjects, within the Province of Quebec, the religious orders and communities only excepted, may also hold and enjoy their property and possessions, together with all customs and usages relative thereto, and all other civil rights, in as large, ample and beneficial manner as if the said proclamation had not been made and as may consist with their allegiance to His Majesty."

So while the Imperial Government would not recognise the supremacy of the Pope in England, yet at the same time they gave the Roman Catholics power to carry on the affairs of the church so long as they did not conflict with the laws of England. The hon. gentleman has referred to the petition of Lord Amherst. I am glad he has referred to that petition, because I think if the hon. gentleman had read the whole history of the question, and read the opinions of the law officers of the Crown, he would have come to the conclusion that the Government were right in passing the law giving an annuity instead of land, because the officers of the

Crown were not quite certain in regard to the title. It is true that Lord Amherst in 1770, after having performed signal services for England, petitioned the King to have the Jesuits' Estates transferred to him. The petition was referred to the Committee of the Lords of the Privy Council; they reported in favor of it, and it was referred to Lords Gray and Williams, who reported on May 18, 1790. If anyone will take the trouble to follow their report, he will see that, in their opinion, the subject was surrounded with grave doubts. It discussed the whole question in regard to the tenure of the Jesuits, it discussed the whole question as to where the land came from, and under what power the Jesuits held it; and we have the fact that at the close of their labors the commissioners appointed to investigate the title stood 6 to 2 on the question. But they recommended the Government to take possession of the land. The Government did so. In 1800 they took possession of the land in this country, they placed the sheriff in possession of it, but they would not give it to Lord Amherst's heirs, and they passed an Act in 1803 giving an annuity of £3,000 sterling a year instead of the lands asked for, which the law officers of the Crown recommended should be granted. If hon. members will look at the recital of the Act, they will observe that the words are very significant, and those words are such as to justify me in stating that the law officers of the Crown were not distinctly in favor of the validity of the Crown's title, but had grave doubts in regard to it. The recital goes on to say that:

"In consequence of difficulties arising from local circumstances His Majesty's intentions were not carried into effect."

So hon. gentlemen will see that while these lands were requested to be granted to Lord Amherst, yet when the subject was discussed by the law officers of the Crown such grave doubts surrounded the question that the Government would not grant the lands but granted a money allowance. The next we hear of the Jesuits was on the 17th September, 1791, when they were suppressed in Canada under Royal instructions. Those instructions we find in the Chisholm Papers, page 252. In 1791 we find these instructions:

"It is our will and pleasure—that the Society of Jesuits be suppressed and dissolved, and no longer continued as a body corporate or politic, and all their possessions and property shall be vested in us for such purposes as we may hereafter think fit to direct and appoint; but we think fit to declare our Royal intention to be that the present members of the said society as established at Quebec shall be allowed sufficient stipends and provisions during their natural lives."

But we have the very significant fact that after that proclamation was issued in 1791, they remained in possession of the estates ten or eleven years, during which they had control over them. We find in the report of the Attorney General and Solicitor-General of England they referred to the fact that Lord Haldimand allowed the Jesuits to remain in possession of the lands for that period. I am not surprised that Mr. Mercier said they had a moral claim, because they appear to have a moral, if not a legal, claim to the estates. Lord Goderich, in a despatch in 1831, sent to the Legislature in that year this question for their disposition. He says:

"The only practical question which remains for consideration is, whether the appropriation of these funds for the purpose of education should be directed by His Majesty or by the Provincial Legislature?

"The King cheerfully, and without reserve, confides that duty to the Legislature, in the full persuasion that they will make such a selection amongst the different plans for this purpose which may be presented to their notice, as may most effectually advance the interests of religion and sound learning amongst his subjects; and I cannot doubt that the Assembly will see the justice of continuing to maintain under the new distribution of these funds those scholastic establishments to which they are now applied."

We find following that, the Act 2nd William IV, cap 41, goes on to say:

"An Act to make provision for the appropriation of certains moneys arising out of the Estates of the late Order of Jesuits, and for other purposes."

"Reciting that His Majesty had been graciously pleased to confide without reserve to the Provincial Legislature the apportioning of the funds arising from the Estates of the late Order of Jesuits to the purposes of education exclusively. Enacted that all moneys arising out of the Estates of the late Order of Jesuits shall be placed in a separate chest in the vault wherein the public moneys of the Province are kept, and shall be applied to the purpose of education exclusively, in the manner provided by this Act, or by any Act or Acts which may hereafter be passed by the Provincial Legislature in that behalf, and not otherwise."

If my hon. friend will only consult this Act he will find that it was given exclusively to the Province of Quebec for educational purposes. Subsequent to this we find, and that my hon. friend has also admitted, that the incorporation of St. Mary's College was passed in 1852 by the old Parliament of Canada and that the Jesuit College which this Act incorporated still remains in existence, and is still doing its good work throughout the country, and no fault has been found with it. In 1856 we find that the Act 14-15 Victoria, chapter 54, says:

"1. The estates and property of the late Order of Jesuits whether in possession or reversive, including all sums funded or invested, is to be funded and invested as forming part thereof and the principal of all moneys which have arisen or shall arise from the sale or commutation of any part of said estate or property, are hereby appropriated to the purpose of this Act, and shall form a fund to be called 'The Lower Canada Superior Education Investment Fund' and shall be under the control and management of the Governor in Council for the purposes of this Act."

"Apportionment of fund among universities, colleges, seminaries, academies, high and superior schools, and as the Governor in Council shall approve."

So that my hon. friend will see that it would be utterly impossible to claim a portion for the Province of Ontario, because this Parliament has declared that the fund should be known as the "Lower Canada Superior Education Investment Fund." Section 5 of that Act says that the apportionment of the fund shall be amongst "universities, colleges, seminaries, academies, high and superior schools, and as the Governor in Council shall approve." But my hon. friend says they have no power to vote the money for ecclesiastical institutions. In this he would appear to be at variance with the *Law Times* and *Law Journal*. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have dealt thus far with the history of the question of the Jesuits, and pointed out to this House the different Acts bearing on the question in England and also in Canada. I wish now to turn my attention to another branch of the subject, and to see in what position we stand when we ask the Government to disallow this Bill. I hold that we have established a constitutional practice in this country, and that the records of Parliament are full of this practice. We have Mr. Todd and other eminent authorities writing on this subject, and I shall briefly allude to them in order that the people of the country may know, as we know in this House, that we have rules and constitutional government by which this Act must be construed, and by which this House must decide whether or not the Government was right or wrong in the course it pursued. At page 358, Todd says:

"The redress of grievances arising out of the operation of provincial laws, can only be constitutionally afforded by the Provincial Legislature by which such laws have been enacted: except in cases wherein the Acts complained of have been unlawfully passed, or are open to objection upon grounds that would justify the interference of the Governor General in Council, or the Dominion Parliament, with the law."

And at page 359 he continues:

"But in all such cases (appeals by petition to the Queen &c) the principle is affirmed that no interposition to the detriment, in any degree, of the established principle of self-government, in matters of local concern, would be permitted or approved, whether on the part of the Imperial or Dominion Government, in their several and appropriate spheres of action, or matters within the acknowledged competency of either tribunal."

You will see that Todd lays down the very sound principle that all matters of provincial concerns come within the jurisdiction of the Legislature and shall not be controlled by this Parliament. Again at page 343 Todd says:

"The British North America Act recognises and guarantees to every Province in the Confederation the right of local self-government, in all cases within the competency of the provincial authorities, and it does not contemplate or justify any interference with the exclusive powers which it entrusts to the Legislatures of the several Provinces; except in regard to Acts which transcend the lawful bounds of provincial jurisdiction or which assert a principle, or prefer a claim that might injuriously affect the interests of any other portions of the Dominion, as in the case of Acts which diminish rights of minorities in the particular Province in relation to education, that has been conferred by law in any Province prior to Confederation."

Now, I think the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has failed to point out that this Act asserts a principle in violation of the interest of the Dominion, or which affects the rights of the minority within the particular Provinces, because if we understand aright the minority of the Province of Quebec, who thoroughly understand their position and who thoroughly understand what the law was, are themselves prepared to accept at the hands of the Local Government the sum of $60,000 as full and just compensation to them for the amounts they were entitled to for their superior education fund, and that while we are so anxious to protect the minority in the Province of Quebec that minority, knowing more than we do, are perfectly satisfied. Todd again says:

"It was manifest that it was the intention of the Imperial Parliament to guard from invasion all rights and powers exclusively conferred upon the provincial authorities, and to provide that the reserved right of interference therewith by the Dominion Executive or Parliament should not be exercised in the interest of any political party or so as to impair the principle of local self-government."

And at page 363 in his work, he continues:

"It has been sometimes worked in repeal of Acts which contained provisions that were deemed to be contrary to sound principle of legislation, and, therefore, likely to prove injurious to the interests or welfare of the Dominion."

You will, therefore, find we have high constitutional authorities on this subject, and authorities which satisfy me that the Government were perfectly right in acting as it has done. We have also the opinions of eminent judges in this country, and my hon. friend has pointed out to judicial authorities in England, in support of his argument. I think that we should quote some of our own eminent authorities, in order to guide the House to a just conclusion on this matter. In the case of Severn against the Queen, Supreme Court Reports, volume 2, page 96, Chief Justice Richards says:

"Under our system of Government, the disallowing of statutes passed by a Local Legislature after due deliberation, asserting a right to exercise powers which they claim to possess under the British North America Act will always be considered a harsh exercise of power unless in cases of great and manifest necessity, or where the Act is so clearly beyond the power of the Legislature that the propriety of interfering could be at once recognised."

And Justice Taschereau said:

"There is no doubt of the prerogative right of the Crown to veto any Provincial Act, and that could even be applied to a law over which the Provincial Legislature had complete jurisdiction. But it is precisely on account of its extraordinary and exceptional character that the exercise of this prorogative will always be a delicate matter. It will be always very difficult for the Federal Government to substitute its opinion instead of the Legislative Assembly, in regard to matters within those Provinces, without exposing themselves to be reproached with checking the independence of Parliament in the Provinces. What would be the result if the Province chose to re-enact a law which had been disallowed? The cure might be worse than the disease and fully as grave complications might follow.

"It cannot, therefore, be argued that, because this right exists, we must adopt an interpretation which could lead to the necessity by having recourse by it."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that points out the fact that while this Government has the power to disallow Acts which are strictly within the power of the Local Legislature, yet that very judge declares that it is inexpedient and impolitic in this Government to set its opinion against that of the Local Legislature, because if it did so the Legislature would turn around and re-enact the Bill, and the result would be a conflict between the Provincial Government and the General Government, which all must deplore. We have also certain principles laid down by the right hon. leader of the Government, whom I look upon as a very high constitutional authority, and I think both this House and the country recognise him as such. At any rate, we know that the rules laid down by him in the year 1868 for the guidance of the Government on such questions, have been approved of by Mr. Mowat, the Premier of Ontario, a high legal authority, by the learned gentleman who sits opposite, the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), by the hon member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), and by other hon. gentlemen in this House. Those rules were as follows:—

"In deciding whether any Act of a Provincial Legislature should be disallowed, or sanctioned, the Government must not only consider whether it affects the interest of the whole Dominion or not, but also whether it be unconstitutional; whether it exceeds the jurisdiction conferred on the Local Legislature, and, in cases where the jurisdiction is concurrent, whether is clashes with the legislation of the General Parliament."

"As it is of importance that the course of local legislation should be interfered with as little as possible, and the power of disallowance exercised with as great caution, and only in cases where the law of general interests of the Dominon imperatively demand it, the undersigned recommends that the following course be pursued:—

"That on the receipt by Your Excellency of the Acts passed in any Province, they be referred to the Minister of Justice for report, and that he with all convenient speed, do report as to those Acts which he considers free from objection of any kind, and if such report be approved by Your Excellency in Council, that such approval be forthwith communicated to the Provincial Government.

"That he make a separate report, or separate reports, on those Acts which he may consider—

"1. As being altogether illegal or unconstitutional.

"2. As illegal or unconstitutional in part.

"3. In cases of concurrent jurisdiction as clashing with the legislation of the General Parliament

"4 As affecting the interests of the Dominion generally. And that in such report or reports he gives his reasons for his opinions."

These rules have been endorsed by all legal gentlemen in this House, and I think no person can deny that they embody the true and correct principle. We also find, by the Sessional Papers of 1877, page 102, that the hon. member for West Durham recommended that the question as to *ultra vires*, with reference to the Escheats Bill, should be referred to the Supreme Court. Again, in 1876, the hon. gentleman, in regard to an Act respecting the Legislative Assembly, said:

"It appears to the undersigned that several of the provisions are open to very serious questions as being *ultra vires* of a Local Legislature, but almost all of them are contained in an Act of the Legislature of Quebec, upon the same subject which was left in its operation. There are indeed some new provisions, but it could not be advisable upon the principle upon which the Quebec Act was allowed to advise the disallowance of the Act by reason of the insertion of these provisions, and the undersigned feels bound to recommend, that following the precedent referred to, the Act should be left in its operation; it being quite possible for those who may object to its constitutionality to raise their objections in the courts."

There we have two of the highest legal authorities in this country, as high almost as can be found in any country, the hon. First Minister and the hon. member for West Durham, laying down the principle that upon the question of the constitutionality of an Act the decision of the courts ought to be invoked. We find the *Mail* of 5th February endorsing that view in the following words:—

"There is nothing in the British North America Act to limit the exercise of the veto power. That it shall not be exercised merely on grounds of ordinary policy, unless the Provincial Legislature has exceeded its jurisdiction, is a good general rule, which once more we commend the Government for observing The authority given to the Provincial Legislature in certain classes of subjects, carries with it, like all authority, a liberty of error which must be respected, so long as the legal power is not exceeded and the error is not manifestly subversive legally or morally of the principle of the constitution or of the great objects of the State."

I have pointed out that the *Mail* in a former article contended that this Act was *ultra vires*, and, therefore, the courts should be invoked to decide upon its constitutionality; and we have affirmed that principle in this House over and over again. It was affirmed in regard to

the Streams Bill, the consensus of opinion being that in regard to legislation which was claimed to be unconstitutional, the proper course for the Government to adopt was to let the measure go into operation, and leave those affected by it to contest its constitutionality before the courts. I commend to this House the opinion expressed by the hon. member for West Durham upon that question, and I think hon. gentlemen opposite will hardly dissent from it. It is a proposition which, I think, was well conceived, and which, though perhaps not accepted by the House at the time, was in entire accord with the views laid down in 1868 by the right hon leader of the Government. The hon. member for West Durham said :

"Can any member of this House, who is a real, live lover of the Federal system, find any possible objection to this proposition ? Where the law and the general interests of the Dominion imperatively demand it, then and then only shall the power of disallowance be exercised ; but it would impair the Federal principle and injuriously affect the autonomy of the institutions of our several Provinces were this power to be exercised on subjects which are within the exclusive control of the Local Legislatures on the ground that in the opinion of His Excellency's advisers, or of the Canadian Parliament, any such legislation is wrong. * * I admit that, under the constitution of Canada and the Provinces, the Local Legislatures have the power to deprive the subject of his property under these conditions, but I say that if we import into the Constitution of the Confederation a restriction upon that power and declare it, as a majority in this House propose this night to declare, we will declare it to be the right and duty of the Government, whenever the power is to be exercised, to nullify its exercise by disallowing such Acts."

On that occasion the Government declared that the Act should be disallowed, on the ground that it interfered with private rights; but the general principle laid down was that in all matters of unconstitutionality, the courts should be invoked and nobody else. We have also a case almost in point in this country, the case of the New Brunswick School Law. When that case arose, members of Parliament who were versed in constitutional law expressed opinions which would be entirely in accord with the action taken by the Government of the day. That school law was one to compel the Roman Catholics of New Brunswick to contribute to a system of education which they could not conscientiously avail themselves of. It was a law which affected a large class of the community, and which that class contended interfered with its rights. That Bill was allowed to go into operation, and was not interfered with by the Dominion Government for reasons given by the First Minister, who says :

"The Provincial Legislature has exclusive powers to make laws in relation to education. It may be that the Act in question may act unfavorably on the Catholics or other religious denominations, and if so it is for such religious bodies to appeal to the Provincial Legislature which has the sole power to grant redress.

"The assumption by the Provincial Legislature and Government of Canada of the right to seek the imposition of further limitations of the powers of the Provincial Parliaments is subversive of the Federal character of the Union, tending to the destruction of the powers and independence of the provincial law to the centralisation of all power in the Parliament of Canada.

"The people of New Brunswick cannot, and will not, surrender their rights of self-government within the limits of the constitution."

He went on further to say :

"In the case of measures not coming within either of these categories the Government would be unwarranted in interfering with local legislation.

"In the present case there was not a doubt that the New Brunswick Legislature had acted within its jurisdiction, and that the Act was constitutionally legal and could not be impugned on that ground.

"On the second ground which he had mentioned in which he considered the Dominion Government could interfere, it could not be held that the Act in any way prejudicially affected the whole Dominion, because it was a law settling the Common School system of the Province of New Brunswick alone.

"The Government of the Dominion could not act and they would have been guilty of a violent breach of the constitution if, because they hold a different opinion, they should set up their judgments against the solemn decision of a Province in a manner entirely within the control of that Province."

There is the decision of the First Minister, entirely in accord with that of Mr. Justice Taschereau. Judge Taschereau adopts almost the very language of the First Minister in the case I have referred to, the Queen *vs.* Severn. It seems to me that, that case is on all fours with the case before the House. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Costigan) moved the following resolution in this House in 1872:—

"That the Local Legislature of New Brunswick in its last Session, in 1871, adopted a law respecting Common Schools forbidding of any religious education to pupils, and that that prohibition is opposed to the sentiments of the entire population of the Dominion in general and to the religious convictions of the Roman Catholic population in particular ;—That the Roman Catholics of New Brunswick cannot, without acting unconscientiously, send their children to schools established under the law in question and are yet compelled like the remainder of the population, to pay taxes to be devoted to the maintenance of those schools ;—That the said law is unjust, and causes much uneasiness among the Roman Catholic population in general disseminated throughout the whole Dominion of Canada, and that such a state of affairs may prove the cause of disastrous results to all the Confederated Provinces ;—and praying His Excellency in consequence at the earliest possible period to disallow the said New Brunswick School Law ;

In that debate the whole question was thoroughly discussed The *Globe* thus commented on it:

"The question so far was exclusively a local one, and it would have been well if it could have been fought out and settled in New Brunswick, as it was in past years in Ontario and Quebec. But the Catholic minority determined to make an appeal to the Dominion Parliament, on the ground that by the Confederation Act they were secured in the rights which they allege have now been taken away."

The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) moved in amendment to that resolution of Mr. Costigan, declaring that it was expedient that the opinion of the law officers of the Crown should be taken :

"That this House regrets that the School Act recently passed in New Brunswick is unsatisfactory to a portion of the inhabitants of that Province, and hopes that it may be so modified during the next Session of the Legislature of New Brunswick, as to remove any just grounds of discontent that now exist; and this House deems it expedient that the opinion of the law officers of the Crown in England, and, if possible, the opinion of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, should be obtained as to the right of the New Brunswick Legislature to make such changes in the School Law, as deprived the Roman Catholics of the privileges they enjoyed at the time of the Union in respect of religious education in the Common Schools with the view of ascertaining whether the case comes within the terms of the 4th sub-section of the 93rd clause of the British North America Act, 1867, which authorises the Parliament of Canada to enact remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions respecting education in the said Act."

You see, therefore, the opinion of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) was that it was not expedient for the House to pass censure upon the Government and disallow that Bill, but on the contrary left the decision with the officers of the Crown. On 29th November, 1872, the law officers of the Crown reported as follows :—

"That we agree substantially with the opinion of the Minister of Justice of the Dominion, so far as appears from the papers before us."

Sir J. D. Coleridge and Sir G. Jessell said of it :

"Of course, it is quite possible that the new Statute of the Province may work in practice unfavorably to this or that denomination therein, and therefore to the Roman Catholics ; but we did not think that such a state of things is enough to bring into operation the restricting powers of appeal to the Governor in Council "

It seems to me that this New Brunswick case is much stronger than the one now before us. We had a minority in the Province of New Brunswick of Roman Catholics, who contended that the law passed was a great injustice to them. The First Minister said he recognised the injustice. The law officers of the Crown said the same thing when their opinion was taken in 1875, but they all agreed that the matter was of purely local concern. I would like to ask the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) if the views of the Catholic minority in the Province of New Brunswick should not be respected as well as those of the Protestant minority in Quebec, which is entirely satisfied with the action of the Government. In New Brunswick the Catholics felt that their rights were unjustly dealt with, the Government law officers of the Crown were of the same opinion, and the Government here were of the same opinion,

but in spite of all that, they all agreed that it was a matter of purely local concern, with which we had nothing to do.

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

After Recess.

Mr. RYKERT. When the House rose at six o'clock, I was endeavoring to show that in the question of the New Brunswick School Law, the Catholic minority in that Province, had made complaint, in reference to the legislation of that Province, that their rights had been seriously infringed upon. I endeavored to show that the Minister of Justice of that day, the right hon. the Premier of this country, had expressed his opinion upon that law, and had stated distinctly that while he sympathised with the Roman Catholics in that Province, yet that the action of the New Brunswick Legislature was entirely within its jurisdiction. I quoted also the authority of several gentlemen, among them the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). I showed that he moved in amendment to have the matter referred to the law officers of the Crown and also expressed his opinion of the Act. I find that opinion reported in the *Globe* of May 19th, 1872:

"Mr. BLAKE said he had from time to time considered the constitution with reference to the state of the law in New Brunswick on the subject of schools, and he was free to confess that his opinion had fluctuated, and any expression he might now give was given with great doubt and hesitation. He was free to admit that there was much to support the view that had been put forward in the report of the Minister of Justice on the subject, and that the conclusion of that gentleman might have been fairly reached and might very possibly be correct; but he desired to point out to the House those circumstances with reference to the Act which led his mind very strongly—he would not say conclusively—to a different conclusion."

He moved in amendment that the question be referred to the law officers of the Crown, and they expressed their opinion that the legislation of New Brunswick was entirely within the jurisdiction of that Legislature. Then we have Mr. McDougall, who poses sometimes as a constitutional lawyer, who, upon that occasion, gave expression to his opinion as follows:—

"I agree that any interference with the powers that are given to the Local Legislature in the framing of laws unnecessarily through political or national, religious or other motive, except on the broadest public grounds, would be injudicious and improper."

In 1875, the question of the New Brunswick school law was again brought to the notice of this House. A resolution was moved by Mr. Cauchon, seconded by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), in which they recited the resolution of the previous year, and asked the intervention of the opinion of the law officers of the Crown. The resolution was as follows:—

"The House regrets that the School Act passed in New Brunswick is unsatisfactory to a portion of the inhabitants of that Province, and hopes that it may be so modified during the next session of the Legislature of New Brunswick as to remove any just grounds of dissatisfaction that now exist. That the House regrets that the hope expressed in the said resolution has not been realised and that an humble address be presented to Her Majesty embodying the resolution and praying that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to use her influence with the Legislature of New Brunswick to procure such a modification of the said Act as shall remove such grounds of discontent."

That matter was referred to the law officers of the Crown, and upon the 18th October, 1875, there was a despatch from Lord Carnarvon, in which he stated:

"That he laid it at the foot of the Throne, but that he could not advise Her Majesty to take any action in respect of it; that he could not advise the Queen to advise the Legislature of New Brunswick to legislate in any particular direction as that would be undue interference"

Further on he says:

"Holding, as I have already explained, that the constitution of Canada does not contemplate any interference with the provincial legislation, on a subject within the competence of the Local Legislature by the Dominion Parliament, or as a consequence by the Dominion Ministers."

So even the law officers of the Crown were of the opinion that, though sympathising with the minority in New Brunswick, they could not advise interference with that law or advise the Crown to disallow the Bill. On that occasion, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), who sympathised very strongly with the minority in the Province of New Brunswick and felt that they had been unfairly dealt with, said:

"But there is a higher principle still which we have to adhere to, and that is to preserve in their integrity the principles of the constitution under which we live. If any personal act of mine, if anything I could do would assist to relieve those who believe they are living under a grievance in the Province of New Brunswick, that act would be gladly undertaken and zealously performed; but I have no right, and the House has no right to interfere with the legislation of a Province when that legislation is secured by an Imperial compact to which all the parties submitted in the Act of Confederation. * * * I have merely to say this, whatever may be our religious proclivities or feelings, whatever may be the feelings that actuate us in relation to local grievances, it is not well that we should endanger the safety of any one of the Provinces in relation to matters provided for in the British North America Act, which is our written Constitution. * * It is not desirable that we should make the way open or that anything should be done which would excite religious discussions and permeate religious animosities."

That was good advice, and that advice was followed by the House. Now, I come to consider a question which seems to have exercised the mind of the *Globe* newspaper, and that is the articles in the *Law Journal* and the *Law Times*. I have shown, I think, by constitutional authority, that the Act, if it be unconstitutional or *ultra vires*, should be allowed by the Government to take its course, and those who are injured by its operation or aggrieved by it should at once apply to the law courts for redress. The *Law Journal* has declared beyond all question that the Act is *ultra vires*, and, if that be so, according to the practice we have always adopted, the parties should apply to the courts for redress. The *Law Journal* says:

"It will, we think, be conceded, apart from any provisions in Imperial statutes, that it is *ultra vires* the constitutional power of a Colonial Legislature to confer on or delegate to any foreign sovereign, potentate, or tribunal, lawful jurisdiction or authority to determine, or ratify, the distribution of the moneys or properties of the Crown, or how money grants to the subjects of the Crown, within its colonial jurisdiction, are to be distributed. The Imperial Crown may in any proper case agree with another crown or nation to refer to a sovereign, or to arbitrators mutually agreed upon questions affecting its belligerent or territorial rights or claims; but this regality of the Imperial Crown is not possessed, nor can it be exercised, by a Colonial Government or Legislature. If it would be *ultra vires* of the Legislature of Ontario to delegate authority to a foreign power—say to the President of the United States—to distribute, or to ratify the distribution of, public moneys legally voted (the Clergy Reserve moneys, for instance), it follows that this delegation of authority to the Pope by the Legislature of Quebec must also be *ultra vires*. What would be unconstitutional in Ontario must be equally unconstitutional in Quebec"

The *Law Journal* lays down the proposition that the Act is *ultra vires*. If that be so, the authorities show clearly that they must go for redress to the courts; but what evidence have we in this instance that the Pope is, as they say, a foreign potentate? The *Law Journal* does not pretend to say how it is, except that, under the Statute of Elizabeth, there were certain documents, or mandates, or judgments issued or sent forth by the Pope, and that those should not be recognised by the authorities in England. But the Statute of Elizabeth was passed under different circumstances from those which exist now, and the position of the Pope to-day, bereft of his temporal power, is entirely different from what it was years ago. Instead of being a foreign power, he is in this case simply an arbiter between two parties in the Province of Quebec. At the time to which my hon. friend from Muskoka alludes, no doubt the Pope did exercise a controlling influence in Europe and over many nations, but now he is bereft of that power and is in a totally different position. The *Law Journal* says this matter is not yet settled, and should be relegated to the courts. That is the position which this Government and all preceding Governments have taken in regard to such a question. Then, as to the *Law Times*. In my judgment,

the *Law Times* shows conclusively that it is quite constitutional for the Province to vote money in the way it has. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) is entirely at issue with the *Law Times* on that point. If he had read the article in the *Law Times*, he would have found that it holds that the voting of money to ecclesiastical institutions or powers is regarded by that newspaper in an entirely different way from that in which he regards it. I cannot understand, therefore, on what ground the *Globe* made its sudden summersault. The *Law Times* says it is constitutional to vote money for this purpose. Of course, the *Law Times* is in conflict with Mr. Wm. McDougall on that point, but I will refer to him later. The *Law Times* says:

"The constitutional question that arises is not the voting away of public money, be the pretext never so shallow, but the subordination of the sovereign to a foreign authority, and the placing of Her Majesty's public funds at the disposal of the same foreign authority. It is of course an unquestionable and fundamental proposition of law that the Legislature cannot deny the sovereignty of Her Majesty or acknowledge the sovereignty of any other person, especially as under the Constitution it derives its sole authority from an Act passed by the Imperial Parliament. But there is authority for saying that such a proceeding would be unconstitutional."

Then it goes on to refer to the case of the International Bridge Company and the Canada Southern Railway Company, reported in 28 Grant, page 14, showing that the action of Parliament would be unconstitutional in declaring that an Act of that kind could go into operation without the consent of a foreign power. It quotes the decision of Vice-Chancellor Proudfoot as follows:—

"If Canada has chosen to pass an Act in terms similar to the New York Act, it derives its validity from the Canadian Legislature, not from the Legislature that originally created it. No express clause was required to exclude the laws of one from operating in the territory of the other; the exclusion arose from the countries forming part of different nationalities with different sovereign powers. Each country has assented to the corporation created by it uniting with the corporation created by the other, and bringing into the union the rights and liabilities conferred or imposed upon it, and certainly Canada has not introduced the provisions of any Act of Congress passed subsequent to the union applying to the united company. Were the Canadian Parliament to endeavor to do so—to say that Canadian subjects and Canadian corporations are to be subject to legislation that might be passed by Congress—it would, I apprehend, be unconstitutional."

And upon that ground the *Law Times* argues that it is unconstitutional in having, as it says, delegated the power to the Pope to say whether the law shall go into operation or not. We have seen that the Act does not depend upon the action of the Pope at all, but the money voted by this Act for a particular purpose is left for the Pope to say how much shall go to one church or another, or to one university or another. Now, we have in our Canadian Parliament enactments which are somewhat at variance with the law as laid down by Mr. Justice Proudfoot. In the Niagara Frontier Bridge Company Act we have a clause to this effect:

"The said company shall not commence the actual erection of the said bridge until an Act of the Congress of the United States of America has been passed consenting to or approving the bridging of the said river, or until the executive of the United States of America has consented to and approved thereof."

We have enacted the same thing in the Niagara Frontier Bridge Company Act. I think I can safely say that the constitutional authorities of this country, who have expressed their opinion upon it, are as reliable and as deserving of our confidence as the expression of the opinion in the *Law Times* or other papers of the same kind. It seems to me that the *Law Times* could not have carefully considered the question, otherwise it would not have arrived at the conclusion I intend to point out. The hon. member for Muskoka states in his resolution that the Act is not legal, firstly:

"Because it endows from the public funds a religious organisation, thereby violating the unwritten but understood constitutional principle of a complete separation of church and state, and the absolutely equality of all denominations before the law."

We have an answer to that in the *Law Times*, which says:

"The policy of disallowing a Provincial Act must be determined by responsible Ministers of the Dominion. They are constitutionally answerable to Parliament and the people, and as has frequently been shown, the right to disallow Acts was not granted in order that unconstitutional or invalid legislation might be got rid of, but in order that the more important policy of the Dominion should not be interfered with by the Provinces. The whole course of English history shows a struggle with the ecclesiastical houses to prevent property from falling into their hands. The policy both in England and her colonies has been the same—to prevent the property of the nation from falling into mortmain. But it is a question, not of legality, but of policy, and with the policy of the Governments of the day we have nothing to do."

Whereas, on the other hand, the *Mail* says it is entirely a question of policy with which we have to do, yet the *Law Times* is of a contrary opinion:

"If a particular Province choose to depart from this policy and permit the absorption of property by ecclesiastical orders, it is undoubtedly acting within its constitutional rights. The Governor in Council would also be acting within his constitutional rights in opposing such a policy by disallowing all Acts tending thereto; but it is a question of policy as we have said, and not of law. The Act then must be looked at with regard only to its contents."

So that while the hon. member for Muskoka takes strong ground that no Legislature has a right to vote money for ecclesiastical purposes to seminaries or churches, or anything of the kind in the Province of Quebec, yet the *Law Times* says that they have got absolute power. Now, which authority are we to take? Are we to take that of the *Law Times*, or that of the hon. member for Muskoka, or are we to say that the Government acted strictly within its constitutional rights and privileges by saying: We will not interfere, because they had a perfect right to vote their money; at any rate it is a matter of purely local concern. Now, it is stated that the Pope is an alien, and as such has no right whatever to express an opinion upon this question. If we look at the Treaty of Paris we find that, to a large extent, his authority is recognised so far as is necessary for church purposes. The clause says:

"For her part, Her British Majesty agrees to grant to the inhabitants of Canada the liberty of the Catholic religion. Consequently she will give most precise and effective orders, so that her new Roman Catholic subjects may profess and practise their religion, according to the rites of the Roman Church, in so far as the laws of Great Britain permit."

Now, the law of Great Britain permits the Catholics to carry on the affairs of their church just as they please, so long as they do nothing in conflict with the laws of England. It seems to me, looking at the *Law Times* and *Law Journal*, that they agree with the proposition I laid down, that if an Act be *ultra vires* or unconstitutional, it should not be a subject of discussion, but one which the Government should leave entirely to the jurisdiction of the courts. Now, we have another authority in this House—Mr. Wicksteed, who has been for years the law officer for this House. He has expressed his opinion upon it, and I find in a communicated article this language:

"And as respects the article questioning the constitutionality of the said Act,—it does not seem to me that the English Acts cited in it can apply to Canada, which, when they were passed, was no part of the realm of England, and the inhabitants of which are by subsequent Acts of the Imperial Parliament, guaranteed the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion, of which the Pope is the head, and his supremacy as such is part of its very essence. The later law derogates from and virtually repeals any former provision contrary to it. The English laws disqualifying Roman Catholics from holding certain offices were never in force in Canada. The money appropriated belonged to the Province, and is granted by its Legislature for the purposes for which the property from which it arises was given by the French King, and the Act of Appropriation is sanctioned by the assent of the Queen, who may, without impropriety, avail herself, in dealing with it, of the advice and assistance of the head of the church and of an ecclesiastical and educational corporation, which, if not legally the same, is morally the representative and successor of that to which the original grant was made, and which, with the Pope, will be bound to use the money in accordance with and solely by virtue of the powers given them by the Act."

So we find that nearly every authority learned in the law who has expressed an opinion, points clearly to the fact that the Government acted entirely within the constitution. But, Sir, these gentlemen who are so terribly annoyed because the Pope has been called in, and has chosen to say

how that money belonging to the church shall be distributed, were not so particular a short time ago when the Pope's opinion was asked upon a more important question. In Ireland, not very long ago, when, as we know, dissensions were rampant, when the people of England were looking to Ireland with dismay, were not the people of England glad to have the Pope act as arbitrator? We have here a very important question, and I see nothing in the English courts, in the English Parliament, or in the English Government, protesting against this. On the contrary, they were glad to see the Pope give his opinion on that question. Also, when the question arose upon boycotting and paying rents, the matter was referred to the Pope, and the Pope issued—I do not know what you would call it—a pronunciamento, or whatever it may be, and sent that to Ireland. No fault was found with that. I wonder the hon. member for Muskoka did not find fault with that. He is opposed to Home Rule, as I am myself, but at the same time, he found no fault with the Pope being called in as arbiter to settle this most important of all questions. Now, let us see what the Pope says:

"On several occasions the Apostolic See has given to the people of Ireland (whom it has always regarded with special benevolence) suitable admonitions and advice, when circumstances required, as to how they might defend their rights without injury to justice or the public peace. Our Holy Father Leo XIII, fearing lest in that species of warfare that has been introduced amongst the Irish people into the contest between landlords and tenants, which is commonly called the Plan of Campaign, and in that kind of social interdict, called boycotting arising from the same contest, true sense of justice and charity might be perverted, ordered the Supreme Congregation of the Inquisition to subject the matter to serious and careful examination.

"Hence the following questions were proposed to their Eminences the Cardinals of the Congregation: Is it permissible, in the disputes between landowners and tenants in Ireland to use the means known as the Plan of Campaign and boycotting?"

"After long and mature deliberation their Eminences unanimously answered in the negative, and the decision was confirmed by the Holy Father on Wednesday, the 18th of the present month.

"The justice of this decision will be readily seen by any one who applies his mind to consider that a rent agreed on by mutual consent cannot, without violation of a contract, be diminished at the mere will of tenant, especially when there are tribunals appointed for settling such controversies and reducing unjust rent within the bounds of equity, after taking into account the causes which diminish the value of the land."

No objection was taken to that. The Pope took steps in these matters as between landlord and tenant, he denounced the plan of campaign, and declared that in his judgment the course taken by supporters and others in the Catholic Church was improper, and he advised them to take a different course. It seems to me that, looking at this question in all its lights, this House is justified in declaring that the Government have acted fairly with the Province of Quebec. Let me briefly refer to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). It states:

"Firstly, because it endows from public funds a religious organisation, thereby violating the unwritten but undoubted constitutional principle of the complete separation of church and state and of the absolute equality of all denominations before the law."

I think I have met that objection, and I have read the opinion of the *Law Times*, an authority which the hon. gentleman will not endeavor to controvert. The amendment further states:

"Secondly, because it recognises the usurpation of a right by a foreign authority, namely: His Holiness the Pope of Rome, to claim that his consent was necessary to empower the Provincial Legislature to dispose of a portion of the public domain, and also because the Act is made to depend upon the will, and the appropriation of the grant thereby made is subject to the control of the same authority."

Let anyone look at the Act and he will see that it says nothing with respect to the benefit of the Jesuits. The preamble of the Act shows there was a controversy going on between the church and the Province of Quebec in regard to claims respecting the Jesuits' estates, and with a view to settling that question negotiations were opened with the Pope in order to ascertain how it could be settled amicably. There is not a word in the whole of the correspondence or in the whole of the Act to show that it was a settlement with the Jesuits themselves, but only with regard to the Jesuits' estates. The hon. gentleman has forgotten that point. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) entirely fails to point out that there is one word in the Act respecting a settlement with the Jesuits, but that it is for a settlement in regard to the Jesuits' estates, which the Act says were confiscated by Imperial authority; and I have endeavored to show from history that there is considerable doubt with respect to the confiscation and as to whether the estates really were within the possession of the Crown. The Act itself says:

"Whereas it is expedient to put an end to the uneasiness which exists in this Province, in connection with the question of the Jesuits' estates, by settling it in a definite manner: Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislature of Quebec, enacts as follows."

It is true that the head of the Jesuits was authorised by the Pope to enter into negotiations, but these negotiations were not with the Jesuits at all, and there is not one word in the Act to show it; it was for the purpose of settling a long standing question as to whether these estates belonged to the church or not. The hon. gentleman says that the Quebec Government are taking out of the Jesuits' estates money and handing it over to the church authorities, that $400,000 is to be placed at the disposal of the Pope and $60,000 at the disposal of the Protestant clergy. Such is not the fact, for there is not a word said about the Jesuits' estates. The Quebec Government has to take the money out of the consolidated revenue, and power is given them by the Legislature, in section 6 of the Act, to sell the estates and apply the money in any way it may think proper. Section 6 says:

"The Lieutenant Governor in Council is hereby authorised to dispose, in the manner he deems most advantageous to the Province, of the whole property, movable and immovable, interests and rights, generally whatsoever of the Province upon the said property known as the Jesuits' estate."

It, therefore, appears that the Lieutenant Governor in Council is authorised to pay out of any public moneys at his disposal, $400,000 under the conditions named, and may make any deed necessary for the full and entire execution of such agreement. The money, therefore, is taken out of the consolidated fund, and authority is taken to sell the Jesuits' estates and apply the proceeds as the Lieutenant Governor in Council may see fit. It appears to me that upon every ground advanced by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), this House is bound to answer his interrogations in the negative and to vote that the propositions made by the hon. gentleman are not in accord either with facts, or with history, or with constitutional law. He says further:

"Thirdly, because the endowment of the Society of Jesus, an alien, secret and politico-religious body, the expulsion of which from every Christian community wherein it had a footing, has been rendered necessary by its intolerant and unchristian intermeddling with the functions of civil government, is fraught with danger to the civil and religious liberties of the people of Canada."

The hon. gentleman forgot to say that there was St. Mary's College, which was a recognised corporation in the Province of Quebec. Yet he deliberately declares they are an alien corporation. What does the Act of 1887 say? It states distinctly that they were incorporated as a body and were recognised as a corporation by the Province of Quebec. Those are the facts, and I leave the House to judge as to their application. I have endeavored to show as briefly as possible, although I have necessarily occupied considerable time in doing so, that the rights of the minority are not interfered with, and I think I have shown that successfully; that the people have acquiesced in and approved both Acts, which is a fact beyond all question; that the feeling raised in Ontario is entirely

uncalled for, the minority in Quebec asking for no such support for them. I have pointed out to the satisfaction of this House, I think, that a large amount of ignorance has been displayed by public men in Ontario in discussing this question, and that the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) was somewhat at fault in his history of the matter. I have also shown that the attacks on the Jesuits, that the historical references made to the past are not with a view so much to condemn the Jesuits as to stab the Roman Catholic Church. That is, at all events, my judgment. I gather that from the resolution passed at the different meetings and the course adopted, a course which in my judgment is not justifiable. I have pointed out that the Jesuits of to-day are not the Jesuits of 100 years ago, that the Province of Quebec are in sympathy with the Jesuits, and I have shown that they are not an alien corporation, and that they are not such people as they are sometimes considered to be in Canada. It is true they were suppressed in 1773, but they were restored in 1814, because the Roman Catholic Church felt that the Jesuits were not at that time the same class of men as they were before; that they did not act as others had acted according to history, but were influenced in their action simply by a desire to promote the best interests of the church. I have shown conclusively that they are entirely in accord with the Roman Catholic Church. I have also shown conclusively that according to our constitution the course taken by the Government was the only proper one, and in support of my statement I have the authority of the *Law Times* and the *Law Journal*. I have also shown conclusively that the Government was justified in voting money for ecclesiastical purposes, and had a perfect right to vote money for Laval University or any other seminary or similar institution, and that if they acted harshly towards any portion of the community it became a question of policy. I have also shown that the Province of Quebec were not bound to give $60,000 to the Protestants which was more than their proportion of the money. It does seem to me, Sir, that it is unwise and inexpedient that this House should discuss a question such as this from the standpoint of my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). I think that I have shown that from every point of view the Government was justified in taking the course they have done: that is to leave the matter to the courts to settle, whether or not it is *ultra vires* or unconstitutional. I, Sir, am going to be the last one to join in an unholy crusade against any portion of my fellow-countrymen. To-day, we are joined together for the purpose of building up this great Confederation into a magnificent nation. Is all that we have accomplished for the last twenty-one years to be set at naught? I, Sir, shall not be a party to such a course. While I feel as strong in my Protestant views as any man in this House, I recognise the foundation of Protestant principles: civil and religious liberty. As long as I occupy a seat in this House, even though I be threatened with extermination from my constituency, I shall endeavor to deal out equal justice to all my fellow-countrymen.

Mr. BARRON. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could content myself with simply giving an affirmative vote to the amendment of my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien); but, Sir, that has become impossible. Fortunately or unfortunately I do not know which, my name has been more or less intimately associated with the subject-matter of the hon. gentleman's amendment ever since the beginning of this Session, and I feel compelled to supplement the vote that I shall give with some explanation. I do that, Sir, even though my duty is a most unpleasant one and a most painful one indeed, especially so when I remember and am conscious of the fact that in voting and in speaking as I do I am weaning myself for the time being—and only for the time being I hope—from few or many, I don't say which, of the hon. gentlemen around me with whom I have been in such happy accord ever since I have had the honor of a seat in this House. Still more especially is it painful to me, Mr. Speaker, to speak as I do and to vote as I do, when I am conscious of the fact that I am separating myself from the hon. gentleman on this side of the House who leads me and who leads us, and for whom I, in common with hon. gentlemen on this side of the House as well as with many hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, have feelings not only of respect but of the deepest possible affection. But, Sir, even under those circumstances I enjoy the comfort which is that I know that hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House will, at least, give me credit for acting from sincere and honest conviction. Believing that I am in the right, I hope hon. gentlemen will give me their sympathetic attention while I speak to the amendment of the hon. member for Muskoka. I may be permitted in passing to make a few references to the remarks of the hon. member for Muskoka, after which I will come to the speech of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). I do not refer so much to the remarks that the hon. gentleman from Muskoka made this afternoon as I do to his remarks of a day or two ago, upon the occasion when he gave notice to this House of his intention to introduce the amendment which he has placed, Mr. Speaker, in your hands to-day. I do not wish to be understood even inside or outside of the House as complaining at all of the course of the hon. member for Muskoka. It has been suggested to me that that hon. gentleman's course was in fact forestalling me and taking from me that course which I intended to pursue; but, Sir, I can tell this House that I was gratified beyond measure when the hon. gentleman rose in his seat a day or two ago and announced his intention of doing what he has done to-day. I recognise, and no one in this House can recognise more than I do, how grave and serious this question is, not only in the present but grave and serious in its consequences in future, and I would be foolish indeed if I presumed to think that I could give the question the weight and the importance of other hon. gentlemen in this House, I, who am comparatively young and especially so in comparison with the hon. member for Muskoka. I recognise, Sir, that someone older in years, older in experience, and older in position than I am should have taken this matter up, and I, therefore, say again, and I hope hon. gentlemen will believe me, that I was pleased and gratified when the hon. gentleman from Muskoka notified the House a day or two ago of his intention to move his amendment, I do not complain even of his words when he spoke, but I may be permitted to make some reference so as to explain away the inference that his words bore. He gave as his reasons for taking the course which he did, that, inasmuch as my resolution appeared so far down on the Order Paper that likely it would not be reached this Session, he thought it was his duty, under these circumstances, to move in the matter. The very best answer to the statement of the hon. gentleman is that my motion was reached, my motion was made and the papers have since been brought down so that it will be understood. I think that the course I took was right, not as has been suggested by people outside of this House, to evade the matter altogether. In speaking on this question I must be understood as having no feelings whatever against the Jesuit body or even against the Roman Catholics, amongst whom I am happy to say I number many, many friends. I have no sympathy with the clamor which is being made outside of this House, clamor, I may say, without reason. The Jesuits have been in some quarters assailed without argument, and I have no sympathy whatever with the course pursued in those quarters against the Jesuits and against the Roman Catholic body. All that has been said may be true or false; I care not. As far as my investigation and my reading has gone, I confess to believing that much that has been said is

false. Even, Sir, taking the maxim, *Finis determinat probitatem actûs*, I believe that it bears no construction such as has been put upon it in certain quarters that "the end justifies the means." But, on the contrary, my reading and education has been such as to inspire me with admiration for the early Jesuit fathers. We need only recall Parkman's account (and he is by no means a very favorable historian toward Roman Catholicism) of the early Jesuit fathers, and we must be inspired and imbued with enthusiasm in our recollection of the work they accomplished in this country. We can recall, all of us, from history, the arrival, in this country, of the unfortunate Father Jogues, his capture by the Iroquois, his cruel and unheard of tortures, his determination to regenerate by baptism, notwithstanding his intense sufferings, his subsequent escape to France, his performing the sacred rites of the mass in his mutilated condition, his return to this country, his recapture and his fearful death at the hands of the father whose child he was trying to save by baptism. The only effect of that will be, the only result can be to inspire us with enthusiasm that such missionaries have lived in years gone by. I approach this grave and serious question entirely relieved from any bias whatever against the Jesuit fathers or against the Roman Catholic Church. Our admiration for them is one thing, our judgment regarding the constitutionality of this Act under discussion is another thing. Now, my first serious objection to the Act is that which has been mentioned by the hon. member for Muskoka. I claim, Sir, that the introduction into the Act of the mention of the Pope is such a serious encroachment upon the prerogative of the Crown, as to call for its disallowance at the hands of the Government. The sovereign is the *caput principium et finis* of all legislation; but in this particular case the Legislature of Quebec makes the Pope the end of its legislation. The Pope is given the right, notwithstanding what hon. gentlemen say, to negative this legislation entirely. Suppose the Pope did nothing, the Act would be a dead letter. It cannot be denied that the effect is to give a foreign potentate—and I shall show that the Pope is a foreign potentate—the right to disallow or negative this legislation; and if that is true, the converse must be true: if he has power to negative legislation, power to make an Act of Parliament a dead letter, it must follow logically that he has also the right to affirm legislation. And here we have introduced into a British Act of Parliament the power given to a foreign potentate, to negative or affirm legislation. Now, we are taught again and again that the right of assenting to or dissenting from an Act of Parliament is a right so peculiar to the prerogative of the Crown that the sovereign herself cannot delegate it. It is quite true that the Governor General is given the right to assent to or dissent from Acts of Parliament; so are the Lieutenant Governors of the different Provinces; but they have not the right to delegate that power to anybody else. *Delegata est non potest delegare*, is a maxim especially applicable to the Lieutenant Governors of the Provinces in cases of this kind. Now, to show that my contention is well founded, I want to refer to the Statutes. First, I will refer to the Statute of 1 Elizabeth, chapter 1, which has already been referred to, and clause 16 of which reads as follows:—

"That no foreign prince, person, prelate, state or potentate, spiritual or temporal, shall at any time after the last day of this Session of Parliament, use, enjoy or exercise any manner of power, jurisdiction, superiority, authority, pre-eminence, or privilege spiritual or ecclesiastical within this realm or within any other of your Majesty's dominions or countries that now be, or hereafter shall be, but from thenceforth the same shall be clearly abolished out of this realm, and all other Your Highness' dominions forever. Any statute, ordinance, custom, constitution or any other matter or cause whatsoever to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding."

The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), although he referred to that statute, did not for one moment contend that it was not in force in this country; but it has been said that because it is an old statute, therefore it is not applicable. Well, I want to read from the Treaty of Paris, and I will read only those portions which bear on my argument. His Britannic Majesty engaged:

"To grant the liberty of the Catholic religion to the inhabitants of Canada; and to give precise and effectual orders that his new Roman Catholic subjects might profess the worship of their religion according to the rites of the Romish Church, as far as the laws of Great Britain permitted."

I want to emphasise these last words, "as far as the laws of Great Britain permitted," because at the time of the making of that Treaty of Paris this Statute of Elizabeth was in force, so that the treaty did not negative the existence of that statute in this country, but, on the contrary, perpetuated it. Now, the hon. member for Lincoln said that there was a distinction between His Holiness the Pope as a foreign potentate, and as the head of the church. I grant you that; but does anyone mean to say that the Statute of Elizabeth is not directed, as all the statutes of Elizabeth were, to His Holiness the Pope? No one can argue to the contrary, if he is possessed of the least atom of historical knowledge. Everyone of the penal Statutes of Elizabeth was pointedly directed to His Holiness the Pope, and, therefore, the Treaty of Paris did not discontinue the Statute of Elizabeth or prevent its application to this country. If we want any further legislative authority, let us look at the Quebec Act of 1774, the 5th section of which reads as follows:—

"And for the more perfect security and ease of the minds of the inhabitants of the said Province, it is hereby declared that His Majesty's subjects professing the religion of the Church of Rome at and in the said Province of Quebec may have, hold and enjoy the free exercise of the religion of the Church of Rome, subject to the King's supremacy, declared and established by an Act, made in the first year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth over all the dominions and countries which then did or hereafter should belong to the Imperial Crown of the realm, and that the clergy of the said church may hold, receive and enjoy their accustomed dues and rights with respect to such persons only as shall profess the said religion."

There we have, first of all, the Statute of 1 Elizabeth positively, in a legislative way, disapproving of the Pope in any way exercising a jurisdiction; then we have the Treaty of Paris coming after that, not preventing the operation of that statute; and then we have the Quebec Act of 1774, specially perpetuating that statute in the Province of Quebec. Now, Sir, let me refer to the opinion of a great judge to show that what I say is correct. Mr. Justice Smith, in the case of Corse *vs.* Corse, reported in the Lower Canada Reports, page 314, said:

"As soon as Canada ceased to belong to France, the public law of France ceased to exist, and the public law of England came in."

Now, it may be said that my construction of that statute is a forced one, is not a fair one, is not consistent with the time in which we are living, in 1889, when it was passed in 1554; but I will read from an authority whose name is a household word, well known to every gentleman in this House. I refer to Mr. Todd, who was cited by the hon. member for Lincoln in his attempts to demonstrate the truth of some of his statements. He says:

"The Statute of 1 Elizabeth, chapter 1, known as the Act of Supremacy, declares that no foreign prince, person, prelate, or potentate, spiritual or temporal shall henceforth use, enjoy or exercise any power, jurisdiction——"

Now, Sir, I want to ask hon. members of this House, how it is possible, if that construction be a correct construction of the Statute of Elizabeth, and I challenge assertion to the contrary, to contend that that construction is not infringed upon by the Act passed in the Province of Quebec last Session? At the very least by it the Pope is exercising the jurisdiction of distributing moneys, if nothing else, which I say is a violation of the statute according to the universal construction thereof. Mr. Todd goes on to say:

"—or authority within the realm, or within any part of the Queen's Dominions: and that all such power or authority heretofore exercised

shall be forever united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this realm. This declaration remains in force to the present day, and it is the statutory warrant for the supremacy of the Crown, in all matters and causes civil or ecclesiastical, throughout the British Empire, as well as for the renunciation of the papal claims therein."

Now, it has been said in this House, and has been written to the press by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) that there is a distinction between the Pope in his spiritual capacity, as the head of the church, and the way he has been brought into this statute; but here we have the opinion of Mr. Todd that his right to exercise papal claims in this country ought not to and does not exist. But, Sir, I shall cite earlier authorities. I understand that some of the gentlemen who are opposed to this resolution rely upon the authority of Lord Thurlow. Now, I ask the attention of this House for a few minutes until I read his opinion regarding the statute:

"By the 1st of Elizabeth, I take it that there is no reason whatever, why the Roman Catholic religion should not have been exercised in this country as well as in that; confining it entirely to that Act, I know no reason to the contrary * * * * for the language of the Act is only this, that no foreigner whatever should have any jurisdiction, power or authority within the realm."

Then I will refer to the language of the celebrated Wedderburn:

"I can see, by the article of this bill, no more than a toleration. The toleration, such as it is, is subject to the King's supremacy, as declared and established by the Act of the 1st of Queen Elizabeth. Whatever necessity there be for the establishment of ecclesiastical persons, it is certain they can derive no authority from the See of Rome, without directly offending against this Act."

Then it may be argued that this statute is not in force now, by reason of some Provincial or Federal legislation which prevents its application in this country. No one who makes that contention could have read the British North America Act, because Imperial legislation, which was in force at the time of Confederation, could not since be repealed or destroyed by any Dominion or Provincial legislation. The 129th section of the British North America Act reads as follows:—

"Except as otherwise provided by this Act, all laws in force in Canada, Nova Scotia or New Brunswick at the Union, and all courts of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and all legal commissions, powers and authorities, and all officers, judicial, administrative, and ministerial, existing therein at the Union, shall continue in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick respectively, as if the Union had not been made; subject nevertheless (except with respect to such as are enacted by or exist under Acts of the Parliament of Great Britain or of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland) to be repealed, abolished, or altered by the Parliament of Canada, or by the Legislature of the respective Provinces, according to the authority of the Parliament or of that Legislature under this Act."

Even if there had been legislation in any way detracting from the Statute 1st Elizabeth, which was undoubtedly in force at the time of Confederation, no legislation, either in this House or in the Province of Quebec, could in any way legally detract from or diminish the extent of the application of that statute. I think I have shown conclusively what is now the statute law of the land, namely, that resulting from the enactments of 1 Elizabeth. But I maintain that the common law, altogether apart from the statute, is such as to prevent the introduction of His Holiness the Pope into this legislation. Some of us can recollect the fact—I only from my reading—that, prior to 1850, the Pope attempted to divide England into different dioceses or divisions, but a statute was passed in 1850 to prevent him from doing so. This statute was the Ecclesiasticals Act of that year. Now, I want to refer to Mr. Todd again, who says, on page 313, that that statute passed in 1850 declaring that the Pope had no power as a foreign potentate, either in his individual capacity as head of the church or as a foreign potentate, to divide England into dioceses, had always been the common law of England.

Mr. Todd says:

"The Ecclesiastical Titles Act was in substance a declaration of the common law, which was affirmed before the Reformation, and ratified by Parliament some five hundred years ago."

If it was always the common law of the land, Sir, that the Pope could not divide England into dioceses, surely it must have been the common law of the land that he had not the right to distribute money, and that money the money of the State. I would like to know which is the most important—dividing a country into different parcels or dioceses with the view of placing church authorities over each, or distributing certain moneys? If it was the common law of the land that His Holiness the Pope could not divide England into dioceses, it must have been also the common law that he could not distribute moneys in the way provided by the statute aimed at by the amendment now before the Chair. That common law of England became the common law of Canada. On this point Sir Richard West gives his opinion, on the 20th June, 1720 (*see* Chalmer's Colonial Opinions, page 510):

"The common law of England is the common law of the plantations, and all statutes in affirmance of the common law passed in England, antecedent to the settlement of any colony, are in force in that colony, unless there is some private act to the contrary, though no statutes, made since these settlements, are there in force, unless the colonies are particularly mentioned."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a settlement not a conquest.

Mr. BARRON. No, but it matters not. I maintain on that authority that the common law of England was such at that time that no distribution of moneys could be made by the Pope in England, and that common law became part and parcel of the common law of this country. Some reference has been made to correspondence from officers of the Crown in England, or others in high authority regarding the right of His Holiness the Pope to exercise any jurisdiction in this country. I refer, in support of my view, to the Royal Instructions to the Duke of Richmond, on his appointment in 1818 as Governor in Chief of Upper and Lower Canada, with reference to the inhabitants of Lower Canada:

"That it is a toleration of the free exercise of the religion of the Church of Rome only to which they are entitled, but not to the powers and privileges of it as an established church. * * * * It is our will and pleasure that all appeals to a correspondence with any foreign ecclesiastical jurisdiction, of what nature or kind soever be absolutely forbidden under very severe penalties."

Then as to the royal supremacy, which cannot exist if this Statute is to become law, I will refer also to Mr. Todd who says at page 313:

"The source of the authority of the Crown in ecclesiastical matters and of its jurisdiction in the last resort all over ecclesiastical causes is to be found in the doctrine of the Royal Supremacy. This doctrine is a fundamental principle of the British Constitution. It was authoritatively asserted by Parliament at the era of the Reformation, and it is interwoven with the very essence of the monarchy itself."

Further on he says:

"While by previous enactment, ecclesiastical supremacy had been conferred upon the Crown, as a perpetual protest against the assumptions, by any foreign priest or potentate, of a right to exercise coercive power or pre-eminent jurisdiction of British subjects."

Now, I think I have fairly shown that, at all events, the statute law is against the introduction of the Pope into any matters in this country in the way this statute provides. I will refer now to what I believe to be the objectionable clauses, and I will ask how it is possible for anyone not to admit, in the face of the statute, that these clauses to which I refer certainly make this law an infringement of the law as it is defined by the Statute of Elizabeth. In reply to a letter of Mr. Mercier, Cardinal Simeoni says:

"I hasten to notify you that, having laid your request before the Holy Father at the audience yesterday, His Holiness was pleased to grant permission to sell the property which belonged to the Jesuit Fathers before they were suppressed, upon the express condition, however, that the sum to be received be deposited and left at the free disposal of the Holy See."

Then, in another place, Cardinal Simeoni replies to Mr. Mercier:

"The Pope allows the Government to retain the proceeds of the sale of the Jesuits' estates as a special deposit to be disposed of hereafter with the sanction of the Holy See."

Is it to be said in this British country that we are to be told by a foreign potentate that he allows the Government of this country—a British Government—to "retain the proceeds of the sale of the Jesuit estates as a special deposit to be disposed of hereafter with the sanction of the Holy See?" Yet, allowing this Act is tantamount to saying that we allow the Pope to assume this important position. In another place, Cardinal Simeoni, replying to the question:

"Should authority be given to any one to claim from the Government of the Province of Quebec the property which belonged to the Jesuit Fathers before the suppression of the society, and to whom and how should it be given?"

Says as follows:—

"Affirmatively in favor of the Fathers of the Society of Jesus and in accordance with the method prescribed in other places, that is to say, that the Fathers of the Society of Jesus treat in their own name with the civil government, in such a manner, however, as to leave full liberty to the Holy See to dispose of the property as it deems advisable, and, consequently, that they should be very careful that no condition or clause should be inserted in the official deed of the concession of such property which could in any manner affect the liberty of the Holy See."

Then in another place Mr Mercier appears to acknowledge all that the Pope, through his secretary, demands. He says:

"That the amount of the compensation fixed shall remain in the possession of the Government of the Province as a special deposit until the Pope has ratified the said settlement, and made known his wishes respecting the distribution of such amount in this country."

Now, the letters containing these sentences are a preamble to this statute. They are referred to by a section of this statute and are made part and parcel of the law of Quebec—a British Province—and that law is that nothing is to be done until the Pope has ratified the settlement and made known his wishes as to the distribution of the property. There is an admission on the part of a Premier of a British Province that a foreign potentate—for such I claim he is—has the power to ratify British legislation. If he has the power to ratify it, he has the power to nullify it, and that is a power which no one, whether he be the head of a church or not, should possess Then the statute goes on, in order to give it a sort of meritorious effect, to talk about restitution. In the very front of the statute, it speaks of restitution being necessary to be made to the Jesuit Society. What is restitution? You cannot restore anything to a person who was not at one time or other entitled to it, or to some one who is entitled to claim it on his behalf. I contend that the Jesuit Society, which was incorporated in 1887, has nothing whatever to do with the original Jesuit Society. Suppose a society is incorporated by charter in this Parliament, and for some reason or other it becomes extinct, and fifty years afterwards another society is formed under the same name, can anyone say, will anyone argue, that the society so formed can have any claim to the estates of the former society which has become extinct? Certainly not; and the same state of things exists here, and there can be no principle whatever of restitution involved. Sir, to contend the affirmative is to contend, not for the principle, but for the irony of restitution. I find that the Jesuit Society was incorporated in the year 1678 in France. I shall not trouble the House by reading at length the diploma or letters patent incorporating that society, but, with your consent and the consent of the House, I shall ask permission to hand it in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. BARRON. On the 2nd August, 1761, that Society was dissolved in France, and, if the House is determined to have lengthy words read, I shall read the decrees of dissolution, contenting myself with the bold statement that the Society was incorporated as I have said. The Society was dissolved by the self-same Parliament which originally incorporated it, and the declaration of the King of France at Versailles was:

"Moreover, we ordain, that during one year from the date of the enrolment hereof, nothing shall be ordered, either definitely or provisionally, upon what may relate to the said institutes, constitutions and establishments of the houses of the said society, unless we shall otherwise so ordain."

Then on the 6th August 1761, by another sentence, the Parliament of France, with reference to the report to them made of the doctrine of the Jesuits, made the following provisions:—

"In like manner it is provisionally inhibited and forbidden unto the said priests, and others of the said society, to continue any lessons, either public or private, of theology, philosophy or of the humanities in the schools, colleges and seminaries within the jurisdiction of the court, under penalty of seizure of their temporalities, and under such other penalty as to right and justice shall appertain; and this, from and after the first day of October next, as well with respect to the houses of the said society which are situated at Paris as to those which are situated in the other towns, within the jurisdiction of the court, having within their limits schools or colleges other than those of the said society; and from the first day of April next, only with respect to those which are situated in towns within the jurisdiction of the court, where there are no other schools or colleges than those of the said society, or in which those of the said society shall be found to occupy any of the faculties of the arts or of theology in the university there established, and, nevertheless, in case the said priests, scholars, or others of the said society, shall claim to have obtained any letters patent duly verified in the court, to the effect of performing the said scholastic functions, the court permits the said priests, scholars, and others of the said society, to produce them before the court, all the chambers assembled, within the delays above prescribed, such order, upon view of the same, and upon the conclusion of the King's Attorney General, to be made by the court as to right shall appertain.

"The court most expressly inhibits and forbids all subjects of the King from frequenting, after the expiration of the said delays, the schools, boarding schools, seminaries, noviciates and missions of the said persons styling themselves Jesuits, and enjoins all students, boarders, seminarists and novices to quit the colleges, boarding houses, seminaries and noviciates of the said society, within the delays above fixed; and all fathers, mothers, tutors, curators or others having charge of the education of the said scholars, to withdraw them or to cause them to be withdrawn therefrom, and to concur, each in respect to himself, in carrying into effect this present decree, as good and faithful subjects of the King, zealous for his preservation. The court in like manner prohibits them from sending the said children to any colleges or schools of the said society, held without the limits of the jurisdiction of the court, or out of the kingdom. And as for the said scholars, the court declares all those who shall continue after the expiration of the said delays to frequent the said schools, boarding houses, colleges, seminaries, noviciates and instructions of the said persons styling themselves Jesuits, in whatever place they may be, incapable of taking or receiving any degrees in the universities, or any civil or municipal offices, or of discharging any such public functions. The said court reserving to itself to deliberate on Friday, the 8th day of January next, upon the precautions which it shall judge necessary to take upon the subject of the offenders, if any there be."

Then the society, having been dissolved by the same Parliament that brought it into existence, appears to have got a respite for a short time. But the letters patent were enregistered, and provided:

"Subject, nevertheless to this: That the respite contained in the said letters patent shall take place only to the first of April next, upon which day the provisional decree of the court of the sixth August last shall be executed *ipso jure*, and also without that the necessary proceedings to enable the court to render judgment on the *appel comme d'abus*, instituted by His Majesty's Attorney General, prove the bulls, briefs, constitutions, forms of vows, and other regulations relating to the said society, can be suspended, and in like manner without prejudice to the provisional execution of the said *appel comme d'abus*.

"And also subject to this: That the public or private lectures on theology, philosophy or the humanities, held and given by the priests or scholars in all the towns or places within the jurisdiction of the court, without distinction, cannot be provisionally continued after the expiration of the said respite, the whole under the pains contained in the provisional decree of the sixth August last."

Thus I maintain that the same Parliament which brought the Jesuit Society, as a corporate society, into existence, by its decree, dissolved the society. Then, we find that His Holiness the Pope, on the 20th July, 1773, dissolved the society by his celebrated brief *Dominus ac Redemptor*. I shall not ask the House to listen to the reading of that brief, which is not necessary for my purpose, and in any event it is familiar to the ear of most hon. gentlemen in this House. A year later, this society was suppressed by royal instructions to the Governor General as follows:—

"That the Society of Jesuits should be suppressed and dissolved, and no longer continue a body corporate and politic, and that all their rights, privileges and property, should be vested in the Crown, for such purposes as the Crown might hereafter think fit to direct and appoint, and the Royal intention was further declared to be that the present members of the said society as established at Quebec, should be allowed sufficient stipends and provisions during their natural lives."

In 1791 there are Royal Instructions to the same effect. The last Jesuit died in 1800; the present society came into corporate existence in 1887, so I maintain that the present society is not in any way connected with the former society; and the principle of restitution does not and can not apply. This Government, at least, should have returned the Bill, suggesting that it should be altered in some respects, and amongst others, the one to which I referred a few moments ago. Even the Bishops of Quebec, or some of them, admitted that the Jesuits were no longer in existence, and they, at the request of the Jesuits, made a claim to the property. I find the following in a petition over the signatures of Joseph, Bishop of Quebec, P. T. Turgeon, Coadjutor of Quebec, and J. S. Lartigue, Bishop of Montreal:

"Your petitioners humbly represent that the Order of Jesuits being extinct in this country, their natural successors are the Roman Catholic bishops of the diocese."

Then the very Act itself incorporating the Society of Jesuits in 1887, makes no claim whatsoever to their rights as owners of this particular property, so I think it cannot be maintained, on the merits, that they are entitled on any principle of restitution to this property. But it has been said that this property was taken from the Jesuits at the time of the Conquest. I deny that, because at the time of the Conquest it did not belong to the Jesuits. It had become Crown property, like any other Crown lands; therefore, when the statute now objected to says that the property was confiscated, it states that which is not the case, and the Federal Government should not have sanctioned that misstatement, but they should, at least, have returned the Act to the Government of Quebec to have it amended in the particular. Now, in some pamphlets issued by gentlemen who support the Jesuit Society, I find Twiss referred to as an authority on the law of nations. A gentleman who writes a very able argument in support of the Jesuit cause, has quoted from this authority as follows:—

"A victorious nation in acquiring the sovereignty *de facto* over a country, from which it has expelled its adversary, does not acquire any other rights than those which belonged to the expelled sovereign; and to those such as they are with all their limitations and modifications, he succeeds by right of war."

They also refer to De Vattell on the Law of Nations:

"The conqueror, who takes a town or province from his enemy cannot justly acquire over it any other rights than such as belonged to the sovereign against whom he has taken up arms. War authorises him to possess himself of what belongs to his enemy; if he deprives him of the sovereignty of that town or province, he acquires it such as it is, with all its limitations and modifications.

"One sovereign makes war upon another sovereign, and not against unarmed citizens. The conqueror seizes on the possessions of the state, the public property, while private individuals are allowed to retain theirs They suffer but indirectly by the war; and the conquest only subjects them to a new master."

Now, I agree with every word of that. Suppose the United States and Great Britain were to go to war—and I think hon. gentlemen in this House on both sides would have but very little doubt as to the result—it would not be said for one moment that Great Britain obtained any rights whatsoever over private property, but she would obtain just the same rights as the Executive of the United States have over private property. Now, at the time of the Conquest this property did not vest in the Jesuits at all; it had become extinct, it had become vacant property; therefore, when it is said outside the House, as it has been said inside, that for meritorious reasons, because the property was taken by a method of confiscation, therefore it should be returned to them—I say it was not taken by confiscation, because at the time that Canada was conquered by England this property was not the property of the Jesuits, but was the property of France, having become extinct. We find the opinions of Her Majesty's Attorney General and Solicitor General for the Crown, dated 18th May 1759, stating in regard to this property:

"As a derelict or vacant estate, His Majesty became vested in it by the clearest of titles, if the right of Conquest alone was not sufficient, but even upon the footing of the proceedings in France and the judicial acts of the sovereign tribunals in that country. The estates in this Province would naturally fall to His Majesty, and be subjected to his unlimited disposal, for by those decisions it was established upon good, legal and constitutional grounds, that from the nature of the first establishment or admission of the society into France, being conditional, temporary and probational, they were at all times liable to expulsion, and having never complied with, but rejected the terms of their admission, they were not even entitled to the name of a society; therefore, they were stript of their property and possessions, which they were ordered to quit upon ten days' notice, after having been compelled to give in a full statement of all they had, with the several title deeds, and documents or proofs in support of it. Sequestrators or guardians were appointed to the management of their estates, and in course of time and with a regularity proportioned to their importance, provision was made for the application of them in the various ways that law, reason, justice and policy dictated; and all this was done at the suit of the Crown."

Now, to show further that at the time of the conquest this was vacant property, I refer to Marriott's opinion, 12th May, 1765. He says:

"From all these premises, it seems conclusive that the titles of the society passed together with the dominions ceded to Great Britain (in which dominions those possessions were situated) attended with no better qualifications than those titles, had by the laws and constitution of the realm of France, previous to the conquest and cession of those countries."

I mention that this Quebec Act is objectionable in many important particulars, and is also objectionable in declaring that those estates were confiscated by the British Crown. I say such was not the fact, and is not borne out by the history of the estates. This property has always been treated as having escheated to the Crown, not as having been confiscated by reason of the Conquest. I find Lord Goderich on 7th July, 1831, spoke to this effect:

"His Majesty's Government do not deny that the Jesuits' estates were, on the dissolution of that order, appropriated to the education of the people, and readily admit that the revenue which may result from that property, should be regarded as inviolably and exclusively applicable to that object."

And the Statute of William IV, chapter 41, states to same effect as follows:—

"And it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same, that from and after the passing of this Act, all moneys arising out of the estates of the late order of Jesuits which now are in or may hereafter come into the hands of the Receiver General of this Province shall be placed in a separate chest in the vaults wherein the public moneys of the Province are kept, and shall be applied to the purposes of education exclusively, in a manner provided by this Act, or by any Act or Acts which may hereafter be passed by the Provincial Legislature in that behalf and not otherwise."

Then we have the petition of the bishops, to which I have already referred. Does anyone mean to say that if the Province became owners of this property by reason of confiscation, the bishops would say the Jesuits were no longer entitled to it, as they did say in their petition? It is quite clear, therefore, that the statute is incorrect in that particular, when it states that the property was acquired by confiscation. Then there is another point to which I desire to refer, and it is one which has not yet been touched upon, and it is this: It is the case that two or more of the properties were acquired by the Jesuits, not from the King of France and not by grants of the Parliament of France, but from private individuals. I do not think anyone will deny that within strict law, and I may say I am speaking from a legal standpoint altogether—and I do not desire to go into the merits or demerits of the Jesuit claim, but to speak of the question from a legal standpoint only,—no one, I think, will deny that it is good and proper law that when property is given to a corporation or society or body of men or to one or more men upon a certain and

specific trust, the very moment that the trust is no longer capable of performance the property reverts to the heirs of the party from which the property originally came. That this trust was destroyed no one will question. It was destroyed by the Parliament of France. Then, if such be the case, the heirs of the donors are now entitled to the property, whoever they may be. But it may be said that I am building up a fictitious case, and, therefore, I will quote the language of the Rev. Father Flannery of St. Michael's Cathedral, of Toronto, on 17th February, 1889. He said:

"These lands were never given to them by the French Government or by any Government, but were the donations of private members of the church who left the lands in possession of the order for religious and educational purposes."

That trust having been destroyed, it will not be denied by any legal gentleman that the property reverts to the original donors. Why, we see only lately that the Seignory of Sillery was given to a certain body of Indians, and that the property has been taken away from them by this objectionable statute. We remember in 1882 in this House the First Minister, waxing eloquent over the contention that the Rivers and Streams Bill took away one person's property and gave it to another, he contended that the public interests were greatly affected, and that it was his duty for that reason to disallow that Bill. The premises he built did not exist; but if he was right in that action, he should have enquired more closely into the facts regarding this question to ascertain whether the rules he laid down for his own Government, and for succeeding Governments, did not apply to this particular case. If he was right in disallowing the Ontario Rivers and Streams Bill because, as he said, it took away the property of one man and gave it to another, *a fortiori*, he should have disapproved of this legislation because the trusts created by private donors have been destroyed from and lands have been taken away by the Parliament of Quebec, and handed over to other parties that have nothing more to do with them than the man in the moon. In order to show that I am not wrong in my view of this question, I quote a letter dated 20th June, 1879, over the signature of Mr. James McGill:

"It seems to us that it would have been proper by an advertisement to call upon the public for any dormant claims there may be on the Jesuits' estates."

I maintain, moreover, that under the British North America Act this Act is entirely unconstitutional. If I remember rightly (I will not read the particular section) it states that each Province of the Dominion shall have the right to deal with educational matters, reserving the rights of the minority in Quebec, and the minority in the Province of Ontario. No one has ever maintained that that Act gave to the different Provinces of the Dominion the right to make denominational grants, as has been done. There can be no doubt that the Jesuits are a religious institution; and are we to understand that the different Provinces have the right to make religious grants to the different religious bodies? I think not. I assert that if the leader of the Government had the very least respect for his own past record and his own past utterances, he would have disallowed this legislation just as quickly as he allowed it. Why, we have only to recall the case of the Rivers and Streams Bill of Ontario. In that case he built up the premises which did not exist. He claimed that it gave the right to take away the property of one man and give it to another; and that the general effect upon the whole country would be such that he had a right to disallow the Bill. I say that, applying that principle, he should have disallowed this Bill, and for the reasons given. If it is true that a portion of the property was given originally to the Indians of the Seignory of Sillery, then I say there are good reasons for disallowing this Bill, as, on the Premier's contention, there was for disallowing the Rivers and Streams Bill of Ontario; there was good reason to disallow this legislation, if for no other reason than that it took away from the Indians land given to them, as it is said, by France originally. I desire to refer to the remarks of the right hon. leader of the Government on the Rivers and Streams Bill disallowance; and I may mention that his remarks were coincided in by several hon. gentlemen, and especially by the present Postmaster General and the hon. member for North or South Simcoe. On that occasion the First Minister spoke as follows:—

"I declare that, in my opinion, all Bills should be disallowed if they affected general interests. Sir, we are not half a dozen Provinces. We are one great Dominion. If we commit an offence against the laws of property or any other atrocity in legislation, it will be widely known."

Can any subject be thought of that affects the people more generally than that of religion? Can any subject be thought of that will affect the people more generally than one respecting the Jesuits' Society. Without reflecting for one moment upon the society, let me point out that this Society of Jesus has been legislated against by the countries of Saragossa, La Palantine, Venice, Avignon, Portugal and Segovia, England, Japan, Hungary and Transylvania, Bordeaux, France, Holland, Tournon and Berne, Denmark, Bohemia, Russia, Naples, and in all Christendom by the Bull of Pope Clement XIV. I maintain that it cannot be said that a society legislated against in all these countries is not of general interest, but it might be said that "this was many years ago and that we are not now in the dark ages." I am quite willing to admit that, but I find that even since that society was restored by Pope Pius VII, in 1814, it has been legislated against by, and expelled from, Belgium, Russia, France, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Bavaria and the Italian towns. I refer to that not because I have the least unkind feeling against the Jesuit Society, but I maintain that it cannot be said that that society is not of general interest when we find it has been legislated against in all these different countries. Can it be said that the question is of the deepest possible interest right up to the imaginary line which divides the Province of Quebec from the Province of Ontario, and that the moment you step across to the Province of Ontario it has no interest at all? I certainly say no. Can it be said that anything which will be injurious to the Methodist body in Ontario, that the same body is not more or less affected by it in the Province of Prince Edward Island? No. The Baptist community, the Congregational community, and all other denominations, have a touch of sympathy throughout the whole Dominion. Therefore, I say that the words of the right hon. gentleman spoken in 1882 in this House in reference, to the River and Streams Bill, apply to this case. By the authority of the words that he used then, I hold it is a strong argument for this Bill being disallowed to-day. I do not like to charge the hon. Premier with making fish of one and fowl of the other in this matter, but his treatment of the Orange Incorporation Bill in this House cannot be forgotten. He takes only three days to intimate to the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec that he assents to and approves of this Bill, but he is dumb to the enquiry of the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, to know if he would assent to and approve of the Orange Incorporation Bill, when one word from him, similar to that he gave Quebec, would have incorporated the Orange Society. If he assents and approves of this legislation it follows as a most positive *sequitur* that when he disallowed legislation in the Province of Ontario, and when he disallowed legislation in the Province of Manitoba, because he disapproved thereof, it must follow that by allowing this Statute to become law he does so because he approves of the same. I would like to give the hon. the Premier an opportunity, but I see he is not in the House just now, of denying what he is credited with having said at a certain meeting on the 20th June, 1886. On that occasion he is credited by his organ, *La Minerve*, with saying as follows:—

"To the calumnious hypocrites who represent him as the personification of religious fanaticism."

Sir John replied by saying:

"That he had never in his life set foot in an Orange lodge. * * * I am accused, said Sir John, of being a Protestant, and even of being a bad Protestant. In like manner I have been accused of being an Orangeman, although I have never set foot in a lodge.

I do not know whether to believe that or to believe the statement of one of his *protégés* regarding our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, that he, or a member of his Government "had no confidence whatever in the breed." I have satisfied myself, at all events, that my conclusions are correct, that this Bill should have been disallowed, and, if possible, that it should be still disallowed, for the reason that it is strictly unconstitutional. Now that I see the Minister of Customs in his seat, I hope that he, occupying the prominent position he does in a certain order which has been mentioned by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), will not allow this opportunity to pass without giving to some hon. members on this side of the House who think as I do, the benefit of his views. I hope, Sir, they will be in accord with many of those who belong to the society of which I believe he is such——

Mr. BOWELL. An ornament.

Mr. BARRON. Yes; such a great ornament.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sure, Sir, that every member in this House must sympathise with the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) when he declared how exceedingly painful it was for him to separate himself even for a few moments only from his beloved colleagues, and still more beloved leader. We can all sympathise with the hon. gentleman, and we can all sympathise with the party that is so painfully distracted at the present moment. I want to refer at the outset to a remark made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) in the opening of his speech. He stated that a newspaper published in the interests of the Orange Order threatened any member of that order who will dare vote for the allowance of this Bill. I would say to the member for Lincoln, what perhaps he knows himself, that the Orange Order has only one organ in the Dominion, and, Sir, I defy him, and I defy any hon. member of this House to point to any such article in that organ of the Orange Association in Canada. I say, Sir, that that organ has, during this discussion which has agitated the public, the press and public meetings, and which agitation has assumed a pretty violent form in many places—I say that that organ of the Orange Association has set an example of moderation that might well be emulated by other organs, and also by some of the members of the sacred profession in their pulpits. I fancy, Sir, that the hon. gentleman instead of reading an article from the *Sentinel* was reading the *Globe* when it was thundering out its anathemas against the hon. gentlemen opposite if they dared to vote against disallowance. For myself, I propose to be able to discuss the very important amendment moved by the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) without any race or religious prejudices or feelings, and purely from a Canadian standpoint. As a Canadian who has the strongest faith in the future of our country and who has watched with pride its rapid march in material progress—the united work of all races and of all religions—I hope that this question may be investigated on its merits and entirely apart from any religious feeling. We came to Canada from different countries, or we are the descendants of those who have come here to enjoy and exercise fully our religious convictions. We have flourished under our free institutions in Canada, and in order to do so we must be prepared to respect not only the rights of others, but also their feelings and, to a certain extent, their prejudices as well. Now, Mr. Speaker, two very important Acts have recently been passed by the Quebec Legislature. The first was the incorporation of the Society of Jesus in the year 1887, and in the following year the "Act respecting the Settlement of the Jesuits' Estates." These two Acts bring up the whole question of the Jesuit Order in Canada, as well, perhaps, as the Jesuit Order in other countries. Previous to the Conquest, in 1759, the Jesuits held property which they had received from various sources in trust, for two purposes: for the training and education of the French youth of the country, and also of the aboriginal inhabitants. Now, Sir, their position under the English régime depended upon the terms, first, of the capitulation to Lord Amherst in 1760, and, secondly, upon the terms of the cession to the English Crown by the Treaty of Paris in 1763. Article 32 of the Capitulation reads as follows:—

"The communities of nuns shall be preserved in their constitutions and privileges. They shall continue to observe their rules. They shall be exempted from lodging any military, and it shall be forbidden to trouble them in their religious exercises."

The reply of General Amherst to this request was "Granted." Then, article 33, of the Terms of Capitulation, was as follows:—

"The preceding article shall likewise be executed with regard to the communities of Jesuits and Recollets and of the House of St. Sulpice at Montreal. This last and the Jesuits shall preserve their right to nominate to certain curacies and missions as heretofore."

The answer of General Amherst was:

"Refused till the King's pleasure be known."

Now, it will be observed from these facts that the Recollets and the Jesuits received no particular or special rights under the Terms of Capitulation of 1760. The next place where these matters were negotiated and regulated was in the Treaty of Paris in 1763. The only stipulation in that treaty bearing on this question was as follows:—

"His Britannic Majesty agrees to grant the liberty of the Catholic religion to the inhabitants of Canada; he will consequently give the most effectual orders that his new Roman Catholic subjects may profess the worship of their religion according to the rites of the Roman Church, as far as the laws of Great Britain permit. His Britannic Majesty also agrees that the French inhabitants, or others who had been the subjects of the most Christian King in Canada, may retire with all safety and freedom whenever they think proper, and may sell their estates, provided it be to subjects of His Britannic Majesty, and bring away their effects as well as their persons, without being restrained in their emigration under any pretence whatever, except that of debts or of criminal prosecutions; the term limited for this emigration shall be fixed for the space of eighteen months, to be computed from the day of the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty."

Therefore, it is plain that the right secured by the Treaty of Paris to the French Canadians was the liberty to worship according to the rites of the Roman Catholic Church, and the limit of the English law as it then stood. They received no further rights under that treaty. Then, Mr. Speaker, there is a great and important distinction between the Jesuits and the Recollets, Sulpicians and other orders established in Canada. The Recollets and Sulpicians were organised by French subjects in France. The Jesuit Order originated in Spain; it is of no nationality, and it has no law but the will of its General. The next change that took place with reference to the Order of Jesuits was under the Quebec Act of 1774, the result of which was given in the royal instructions to the Governor of Quebec in the year 1775. This made a new departure in the rules governing the Jesuits, and made a very wide distinction between the Recollets and the Sulpicians on the one hand and the Jesuits on the other. For instance, the orders to the Governor in 1775 stated:

"That the society of Romish priests, called the Seminaries of Quebec and Montreal, shall continue to possess and occupy their houses of residence and all other houses and lands to which they were lawfully entitled on the 31st September, 1759, and it shall be lawful for those societies to fill up vacancies and admit new members according to the rules of their foundation."

That was the regulation with regard to the other orders of the Roman Catholic Church. But, Sir, what do we find in reference to the Jesuit Order? An entirely different regulation was meted out to them, and it was as follows:—

"That the Society of the Jesuits be suppressed and dissolved and no longer continue as a body corporate and politic, and all their rights, possessions and property shall be vested in us, for such purposes as we may hereafter think fit to direct or appoint; but we think fit to declare our royal intention to be that the present members of the society, as established at Quebec, shall be allowed sufficient stipends and provisions during their natural lives."

Now, Sir, by order of the British Parliament, in the Royal Instructions given to the Governor of Canada in 1775, while the other orders of the Roman Catholic Church were permitted to remain in Canada, enjoy their property, and continue their work, the Jesuits were suppressed. This took place not only in Canada, but in various countries in Europe. We find that in 1759 the order was suppressed in Portugal; in 1764 it was suppressed in France; and in 1767 it was suppressed in that country where it first had its birth, in Spain; and not only was it suppressed in those countries of Europe, but in all the colonies and possessions of those countries throughout the entire world. Following those events, Pope Clement XIV, the head of the Roman Catholic Church, found that order to be so intolerant, so mischievous in its workings, so inimical to the peace not only of several Governments, but of the church itself, that he determined to suppress and abolish the order. We, therefore find in 1773 a brief from the Pope of Rome, and I will trouble the House while I read a few extracts from that brief. It is addressed to the Catholic Church throughout the world. His Holiness cites many instances of the suppression of religious orders by the Holy See; he recites the many favors and privileges conceded to the Jesuits, and then he says:

"There arose in the bosom of the society divers seeds of discord and dissension, not only among the companions but with other regular orders, the secular clergy, the academies, the universities, the public schools and lastly even with the Princes of the states in which the society was received."

The Pope then recites at some length these quarrels; the accusations, he says:

"multiplied without number, especially with regard to that insatiable avidity of temporal possessions with which it was reproached."

Then he gives an account of some unavailing efforts to reform the society, and adds:

"In vain did these Pontiffs endeavor by salutary constitutions to restore peace to the church, as well as with respect to secular affairs with which the company ought not to have interfered."

After reciting some further efforts he proceeds:

"After so many storms, tempests, and divisions, every good man looked forward with impatience to the happy day which was to restore peace and tranquility; but, under the reign of this same Clement XIII, complaints and quarrels were multiplied on every side, in some places dangerous seditions rose, tumults, d cords, dissensions, scandals, which, weakening or entirely breakingisthe bonds of Christian charity, excited the faithful to all the rage of party hatreds and enmities"

Then he says:

"After a mature deliberation, we do, of our certain knowledge and the fullness of our apostolical power, suppress and abolish the said company. * * *

"Our will and meaning is that the suppression and destruction of the said society and of all its parts shall have an immediate and instantaneous effect."

Previous to 1773, the society had been abolished by almost every Roman Catholic country in Europe, and, finally, that year it was suppressed in every part of the world by the head of the Roman Catholic Church itself. I think no stronger evidence could be given of the character of that order than the character given to it by Pope Clement XIV. Pope Clement would not have uttered a harsh word against the society if he could have avoided it. He knew the machinations of the order, and in this brief he states what he was compelled, though reluctantly, to do in the interests of the church and of society and of civil government. We are told, however, that the society was restored. True, it was restored; and I will refer briefly to one or two facts in connection with the society after its suppression. In Canada they were allowed, what they were not allowed in any country in Europe, to enjoy in peace and quietness the property they had acquired or which they had received in trust. In the countries of Europe, they were not only banished, but were deprived of all their properties of every kind whatsoever. Now, the British Government, after the death of the last member of the order in Canada, in 1800, took possession of the whole Jesuits' estates. The Crown held these properties until 1831, when, after some negotiations, they were handed over to the Government of the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, with the stipulation that the revenues therefrom should be devoted exclusively to the higher education of the young. That stipulation has been carried out up to the present day. But now we find a different state of affairs. We find an Act of Parliament passed in 1887 incorporating this society, and in 1888 an Act giving them $400,000, also giving the Government of the Province of Quebec power to sell this property, which has been estimated and valued at $2,000,000, and to devote the proceeds to any purpose they may think proper:—not to the purposes of education, but to any purpose whatever. Another important feature in this matter is this? $60,000 are voted for the superior education of the Protestants in the Province of Quebec and $400,000 are voted to the Jesuits. A good deal has been said about the Pope's extraordinary powers in connection with the latter vote. The first point that I would call your attention to is this: That $400,000 is voted, not for the purposes of education, not for the purposes for which the British Government held the property, not for the purpose for which the property was handed, in the first place, in trust, but for any purpose the Quebec Legislature may choose. Not only $400,000, but the entire proceeds of the estates. While from year to year until now the revenues derived from them were devoted to superior education, now power is taken to sell the property and devote the proceeds for other secular purposes, and the $400,000 are to be divided as the Pope may determine. That money is not required in the Act to be devoted at all to the education of the young, but it may be devoted to any purpose. It may be devoted to the propagation of the Roman Catholic religion, or to any other purpose they may think fit. I have carefully looked over the British North America Act, under which the Dominion Parliament and the various Legislatures of this country carry on their operations, and I am unable to see one line of that Act in which power is given to a Local Legislature to vote money for the purposes of any church. Many years ago, when severe and bitter contests were going on in this country for the complete separation of the Church from the State, we thought in Canada that we had obtained that complete separation, and that all the churches stood on the same plane in the eye of the law; but if this Act is allowed to go in force, an end is put to that equality, and I think it would be a lamentable thing if a law should be passed in any Province giving greater power to one religious denomination than is given another. There are one or two features of this Act of incorporation and the moneys voted which, I think, are deserving of a little attention. We know there is no love between the Jesuit Order and certain other orders in the Roman Catholic Church, and we know through the legislation by which the Jesuits are incorporated, they are given only the right to exercise certain rights, not in the whole Province of Quebec, but only in certain portions. The second clause says:

"The corporation shall not have the right under this Act to possess educational establishments elsewhere than in the Archdioceses of Montreal and Ottawa, and in the Diocese of Three Rivers."

Still further on it says;

"The corporate seat of the corporation shall be in the city of Montreal and another place in this Province, within the present limits of the Archdioceses of Montreal and Ottawa, and of the Diocese of Three Rivers, which may be selected later on by a by-law of the corporation."

That means that in the archdiocese of Quebec, that diocese over which the Cardinal has control, the Jesuits are not allowed any privileges. They are not allowed to establish their headquarters or schools there. As a matter of fact, they are incorporated only in a part of the Province of Quebec. What is a still stranger feature is the fact that they are incorporated in the Archdiocese of Ottawa. I do not know much about the divisions and boundaries of the dioceses of the Roman Catholic Church, but I am informed that the Archdiocese of Ottawa includes three counties in the Province of Ontario. That it includes the city of Ottawa, and, therefore, the society which was incorporated by the Province of Quebec would be incorporated only in portions of the Province of Quebec and also in portions of the Province of Ontario. That would be one reason for disallowing the Act, that it incorporates a society not only in the Province of Quebec but also in portions of the Province of Ontario. It appears to me, from the reasons I have already adduced, from the reasons recorded in the resolution in your hand, and from other reasons, that it would have been better for the peace and happiness of the various portions of this community if this society had not been incorporated and had not received this endowment. In the first place, it diverts money from its lawful object. That money, has been, I belive, faithfully administered for the purpose of superior education since the Quebec Government got it in 1831. This Act also recognises the supremacy of the Pope over the Queen and over the Quebec Government; and it is also bringing into life—illegally, as I believe—a society which was legally suppressed by the British Government in 1775. As there was no Legislature in Canada until 1791, I believe that Act, not having been repealed, is still law in Canada to-day. I am against this Act for another reason, as I have already said, that I do not believe the Confederation Act gives any such power to vote any such money for any such purpose, and, therefore, though agreeing with the Government in its great policy, which has been so successful in this country, and has made this Canada of ours a great and prosperous Dominion, I shall be compelled to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien).

Mr. COLBY. In addressing the House I shall endeavor to confine my remarks very closely to the question now before the Chair. I do not find it necessary, in the discussion of that question, from my standpoint at least, to go into the record, as other speakers have done, of that remarkable order of men, the Society of the Jesuit Fathers, of their beliefs or of their conduct a century or more ago. I do not think that necessary to a proper determination of the question now before the House. Nor shall I go into any close legal consideration of the case, as did the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), because I think it must be decided upon other, and broader, and more liberal ideas than can be drawn from nice legal, fine-drawn, hair-spun distinctions; and I think such remarks would have been more applicable in the Quebec Legislature at the time when the Bill referred to was under discussion, than they are in this Parliament at this time. The proposition now before the House, as I understand it, carries an implied censure of the Government for not having disallowed the Act of the Quebec Legislature for the settlement of the Jesuits' estates, and a positive instruction to the Government to disallow it. I think we will all agree that the power of disallowance, which, by the Constitution is vested in the Governor General and his advisers, is a power which should be exercised with the greatest discretion; that, in the first place, it should appear, before an attempt is made to exercise that power, that the Government has the clearest possible right to exercise it; and then it should appear that there was an obvious necessity for its exercise. It is a serious matter to interfere with the deliberate will of a Local Legislature under any circumstances whatever—the clear and deliberate will of a Local Legislature. It is a more serious matter—for the gravity is vastly magnified—when the question upon which it is attempted to counteract their will and to nullify their legislation is one which touches the most sensitive feelings, the religious sympathies and convictions of the majority of the people in the Province which is to be affected. Now, there are certain things which we must recognise as existing facts. It is true that this order of the Jesuits was at one time suppressed; that is a historical fact. It is equally true—and that is a present and pregnant fact which we must recognise—that this order of the Jesuits has to-day, in the Province of Quebec, legal status, a status which is assured by the strongest legal sanctions of the Legislature, and which is assured by the highest sanction of the church and recognised by the whole body of the Roman Catholic Church. So that, an attack upon the order of the Jesuits in the Province of Quebec is an attack upon the Roman Catholic Church, upon the entire body of the Roman Catholic Church, and there should be no misapprehension upon that point. We must not delude ourselves into the belief that we are assaulting an obnoxious and a friendless power or entity that is entitled to the execration of all mankind. We must recognise the fact—and I do not know how it has come about, whether by a change in their practices or a change in their beliefs or otherwise; I have not gone into an enquiry into that point—but we must recognise it as a postiive fact that they are to-day under the ægis of the Supreme Pontiff and of the church, and are fraternally recognised to-day by the entire body of the church. Consequently, we must realise that if we nullify this Act of the Provincial Legislature as is proposed, we have not only to override a sentiment in Quebec, which is stronger in that Province than in any other in this Dominion, in favor of the maintenance of provincial rights, but we have to make up our minds to attack the solid sentiments of the majority of the people of that Province in their religious convictions, and in regard to that legislation which the majority believe to be their right and duty within the lines of the Constitution. I say, then, that we must carefully revise our position and see that we make no mistake. We must see that we have a clear, and positive, and undoubted right to do this thing; then we must see that there is an obvious necessity for doing this thing, and then we must consider, in view of the integrity of our country, in view of the peace, the prosperity, the harmony and the contentment of our people, the full, the possible, the certain consequences of adopting the course which is now proposed. We have a Constitution, it is true, which binds our Provinces together in a Confederation, but that is a paper bond. The moment you destroy mutual good-will between the people of this country, the moment you array the people of this country in hostility—personal and religious hostility—one against another, you have destroyed the only bond which can permanently hold us happily together. Now, I am going to limit my argument within very narrow lines, and I maintain that if this House agrees with me in these premises, the right to disallow must be very clear and the duty obvious, before we undertake this serious responsibility, before this House goes on a step further in the direction proposed. We had the deliberately and carefully considered opinions of the Minister of Justice, and all his colleagues in the Government, that the Act of the Quebec Legislature was wholly *intra vires*, and that there is no legal or constitutional power in the Dominion Government to disallow it. Does not that of itself create a doubt? Have we not also the opinion of men of eminent ability in this House and in this country, of high authority on constitutional questions, differing from the Government in politics, differing from them on most every

point, yet who are in agreement with them on this point, that we have no right to disallow this Act? Then, I say, is there not sufficient ground to establish the only proposition I care to establish, that there is some doubt about it? Then, I say, if it is a doubtful right, we should not face the certain consequences, the disastrous consequences of disallowance. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have in the records in this Parliament a closely parallel case to this, and in many respects a stronger case than this, in which Parliament has recorded its deliberate opinion; I refer to the New Brunswick school question, which was precipitated upon Parliament within the memory of those of us who were members of the first Parliament of Canada, precipitated upon us at a very inconvenient period, just on the eve of the general elections of 1872, a question which raised discussions of a most alarming character, and which created a degree of anxiety in the minds of every member of the House, which has never been equalled in the 21 years of my experience in Parliament. At that time a Catholic minority of one of the Provinces of this Dominion came before Parliament, not with any abstract proposition, but with a clear and positive grievance. They made out a case which aroused the sympathies of Parliament to an extent that I have never seen them aroused before. There was not in Parliament, as the records will show, an individual member of this House, on either side, Protestant or Catholic, or of any nationality, or from any Province, who did not record his vote of censure against the authorities of New Brunswick by an expression of regret and a hope that the causes of discontent would be removed—I say not a single member of the House who did not record his vote in that sense except those who wanted to go further and give a positive remedy. The Catholic minority of New Brunswick came to us and said: "Before Confederation we had the right of enjoying our own separate schools; we were receiving Government assistance in support of our own schools; we were not compelled to send our children to the schools or to assist in maintaining the schools, which we thought dangerous to the morality and the religion of our pupils; we enjoyed that right long before Confederation; Government assisted those schools; we built the schoolhouses at our own expense, the Government made appropriations for the support of those schools; we had, in fact enjoyed a system of separate schools for many years before Confederation, and from Confederation up the year 1871, when, contrary to the determined opposition of the Catholic minority, composing two-fifths of the population of New Brunswick, contrary to their protestations, the Legislature of New Brunswick, by a vote which was carried in the Upper Chamber by a majority of one, reversed that system, and compelled us to support schools to which we could not send our children, they withdrew all support from the schools which we must sustain as conscientious men;" and they came to this Parliament and asked a remedy. They said to us: "We think this is a case clearly within the 93rd section of the Constitutional Act, and we ask for remedial legislation under the 4th sub-section or for disallowance; but if you are unwilling to apply either of these remedies, then we ask that you will memorialise the Imperial Parliament to revise the Constitution and place us where we ought to have been, place us where we supposed we were at the time of Confederation, place us as the minorities in Ontario and Quebec are placed in respect to separate schools, we care not what remedy you apply, but relieve us from the situation. Those different propositions were brought before the House, and every one of them was refused. We refused to disallow the Act. Why? Not because we did not believe that if fairness and equity alone were to prevail it ought to be disallowed; but because we had a doubt as to the right to exercise that veto. The Minister of Justice of the day expressed the opinion that we had no right to disallow it; and an hon. learned gentleman of highest authority in this House at that time, and of highest authority in this House and in this country on those matters at the present time—I allude to the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake)—expressed himself as having doubts on that question. On the other hand Hon. Mr. Dorion, now Chief Justice of Quebec, Hon. Mr. Fournier, now a judge of the Supreme Court, Hon. Mr. Holton, a high authority on constitutional law, and Hon. Mr. Joly, with thirty-four, voted to censure the Government for not having disallowed the Act. Parliament deliberately recorded its doubts by adopting the Mackenzie amendment, which asked the advice of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on that question. We felt it was a case where a remedy should be applied to remove an existing grievance, but we doubted our right to apply that remedy, and we expressed our doubt by adopting the Mackenzie amendment, and proposing a reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. We acknowledged the justice of their cause, they were coming to us for relief, the whole of the Catholic portion of the Province was aroused on that question, their clergy and leading men came to us, bringing every influence they could to bear, and yet we refused that remedy to the Catholic minority of the Province of New Brunswick. To-day we are asked, in a case of doubtful authority, to do for the Protestant minority of the Province of Quebec that which we refused to do in a similarly doubtful case for the Catholic minority of New Brunswick. So this House is asked in regard to the Protestant minority in Quebec, which made no strenuous resistance to the passing of the obnoxious Act by the Legislature of that Province, to intervene upon doubtful grounds, while we refused to intervene in behalf of a Catholic minority whose claims we acknowledged to be just claims, who used every influence and power they possessed, who fought the question in the Local Legislature inch by inch and then came here resting on their rights and claiming them and urging them in the most emphatic manner upon us. Now, I think we can hardly be expected to do that. If the former course was the right course, the course now proposed would be a glaringly wrong course. If we will not relieve actual grievances of the most serious character to persons aggrieved and who claimed they were aggrieved, and who begged our intervention, shall we intervene in behalf of those who do not claim, who do not state they have any grievances; shall we step out of our way to do this, to voluntarily do it when our right to do so is doubtful? I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that this House can deliberately come to any conclusion of that kind. When we remember the keen resentment which was expressed by all the organs of Protestant sentiment in New Brunswick because this Parliament had presumed to express regret that discontent existed there, and a hope that the School Act might be so amended as to give reasonable satisfaction to the Catholics of New Brunswick, which was the substance of the amendment which I had the honor to propose at that time, and which Parliament then adopted in order to alleviate the situation; when I say we call to mind the keen resentment with which this mild interference was received by the Protestants of New Brunswick, we may well imagine what an outbreak would occur in Quebec were the Protestant majority in this Parliament to cause the disallowance of an Act which was passed by the unanimous vote of the Legislature of Quebec; that Legislature having acted, as is believed by a majority of the people, within the line of their strict rights. I believe, Sir, that the paramount duty of whatever Government controls the destiny of Canada is to preserve the integrity of the Union within the lines of the Constitution. I believe it is their duty to avoid, so far as they can do it, keeping within the lines of their constitutional duty, every cause of offence to the various Provinces, because any conflict between provincial authority and the central power is pregnant with danger. The Constitution has already stood several severe strains. We have seen, I will not say by whose

fault, in one Province of the Dominion, that Province swept by a sentiment favorable to an entire separation from this Dominion. We have seen in another Province the Government of the day and all existing things swept away by a spirit of nationalism, that felt in some way injured by the action of the central Government. We have seen the Province of Ontario agitated on account of an alleged infringement of provincial rights, and so also the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). A real infringement.

Mr. COLBY. A real or fancied—I am not discussing that question now. All these were serious blows and injurious to the Constitution and to the country, and are to be deeply regretted. Those who desire the perpetuity of our system of Confederation should never make use of such questions for party purposes, except constrained by necessity, because they are not fair party weapons, and they tend to disorganise the country. I say the constitution has stood several strains of a serious kind; but there is one strain it has not been subjected to, and I hope it may never be subjected to it, and it is that where religious strife and altercation, where animosities and feelings of the kind which grow out of exasperated religious sentiment are evoked. We know, and I will not comment upon it, and people outside of this House must realise, that if we pass the resolution proposed it will precipitate a crisis the most dangerous that ever occurred in the history of this country, and the most dangerous that could possibly be imagined. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, from the manifestations of feeling which are being expressed in certain parts of the Dominion, that the very zealous Protestants of some sections must have felt that the Protestant minority in the Province of Quebec have been very apathetic in the matter of the passage of this Jesuit Settlement Act. I believe there is nowhere in this Dominion a body of Protestants more willing to vindicate their rights, more willing to make sacrifices for the preservation of their rights than are the Protestants of the Province of Quebec. I do not believe they are disloyal to Protestant ideas. But the Protestants of the Province of Quebec have lived for many years in close relation and in close contact with their fellow-citizens of a different religion, and many prejudices which the one might otherwise feel against the other have been worn away by contact. The Protestants and the Catholics of the Province of Quebec, so far as I know their relations, live together happily upon mutually respecting terms, each respecting the other's rights, each respecting even the other's sensibilities and prejudices, and co-operating together, working together, for what they believe to be for the common interests, without jealousy, without friction, without over-sensitiveness, recognising the good things in each other; if they differ, quietly differing, and not making themselves ob noxious to each other. These are the relations which have grown out of long years of personal contact, living together side by side, meeting and knowing each other. That is a happy condition of affairs, but it is an actual condition of affairs in those parts of the Province with which I am personally acquainted. That is not a condition of affairs that the Protestants of Quebec desire to have disturbed. The Protestants of Quebec, and I think I fairly voice their sentiments, acknowledge the fact—if they do not acknowledge it to be so, it is a fact—that there never was a minority in any country treated with more justice, with more liberality, with more generosity than the Protestant minority of the Province of Quebec have been treated, irrespective of political parties. They have always had the control of affairs that most concerned them, those matters connected with education and other matters concerning which the Protestants were most interested aa Protestants, and they have had as much control over such questions as if they had had an entire Legislature of Protestants; they have not been meddled with, they have simply been permitted to manage their own affairs and they have not felt that they were in a minority in any instance that I recollect. Look at the political sentiment also. The Liberal party of Quebec elected as its leader for many years that noble man whom we all respect, Mr. Joly, a Protestant. They were not jealous, they had no objection on account of his Protestantism to serving under a leader whom they recognised as an able man whose views were in political accord with their own. The Conservative Government were equally liberal. Why, during the Conservative régime in Quebec, perhaps the most important office in the Cabinet had all along been held by a good old orthodox Presbyterian Treasurer, Mr. Robertson, and we were allowed during that régime, perhaps, an undue representation in the Government of the Province. We had two members, able and influential men, in a Cabinet of seven, which is certainly an undue proportion, and they were men of influence and men of character and ability. So that in all these respects we have nothing to complain of, and, perhaps, it is for that reason that we do not wish unnecessarily to provoke an issue which would result in the disturbance of those kindly relations. Then, again—and I know it influenced some men of high standing among the Protestants of that Province—we are finding Protestants and Catholics alike, Protestant and Catholic clergymen, standing on a common platform in the advocacy of matters which both think concern the well-being of the people. It is not very long ago, if I recollect aright, when His Eminence Cardinal Taschereau presided over a meeting held by Catholics and Protestants to consult with regard to the best legislation to be had on the subject of temperance. Leading men of both churches are working together to promote the best ends of the community as viewed from their common standpoint. That is a condition of affairs which had been recognised by many Protestants who are interested in the cause of temperance as one which should be perpetuated. I simply instance these things to illustrate the friendly sentiment, and to show the cordial relations existing between Protestants and Catholics in the Province of Quebec and the desirability from the point of view of either that those relations, friendly co-operative relations as they are, should not be disturbed. Again, let us consider what would have been the result if we had precipitated an agitation, if we had made the attack, or if we had raised this issue in which we were sure to be defeated. I may say here, which is a fact, that there is hardly a constituency in the Province of Quebec in which either the Roman Catholic electors are not in an actual majority, or in which they do not hold the balance of power. It is attributed to an hon. member of this House—I do not know how truly—that he said the other day with regard to the French Roman Catholics that they considered first their religion, second their nationality, and third their party, and I believe that this is truly said of them. We saw in the great change that was made at the last elections in the Province of Quebec what the national feeling when appealed to would exhibit. I think it is true that the religious sentiment is the highest with the French Canadian people, and if it is above nationality, if it is above party, if that sentiment is prepared to ally itself with one party or another party and that the question of party is a minor consideration, then in almost every constituency of the Province of Quebec the Protestants would be deprived of their just representation in the Legislature of the Province. There was nothing to be gained by raising an issue in which the result was a foregone conclusion and which issue could not by any possibility have resulted favorably to the Protestants. For these reasons what course was pursued? The Protestants of Quebec have never acknowledged that the Jesuit body had a legal claim to the restoration of those estates. The press has never acknowledged it, the public men have never acknowledged it, the pulpit has never

acknowledged it. Further than that the Protestants of Quebec have never acknowledged that the Jesuits had a moral claim to the restoration of those estates, and they placed themselves deliberately on record by their speeches in the Legislature on that point. It was a most bitter and nauseous pill they had to swallow when the name of the Pope was foisted into that Act. But that objection was more a matter of sentiment than otherwise. Assuming that the thing was to be done, assuming that $400,000 was to be divided among certain Roman Catholic institutions, it certainly was desirable, from every standpoint, that that distribution should be final; that it should not be an ever-recurring question and a reference to the highest authority of the church, the only one power which could make that a final settlement had its advantages. There is no doubt about that. If it was acknowledged that a sum of money should be distributed among the Catholic institutions it was desirable that it should be so distributed as to satisfy those who would receive it, and it was desirable that it should be recognised as a final settlement, so that, from a practical standpoint, it might have been attended with certain wise and practical advantages if this reference were made; but I say that, as a matter of sentiment, it was not a pleasant thing to Protestants that the Pope should be consulted. Yet the Protestant press did nothing more than to record their protests against it. I do not think that any one who knows the editor of the Montreal *Witness* will suspect him to be a man who would not proclaim his Protestant principles if assailed, or who would truckle to Roman Catholics; and yet, if I recollect aright, the Montreal *Witness*, which is the most outspoken and the most advanced Protestant newspaper in the Province of Quebec, had but two mild editorials while this thing was going on. It published the reports of proceedings as news items, but it simply quietly objected to the proposition that the Jesuits had either a moral or a legal right to what they asked. It did not say to its readers: "Your rights have been assailed —agitate! agitate! arouse yourselves!" It said nothing of the kind. The pulpit is usually outspoken when the pulpit feels that rights dear to it are invaded; yet no man that I have heard of from the pulpit ever called upon his congregation or upon the people to agitate on this question. He expressed his views upon it; and there is no doubt as to the Protestant view on the subject; it is not the Catholic view of the question; and while the Protestants have never surrendered their views, they have placed them quietly on record, and they have contented themselves with that. I do not read all the newspapers of the country, but I do read that great organ of public opinion, the Montreal *Herald*, and I do not recollect that the Montreal *Herald* ever put in anything more than a mild protest. It did not call on the people to "agitate! agitate!" The Montreal *Gazette* was, perhaps, the most pronounced in its utterances on the question, but it merely expressed its views, and did not call upon the people to agitate the question. There were no petitions that I know of going up to the Legislature from any portion of the Protestant community, asking it not to pass that Bill. So, if the Protestants of Quebec may be fairly credited by the Protestants of Ontario and other Provinces as being men of equal ability with themselves, of equal fidelity to the principles of Christianity, of equal capacity to judge with regard to the fitness of things and what was right or wrong, what was opportune or inopportune, if they may be fairly credited with equal opportunities of judging, I think they should be spared the animadversions which some are inclined to cast on them. I think they understood the situation better, and I think they were as true to the principles of Christianity as the blatant men are now who are trying to agitate the country after the thing is done, and when there is no good object to be served. I think they are equally true, equally intelligent, equally devoted to the cause of Protestantism, and I think they are in a better position to know what is best for them, from their individual standpoint. At all events, if the Government are censurable for not having disallowed this Act, what opprobrium should not be cast on the Protestant minority of Quebec for not having protested against it, as the minority of New Brunswick did against the school law in that Province. It was because they felt and realised no actual grievance, and because they did not want, for a sentimental grievance, to fight in a hopeless cause, to arouse animosity, to disturb the relations which are beneficial and in the interest of the whole community. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not care to protract my remarks longer. I am a Protestant. The Roman Catholic Church—I will not speak of it as a religious body—I look upon to-day, speaking of it from a political standpoint and a political standpoint only—as one of the strongest if not the strongest bulwark we have in our country against what I conceive to be the most dangerous element abroad in the earth to-day. The Roman Catholic Church recognises the supremacy of authority; it teaches observance to law; it teaches respect for the good order and constituted authorities of society. It does that and there is need of such teaching; for the most dangerous enemy abroad to-day in this land and on this continent is a spirit of infidelity; is a spirit of anarchy, which has no respect for any institution, human or divine; which seeks to drag down all constituted authorities; emperors, kings, presidents from their seats; the Almighty from the throne of the universe, and lift up the goddess of Reason to the place of highest authority. This dangerous enemy, this insidious enemy, is infecting the popular mind, not so much in Canada—thanks, largely to the safeguards thrown about its people by the Roman Catholic Church—as in the neighboring Republic. If there is a danger in that country and in this more to be dreaded than all others it is to my mind that spirit of infidelity and anarchy, that destructive insidious spirit, and it can be best combated by that great spiritual power which upholds authority and law, whose very existence is dependent on the idea of authority, which cannot exist as a church or an institution of influence except upon the idea of authority and the observance of law, whose teachings are all in that direction. I do not believe it is in the interest of this Dominion to alienate, by any undue or unnecessary attacks, any one of the great powers upon which we must depend for the maintenance of our most cherished principles and institutions. I believe, Sir, that we have a duty to perform to each other, and that duty I have indicated. I did not intend to trespass on the House so long as I have done, but I thought it was proper that someone should represent what he conceives, at all events, to be the sentiment of the Protestant community in the Province of Quebec. I think the time is near at hand when it will be recognised by the two great religions of this country, the Protestant and the Roman Catholic, that the time for bickering has pased, that they have a common interest, and that for the promotion of that common interest they should stand shoulder to shoulder, work confidingly and in a friendly way together for the preservation of a common Christianity and all that is most dear and sacred to both, and thus, I conceive, will the best interests of this Dominion, and the best interests of civilisation on this continent, be promoted.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise for the purpose of making a speech on this question, I rise for the purpose of simply giving a few brief explanations for the vote that I shall give. I may say at the outset that for once during the present Session and the last preceding one or two Sessions, I am going to support the Administration. I do not do it because of any particular virtue in that Administration; nobody would believe me if I said I did; but I do it because I feel it to be to the interest of the smaller Provinces, a county in one of which I have the honor

to represent. Sir, I am not going to enter into the merits of the question as to the whether the course Mr. Mercier pursued in dealing with the Jesuits' estates was a prudent course or not. Perhaps, if I had been a member of the Legislature of Quebec, representing a Protestant element in that Province, I might have doubted the propriety of that measure, and, perhaps, have voted against its passage. I have heard it stated to-night by some gentlemen that it was an improper thing to first charter the Jesuit Society. I have heard it next stated that it was an improper thing to pass the Bill voting the money, and that it was giving to a foreign power the right to dictate how the money of the people of the Province of Quebec was to be administered. These questions, I take it, are within the province of the Legislature of Quebec, and during the passage of that Jesuit Bill, occupying a public position as connected with a leading journal—I am proud to say it is recognised on the other side—I have taken somewhat of an interest in observing the effect it had amongst the Protestant element in that Province who are paying the money. Now, Sir, I may say this, and I think I will say it without fear of contradiction, that during the passage of the Bill incorporating the Jesuits' Society, there was scarcely a Protestant paper throughout the whole of the Province that raised one single objection against it. I will next say, when dealing with the financial feature of the question, that with the exception, so far as I can recollect, of two members out of the fifteen Protestant members in the Legislature of Quebec, not one of them raised their voices against the passage of the Bill, and those two did raise them in very moderate tones. And when it came to the question of dividing the House upon the point, these gentlemen called out, "carried on division." The Premier said: No, I will take the names upon it; and when they found that the names were to be taken, if I recollect the facts aright, they said "unanimous," and it was carried unanimously. Was there any excitement or any agitation on the part of the Protestant element of the Province of Quebec during that time? No. Months have elapsed, and it is only when some of the—shall I call them fanatics?—I think it would be a good name to give them—in the Province of Ontario raised, for what purpose I do not know, this agitation, that this question comes up A good many of them are friends of the right hon. the First Minister, and I fear he has often expressed the wish: "Save me from my friends." But whatever may have been their motive, it could have been no very good one, for there is no object to be gained by the agitation of this question, but to create trouble, dissension and bad feeling throughout the community. I re echo the sentiments of the hon. gentleman who last spoke, that Christian charity should prevail, and that in place of sowing dissension broadcast throughout this land, we ought to endeavor to harmonise in a community, so mixed as this, the different religious elements, in place of sowing discord among them and creating feelings such as have been created by these men to-day. If there are any people aggrieved in relation to this matter, who are they? Are they the Protestants of Ontario? What right have they to dictate to us, the Protestants of the Province of Quebec, as to how we shall dispose of our own money? I have heard the arguments they have used by those who sustained this motion, that this property was given for a special purpose. But how is this money voted? For what purpose is it given? Is it not given for the purposes of education, for that is the object for which those who receive it intend to appropriate it? Let any one come and reside in the Province of Quebec and become acquainted with the institutions which are to get this money, and he will find that they are promoting education among a large and the most numerous class of the people in the Province of Quebec in a manner that reflects credit upon their institutions. I am not a Roman Catholic, but I respect the Roman Catholics of the country. It will ever be my wish to live in harmony and peace with them, and wherever I can promote their interests fairly, giving due consideration to the interests of the Protestant community, they will always find, as they always have found during my past career, that I will do it. Our Provincial Legislature voted this money—and I will not say it was a wise thing to do, because it has raised a feeling which I regret has been raised, and which I will say now never ought to have been raised by the people of Ontario. It has raised that feeling, but as the money has been voted, I say it is the money of the people of the Province of Quebec, and the Protestants of the Province of Ontario have no excuse for their agitation. Years after the incorporation took place, and many months after the money was voted, they have no right to create that agitation, whatever may have been the motive for it. They have no right to interfere with the manner in which we, in the Province of Quebec, shall dispose of our own money. I represent and have some control over a leading organ of the press in that Province. I have taken very little part, through that paper, in this discussion, but throughout the whole of it, while I did not approve of Mr. Mercier's course in voting the money, I justified the action of this Government to-day in refusing to veto this Bill. When one of these Provinces, coming within the limits of the power given them by the British North America Act, chooses to dispose of its money in the way this money has been disposed of, I justify this Government in not interfering with the operation of the Act; and if they had interfered, they would have met with any censure which I, in my place here and through the newspaper which I control, could have passed on them. I am glad to say the Government have pursued the course they have. I am glad to say they have done the right thing. From the standpoint of a Maritime Province man, coming from one of the two or three smallest Provinces of this Dominion, it would be a sacrifice of the dearest interests and the greatest security which the British North America Act gives to the smaller Provinces if the Government had been allowed to interfere within the limits of the powers of the Legislatures of these Provinces in the way some hon. gentlemen desire they should. I have simply risen to state these few facts, in order to justify by this explanation the vote which I shall give. I feel that outside of everything else, I am a protectionist of my own Province. I desire to protect the rights of the smaller Provinces of this Dominion against the superior ones, and I think that the people of the Province of Ontario, where this agitation has entirely arisen, have gone beyond their limits in this matter. The agitation has been created in the Province of Ontario; it has been swelled into importance by the agitation, the ministerial agitation—I do not mean governmental; I mean ministerial in another sense. And for what purpose? Ought it to be the desire of any man who seeks to secure the future peace, harmony and prosperity of this country, to create dissensions between the Roman Catholics and Protestants, between the French Canadians and Ontarians? No, Sir. We ought to promote harmony if we can; we ought to endeavor to remove religious dissensions; we ought to endeavor to keep within the bounds of the political rights which the British North America Act has established for the different Provinces of the Dominion, and we ought to be especially careful that the larger Provinces, or the Dominion, should not attempt to assume a jurisdiction they have no right to exercise, and to infringe upon the privileges and rights of the smaller Provinces. With these few remarks, I shall endeavor to bring to a conclusion anything I have to say upon this matter, and I should not have spoken upon it were it not that I did not wish to give a silent vote on an important motion like this. I wish to say one thing more, and I hope the right hon. the First Minister will receive it in the spirit in which I give it. I do not think it is good

policy for my right hon. friend to put up his followers behind him to defend the course the Administration will pursue in relation to this matter; and in place of protracting a discussion such as this, the right hon. gentleman or the gentleman in his Cabinet who occupies a prominent position in the Orange Association, which is largely at the bottom of this matter, or my respected friend the Minister of Justice, who is so able to do it, should rise and state the policy of the Government. I now call upon one or other of them, I do not care which —and I believe I have the right to do so, under the practice of the Imperial Parliament on such an occasion—to state what is the policy of the Administration on this matter. Let them come out frankly and state if they are prepared to stand by the course they have pursued of not touching the Bill, of not attempting to disallow it, but of letting it take its operation, emanating as it does from the power which had the constitutional right to pass it. I say, if one or other of those gentlemen will get up and make a declaration on this point, I believe they will squelch out the efforts which are being made to sow dissension throughout this land, and will put an end to this senseless debate which has been brought before this Parliement.

Mr. McCARTHY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think Sir John A. Macdonald will agree with me that we should go on and finish this to-night.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think there is any chance of finishing the debate to-night. I know there are a great many gentlemen who intend to speak, and that being the case, and as it is must stand over for another day I think it would be well to agree to the motion of my hon. friend.

Mr. LAURIER. Though it is rather early, still, as an important member like the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) is to speak next, I think it is only right, in courtesy to him, that we should adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

Mr. LAURIER. Will this debate go on to-morrow?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Has the hon. gentleman the hardihood to take away from private members the only day we have this week, yesterday being a holiday?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was at the special request of the hon. gentleman that instead of taking last Wednesday for Government business we took to-morrow. He insisted upon it, and I gracefully yielded to his pressure.

Mr. MITCHELL. I asked that you should not take last Wednesday, but I did not agree that you should take this Wednesday away.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 27th March, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That as the time for the reception of reports from the Committee on Private Bills expires to-morrow, the same be extended to the 4th of April next, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the Tenth Report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines.

Motion agreed to.

INDIAN TREATIES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether any new Indian Treaties have been concluded since the 1st day of July, 1888? 2. If so, what extent of land, in square miles, has been assigned in each case as a Reservation for the Indians included in such treaty? 3. How many Indians came under the operation of said treaty, or treaties, in each case? 4. What are the terms of said treaty, or treaties?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A treaty was made on the 11th of February of this year with two bands of Wood Cree Indians. About 11,000 square miles were surrendered, and 577 Indians were treated with. The number of acres to each family of five is the same as in Treaty No. 6, namely, 640 acres. The terms are similar to those of Treaty No. 6.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—MORTGAGE BONDS.

Mr. STE. MARIE asked, When will the Government produce the report ordered on the 4th March instant by this honorable House, on the motion of Mr. Ste. Marie, concerning the sale of fifteen million dollars of mortgage bonds by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The information asked for has not yet been received, but as soon as we have it the same will be laid on the table.

CAPE ENRAGE LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) asked, Has there been any change of the lighthouse keeper of the Cape Enrage Light? If so, when was it made, and for what reason, and who is the present keeper? Has there been any investigation or enquiry as to the cause of the late fire which destroyed the engine house; when was such enquiry made, and what was the result of the enquiry?

Mr. TUPPER. By Order in Council of 29th March, 1888, Mr. W. J. Starratt was dismissed from the service, it appearing on an investigation held by the agent at St. John, that he had not given proper care and attention to the duties required; that on certain occasions the fog-alarm was not sounded during thick weather as required by the regulations, and that he had absented himself from his station without leave. Mr. James G. Barbour, of Waterside, Albert County, was appointed lighthouse keeper by Order in Council of 11th May, 1888. The old engine house was destroyed by fire on the 19th of December last, and the agent of the Department at St. John was instructed on the 22nd of December, to make enquiries and report fully as to the cause of the fire, and so on. A report was received on the 29th of December from the agent, stating that he did not consider that suspicion rested upon anyone, that the fire was accidental, having taken inside near the roof, and made strong headway before it was discovered. The engineer stated that he had incurred a personal loss of $100.

ARICHAT WEST BREAKWATER.

Mr. MACDOWALL (for Gen. LAURIE) asked, Whether the Department of Public Works has received any claim for compensation on account of property expropriated at the breakwater at Arichat West, in the county of Richmond, Cape Breton, for Miss Annabella Hubert; and if so, whether the claim can be favorably considered?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A claim was received, and on enquiry it was ascertained that Miss Hubert was not

the owner of the property in question; the agent of the Department of Justice, who examined the title, stating:

"It is plain that Miss Hubert has no title to the property in question; and as the works do not extend above the line of high water mark, no grant of a water lot for that spot having ever issued, and no damage being done to the premises, it is evident the parties actually owning those lands have likewise no right to claim damages."

This opinion was conveyed to Miss Hubert under date 8th November, 1886.

CORRECTION.

Mr. COOK. I notice in the Toronto *World* of the 22nd of March the following statement:—

"Mr. Cook's Bill to compel owners of elevators to provide proper precautions to prevent accidents, came to grief to-day in the Select Committee to which it had been referred. They came to the conclusion that the subject was one for provincial legislation."

I am not the author of the Bill. It was introduced by the member for North Ontario (Mr. Edgar).

Mr. MADILL. The Bill got the six months' hoist.

SUPPLY—JESUITS' ESTATES ACT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply;" and the motion of Mr. O'Brien in amendment thereto.

Mr. McCARTHY. At the close of the sitting last evening I rose somewhat reluctantly, and only because I thought if I did not seize that opportunity, you, Sir, would call in the members, and the opportunity of addressing the House would be lost. I thought then, and I think now, that considering the nature of the motion which is before the House, it would not have been unreasonable for the Government, or some member of the Government, to have defended their action in the past in allowing the Bill under discussion, and to have given those reasons to us which, perhaps, would have justified their course, and, at all events, would have enabled those who differ from them to show wherein that difference lies. My hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) is entitled to the thanks of this House and country for bringing this matter before Parliament. It would have been, I think, an everlasting disgrace to us if, in this, a free Parliament and free country, there would be no member found out of the 200 odd who compose this House, to give voice to the opinions of a very large body of the people who have been aroused with regard to this measure. I say when my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) gave reasons why he thought this Bill should still be disallowed, notwithstanding the action of the Government, when he assailed the action of the Government upon constitutional grounds, and when to that was added the attack made by my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace), and the more elaborate attack, upon legal grounds, made by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), it does appear to me that it would have been ordinary courtesy to those hon. gentlemen, and to the House itself, that some defence should have been made from the Treasury benches. I hardly think that we can take seriously the defence which has been offered by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). I do not for myself take it seriously. With regard to the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), the case is different. His remarks require attention, and from me they shall receive serious consideration. But, although my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) is a gentleman of long standing in the House, he frankly told us that he prayed, as I understood him, that he never again would have to present himself before his constituents to ask for a renewal of their confidence.

Mr. RYKERT. I did not say so.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Mr. McCARTHY. I must have misunderstood the hon. gentleman, and, of course, take that back. Then my hon. friend, the other gentleman to whom I have referred (Mr. Colby), who spoke so feelingly and so ably, whose voice we are always glad to listen to, whose wisdom we all recognise, is possibly a prospective Minister; but, although that be so, I think it would still have been perhaps better if we had heard from an actual Minister, and not a prospective Minister, on a question of this importance. It may be that before this debate closes the House will hear from the Treasury benches upon this subject. Their silence so far in the discussion is, I consider, hardly giving us fair play. Fortified by the leaders opposite, fortified by the great number of hon. gentlemen who are going to support them in this House, I do think they should have allowed the small band here who are opposed to their action any possible advantage that could be given by the debate, and not have remained silent, but have given the reasons why the course of the Government should be sustained. However that may be, we must take the situation just as we find it, and I was not willing the discussion should close without giving the reasons why I am taking the course which I propose taking on this important matter, and in which I will have to separate myself from my political friends with whom it has been my pride and pleasure to act up to this time. The question must be considered in a two-fold aspect. It has to be considered as to its constitutionality in the narrower sense of the term, and as to its constitutionality in the wider sense of the term. If it is *ultra vires* the Legislature of Quebec, it ought to have been disallowed. If it is *intra vires*, if it is within the powers of the Legislature of that Province, then I still say it ought to have been disallowed. But the matters are so entirely separate and distinct—the one resting upon legal constitutional principles of one description, and the other depending upon considerations of a widely different character, that I have to ask the permission of the House to deal with these matters separately and distinctly. First, it is well we should clearly understand the character of the legislation which is assailed. It will not do to ignore the past; it will not do, as the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) did, to say it is not necessary to consider fine spun legal arguments, or to deal with the question in that way. All these questions have first to be considered from the legal point of view. We have a very large volume, not down to the present time, of the cases which have been disallowed, most of them because they were beyond the power of the Provincial Legislatures to enact. Therefore, the first question which the Minister of Justice had to report upon was whether this Act was constitutional in that sense of the term. The first question was whether it was within the powers of the Legislature of the Province. Then the other question came before himself and colleagues—a matter more of great public policy than of law—as to whether on these grounds the measure ought to have been disallowed. It is well to look at the Act, and although I have no doubt that all of us have read the Act and pretty well understand it, yet I will ask the House to bear with me while I give shortly a summary of what I consider to be the salient features of this most extraordinary piece of legislation. It commenced by a letter from the Premier of Quebec, in which he addressed His Eminence the Cardinal, who, I suppose, occupies somewhat the position of the Prime Minister of His Holiness the Pope. In that letter Mr. Mercier, having recited the history of the case, says:

"Under these circumstances, I deem it my duty to ask Your Eminence if you see any serious objection to the Government selling the property, pending a final settlement of the question of the Jesuits' Estates."

Here we have the Premier of one of our Provinces asking of His Holiness, or of the Secretary of the Propaganda, occupying the position to which I have referred, for per-

mission, it being his duty, as he says, so to do, to sell the property—asking him to see if there is any serious objection in the way of the Government selling the property, pending the final settlement of the Jesuits' Estates. It is sufficiently startling to find such a recital in a British Act of Parliament, and I venture to say it is unheard of, I venture to say that, in all the legislation passed by the Parliaments of Great Britain or the Legislatures of any of the Colonies, you will search in vain to find any so humiliating a statement as this very first paragraph of the Bill presents to you. But that does not seem to excite surprise in the power to which it was addressed, because the answer is in this form:

"I hasten to notify you that, having laid your request before the Holy Father at the audience yesterday, His Holiness was pleased to grant permission to sell the property which belonged to the Jesuit Fathers before they were suppressed,——"

So the permission is given—

"—upon the express condition, however,——"

So the condition is annexed—

"—that the sum to be received be deposited and left at the free disposal of the Holy See."

Thus the Province of Quebec is permitted to legislate. The first step has been gained in the settlement of this important question. The free Parliament of Quebec, entrusted under the British North America Act with important powers, and representing a mixed community, a community with which the Supreme Pontiff of Rome has no power to interfere as a temporal power, asks, and the Supreme Pontiff graciously grants permission to that Legislature, to deal with what, I think I will show to the satisfaction of every member of this House before I close, was recognised as a portion of the public domain. Mr. Mercier did not see his way to allow this condition to be imposed. It could not be at the disposal of the Holy See, but—and to my mind it is a distinction without a difference—it was to be retained as a special deposit to be disposed of hereafter with the sanction of the Holy See. I do not know whether there is very much difference between these two provisions. It is a difference in words, but not a difference in fact or in substance, as the sequel has shown. Practically, it has been a gift to the Holy See, and has been distributed as to His Holiness the Pope seemed best. Then, having obtained this consent, as a condition precedent to the legislation, we find that negotiations were entered upon, and the result of these negotiations is that the lands of the Jesuits' Estates are to be left intact. That is another concession granted by the representative of the Holy See; and, instead of that, compensation in money is to be made, and the claim is presented, which we find amounts to $2,000,000. As $1,000,000 of that is the property of this Dominion, I do not think we have got rid of that claim yet. I do not suppose that the Province of Quebec could do more than make an arrangement in regard to that property which belonged to that Province; but, in regard to that which belongs to this Parliament or to this Dominion, I suppose, by-and-bye, we will have our First Minister asking leave—because what can be assented to by the authorities here as right in the Province of Quebec would not be wrong in regard to the property belonging to the Dominion—we may have the First Minister here asking that the portion of that property belonging to the Dominion shall be dealt with by permission of his Holiness at Rome. I find further in these documents the following:—

"I deem it my duty to ask your Eminence if you see any serious objection to the Government's selling the property, pending a final settlement of the question of the Jesuits' Estates."

There is no doubt at all about the meaning of this. There is no doubt about the understanding which is arrived at. Before the Government are put in full possession, and in order that they may be put in full possession of these estates, there is to be a compensation made, and, finally, the bargain is worked out, and the conditions of the bargain are, what? The conditions are that this arrangement is to be non-effective until it receives the sanction of His Holiness of Rome. It is to be ratified—that is the term used—but it means practically that it might be vetoed, and to make, no doubt, that there was no attempt at conciliation or at sparing the feelings of those who are known to entertain strong feelings on this subject, this matter was not submitted to His Holiness of Rome until it was brought before the Legislature of that Province. Whether that was by arrangement or not, I do not know. Whether it was paying proper respect or not to the Sovereign Pontiff to ask him to express his approval or disapproval, I do not pretend to judge, but the legislation of the Province is clearly made dependent upon the act of His Holiness the Pope of Rome. Not only so—and then I have finished my summary of the Act—but the sum of money which is granted, the $400,000 granted which is payable out of any money of the public revenue is to be distributed, in effect, though perhaps not in the terms of the contract, under and with the sanction of His Holiness of Rome. Now, that is shortly the meaning of this legislation. I will have finished with the Act when I make a further observation, and I make it now, perhaps, a little out of place, but it must not be altogether lost sight of. This Act in effect does away with the purposes for which the Jesuits' Estates were appropriated, and I think that is a matter of such great importance that I can only feel astonished at the calmness with which my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby) regards it, and the indifference with which it has been received among the Protestant portion of the Province of Quebec, as my hon. friend has stated. This Bill puts into the general fund the money which was granted for educational purposes. It misappropriates—I do not use the term in its technical sense, for I quite recognise the right of the Province to use the fund—but from a general standpoint it misappropriates this fund by providing that $400,000 may be paid thereout to a certain institution. Now, having said so much as to the Act, let me say a word or two as to the property, and that brings me to what might be a long history and a long statement, and I hope the House will not be impatient with me when I deal with this somewhat complicated matter, which I will endeavor to make as plain as I can. I do not accept the theory which I have seen put forward in some quarters, that the Jesuits held their estates in trust for educational purposes. As far as I have been able to examine the deeds—and I have examined the report made in the year 1824—these estates were given to them in fee simple for all time. So far as I can judge from the history of the body at that time, it was not an uncommon thing for the Jesuit Fathers to accumulate both lands and goods in very considerable quantities. I find that one of the accusations made against them was avarice; one of the causes of the suppression of their order shortly after that, was the complaint made by the other orders of the Church, that they were avaricious, and that they accumulated wealth unduly in their order, notwithstanding the vow of poverty which they had taken. But however that may be, I think it is quite plain that they did hold these estates for themselves. Now, then, just let me trace the story of events by which this country became subject to the British Crown. We must never forget—I am afraid that some of my friends from the Province of Quebec do sometimes forget—that this is a British country, that by the fortunes of war that event was decided and the greater half of North America passed under the British Crown; and that being so, effect had to be given to the laws to which the country then became subject. Now, what were those laws? Granting, Sir,—which is not quite accurate—that the Jesuits held these estates at the time of the Conquest—I spoke before of the manner in which they held them originally—but

granting they held them at that date—which would not be accurate—when we have before us the decree of the Parliament of Paris, suppressing the Jesuit Order in the year 1762, taking from them their land; when we have that, it would not, I say, be strictly accurate to affirm, that at the time of the Definitive Treaty in 1763, these Jesuit Fathers held their estates as they certainly did aforetime. But even if they did, while admitting freely that this country, New France, having then a settled law, and passing under the British Crown as a conquered country, while I admit freely, that the British law did not, by virtue of the conquest, become the law of New France, I do say, it is beyond all doubt, that it was in the power of the conquering State to enact such laws as to the conquering State seemed proper, to change the civil law which then prevailed, and to introduce the common law of England. It is beyond all controversy that, the treaty having been agreed to on the 10th February, 1763, in the October following, the King did issue a proclamation that introduced at once into this country, the laws of Great Britain, and that those laws continued to be the laws of this country until, in 1774, the Quebec Act was passed, which restored to the French Canadian inhabitants, the civil law which they liked best, to which they were accustomed, and for which they had petitioned to the King and to the British Parliament. The constitutionality of the proclamation, the power of the King to introduce English law, is not now open to controversy, because the very self-same treaty underwent consideration in the celebrated case with which all lawyers who have made any attempt to master this subject are perfectly familiar; and it was upheld as constitutional, as a proper exercise of the prerogative power, and as being binding and efficacious to the full extent and limit of the command contained therein. Now, Sir, what was the effect of that? It will not be denied that at that time the Jesuits were an organisation which could not be tolerated, and were not tolerated, by the laws of England. I am not going now into any argument, any citation, to establish that point; it is beyond controversy. It was laid down by the law officers of the day—I have their citations here to establish it—it was laid down by Blackstone in his Commentaries, the first edition of which was published shortly before that period, that the Jesuit organisation was an illegal one, and then the moment British laws were introduced into this country, *ipso facto* the Jesuits' estates became forfeited to the Crown, and the title of the Crown to these estates has always been recognised from that period up, has always been considered as indefeasible. If sanction was wanted for it, we could find it by the action of the Parliaments of this country, upon petition of the French Canadian people of the country, who desired that the lands should be kept for educational purposes when it was proposed to give out of these lands, and perhaps the lands themselves, to General Amherst, who had been the general in command at the time of the cession. So not only have we, as I will prove, by the law that was enunciated by the law officers of the Crown, by the highest authorities of the day, but we have the action of our own Parliaments, the Parliament of the Province of Quebec before the Union, the Parliament of United Canada after the Union; and yet, Sir, here, 100 years afterwards, we find the Premier of the Province suing humbly to the Pope of Rome for liberty to sell the Jesuits' estates. Can humiliation go much further, if we are indeed a free people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! Oh!

Mr. McCARTHY. Some of my hon. friends laugh; I do not see any laughing matter in it, I cannot see why they should laugh about it. If the property is in the condition that I have proved it to be, I think the conclusion that I have stated follows from it; and if we are a free people, if the Act of Supremacy means anything, if we are not subject to his Holiness of Rome in temporal matters—I am not speaking of spiritual matters, I am speaking of the public domain of this country, I am talking about the temporal power, it was of that power that consent was asked to dispose of the estates—and so I say it is a humiliation to us as a free people to find that one of the Premiers of this Dominion has thought it necessary to obtain the sanction of any foreign authority to dispose of this property. It is argued that the Pope is no longer a foreign potentate; I think he is. His temporal power was never feared, it was the spiritual power which was struck at by the Act of Supremacy, not the temporal power of the Pope. It was the power that he claimed to excommunicate Sovereigns, to absolve their subjects from their allegiance—these were what was struck at by the Act of Supremacy, not his guns or his men, for guns and men he never had in numbers to alarm or affect any of the great powers of Europe. Now, Sir, am I right or am I wrong, in what I have stated?—because I desire to make no misstatement of this question. Let us see just what the law officers of the Crown stated at that time. We know how it was done. The law officers, I believe, at that time, were Mr. Thurlow, the Attorney General, and Mr. Wedderburn, Solicitor General, both distinguished lawyers, but neither of them perhaps, competent to give an opinion in matters of civil law. Sir James Marriott was skilled in civil law and in ecclesiastical law, and he was called upon for a report—merely for a report, because the responsibility still rested with the law officers of the Crown. Extracts of his report have been published, and we are more or less familiar with them, and his report established, and the law officers adopted his conclusion, that the Jesuit estates were at once forfeited to the Crown. That under the treaty there was no claim for either the Jesuits or for other religious communities; but, anxious as the Sovereign was—and, I say, if you will look back at the history of that period, no man with British blood will have cause to regret the conduct of the British authorities in those days or the manner of their disposition—the Sovereign said: The Jesuits are beyond the pale. We cannot listen, for one moment, to their holding their estates, but the other religious communities are to be permitted to remain in possession of their estates, and they are to remain there for the purpose of enabling us to judge whether it is necessary under the treaty (afterwards, under the Statute of 1774, they were continued in their possession), in order that effect might be given to that portion of the treaty, and that portion of the Act of Parliament, which guaranteed to the inhabitants of the conquered country their rights. I shall have to trouble the House with reference to the facts which govern the whole subsequent proceedings, and let me commence with the earliest date. On 13th August, 1763, in the instructions which were given by the Earl of Egremont to Governor Murray, we find these words:

"Though the King has, in the 4th article of the Definitive Treaty, agreed to grant the 'Liberty of the Catholic religion to the inhabitants of Canada;' and though His Majesty is far from entertaining the most distant thoughts of restraining his new Roman Catholic subjects from professing the worship of their religion according to the rites of the Romish Church, yet the condition expressed in the same article must always be remembered, viz:—'As far as the laws of Great Britain permit:' which laws prohibit absolutely all popish hierarchy in any of the dominions belonging to the Crown of Great Britain, and can only admit of a toleration of the exercise of that religion. This matter was clearly understood in the negotiation of the Definitive Treaty. The French Ministers proposed to insert the words *comme ci-devant* in order that the Romish religion should continue to be exercised in the same manner as under their Government; and they did not give up the point till they were plainly told that it would be deceiving them to admit those words, for the King had not the power to tolerate that religion in any other manner than 'as far as the laws of Great Britain permit.' These laws must be your guide in any disputes that may arise on this subject; but at the same time that I point out to you the necessity of adhering to them, and of attending with the utmost vigilance to the behaviour of the Priests, the King relies on your acting with all proper caution and prudence in regard to a matter of so delicate a nature as this of religion; and that you will, as far as you can consistently with

your duty in the execution of the laws and with the safety of the country, avoid everything that can give the least unnecessary alarm or disgust to His Majesty's new subjects."

That is the foundation of all the subsequent proceedings. We find in 1765 these instructions further given, and they are found in the commission to the King's Receiver General, and read as follows:—

"And whereas the lands of several religious societies in the said Province, particularly those of the Society of the Jesuits, are, or will become, part of His Majesty's revenue, you are therefore to endeavor, by agreements to be made with the persons interested for the present in any of the said estates, to take the said estates into your charge, giving unto them respectively such competent allowance thereon for their lives, as you may judge proper, taking care that these lands may not be sequestered or alienated from His Majesty."

Again, in a letter from Lord Shelburne to Governor Carleton, November 14, 1767, we read:

"It has been represented to His Majesty that the Jesuits of Canada make large remittances to Italy, and that they imperceptibly diminish their effects for that purpose * * * Too much care cannot be taken that they do not embezzle an estate of which they enjoy only the life-rent and which must become on their demise a very considerable resource to the Province, in case His Majesty should be pleased to cede it for that purpose."

As to the effect which is to be given to the treaty, although perhaps I have said enough on that point, I want to fortify my position. I do not expect hon. gentlemen will be willing to take my *ipse dixit* in a matter of this kind, and I desire to establish from the public records the doctrines which were held by the law officers at the time, in order to make good my point. Sir James Marriott reported at great length, and the book is accessible to all, and no doubt many hon. members have taken advantage of it. He reports on this particular question, which hon. members can easily understand when we look at the terms of the treaty. Let me read from it:

"His Britannic Majesty agrees to grant the liberty of the Catholic religion to the inhabitants of Canada; he will consequently give the most effectual orders that his new Roman Catholic subjects may profess the worship of their religion according to the rites of the Roman Church as far as the law of Great Britain permit."

Now, we all see the difficulty that at once arose. The laws of Great Britain at that time hardly permitted the exercise of the Roman Catholic religion. The law officers of the Crown, however, decided that this was not to be treated as a dead letter, but that full effect in every way must be given to the treaty. The difficulty was in reconciling the profession of the Roman Catholic religion with the laws of Great Britain, which practically forbid the practice of that religion, and so the proposition is worked out. And how is it worked out? Sir James Marriott gave an opinion on this point as follows:—

"Now, I consider that the laws and constitution of this Kingdom, permit perfect freedom of the exercise of any religious worship in the colonies, but not of all sorts of doctrines, nor the maintenance of any foreign authority, civil or ecclesiastical, which doctrines and authority may affect the supremacy of the Crown or safety of Your Majesty and the realm; for a very great and necessary distinction, as it appears to me, must be taken between the profession of the worship of the Romish religion, according to the rites of it, and its principles of church government. To use the French word, the *culte*, or forms of worship or ritual are totally distinct from some of its doctrines The first can, may and ought, in my opinion, in good policy and justice to be tolerated, though the second cannot be tolerated."

Mr. Wedderburn, afterwards Lord Loughborough, gave an opinion on the same subject. Speaking more especially in regard to the Jesuits, he said:

"The establishment of the first (the Jesuits) is not only incompatible with the constitution of an English province, but with every other possible form of civil society. By the rule of their order the Jesuits are aliens in every government. They are not owners of their estates but trustes for purposes dependent upon the pleasure of a foreigner, the General of their order. Three great Catholic states have, upon grounds of policy, expelled them. It would be singular if the first Protestant state in Europe should protect an establishment that ere now must have ceased in Canada had the French Government continued. * * * It is therefore, equally just and expedient, in this instance, to assert the sovereignty of the King and to declare the lands of the Jesuits are vested in His Majesty, allowing at the same time to the Jesuits now residing in Canada liberal pensions out of the incomes of their estates."

This opinion was reported by him to the law officers of the Crown, and the opinion of the law officers of the Crown framed upon it is the foundation of what was afterwards embodied in regard to this subject in the Quebec Act. Then we find in the Quebec Act that while the religion of the inhabitants of the country was specially protected, that the religious communities were excepted therefrom and that they were left to be dealt with by the Crown, thereby leaving those matters just as they stood,—owing to the conquest, by virtue of that conquest and by virtue of that proclamation—leaving matters exactly as they stood with regard to the religions communities, and dealt with the people of the country as distinct and separable from their religious communities. Then let me read what was the outcome of the Quebec Act. It was passed in 1774, and in 1775 express instructions are given to Guy Carleton, the Captain General and the Governor in Chief of the Province of Canada, and these are the instructions:

"That the Society of Jesus be suppressed and dissolved, and no longer continued as a body corporate and politic, and all their rights, possessions, and property shall be vested in Us, for such purposes as we may hereafter think fit to direct or appoint; but we think fit to declare Our Royal intention to be, that the present members of the said Society as established at Quebec, shall be allowed sufficient stipends and provisions during their natural lives."

Now, can it be reasonably argued, that this estate of the Jesuits did not vest and pass to the Crown, and were not held by the Crown? I have spoken of this simply as a lawyer, I have spoken of it simply upon the grounds and with reference to the authorities which I find I offer no opinion of my own about it, and I simply state facts as I find them. Let me follow up a little farther to see what becomes of these matters. Sir James Marriott's opinion is again invoked, but I will not trouble the House with this long extract. Sufficient to say that it substantially agrees with his former opinion. In a few words, just to summarise what he states, he says:

"In a few words the Society of Jesus had not and cannot have any estate in Canada legally and completely vested in them at any time, and therefore could not and cannot transfer the same before nor after the term of eighteen months so as to make a good title to purchasers, either with or without the powers or ratification of the Father General who, as he could not retire, so he cannot retain any possessions in Canada, since the time limited for the sales of estates there agreeably to the terms of the treaty; because he is as incapable of becoming a British subject, as he was of being a French subject; nor can the individuals of the communities of the Jesuits in Canada, take or transfer what the Father General cannot take or transfer; nor can they, having but one common stock with all to other communities of their order in every part of the globe, hold immoveable possessions, to be applied for the joint benefit of those communities which are resident in foreign states; and which may become the enemies of His Majesty and his Government."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is the third opinion as to how the estates are confiscated.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is the third opinion. It is in the same report to which I have referred, or rather it is the second opinion on this special question submitted to Sir James Marriott with regard to the Jesuits' properties. Now, in 1770, General Amherst, then Lord Amherst, I believe, petitioned the Crown to be compensated for the services which he had rendered the country in the conquest of Canada out of these estates; or rather he made a petition generally, and the King ordered and directed that the General should be compensated, and compensated out of the Jesuits' estates. I only state that to show that these estates were dealt with at that time beyond all peradventure as a part of the Crown lands. Now I would read one extract which shows the different manner in which the Jesuits were treated from the other religious communities; by-and-bye, perhaps, it may be my duty to point out why it was so, for I cannot very well, however much I would wish to avoid it, however much I would wish to do as my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Colby) did, ignore the past. I am afraid it will be impossible to treat this subject properly without some little reference to the historical facts we have relating to the

Jesuit Order. But however that may be, we find that the Royal Instructions in 1772 were conveyed in this way:

"It was declared that for the present and until we can be fully informed of the true state of the religious communities, and how far they are or are not essential to the exercise of the religion of the Church of Rome as allowed in the said province, to permit those religious communities to remain in possession of their estates."

There, was a clear line of demarcation in dealing with the ordinary religious communities. I, perhaps, am not familiar enough with the language to state what that difference was, but there was a clear distinction drawn between the ordinary religious communities, if I may so express it, and the particular body which is now more especially under discussion. Now we have come down very nearly to 1791 or 1792. We have got things down to the period in which the Province was granted a species of representative government which continued up to the Union of 1840 or 1841; and we find, if we consult history, that there was a loud protest against the King appropriating this property. It was no denial of his right, but it was against the wisdom and fairness and justice of his handing over this property to the General who had conquered the country; the allegation being put up then, and then, so far as I know, for the first time, that this property had been really given to the Jesuits for the purpose, and in trust, for education. I think, Sir, that if you will consult Mr. Garneau's history, which I believe is the history most acceptable to my hon. friends from the Province of Quebec, that it will be found as early as 1800 that that matter was brought prominently before the Legislature, and from that time out the agitation in that view was kept up so briskly and so successfully, that in 1830 or in 1831 the Crown ceded and granted to the Province all these Jesuits' estates for the express purpose for which it had been asked, and that was for the purpose of education. The Province accepted the trust, the Province dealt with it on that footing; and if I may read the first section of the Act, chapter 41, William IV, passed in 1832, we find that by an Act of that Province it was stated:

"That all moneys arising out of the estates of the late Order of Jesuits which now are in, or may hereafter come in the hands of the Receiver General, shall be applied to the purposes of education exclusively."

Again, in 1846, 9 Victoria, chapter 59, another legislative declaration, this time by the united Provinces, says:

"That the revenue and interests arising from the real or funded property forming part of the estates of the late Order of the Jesuits and now at the disposal of the Legislature for educational purposes in Lower Canada, shall be, and are hereby declared to be applicable to such purposes, and to no other."

And, finally, in 1856, 19-20 Victoria, chapter 54, the legislation on the matter says:

"The estates and property of the late Order of the Jesuits, whether in possession or reversive, including all sums funded or invested, or to be funded or invested as forming part thereof are hereby appropriated for the purposes of this Act and shall form a fund to be called the Lower Canada Superior Education Investment Fund."

I think, if there ever was a title to an estate or property recognised by legislative action, clear in its origin, made more certain and more definite at every stage in which we find it cropping up from time to time, it is the title to the Jesuits' estates. When we are asking His Excellency the Governor General to disallow this Act, when we are taking upon ourselves the responsibility of saying yea or nay on that question, it is impossible that we can deny to ourselves the opportunity of scrutinising every syllable and every letter in it; and I find here:

"The Act of the Legislature, 48 Victoria, chapter 19, notwithstanding section 5 of the said Act, and notwithstanding any other Act to the contrary, shall apply to the said estates, the proceeds whereof may be applied also, notwithstanding any Act to the contrary, for the above mentioned purposes, or for any other purposes approved by the Legislature.

So that this special property, set apart for education in the Province of Quebec—not the education of the majority,

to whom my friend behind me pays such humble court, but all the people of the Province of Quebec, the minority as well as the majority—has been swept away by this enactment; although, when the Premier was taxed in Quebec the other day with the question, his answer was by no means such as might have been expected, but was evasive, and not, I am afraid, altogether according to the record. If ever there was legislation which we could interfere with on such grounds, it is this;—property given by the Crown, for the express purpose of the education of the people of the Province; property which remained for that purpose from the year 1831, to the year 1888; property which a Parliament, elected under an excitement of race and revenge, has decided should be taken away from the minority, as well as the majority, and dedicated to other purposes and other uses. Well, Sir, I say—and that is my first proposition—if I have satisfied this House, that this property was public domain—and, if I am not able to satisfy the House of that, I am incapable of making any statement—then the proposition with which I started, is made out, that this Act uses Her Most Gracious Majesty's name as enacting that, her own estates, or the estates she had surrendered to the Province of Quebec, for the purposes of education, were not hers, not the Province's. All this history of the past is to be blotted out; it is to be all child's play; the Crown did not own, the Crown did not get, the Crown did not take, the Crown did not grant a rod, but went through a farce, when it dedicated the property for educational purposes, at first to the Province of Quebec, and again, to the United Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada. All that was humbug, nonsense, child's play; the property was all the time vested in either the Sovereign Pontiff, or in the Order of Jesuits; and, as a result, the Pope is applied to, as the only authority which could authorise the disposal of this property, which, most people had thought, belonged to the Crown, for permission to dispose of it. Let me do no injustice; let me read the words again:

"Under these circumstances, I deem it my duty to ask Your Eminence if you see any serious objection to the Government's selling the property, pending a final settlement of the question of the Jesuits' estates."

If the Supremacy Act is in force, and whether it is in force or not, I hold it to be, and I believe it can be established to be, a well settled principle of international law, that no foreign authority or power—I care not whether it be temporal or spiritual—can be allowed to interfere in the affairs of another country or another state; and if that be the rule of international law—as I think my hon. friends, if they choose to consult the authorities, will find it to be—how much more does that principle apply to the municipal law of the country, and to the law of Elizabeth, which has been handed down and made specially applicable to this country by the Quebec Act of 1774. How was it possible, I say, to tell that an Act of Parliament would be submitted to His Excellency the Governor General, that he was to pass upon it by the advice of his Minister of Justice, and that the Minister of Justice should send it back—how? Why, Sir, with a dozen other Bills of no more consequence than an Act incorporating a joint stock company or a railway company—no explanation, no justification, no reasons given. I regret that I have not heard the argument of the hon. Minister of Justice. I may do him an injustice; but I read here, that when an appeal was made from the Evangelical Alliance or some other body in Lower Canada—those people who my hon. friend says are willing that this legislation should stand—the hon. Minister of Justice reported that this was a fiscal matter. Sir, I do not understand the Queen's English if this can properly be described as a fiscal matter. But so it passed before His Excellency, and upon that His Excellency has acted; and I trust the opportunity will be afforded to His

Excellency to reconsider that question, and see whether Her Majesty's name is thus to be trailed in the dust, is thus to be dishonored, and whether this legislation should not disappear from our Statute-books, whether it be provincial or federal. Well, I assail this, not merely upon that ground. I assail it upon other grounds. I say that either this Act is unconstitutional, that it is *ultra vires* of a Province, that it ought to have been disallowed upon that ground, because it violates a fundamental principle of this country, that all religions are free and equal before the law; or, if that be not so as a legal proposition, then, Sir, I claim that there should have been exercised that judgment, that discretion, that policy, which would at once stamp out in whatever Province it reared its head, the attempt which has been made here to establish a kind of State Church amongst us. Sir, is that law or is it not? We find that in the good old days a Protestant Church had to be despoiled; and for my part, Sir, I have never regretted that the Clergy Reserves were secularised, and I do not believe that anyone who belongs to that church can say that that measure has proved injurious to it. It placed it on a footing of equality with the other religious bodies throughout the Provinces; and I believe that church has grown and prospered far more as a church, holding no legal pretence of superiority over other religious bodies, than it would have done if it had continued to hold the Clergy Reserves, no matter how much wealth they might have added to its coffers. Now, what do we find in this Bill, enacted by the United Parliament of Canada—an Act referring to Upper Canada and to Lower Canada, and, so far as I know, to this very moment, the law of the Province of Quebec? First, we do know that the laws of the Provinces which were in force at the time of the British North America Act, remained in force until repealed. And what do we find?

"Whereas the recognition of legal equality among all religious denominations is an admitted principle of colonial legislation; and whereas, in the state and condition of this Province, to which such a principle is peculiarly applicable, it is desirable the same should receive the sanction of the direct legislative authority, recognising and declaring the same as a fundamental principle of civil policy."

Therefore the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession, without discrimination or preference, so long as the same be not made an excuse for acts of maliciousness, or a justification of practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the Provinces, is, by the constitution and laws of these Provinces, allowed to all Her Majesty's subjects therein. There is a legislative declaration of what every man who lives in this country has always understood to be the law. Does this enactment of the Province of Quebec violate that principle? Is the grant of $400,000, to be distributed under the sanction of His Holiness of Rome, not a grant of public money to a particular church? I am not saying whether the church may or may not be the correct church; I am simply speaking of the legal principle. I ask, how is that? Let me give you an answer from the books of the Legislature when the Clergy Reserves were secularised. What were those reserves? They were lands belonging to the Crown, held in trust for the support and maintenance of the Protestant faith, and held to apply to the Church of England and the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. When these lands were secularised, it was declared that the Act was for the purpose of sweeping away the last vestige of connection between Church and State. The holding of these lands by the Crown for this purpose formed a connecting link between Church and State, which Parliament stated should be swept away, which the representatives of the Province of Quebec joined with those from the other Province in saying should be swept away. Will any man of common sense tell me that this grant of $400,000, given as it is given, is not a recognition of Church and State? How is it given?

"The aforesaid arrangements, entered into between the Premier and the Very Reverend Father Turgeon, are hereby ratified, and the Lieutenant Governor in Council is authorised to carry them out according to their form and tenor.

"The Lieutenant Governor in Council is authorised to pay, out of any public money at his disposal, the sum of four hundred thousand dollars, in the manner and under the conditions mentioned in the documents above cited, and to make any deed that he may deem necessary for the full and entire execution of such agreement."

Then the document I have just cited declares that this $400,000 is to be distributed under the sanction of His Holiness the Pope of Rome. Now, I have heard it said—I rather think I heard the First Minister applauding the sentence—that this was given for the purposes of education. Surely the First Minister has not read the Act, or he would never assent to a statement of that kind. Education—why, if it is possible to draw a distinction in an Act of Parliament, it is drawn here. While the $60,000, which is the supposed compensation to the minority, is expressly given for education—expressly tied up, and is not to go to any sectarian purposes—the other is left subject to the disposition of His Holiness of Rome. There is but one condition annexed, and that is that this money is to be spent within the Province of Quebec. That is the sole condition. We have had an indication in the press this morning that a bull or a brief, whatever be the correct ecclesiastical term, either has been or is to be issued, disposing of this money. Do you want any further evidence that the grant was made absolutely subject to the disposition of a particular religious body? If so, on what pretence, on what ground was it made. Was there a legal claim? Mr. Mercier says no. Was there a moral claim? I would like to know who will answer yes to this. Even my hon. friend behind me will not say that. He and his Protestant friends have always repudiated the idea of a moral claim. What pretence of a moral claim is there? Where is it? In whom is it? Why, the Jesuits of those days, if they held it individually, are extinct. They left no heirs. If they held it as a community, and undoubtedly that was the opinion of the law officers of the Crown—an opinion which I humbly venture to think was right—it belonged to the whole body. That was held by the Parliament of Paris in the great Trading Case, where the General Superior of the Order repudiated the liability contracted by one of the communities or one of the Jesuits. After full investigation, after an appeal to the highest tribunal, the tribunal of the Parliament of Paris—and hon. gentlemen, I am sure, from the Province of Quebec will not object to that—my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Curran) laughs. He is an Irishman and perhaps despises the Parliament of Paris. I confess I do not join with him, although I am an Irishman also. I rather think that must have been a very important appelate tribunal. At all events, if you will read the report of the Attorney General with regard to that, if you will read the proceedings, if you will remember that all the books of the order were for the first time brought into court in order that the order might escape liability, and repudiate responsibility, and make it appear that they were not bound to these merchants for the money that Father Lavalette owed—if you will look at all that, you will see the result was the court determined there was a solidarity amongst all the communities, and that the Jesuit property belonged to, and was at the disposal of, the General of the Order and was vested in him alone. I have taken the trouble to examine into the authority of the General of the Order, and if it were not too tedious, I would give some extracts which would abundantly establish that. I, therefore, contend there can be no pretence of a moral claim. Is the incorporated body of the other day the successors of these men of 1763? On what pretence? If I read the Act of Incorporation aright, I understand it to mean that the whole body of Jesuits throughout the world are incor-

porated by the Province of Quebec. The first clause of the Act is as follows:—

"The 'Society of Jesus' shall be a corporation, composed of the Reverend Fathers Henri Hudon, Adrien Turgeon, Léonard Lemire, George Kenny, Arthur Jones, and all persons who now or may hereafter form part of the said Society, in accordance with its rules, by-laws and regulations. Under the above name it shall have perpetual succession."

So that the Act of Incorporation, which I venture to think is not worth the paper it is written upon—and I trust it may be found so—actually incorporates the whole body of Jesuits, and only in that sense. They pretend to represent the body of 1763 which was suppressed in 1774, but I place no reliance on that suppression. I admit we cannot take notice, standing in an English country, governed by English laws, paying regard, as we are bound, to the Act of Supremacy, of that suppression. The English law officers of the Crown could not notice the suppression by the Pope of the Order of the Jesuits. I affirm that beyond all fear of contradiction. I say it is impossible, in an English community, to say that the Pope's bull or the Pope's brief dissolving a corporation could have the slightest possible effect. So that the matter stands in the way I have endeavored to point out, and I say, without fear of contradiction, that my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby) was right, when he said, there was not the shadow of foundation, or even the pretence of a moral claim. Under these circumstances, is there any possible standing ground for this Act? Does it not violate the rule of the separation of Church and State in this country, and the equality of all religions? I need not go through the second ground of this resolution, because I have sufficiently dealt with it; so I have now come, and I trust without undue delay, to the other branch of the argument which I desire to present. In all fairness to my hon. friends, I must say that, if there is, in the legal propositions which I have endeavored faintly to put forward, a reasonable doubt, I do not think that, standing alone, it would be becoming on the part of a Minister of the Crown, to disallow the measure, because that would place it, as you will see, in the hands of the Government here, to disallow, on pretence of *ultra vires* of the Local Legislature, enactments which might be open to question, and which the parties ought to have the benefit of the ruling of a court upon. But I have endeavored to point out, upon the grounds I have already stated, that this Act ought to have been disallowed as being beyond the power of a Local Legislature. I do not desire to be at all misunderstood. I do not pretend that the Crown of England, or the Crown of any other country, cannot submit matters to a foreign Power. We know it is done continually. We know that matters are settled by arbitration, and that generally, and almost always, it is done by calling in the arbitrament of a foreign Power; but I contend that, while the Sovereign Power can do that, the private subject cannot. There is a broad distinction. If I have a dispute with my hon. friend, I cannot submit that to the President of the United States, because the dispute would be between British subjects. And I say that a Province cannot do that, because it does not represent the plenary power of the Crown; and I say that even this Parliament cannot do it, and, of course, it does not stand in the same position as the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland. But on the grounds of policy, surely I am right. Surely there are not men enough in this House who will cast any doubt upon the clause of this resolution which declares that there should be a separation of Church and State, and absolute equality of all religions before the law. Surely, in this part of the nineteenth century, and in free Canada, we will not have to fight for a principle which we thought was determined for all time when the secularisation of the Clergy Reserves took place. Is it because this is a particular church? If it is right in the Province of Quebec to grant money to the Church of Rome, it would be equally right in the Province of Ontario to grant money for the maintenance of the Methodists or the Episcopalian body or Scotch Church; and, if we did that, there would be no hesitation—and properly so—in bringing before the House the complaint of the minority whose money would be spent in that way and for that purpose. We never find that, when the body to which I refer feels that its interests are at stake, and that injustice is being done, it has any hesitation or makes any delay at all in coming at once before Parliament and proclaiming its grievances. These people never say: We are afraid we will be stirring up religious strife, causing hard feelings, or putting race against race and Catholic against Protestant. No, they come here—as they have a right to do—and boldly put their case before Parliament, no matter what it may be; and they always manage to get justice, at all events. If Parliament think any doubt is to be cast upon this measure, if they find that this money is dedicated for educational purposes, I think in that case the point I am attempting to make would fail; but when I observe the definiteness of the provision under which the $60,000 is granted, I cannot see that any such purpose is intended with regard to the $400,000. I, therefore, say that that part of the case is made out. Let me now come to a question which I would have willingly avoided. Let me invite the attention of the House to the greater question which is before it. These are technical matters that I have dealt with so far—matters perhaps of moment, matters of great importance, but still, after all, they are more or less purely legal in the narrow sense of the word, or purely constitutional in the same narrow sense of the word. But I assail this legislation upon broader and higher grounds. I say that the incorporation of, and the grant of money to, the Jesuit body under any pretext or for any purpose, was an Act which should have at once been disallowed if it were passed by a Provincial Legislature. I put that upon the highest possible grounds. I think I have a right, and it is a right which I propose to exercise, to speak with freedom on this subject. I will assail no man's religion. I will not utter a word, which, properly understood, will give offence to the most sensitive on this subject; but I deny the right of my hon. friend behind me or any one else to gag me, and to say, You must remember that the Jesuit body is under the protecting ægis of His Holiness of Rome, and you must not speak of it except with bated breath. I deny that any such rule can apply to this free Parliament. It is not a question of religion. It is not a question whether the religion of the Church of Rome is better than the religion which I was brought up in, and which I profess. I am not to sit in judgment on my fellow members. They are quite right to worship their God in the manner they choose, as I am right in worshipping Him in the manner I choose, but I contend that the Church of Rome needs not the Jesuit body for its organisation or its support. It is true that, during the reign of certain Pontiffs, that order has received the support of the church. It is also true that, during the reign of other Pontiffs, it has been banned and sometimes dissolved. One case has been mentioned, and it was once before, if my hon. friend will go so far back, though it is perhaps unfair to bring it up here in judgment against them. The fact, however, proves that the order, or company, or society of which we are speaking, is not in any sense essential to the free, perfect and full enjoyment of the Roman Catholic religion. And what is the society, what is the object of its founder? I will quote from what appears to be a very fair statement in the *Quarterly Review* of 1874, containing a summary of what appears to have been the object of the founder. It was:

"To effect an organisation which would result in a thoroughly disciplined and mobilised body of men, moving like a highly trained military unit at the word of command, and standing ever ready under the proclaimed chieftainship of Jesus, to war against and smite by superior

dexterity in arms, the foes adverse to the absolute ascendancy of the Papal system."

Let any person who knows anything about their history quarrel with that definition of the Order of Jesus. I should be glad to know wherein that definition is incorrect. They take a vow of implicit obedience to their chief. He says go, and they go; come, and they come. They are educated so as to have no will, and, to use the language of the Spiritual Exercises of the founder of the order himself, they ought to be:

"Like a corpse who has neither will nor understanding, or like a small crucifix which is turned about at the will of him who holds it, or like a staff in the hands of an old man, who uses it as may best assist or please him."

I believe I am citing nothing which is not reliable. I take this from the authorised version of the constitutions, as they are called, and it is to be found among the Spiritual Exercises determined by the founder. Let me give one extract upon this subject:

"It is so complete and entire that while every member of the society is obliged to obey the General as implicitly and blindly as if he were Jesus Christ, in all things whatsoever, without reserve, without exception, without question or examination, or even mental hesitation, to carry into execution anything he may prescribe with the same fullness of consent and submission that they feel in the belief of the dogmas of the Catholic faith itself, to be in his hands as passive as a corpse, or as a staff in the hands of an old man, or as Abraham when under the command of God, he was ordered to sacrifice his son, he must persuade himself on principle that all that he has ordered to do is right, and above all personal feeling and volition."

I am quoting from the decree of the Parliament of Paris. Much more might be adduced to the same effect. Those who have thought of this subject, those who have given it any consideration, have, no doubt, made up their mind one way or the other on it. Nothing, perhaps, is more true than the statement that is made in the report of the Attorney General of Paris, who was called upon to investigate the position of this body. Looking at them as one set of people are anxious to do, and they appear to be all right; look at them from the other side, and they hardly appear to the same advantage. I think it is only fair to say—I do not desire at all to be misunderstood—that the individual men are, perhaps, the *élite* of their order, highly educated, better educated, better men upon the whole, for their system of drill. The long probationary period they have to undergo, necessarily weeds out the weak ones and leaves only the strong and robust—intellectually as well as physically—and, I suppose, that amongst no equal number of men will the compeers of the Jesuits be found. I will read a note showing the view of the Attorney General of the Parliament of Paris, in his report:

"The constitutions have two faces——"

That reminds me of the shield of the hon. gentleman opposite, one side of which he presented on his visit to England to float our bonds, and the other side of which he shows to us when he comes back.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Both sides were perfectly correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. I accept that illustration also; that applies still more forcibly to what I am going to read—both sides here appear to be perfectly correct also:

"The constitutions have two faces, because they were formed into two intentions—on the one side, for the glory of God and the salvation of souls; and on the other side, for the glory of the society and its future extension. This causes the difference of opinion concerning them. Their admirers look only at the first aspect, and their detractors see only the second."

Now, I think that statement was one that I was bound to make, because I am not at all here as a Protestant bigot. I do not pretend to make any statement here as a Protestant. I was astonished to hear the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) speak as a Protestant. I do not speak as a Protestant, I speak as a representative of my constituency, entitled to discuss all subjects that are presented here, and without offence, as I trust I am doing on this occasion, to the feelings of any hon. member of this House. Now, let me give a slight idea of their organisation, of the vows which they take, of the obedience which their constitution inculcates, and which they are always willing to render. I will show what is said of them in modern times, because I have been told, and I admit the fact, that it is not fair to judge any order or body of men by their history of two or three hundred years ago. But I think I will be able to show that, down to a very recent period, there is in this body no change nor shadow of turning, that it is their boast that they are, and will continue, as long as they exist, to be under the same rules that the founder of the order, now the sainted Ignatius, established for them. Now, let us see what is said of them by comparatively recent writers. I regret that our library does not afford a very full catalogue of works in regard to this subject, and I have been compelled to rely upon authorities written 20 or 25 years ago. I will read such as I have, and the House will be able to judge of their pertinence to the order at present. Garnier-Pagé says:

"They know but one law, one faith, and one morality. That law, faith, and morality, they call authority. To a superior they submit life and conscience. To their order they sacrifice individuality. They are neither Frenchmen, Italians, Germans, nor Spaniards. They are not citizens of any country. They are Jesuits only. They have but one family, one fortune and one end; and all these are included in the word community."

Mr. LANDERKIN. A regular Tory Order.

Mr. McCARTHY. Very much like that: that is the only reason you do not belong to them, I am afraid. I am now quoting from the *Quarterly Review*, and if hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to read that article, and it is a fair criticism, so far as I am capable of judging, of the works of the Jesuits and the Jesuit writings which were under review, I think they will be satisfied. In the *Quarterly Review* of 1874 I was very glad to find that the popular delusion as to the poisoning of the Pope who dissolved the order, was exploded by the writer. Down to a very recent period, indeed, this had been believed on the authority of a high and distinguished German doctor, who wrote in 1872, and stated on undoubted authority that Pope Clement the Thirteenth had been poisoned by that order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McCARTHY. I say that a German doctor said so; and that this English authority in 1874 exploded that doctrine and showed that it did not rest on any solid foundation. I was very glad, and I am sure any hon. gentleman will be glad to find that that is so. But the author who dealt with the Jesuits in that impartial spirit may be perhaps entitled to some credence when he depicts, as he does in the following year, some doctrines held by the order. He endeavors to establish, and, in my humble judgment, he does establish, that the three principles upon which the order is established are justified, a Probabalism, Mental reservation, and that the end justifies the means. To argue that, would involve an enquiry foreign perhaps to this discussion. I am merely stating the conclusion at which the writer arrived, and every hon. member can form his own opinion as to whether that opinion is well or ill-founded. But, in practical matters, let us see what this order lays down. First, as to the duties of a judge, the writer says:

"We are told, also, it is by no means decided that a judge is bound never to accept money gifts from a party to a suit before him. If the gift were proffered with the view of influencing a prospective judgment, contrary to justice, the judge should, indeed, sternly refuse acceptance; 'but, the sentence having been already pronounced, it is a matter of controversy' whether he may not retain what might then seem a mere offering of gratitude from one benefited by the delivered sentence, even when this had been contrary to justice. Decisions of this character subvert fundamental notions as to right and wrong. Let us take the case of a person knowing all about a theft and accepting hush-money from the

guilty party. According to received ideas, the compact would be criminal. Father Gury, however, decides that, provided the person bribed be not *ex-officio* bound to give information, the bargain would be quite lawful, 'as without injustice he might keep silence about the thief, in deference to his entreaties * * * therefore, *espari*, without injustice, silence might be observed in deference to gifts given or promised.'"

I need not tell hon. gentlemen who have paid any attention to the subject, that Father Gury is a comparatively modern writer, that his works were published under the Propaganda, and therefore under the highest authority, and his works are for morals, for teaching in the schools, and for the guidance of those who desire instruction of this kind. So far in regard to the judges. But there is also a law for witnesses, and the law for witnesses is even more dangerous than the law laid down for the judges. The writer says:

"The first point laid down is, that no obligation to make reparation can attach to any one who has given false witness from invincible ignorance, inadvertence, or delusion, a proposition which, though not wholly free from objections, we will not canvass. But Father Gury proceeds to consider the case of one who, with the view of supplying deeds that have been lost, and of promoting the success of indisputable right (the indisputableness of such right being left to the subjective test of individual appreciation), either reproduces, that is, forges, or tampers with a writing, a chirograph, or a deed of acknowledgment; and he concludes that, though a person acting thus 'would, indeed, sin venially on the score of a lie, the document produced not being the authentic one, on the strength of which judgement should rest; and though he might possibly incur a grave sin against charity toward himself by exposing his person to imminent peril of very severe penalties in the likely event of detection; nevertheless, he would be wholly free from all sin against mutual justice, and would consequently stand absolved from all obligations to make restitution.'"

Mr. CURRAN. Will the hon. gentleman give the authority?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am quoting from the *Quarterly Review* of 1875.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Who is the writer?

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot tell.

Mr. CURRAN. Has the hon. gentleman consulted Father Gury in the original?

Mr. McCARTHY. I leave that for the hon. gentleman to do. I do not suppose a writer in a great magazine like the *Quarterly Review* misrepresents Father Gury; if the hon. gentleman thinks so, I rather imagine he will find himself mistaken. If he will take the trouble to read the article, which was not written in a spirit of hostility but rather of enquiry for the truth, I shall be glad. I have now done with that part of the subject. But I think there are people in this country, the fair sex, who ought to be protected. It seems there is a rule, a law for them also, and that breach of promise is not an improper act in certain events and in certain cases. The writer says:

"In the matter of plighted troth we learn from Gury, 'that he who has sworn it to a girl, rich and healthy * * is not bound by his oath should she happen to have become poor or fallen into bad health.' Again we are informed that a probable opinion, countenanced by St. Liguori, would allow an engagement to be broken off if a 'fat inheritance' should accrue, seriously modifying the status as to fortune of either party, and the case is thus illustrated: 'Edmund had betrothed himself to Helen, a girl of the same station and fortune as his own. As he was on the very point of celebrating his wedding, he acquired a fat inheritance from a deceased uncle. Wherefore, he repudiates Helen, that he may marry another with a fortune to match. It seems that Edmund should not be disturbed for this. Jilting is no unfrequent practice, but it is striking to find it justified in a handbook of morals, whenever 'faith could be kept only by the surrender of a big advantage which would be tantamount to great loss.'"

That is a comfortable doctrine for one side, but rather uncomfortable for the other.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is hard on the girls.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, as my hon. friend says, it is hard on the girls. I will pass over the next extract in consideration for the galleries. If this is anything like a proper statement of the moral teaching of the order, I hardly think it is one that ought not to be bonussed, to use a familiar term, by any of our Local Legislatures. But what as regards the history of this order? Is it disputed as an historical fact that they are responsible for the expulsion of the Huguenots? I trow not.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). It is disputed.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am astonished to learn it; I thought it would not be disputed. Is it doubted that they brought about the revocation of the Edict of Nantes? Is it doubted that they were responsible for the causing the Thirty Years' War? Is it seriously open to question that they had much to do with precipitating the Franco-German war? Of course, those hon. gentlemen who will not believe anything against the Jesuits will not believe that, but there is weighty evidence to show that they were concerned in precipitating that war, which, as we all know, occurred in comparatively modern times.

Mr. BERGERON. In whose interest?

Mr. McCARTHY. In the interest of the order and body to which they belong, in the interest of the church, of which they are the light horse—the Cossacks, the advanced guard. Now, I suppose Cardinal Manning's statement with regard to them will not be denied to be, at all events, an authentic statement; and Cardinal Manning, in his book of sermons published by Duffy of Paternoster Row, at page 187, says writing of the Jesuit Order:

"That it embodies the character of its founder, the same energy, perseverance and endurance, it is his own presence still prolonged, the same perpetuated order, even in the spirit and manner of its working, fixed, uniform and changeless."

That is within the life of the distinguished prelate who speaks of them as being the same as they were 300 years ago.

Mr. BERGERON. We do not deny that.

Mr. McCARTHY. No person will deny that. Then, it is useless to continue the argument, it is useless to make citations; but I do think that their expulsion from France in 1880 would be of interest to my hon. friends, and that it would not have been altogether treated as of no consequence. It is strictly true that France is now a Republic, enjoying a free Government, but it is perfectly clear that the Jesuits were expelled, and the gentleman who had charge of the educational department in France put forward those grounds for the reason for their expulsion. If I cite from past history I will be told: "Oh, the order may have changed;" and if I cite from modern days I dare say that there will be some other answer, but I do say this, and I think we ought all to be willing to accept it, that everybody else cannot always have been in the wrong, and the Jesuits always in the right. They have been expelled from every country time and time again.

Mr. BERGERON. But they are back again.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, they are back again.

Mr. AMYOT. They were not then expelled from Russia.

Mr. McCARTHY. They were, and I will give the hon. gentleman the date of their expulsion. Having been expelled from the Catholic countries, they found a harbor of refuge in Russia and Prussia, after being suppressed by the Sovereign Pontiff, and, having lived there under the protection of that Government, their education and training of those whom they brought up were found incompatible, as they were found elsewhere, and must always be found, according to their teachings, incompatible to any State Government or to any organised condition of society. These are the reasons which made not only the expulsion of the Jesuits from Russia necessary, but also brought about, as we find, the putting an end to "the concordat"

which, up to a certain time, had existed between the Court of St. Petersburg and the Sovereign Pontiff at Rome. I will refer to what Mr. Ferry said, in introducing this measure in France for the expulsion of the Jesuits, and I am not going to read it all but just one or two particulars, because I do not care to deal with what may be termed even remotely the religious aspect of the question. I want to treat this simply from the position of State: whether as a matter of statesmanship, as a matter of policy it was proper to have admitted this Act to remain in force, or whether it is not proper and right that this Act should still be vetoed. The measure in the French Chamber, as explained, is chiefly directed against the Jesuits on the ground that "they are the enemies of the state, that their teachings are in opposition to the principles of government, and would suppress all freedom of education." Many other reasons were given against the Jesuits by Mr. Ferry, and the following among the rest. He quoted the decree of the Parliament of 1826 which recites:

"That the edicts by which Jesuits had been banished and dissolved, were founded upon the recognised incompatibility of their principles with the independence of every Government."

Mr. BERGERON. What are you reading from?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am reading from the published report of the debates that took place in Paris at the time of the expulsion of the Jesuits.

Mr. MULOCK. What report is it?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is a condensation of the report of the debates. Mr. Ferry then goes on to say, from the statement of the Archbishop of Paris, Mgr. Darboy:

"That the Jesuits were neither subject to the jurisdiction of the diocesans, nor obedient to the laws of the State."

And further:

"That the State is, in temporal matters, subordinate to the church, and has only the authority which an inferior tribunal possesses, for confirming the sentence of the superior; that in questions of marriage, burial, institutions for charitable purposes, liberty of conscience, and questions of the moral law, the spiritual power may intervene to correct or annul the civil laws."

Further, Mr. Ferry quoted from some passages from public works, showing:

"A detestable hostility to all the laws and institutions of modern society. These works distinctly taught the divine right of kings, and advocated the carrying on of religious wars. They attacked the revolution, and glorified the revocation of the Edict of Nantes; they calumniated Nicker and Turgot; they rejected the principle of the national sovereignty, and they taught that France was beaten in the late war because she had deserted the Pope. In these books universal suffrage and trial by jury were denounced as vexatious institutions, liberty of conscience and of worship were condemned, and the liberty of the press was asserted to be a principle that has never been admitted by a wise Government."

Whether those are principles which ought to be endorsed by this Parliament it will be for the House to judge.

Mr. BERGERON. Were they expelled then?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. But they are there now.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman has perhaps more information than I have on that subject, but that they were expelled is beyond question. I told the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) that they were expelled more than once from France. They were expelled from France in 1595, at the close of the War of the League. Now, I do think that in the stage of the debate it is not necessary to trouble the House by reading the decree of suppression of the Pope in 1773; but surely if the order has not changed, surely if they have remained as they were, there is ground for interference. I think that it was about the time of their expulsion from France, in 1762, when it was asked of them to change their mode of carrying on operations, and when the answer was: "We must continue to be as we are or cease to exist." I say that when those things are considered; this evidence of a statement made by the Pontiff with full knowledge of all the circumstances it is impossible to displace; there is no way of getting rid of that evidence. It cannot be impugned by the members of the church of which the Pontiff referred to was a distinguished ornament. It cannot be impugned by any candid person, because the character of Pope Clement was of the very highest order, and he stood conspicuously above his compeers. Now, a list was given—and, therefore, I need not repeat it—of the expulsion of the Jesuits from various countries. It is not to be lost sight of that they were expelled from Germany in 1872. They had been admitted into Prussia by Frederick II, and why were they expelled! It seems to me that the reason for their expulsion is particularly applicable to our position here, for there was in that country a mixed community of Protestants and Catholics. The Jesuits were admitted to this country, the corporation having been dissolved and their having been sent about their business by a decree to which I have referred. And having obtained a foothold in Prussia, what was the result? Let me read:

"But in North Germany they became very powerful, owing to the footing Frederick II had given them in Prussia, especially in the Rhine Provinces; and, gradually moulding the younger generation of clergy after the War of Liberation, succeeded in spreading ultramontane views amongst them, and so leading up to the difficulties of the civil government which issued in the Falk laws and their own expulsion."

Now, Sir, I have done with the extracts which I propose to make upon that subject, and I come to the more important part of the subject under consideration. It may be that all I have said is true, and that yet if this matter—I am arguing it now, of course, upon that theory—was in the legislative competence of the Province, it ought still to remain as law. I venture, Sir, to ask the House seriously to consider the position in which we stand. The worship of what is called local autonomy, which some gentlemen have become addicted to, is fraught, I venture to say, with great evil to this Dominion. Our allegiance is due to the Dominion of Canada. The separation into Provinces, the right of local self-government which we possess, is not to make us less citizens of the Dominion, is not to make us less anxious for the promotion of the welfare of the Dominion; and it is no argument to say that because a certain piece of legislation is within the power of a local Parliament, therefore that legislation is not to be disturbed. By the same Act of Parliament, by which power is conferred upon the Local Legislature, the duty and power—because where there is power there is a corresponding duty—are cast upon the Governor in Council to revise and review the acts of the legislative bodies. The Legislatures are not to be at liberty to run in different directions, to promote in one Province one nationality and one church, and in another Province another nationality and another church, or in any other way to run counter, because such courses must inevitably bring about the dissolution of Confederation. It is not because a Province is kept in check, it is not because its legislation is vetoed, that there is danger to our system. We can impose no law upon a Province; it is merely a negative power which the central Government possesses—a power to prevent evil laws, in the sense which I speak, in the wider field of the Dominion, viewed here from the centre—and this power ought to be, of course, prudently, wisely, but duly exercised when occasion may require. It must be exercised by Ministers who are responsible to this House. To my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake), we are indebted for the clear recognition of the principle that His Excellency the Governor General, in every act of allowance or disallowance, must find Ministers in this Parliament who have the confidence of this Parliament, and who are willing to accept the responsibility for that act. And that is the safeguard to the Constitution; that is the safeguard which will always make it

impossible for any Minister here to advise His Excellency to disallow measures which ought to be permitted to go into operation. But if the other system is set up, if the alternative presented by my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby), is to be adopted; if you are to say that because a law has been passed within the legislative authority of the Province, therefore it must remain; we can easily see, Sir, that before long these Provinces, instead of coming nearer together, will go further and further apart. We can see that the only way of making a united Canada, and building up a national life and national sentiment in the Dominion, is by seeing that the laws of one Province are not offensive to the laws and institutions, and, it may be, to the feelings of another—I will go so far as to say that they must be to some extent taken into consideration. Not, by any means, that those considerations are always to govern, but they are matters worthy of the consideration of statesmen. If the Provinces were foreign powers, if they owed no local allegiance, if they were not subject to the control of a Governor who enjoyed the confidence of this House, the hostile legislation of one Province would be a fit subject of remonstrance from a friendly power. It may not be a very apt illustration, but at the moment it occurs to me that Napoleon III remonstrated during the time of Lord Palmerston, because he said that under the law of England persons who were known to intend his assassination were harbored in England. We know what the result of that was, that the English people rebelled against the interference of a foreign power. I do not know whether the same spirit dwells in their descendants here or not. This illustration shows what I mean. Under our system, no matter what the law may be, no matter how hostile the people of the adjoining Province of Ontario may consider this law to be, the answer which is given as the final and conclusive answer, without appeal or resort, is that it is passed by the Province of Quebec in the legislative power of that Province, and therefore it must go into operation. Now, take this particular Bill. If the view which I venture to hold is correct—and, Sir, I hold it after careful consideration—the view which is held by a large body of the people of the Province, men distinguished for learning, men distinguished for piety, men distinguished in all the walks of life, as to the character of this order; the view which is held, with the record before us of the expulsion of the order from every Christian state in Europe; I say, is it possible to imagine that the establishment of such an order as that is not a matter of concern to the people of the Province of Ontario and the rest of the Dominion? Putting the question on the lowest ground, is this order, thus subsidised, going to confine its operations within the limits of the Province of Quebec? True, the money is to be spent there, although I do not know how that is to be guaranteed. I find no machinery for ascertaining how the money is to be expended; but, assuming that the money is to be spent there in good faith, it only strengthens the order for incursions beyond the border. We know that some of its members—some of the very same gentlemen, I believe, who have been incorporated—do sometimes visit the Province of Ontario. It is idle, therefore, to say that you can establish such an order as that, and claim it is not a matter of common concern to the rest of the Dominion.

Mr. AMYOT. Do you object to that?

Mr. McCARTHY. I decidedly object to them, or I would not be standing here.

Mr. BERGERON. They are British subjects.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, I believe those at present in this country are; but, as I have already pointed out, the whole body, numbering perhaps 20,000 men, is incorporated by this little Bill of the Province of Quebec. The very words of the Bill are: "All who now are or may be of that order." I have heard it said: Oh, you are too late. Where were you when the incorporation Act was under consideration? Why did you not raise your voice then? Why did not the Protestants then strike at the root of the evil? I do not know, though I am pretty familiar with what is called the doctrine of estoppel, that any such doctrine can be applied to a people. I am not aware that the laches of a Government I have supported, or that the laches of hon. gentlemen on either side, are going to prevent the people from objecting, even if it be too late to object to the Act of Incorporation, to the Act of Endowment, honored by the official seal of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec. In my judgment the Act of Incorporation amounted to very little. The Jesuit body claimed to be incorporated before, and they did not care for incorporation, except for the purpose of holding lands in the Province. They claimed to be incorporated under the revival of the order by the Pope in 1814, and the only object of their incorration by the Act was to enable them to hold real estate, which is a matter not particularly concerning the rest of the Dominion. What does strike me, what has roused the people of the Province from which I have the honor to come, as they have never been aroused in my time, is that one of the Provinces has thought fit to recognise by its legislation, and its grant of public money, the order which they have been brought up to oppose, their reading as to which in later years has strengthened their early training in that respect. Is it the work of politicians? I think in that it is unique in its character. I believe on no platform, in no place has the voice of any public man in the Province been raised in promoting this agitation. It has come from the people. It is promoted, not by the so-called professional politician or any politician, but by the people. By the people it is supported, by the people it is maintained, and by the people it is bound to succeed, be it sooner or later. This is not going to end the controversy. The controversy, as it is said, has come to stay. The principle which this Bill involves and which this measure has drawn attention to, is perhaps the one which excites naturally the greatest indignation, and has called forth the greatest agitation. It is impossible to believe that the men who are at the bottom of this agitation are moved by any particular purpose, or particular view, or desiring aggrandisement. I was astonished to hear the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) denounce these men. They were, he said, mere ministers. Principal Cavan, a teacher of the Presbyterian body, a man with whom I have not the honor of personal acquaintance, a man who, so far as I know, in politics differs from me, but a man who, so far as I have heard, is entitled to the respect of every citizen where he lives and is known. Dr. Stafford, who ministered in this city for many years—men of that description are not thus lightly to be spoken of and to be sneered at because they have stepped out from the ordinary walk of their calling, and gone on the platform to uphold what they believe to be the rights of the citizens. I submit instead of that being a subject for sneering, instead of its being a subject which would call for the condemnation of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), it is the best tribute to their sincerity. This spontaneous exhibition on the part of the people is genuine and heartfelt, because it is really intended and really meant. Now, these are the reasons why the Government should disallow this measure. I have but one other, which I spoke of before, and it is the question of religious equality. I listened with rapt attention to the—will I call it plaintive—appeal made by my hon. friend behind me. There is no censure, he said, which you can make upon this occasion, which will not fall with ten-fold force upon the Protestant minority of the Province of Quebec. Nothing that you can say here can remedy the laches which the Protestant min-

ority displayed in not opposing the majority. I am not here to explain the cause of these laches. I do think we need not go very far for the reason, and I dare say before this debate closes we will learn it; and I call upon hon. members who represent the Protestant constituencies in Quebec, to tell us whether they accept the doctrine of my hon. friend behind me. I ask the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), I call on the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), I call on the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Wilson) to let us in Ontario understand whether there is the turtle dove, peacefulness, existing between the Protestant minority and the Catholic majority in the Province of Quebec which the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) depicted last night. I call on them to state here whether there is nothing but billing and cooing between these separate and distinctive parts into which that Province is divided. My hon. friend's language would seem to imply that. The Protestants enjoyed every Protestant liberty—really, they were allowed to manage their own little Protestant affairs as if there was no majority at all. They were in no way thwarted, interfered with, or troubled by this majority, and the instances he cited to us of this spirit of toleration on the part of the majority were, to my mind, unfortunate and unhappy. Mr. Joly was one. He was, I believe, the leader of the Liberal party, as my hon. friend has stated, but has my hon. friend forgotten modern history? Has he forgotten that Mr. Joly was deposed from his position, or resigned, because of the impossibility of acting? Has he forgotten that Mr. Joly actually resigned his seat, and that practically he was driven out of public life?

Mr. LAURIER. He was always opposed by the minority.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, so much the worse for that minority. I say that minority has no reason to plume itself upon Mr. Joly's successor. Those who opposed him in former times must certainly now look back with regret.

Mr. MITCHELL. You mean Chapleau, Ross and the others. You cannot mean Mercier also.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not mean you, and that ought to be quite sufficient for my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), nor do I even mean his organ, the *Herald*. Another example cited was the Protestant paper, the *Witness*. The *Witness* had never said anything. I do not know how that may be. But is it true that the *Witness* was excommunicated, and remains still under the ban of the Church? Is it not true that the people of a certain religion cannot buy the *Witness* newspaper, under the pains and penalties that may follow thereon? That did not seem a very happy way of manifesting the toleration of the majority of the Province of Quebec. At last my hon. friend's argument culminated—will he pardon the world—in what appeared to me the acme of absurdity, when he said the Protestants recognised no right in the Jesuits of a legal kind. The Protestants disclaimed that there is any moral claim. The Protestants were opposed to the introduction of the name of His Holiness the Pope as—did he use the word pestiferous? or what was the word almost as strong—a bitter pill for them to swallow. But they did not do anything. The Act took away from them their education fund. By one short clause it is declared that the education fund hitherto belonging to Protestants and Catholics alike shall become a part of the general revenue of the country, and that out of the general revenue of the country $60,000 might be paid to the Protestant minority of the Province of Quebec; and not one word was raised against this Act of spoliation.

Mr LANGELIER (Quebec). Where is that to be found?

Mr. McCARTHY. In the latter part of the Act, if the hon. gentleman will read it.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I have not seen it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot make the hon. gentleman read it. And there is not one word from the Protestant minority. It is easy to understand how they get on, as he says, if they submit to all that injustice without a word of remonstrance. It is easy to understand how happy they can be if the Protestant minority are willing simply to take what they can get, a seat here occupied by my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby), with a seat in the other House given to the representative of the majority. My hon. friend tells us that no Protestant can be elected in the Province if the majority chose. If the Protestants come here from that Province only to carry out the behests of the other side, they are a deception. We do not realise their position, because we understand that they are representing the minority, but it appears that they are truly the representatives of the majority, and we are told that, if this cry is raised, if this body is assailed, if we venture to raise our voices in this Parliament, we are going to raise such a cry that the Protestant representatives from the Province of Quebec will lose their seats. I cannot believe that that is possible. I cannot believe that my hon. friend is right in thinking so; but even at that expense, even at the expense of the loss of my hon. friend from this House, which, together with that of other members, would be a calamity to the country, though I cannot believe that that would be the result of a fair, full, frank and calm discussion of this subject, although it is one which trenches upon feelings which are guarded most sensitively, still that would have to be borne. For these reasons, I venture to think, it will not be found that my hon. friend's statements are correct. As he made the statement, my eye caught the report in a newspaper that petitions were being signed in the city of Montreal, that already 3,000 names had been obtained to those petitions, and that more were coming in—petitions to the Governor General, calling upon him to disallow this measure. Does this look as if the Protestants of the Province of Quebec were desirous, and willing, and anxious that this legislation should remain unchanged, or does it not look as if the Protestant minority in that Province were given reasonable encouragement, that they would get justice—and no more than justice are they entitled to, and no more than justice I hope they will ever ask for—from the Parliament of this country? Then they will be up and doing, to do their share of this legislation. But in the Legislature of that Province, composed as it is now, they cannot expect it. There was no Protestant representative in the Cabinet of that Province until recently, and, when one was chosen, he had to be elected in spite of the vote of the Protestant minority. I can understand that, if there were a fighting man in that House like the hon. member who leads the Third party here, there might be a chance of obtaining something like justice, but men with that skill and ability, with parliamentary knowledge to back it, are not to be found every day, and we are not to judge the Protestant representatives of the Province of Quebec on that high standard. We were told that the *Herald* had not said anything about this iniquitous scheme, though the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mitchell) said that, if he had been there, he would not have approved of it. I have not heard anyone approve of it. It has gone without defence. The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) does not approve of it. Perhaps my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) does approve of it, in his great desire to have perfect religious liberty, and not to drive the French out of Ontario. My hon. friend candidly told us that he would not have approved of it. Then, what muzzled the great organ of public opinion? Was it because it was the organ

of the Government? At one time that was the organ of the Protestants of the Province of Quebec.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will tell the hon. gentleman, if he wishes to know.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will let the hon. gentleman tell me when I get through. Perhaps then you will allow me to ask you a question or two.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will give you perfect liberty.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think we are encouraged to persevere in the course we have pursued, and the course we have taken, by the ebullition of popular feeling which we now see is aroused and is manifesting itself in the Province of Quebec. It cannot now be said that it is only the members from Ontario who have raised this cry and who are seeking for this disallowance.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is all it is.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then the petitions are very extraordinary, and I can hardly accept the contradiction of my hon. friend in the face of those petitions. I cannot do better than close in the language of Principal Cavan. I adopt every word which that distinguished gentleman uttered the other evening in reference to the question of disallowance. Speaking on this question, he says:

"He was quite willing to admit that within their own distinct limits the autonomy of the Provinces ought to be respected. Under the Act of Federation certain subjects were designated as belonging to the Dominion, and certain subjects were named as within the jurisdiction of the several Provinces, and while he had never committed himself to the principle, as a universal principle, that the central authority could not revise the Acts of the Provinces that were within their own limits; while he distinctly desired not to be committed to that principle; while he did hold that as a general thing it was a safe and wise principle, as long as the Province has kept fairly and definitely within its own limits, even though its action is not the wisest action, that the central authority should be very careful about revising it—he believed that occasions did arise when it was not simply permitted to the central authority, but that it was the bounden duty of the central authority to revise provincial legislation, legislation lying distinctly within the limits of the Provinces. He supposed on most subjects he would be regarded as thinking with the Liberal party, but if the Liberal party had even taken ground in opposition to that he must beg to be excused from following the Liberal party. He supposed that was a bold thing for a man who was neither lawyer nor politician to say, but was prepared to take the ground that the Jesuits' Estates Act was not within the limits of the Province of Quebec. So far as it dealt with education it was within those limits, so far as it dealt with money it was within those limits, but he thought he could show that it was marked by features which took it out of those limits, and making it a matter that the Dominion ought to deal with."

DERBY BRANCH RAILWAY.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, 1. Is the section of railway subsidised by Parliament completed, extending from the western end of the Derby Branch Railway to a connection with the Northern and Western Railway at Blackville, in the county of Northumberland? 2. If so, when was its completion accepted or recognised by the Government? 3. Is the said section of railway now in operation? If not, why not? 4. Has the Government taken any steps to have the said railway put in operation, and if so, what were they? 5. Has the Government had any negotiations or correspondence with the proprietors of the said railway, for the purpose of extending the traffic on the Derby Branch and securing for the public the advantages which the public were expected to receive when Parliament subsidised said line; and if so, what were they, and with what result?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 1. Accepted as completed, the company having given a bond to replace the cedar cribwork with masonry when called upon by the Government to do so. 2. On the 26th October, 1887. 3. Have no knowledge as to the cause. 4. No. 5. Yes; they were in the nature of a proposition of leasing the Indiantown Branch to the company, it resulted in the Government preparing a lease for the execution, after which the company refused to execute, since which the Government have operated the Indiantown Branch.

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

After Recess.

UNION RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) moved second reading of Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Union Railway Company.

Mr. BRYSON. Before this Bill is read the third time I desire to make one or two observations in reference to it. It will be within the recollection of hon. gentlemen in this House that on the 17th of June, 1887, a Bill in favor of the Pontiac Railway Company, asking for an extension of time for the completion of that road to the town of Pembroke, was passed by this House. To my mind, if this Bill now before the House comes into operation, it may seriously interfere with the completion of the line of the Pontiac Railway. I may say at the outset that the line of the Pontiac Railway is now within a very short distance of the town of Pembroke, that the iron upon that road has been laid to within 14 miles of that town; and the difficulty which now exists with respect to the completion of that road is simply a matter of negotiation for a financial arrangement to raise money to build this bridge. That bridge, as the House is aware, received a consideration at the hands of this House last year of 15 per cent. of the actual cost, which was then estimated to be about $225,000. I contend that if this Bill be allowed to pass as it is at present drawn, and as the railway will touch certain villages in the county of North Renfrew, to a very great extent it will be a rival line to the Pontiac Railway. The greatest distance at any point between the Pontiac Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway does not exceed 17 miles; and I contend that the farmers of the townships of Westmeath and Ross cannot in any way be considered as suffering for the want of railway facilities. When people are living within 8 miles of a line of railway, with good roads, I consider there can be no hardship endured by them, and consequently this Bill ought to stand over for a time. In looking at the names of the petitioners for this Bill, I find that the gentlemen who are asking for the incorporation of this company reside in the town of Pembroke. If I were convinced that the promoters of this Bill were residents of these townships, I would look upon it differently. I may be permitted to refer to an argument used by the hon. member for North Renfrew in the Railway Committee—he contended that we would be depriving these people of a railway. Well, in looking over these names I find that not one of the gentlemen who are asking for incorporation, are residents of this portion of the country through which this line of railway would run. Therefore, I come to the conclusion that the promoters of this scheme are in a measure promoting a line of railway which will be a rival line to the Pontiac Railway, and may result disastrously to that line. Irrespective of the interests of the county which I have the honor to represent, a very large portion of the community in the county of Pontiac might for all time to come be deprived of a line of railway. It is contended with some force that the Ottawa River, lying between these two lines of railway, is a very serious embarrassment to the people of these townships that I have just named; but when you take into consideration that at the village of Portage du Fort we have a bridge for highway traffic, and two very good ferries at Lapasse and at the mouth of the Black River, which is immediately opposite the end of the iron on the Pontiac Railway, it will be seen that the people of the township of Westmeath, who are furthest from the line of railway, can suffer no serious injury by delay in building this road. I, therefore, move:

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole, in order to insert a clause providing that the Act shall not come into operation until 1st January, 1891.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I hope the House will not agree to the motion of my hon. friend. The matter was discussed in the Railway Committee the other day, and if such an amendment should be inserted the Railway Committee was the proper place to make it. The people who promote this Bill prefer withdrawing the Bill altogether, to having the proposed condition imposed. I cannot understand upon what grounds my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Bryson) proposes that this provision should be incorporated in the Bill. The railway, the construction of which is proposed to be authorised by this Bill, will go through the townships of Westmeath and Ross, in the county of Renfrew. It does not touch the county of Pontiac until it reaches Portage du Fort, 30 miles from Pembroke, and there it crosses the Ottawa, but does not come into contact with the Pontiac Railway, and it is not, so far as I am able to judge, going to be a competing line to the detriment of the county of Pontiac with the Pontiac Railway. If anybody had any reason to complain of the road preventing the construction of the Pontiac Railway it would be the very people who are applying for this Act of incorporation, because if the Pontiac Railway is prevented from coming to Pembroke it would, of course, be disadvantageous to that town. There is nothing, however, in this Bill or in the scheme promoted by this Bill either to interfere with the people of Pontiac or that will prevent the Pontiac Railway reaching its terminal point of Pembroke. It is not proposed under the provisions of the Bill, to draw away from the Pontiac Railway one dollar of the subsidy that has been granted by Parliament to that road, and it is not going to interfere with the construction of the Pontiac Railway to its terminal point. Under these circumstances I hope the House will not consider for a moment the proposition of my hon. friend. I may say that these two townships to which I have referred are now without railway communication because they happen to lie along a tract which has on one side the Ottawa River and on the other Muskrat Lake, the latter being in some parts from one to two miles wide and ten to twelve miles long. So these two townships are wedged in between the lake and the river, with the Pontiac Railway lying to the north of the Ottawa River and the Canadian Pacific Railway to the south of the lake to which I have referred. What is proposed by the Bill is to give communication between Pembroke and Portage du Fort through the rich townships which I have mentioned. I repeat, that I hope the House will not entertain the proposition which my hon. friend has submitted.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This subject was discussed in the Railway Committee the other day, before it was decided to report the Bill to the House. The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Bryson) made a strong appeal to the promoter of the Bill for the purpose of having the Bill delayed. The reason given was that the new railway in the county of Renfrew would be a competing line to the Pontiac road. The Pontiac Railway is on one side of the River Ottawa, and the proposed railway, in the county of Renfrew, is on the other side of the river. I understand the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Bryson) fears that if the proposed road is built in the county of Renfrew, starting at Pembroke and going to Portage du Fort, it will delay the building of the Pontiac road, and, perhaps, prevent its crossing the river at Pembroke. I must say that the distance between the two lines is from 18 to 20 miles, and there is a river between the two roads, and, therefore, I do not think the competition will be very great, because the people on one side of the river will not cross it to take the railway on the other. The only objection could be that the Pontiac road, being not yet completed, the proposed road might interfere with the crossing of the river. I think the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Bryson) does not give sufficient weight to the strength of his own road, and that he minimises the ability of its promoters to complete its line, and cross the Ottawa to Pembroke, even although the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) may obtain a charter for the road from Pembroke to Portage du Fort. I think, therefore, that the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Bryson) would act wisely not to oppose the Bill, and postpone the operation of its Act until 1st January, 1891. A year would certainly be occupied in organising, before contracts could be given out, and during that time, with the assistance of the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Bryson), his railway will have crossed the Ottawa, and have reached Pembroke. I think, therefore, that my hon. friend would do better not to insist on his amendment.

Amendment negatived on a division, Bill read the third time and passed.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, KINGSTON.

House proceeded to consideration of amendments made by Senate to Bill (No. 46) to amend the Act respecting the Queen's College of Kingston.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What are these amendments?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The only amendment made is to the clause allowing the corporation to hold real estate in the Province, subject, however, to the laws of any Province in which any real estate was acquired.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has that been asked for?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No; the Senate put it in of their own motion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. To make the holding of the lands subject to provincial laws.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask as to whether that is not done to give this House jurisdiction over the subject?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It was not asked; as to the jurisdiction of this House I would refer the hon. gentleman to the opinion in this morning's paper of the Hon. Mr. McDougall showing that we have jurisdiction in this matter.

Amendments concurred to.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 37) to amend the Act incorporating the Massawippi Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Colby.)

Bill (No. 63) to enable the City of Winnipeg to utilise the Assiniboine River water power.—(Mr. Watson.)

Bill (No 62) to incorporate the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Watson.)

Bill (No. 99) to incorporate the Three Rivers and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Riopel.)

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved, that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 68) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are only a few minutes left of the hour for Private Bills, and as I am aware this Bill will be considerably discussed and amendments to it proposed, I do not see any object in going into committee on it now. I would ask my hon. friend to withdraw his motion.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I accede to the request of the right hon. gentleman, but as the time for Private Bills is coming to a close, I hope the Government will give us an opportunity to have the Bill discussed and not confine us to the hour on Friday night.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that I can do that. It will be the very first Bill on Friday and Monday as well, and there is no chance of its being thrown over.

Motion withdrawn.

SUPPLY—THE JESUITS' ESTATES ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I feel that in addressing the House upon this question and in presenting to it, at this stage of the debate, the reasons which, I believe, justified the Government in advising His Excellency not to exercise the power of disallowance as to the Jesuits' Estate Act of Quebec, I must ask more than the usual indulgence of the House. I shall be compelled, in the first place, to dwell at considerable length, on details which the House has already heard discussed; and I shall have to speak under a sense of the fact that with one large portion of the people of Canada nothing that I can say will be satisfactory, and that with another, and I hope the greater portion of the people of Canada, no defence of the Government is necessary. Nevertheless, considering the arraignment which the policy of the Government on this question has had, considering the interest which the measure has excited in all quarters of Canada, it is only becoming that I should ask the indulgence of the House in order that I may make a plain statement of the reasons which have induced us to give to His Excellency the advice for which we are to be held responsible to-night. I desire, before beginning a statement of these reasons, to take exception to a remark which was made by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), at the outset of his address, with reference to the position which members of the Government occupy in this debate. The hon. gentleman, in complaining that no member on the Treasury benches had risen to take part in the debate down to this stage, spoke of it almost as an act of discourtesy. He seemed to think that the mode in which the discussion should be carried on was a mere matter of politeness and a mere matter of fence. I do not so regard it I understand the position of the Government to be this: The case on behalf of the amendment was first presented forcibly and ably last night by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), sustained by an hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House (Mr. Barron); but I leave it to the sense of the House, whether, when the debate was adjourned at near midnight, any argument remained unanswered which called for an answer from the Treasury benches. But with regard to the hon. member's complaint on the ground of discourtesy, I have to appeal to the sense of fairness of the House in this particular. No member on either side of the House was unaware from the commencement of this debate, that the main argument on which the conduct of the Government would be assailed, would be presented by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I was the Minister, who, if there be a difference between colleagues as to the extent to which responsibility is shared, was primarily responsible, and I submit it to the sense of fairness of every member whether, before giving the reasons upon which I must stand or fall as regards the correctness of the advice which I gave to His Excellency it was not my right to hear my accuser? The hon. gentleman thinks otherwise, and the position he takes is this: That courtesy to him and to the gentlemen who will divide with him on this question to-night require that his arraignment of my report, his arraignment of the Government with regard to every subject of this discussion, should have been made after my mouth had been closed, and I had ceased to have a right to defend myself. If there is any fairness or courtesy in that position, I am willing to submit that I was wrong in reserving the remarks which I have to make until the hon. member for Simcoe had been heard. Now, in presenting the case which I have to present on behalf of the Government, I must ask your attention for a few moments again to the wearisome narration of the position which these lands occupied in the Province of Quebec. Not that that matter has not been discussed in every detail, but because in almost every detail I have essentially different opinions from those of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and because, in some respects, the points upon which the merits of this case depend were lost sight of by the hon. member in the admirable address he made this afternoon. Why, I venture to say, without the slightest disrespect for the hon. member, for whose talents no one in this House has a higher respect than I, and I would be the last person to disparage any observations which he might address to us—I venture to say that the reason why this House ought not to ask His Excellency now to disallow that Act, if we had no better reason, is that the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy)—a master of legal argument—addressed the House for nearly three hours this afternoon, and presented a case in which, to say the least of it, the greatest doubt must exist—presented a case in which, for one whole hour, the hon. gentleman went from detail to detail, from step to step, for the purpose of proving—what? for the purpose of proving that the Jesuits of Quebec lost their legal title to the estates in question—a fact which is admitted in the preamble to the Act. He spent an hour more in discussing theological questions, and questions connected with the ecclesiastical history of England, which, in England itself and in every one of her colonies, have been kept asleep for the last two hundred years by the spirit of toleration on which alone a British country can be governed. Now, let me call the attention of the House to a brief statement with regard to the position of these estates, not for the purpose of showing that this society in the Province of Quebec, whatever its character and merits may have been, had a legal title to the property, but for the purpose of showing that this is not a question which we can decide, but is one which must and ought to have been left to that authority which the Constitution makes not only competent to deal with such questions but omnipotent in dealing with them, subject only to control in so far as the rights of the whole Dominion or the policy of the Empire may be involved. Now, Sir, the House will remember that, long before the cession of Canada to the Crown of Great Britain, the Jesuits had labored in the wilderness, and in the schools of Canada, and in the churches of Canada, and that, as a reward for their missionary zeal, for their talent as teachers, and for their services to this, one of the great colonies of France, that order had been erected into an incorporated body, under the most solemn acts which the King of France could pass under his hand, had been endowed with these estates by the King of France, and by private donors, who wished to place in their hands the means by which the work of Christianity and civilisation amongst the savages could be carried on, and by which the work of education amongst the youth of the Province of Quebec could be carried on. These were the terms on which they held their lands when the battle was fought on the Plains of Abraham, and the conqueror took possession of Canada under terms which are in the first place set forth in the capitulation of the city of Quebec, and afterwards in the capitulation of the city of Montreal, and under terms which are plainly defined by the law of nations, recognised by every civilised country in the world. What were these terms? By the law of nations, recognised, as I have said, in every civilised country in the

world, the conquering power took possession of all the rights, privileges and property of the conquered monarch in the country, but he took no more. He took the sovereignty of the country, he took the King's fortifications in the country, he took the King's stores of arms and ammunition in the country, he took the King's lands in the country, he took the King's treasures in the country, but he had no right by the law of nations to lay his hand on the property, movable or immovable, of the humblest subject in the country. If he had despoiled private property it would have been an outrage which would have disgraced the British arms, and he would have committed an act, let me tell the House, which, irrespective of the law of nations, the conquering General stated in the Terms of Capitulation, begun at Quebec, repeated at Montreal, he would not do. It has been said in this debate that, by the Terms of Capitulation, the Jesuits of the Province of Quebec, and all their property, were placed at the mercy of the conqueror. I do not so read the Terms of Capitulation. Let me see article 34 of the Terms of Capitulation of Montreal:

"All the communities——"

And at that time the Jesuits were in community in the Province of Quebec——

"——and all the priests shall preserve their movables, the property and revenues of the seignories and other estates which they possess in the colony, of what nature soever they be, and the same estates shall be preserved in their privileges, rights, honors and exemptions."

That was the request made, and the answer given to that request was unequivocal—"Granted." And yet we are told that these estates, which came within the exact words of that provision as to the seignories and property, movable and immovable, of the priests and religious orders in the Province of Quebec, were reserved to the King's mercy. It is true that the preceding section 33 was refused until the King's pleasure should be known, and in that there was a distinct reference to the Jesuits, but that article referred, not to the property only of the Jesuits, but asked in addition to the provisions as to their property in section 34, that they should have all their constitutions and privileges, that their monasteries should not be entered by troops, and that safeguards should be given to them from military intrusion, and that they should preserve their rights to nominate to certain curacies and missions as theretofore. Those privileges, vague and undefined by the terms of the article, were met by the words: "Reserved until the King's pleasure be known," although the response to the article, dealing with the properties of these people, was the unequivocal one—"Granted." The conquering arms of England were used against the soldiers of France, but not against individuals, either religious or secular, either in France or in Canada. Now, we go a step further, and we read the Treaty of Peace. The war had gone on, and the treaty was not made until 1763, and let me read to the House a passage from the treaty, because the Terms of Capitulation are liable to be qualified by the final and definitive treaty at the close of the war. This provision was made by the treaty:

"His Most Christian Majesty cedes and guarantees to His Britannic Majesty in full right, Canada with all its dependencies, as well as the Island of Cape Breton, and all the other islands and coasts in the Gulf and River St. Lawrence, and, in general, everything that depends on the said countries, lands, islands, and coasts, with the sovereignty, property, possession, and all rights, acquired by treaty or otherwise, which the Most Christian King and the Crown of France have had till now over the said countries, islands, lands, places, coasts, and their inhabitants, so that the Most Christian King cedes and makes over the whole to the said King and to the Crown of Great Britain, and that in the most ample manner and form, without restriction, and without any liberty to depart from the said cession and guaranty under any pretence, or to disturb Great Britain in the possessions above mentioned."

Now, in return for that cession of Canada and Cape Breton and all the islands of the St. Lawrence, this solemn compact was made by His Britannic Majesty:

"His Britannic Majesty on his side agrees to grant the liberty of the Catholic religion to the inhabitants of Canada. He will consequently give the most precise and most effectual orders that his new Roman Catholic subjects may profess the worship of their religion, according to the rites of the Romish Church, as far as the laws of Great Britain permit. His Britannic Majesty further agrees that the French inhabitants, or others who had been subjects of the Most Christain King in Canada, may retire with all safety and freedom wherever they shall think proper, and may sell their estates, provided it be to subjects of His Britannic Majesty."

This House has been told that the essence of the whole clause is in the qualification, "as far as the laws of Great Britain permit," and we are told that that of itself introduced all the laws of England relating to public worship, the Supremacy Act, and everything of that kind which could be invoked.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not by me.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for Simcoe did not assert that it introduced the Supremacy Act, but the argument was made before he spoke in the debate, that that introduced all the restrictions on the exercise of religion; and we were told that it even introduced the Supremacy Act, under which, let me tell the House plainly, if it had been introduced in the Province of Quebec, no man could have exercised the Catholic religion at all. The very essence of the Supremacy Act is that no person—I am stripping the Act of all its verbiage, I am giving its essence, and at the same time quoting its exact words when I say, that the gist of the whole Act is this: That no person outside the realm of England shall have or exercise within the Queen's dominions—even spiritual superiority. If no spiritual superiority in Rome then no bishop in Canada; if no bishop in Canada, no priest in Canada; if no priest in Canada then no sacrament for the living or the dying in Canada. Every altar in Canada would have been thrown down by the very terms of a treaty in which His Britannic Majesty, in return for the cession of half the continent, solemnly promised not only that the people should have the right to exercise their religion, as they had been accustomed to do, but that he would give the most precise orders that freedom of worship should be carried out in every particular. Now, Sir, obviously the treaty meant no such thing; obviously His Britannic Majesty did not take with one hand the cession of this country, and hold out a false promise with the other. Obviously he meant that there should be perfect freedom of worship in Canada, the newly ceded country, subject only to the legislation which might be made upon this subject from time to time by the Parliament of Great Britain, certainly not that it was subject then to the laws as regards freedom of worship in Great Britain; for, let me remind the House, that instead of there being any freedom of worship in Great Britain at that time, the exercise of the Roman Catholic religion then amounted to the crime of high treason; and no dissenter, under the risk of long imprisonment, could enter a conventicle or a meeting-house; so that obviously it did not mean to introduce into the country ceded, the laws of Great Britain with regard to public worship or even with regard to supremacy at that time. But let me sugest to the House what the obvious meaning was, as quoted from the words of the Attorney General and the Solicitor General of England, and of the Prime Minister of England, in discussing this treaty stipulation, and what, upon its face, every sensible and unprejudiced man will say its meaning was; and that was this: "In so far as the laws of Great Britain permit freedom of worship in her colonies"—and the laws of Great Britain at that time did permit freedom of worship in her colonies—and likewise "in so far as the laws of Great Britain passed in future years might permit." Well, Sir, we pass on to the Quebec Act of a few years later, in 1774, and I come now certainly to a branch of the argument against us which my hon. friend from Simcoe did press upon us this afternoon, namely,

that by the express term of that statute, the provisions of the Statute of Elizabeth with regard to the supremacy of the Queen, was enacted with regard to the Province of Quebec. Now, let me ask the House, for the purpose of considering how far passion has guided and swerved the reason of some of those who have spoken upon this question, to look at that statute, and they will find that the rights of the people of Canada and their freedom of religious worship are as fully guaranteed by the terms of the Quebec Act as they were by the terms of the Treaty of Paris itself. While it is true that one of the provisions of that Act declares that the statute made in the first year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth should apply over all the countries which then did, or thereafter should belong to the Imperial Crown of this realm, and should apply to the Province of Quebec, this is subject to a limited construction, because if it is to be read in its literal sense, it was an absolute prohibition of the practice of the Roman Catholic religion in the Province, an absolute prohibition under the penalties of high treason itself. But the Act left no such ambiguity to be dealt with by mere construction, because it goes on to limit the operation of the Statute relating to Royal Supremacy, by declaring that instead of the oath of abjuration which, by the terms of the statute of Elizabeth, all people professing the Catholic religion were to take, not only to abjure all foreign jurisdiction in relation to temporal matters, but all foreign jurisdiction in relation to spiritual matters as well: there is to be a new form of oath and a new statutory provision for the people of the Province, whereby they shall no longer be bound to abjure foreign jurisdiction in matters spiritual, and shall be entitled to all the privileges of British subjects, and all privileges of worship on taking an oath of allegiance merely, which applies only to the temporal affairs of the reigning sovereign. Therefore, instead of its being in any sense true that by the terms of the Quebec Act the restrictions of the Supremacy Act were imposed upon the Province by the express terms of that statute, the people of Quebec were relieved from the most odious provision of the Supremacy Act—the provision by which they were bound to swear against conscience, and in abnegation of their faith, that they would recognise the power of no foreign priest, even in spiritual matters. So much then for the Quebec Act of 1774, by which, I think, I have shown that there was a toleration extended in regard to the Province of Quebec which did not exist in the mother country, and which was utterly inconsistent with these old statutes, which, forsooth, 115 years afterwards, we are asked to advise His Excellency to apply to the Province of Quebec. Now, Sir, in 1791, 30 years after the conquest of Canada, the King of Great Britain issued a proclamation suppressing the Order of Jesuits in the colony. As history has told us, the estates which are even now in question, were looked upon with a covetous eye by Lord Amherst who had taken an active part in directing the armies of Great Britain. On this subject I need not go into details. This covetous attempt was frustrated, but suffice it to say, at this stage of the controversy, that the King of England, and I submit it to the legal sense of the House, the King of England had no power to revoke the terms of the charter of incorporation which the Jesuits of Canada had received from the King of France. I admit that the Parliament of Great Britain could have brought in the whole body of the common law, and could have applied to the colony all the penal statutes which the bigotry of that age might choose to invoke. But the King of England had probably no such prerogative. If the King grants a charter, the King himself, with all his power, cannot revoke it. It is only Parliament who can do that, and, in this instance, by the attempt, I venture to think, of the King to suppress that order, and to revoke that charter, he exceeded the authority which he possessed. But, Sir, we were told

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

that by a royal proclamation all the common law of England was introduced into Canada. I doubt that that could be done. By the law of nations, recognised at every stage and period of English law, the laws of a conquered country prevail until the paramount authority of the conquering country imposes new laws upon it. But the monarch of a conquering country probably cannot of himself change those laws, cannot of himself do it under the constitution of Great Britain. But if there is a doubt upon that subject as to the general rule, I say this, that the King of England could not introduce the common law by his proclamation in violation of the treaty which he had made in 1763, and by the terms of the treaty he had reserved all those rights which touch this question, even in the remotest degree. Therefore, it is idle for us to discuss how far he might have made other branches of the common law applicable to this country. In the year 1800 the last Jesuit died, and I think that by the law of England, applicable, perhaps, at that time to this property in Canada, on the death of the last surviving member of the corporation the property escheated to the Crown, and the Crown could have taken possession of it as escheated lands. Steps were taken to assert this right on the part of the Crown; but the question had been complicated in the meantime by the fact that the Pope had suppressed the Company of Jesus nearly all over the world. By the terms of that suppression and by the terms of the civil law, which, it is contended still prevailed in the Province of Quebec, the properties, instead of reverting to the Crown, passed to the ordinaries of the dioceses in which they were situated. I do not mean to say that that is so: I present that to the House as one of the questions which has been raised, and which tends to make this case anything but a plain one. I will do more. I will admit the hon. member for Simcoe's contention, that the common law had in the meantime been introduced, that the civil law had been superseded, and that by the terms of the common law these estates had become escheated to the Crown. One of the questions, however, which has been constantly agitated ever since in the Province of Quebec is this—that if you are to subject this property to the rigor of the common law, you at least ought to give the benefit of that principle of the common law, which declares that whenever property of any kind has been escheated to the Crown some consideration should be shown to the persons who are morally entitled to it, and regard should be had to the use to which it was intended to be applied. By this rule of practice the escheat does not wholly result as an emolument to the Crown or as an augmentation of the revenue, but a liberal proportion is appropriated to the intention of the donors or to those who morally may be considered entitled to it. If that consideration were to prevail to any extent, the clergy, and it may be the Jesuits, on the reinstatement of the order, would have some kind of moral right to compensation respecting these estates. But let me call the attention of the House to this fact, which I think has been kept out of view, and which certainly the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron) who addressed the House last night, overlooked in his argument, that the very brief by which these properties were taken possession of on the part of the Crown, when they were eventually seized, does not allege the right of escheat, but declares the right by which the Crown intended to claim the properties to be the right of conquest—a right which, as I have said, is repudiated by the law of nations, was repudiated by the Crown officers of Great Britain at the time, and which, after all that has been said in this debate, has not had one word said in favor of it. That was the only title by which Great Britain claimed she had a right to these estates. Now, it is true likewise that subsequent statutes vested the title in the Province of Canada, and ultimately in due course of law, and as the result of statutes, the title to those lands became vested in the Province of Quebec,

As to the conclusion which the hon. member for Simcoe drew, that the Province had a good title to them, a perfect title under the law, I have not one word to say; and if this Act had come before us as legislation in recognition of a legal title, I would have felt bound to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that a very great mistake had been committed, on which, perhaps, it might have been necessary to have advised the Provincial Legislature to reconsider its conclusions. But it is admitted by the Legislature of Quebec that a good title existed in the Province, and all that is said on the face of this Act or in the arguments in support of it, is this: That there existed a moral claim to some degree of compensation, little or much, which, to a greater or less extent, was binding upon the conscience of the Legislature of that Province. Now, Sir, the result of the existence of that claim—the result of the assertion of that moral right, whatever it may have been worth, was that, from year to year, when the Province went on to assert its right to those estates, and as the Province ventured to place piece after piece of the property on the market, it was met by a protest from the united hierarchy of Quebec, demanding that such properties should not be sold, should not be diverted from the original charitable and religious purposes for which they were intended, and so every step by which those estates were sought to be made useful to the revenues of the Province was contested in the most formal and solemn manner. It is recited in part of the preamble of this Act, that not many years ago, one of the most valuable parts of the property, being situate opposite the Basilica in the city of Quebec, was brought to market, and there was met by the solemn protest of all the hierarchy of the Province. In face of that protest, casting as it did, a cloud upon the title of the Province, involving as it seemed to do a dispute as to the right of the Government, and as to the title of the purchaser, that property had to be withdrawn from sale. Let me assure this House again that in presenting our case I am endeavoring to do so, not from my individual point of view at all, but simply from the point of view in which we may be asked to withhold or to give advice with respect to the great power of disallowing a provincial statute. Let me call attention then to all these details, and let me ask the House to keep in mind that state of affairs with respect to the property itself, with respect to the assertion of this claim, good or bad; with respect to the assertion of this moral right, worth little or much, and to remember the difficulty of marketing the property in the Province of Quebec under these circumstances. If the House will bear all this in mind, and then will read with me the statute which we are asked to disallow, I say that the provisions of that statute will cease to be obnoxious to any reasonable man, that they cannot be misunderstood and that they can hardly be misrepresented even by the most violent prejudice. The sale, as I have said, was forbidden. I am not driven at all to defend the policy of the Government of the Province, as to the propriety of opening up that question; as to the propriety of not insisting that these properties should be sold even if they should be sacrificed in the face of that formidable protest. That was for the Legislature of Quebec to say. The constitution has charged me with no duties and with no responsibilities, as to the weight of any legal or of any moral claim which the Legislature has thought proper to recognise. I may concur with gentlemen who have spoken this afternoon that it was unwise not to insist on the strict statutory title based on confiscation, severe though it may have been, but in this case the constitution has not made me the judge. It has not made me or my colleagues the arbiters between the two sets of opinions in the Province of Quebec; it has not clothed His Excellency with the power to step in and consider every question which arises among the people of the Province: it has vested that authority in the Provincial Legislature, which by a unanimous vote, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) last night declared that this was the true and proper solution of the question. Under those circumstances have I any right to exercise a superior and overruling judgment over the Province? Is that the theory upon which our constitution is to be worked out? This moral claim, as they choose to call it, may have been as weak as air, but it was considered weighty by the conscience and the judgment of those whom the constitution solemnly appointed to decide and after that it is not for us to say: "The Legislature arrived at a wrong conclusion." I can state the matter no more forcibly than in the very words of one of our opponents on this question, who declares that the authority given to the Provincial Legislatures over certain classes of subjects carries with it, like all authority, a liberty to error which must be respected so long as the legal power is not exceeded, and the error is not manifestly subversive legally or morally of the principles of the constitution or of the great objects of the state. As far, therefore, as we have to consider the power of the Legislature to recognise a moral obligation—leaving out of sight for a moment the theological questions which my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and I are to join issue on, with a view to the House passing judgment, as to which is the better theologian forsooth, and as to whose advice on the question of theology His Excellency the Governor General as the supreme theologian is to act—I contend that the Legislature had supreme authority to decide, and had a perfect right to decide, without veto or controlling authority at Ottawa, even though we thought they decided erroneously. Now, Sir, having asked the House to bear in mind the situation in which these properties stood in the Province of Quebec, the way in which an attempted sale was met by a protest which completely frustrated the sale, let me call the attention of the House to another state of facts as regards the various claimants upon this property. There were the Bishops of the Province who said: "As a result of the suppression of the Society of Jesus in this Province we were vested with all the estates as the ordinaries of the various dioceses in which these properties were situated." Nay, more, they said: "We have inherited their moral claim too, because when the means were striken from their hands of carrying on the missionary work and the work of education, we took it up and, by the sacrifice of our people's labors and treasures, we built up institutions of education all over this country." The Society of the Jesuits had in the meantime been re-instated and re-organised in the Province, and upon this point let me call the attention of the House to the argument of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) which was that by the decree of suppression in France the order became extinct in Canada. He cited to prove that the decision of the Parliament of Paris, which merely decided that the Jesuits in France were liable for the debts of the Jesuits in Paraguay, because the properties of the two sets of men were held in solidarity. That decision has not the remotest effect upon the status of the Jesuits in Canada, who, themselves, were a body corporate under the most solemn instrument which the King of France could give them to indicate his will in that regard. I have mentioned that the bishops claimed that they represented the moral right, which, as I have said, the Legislature thought was worthy of compensation, and the Jesuits claimed it likewise. Look at this as a business matter. Look at this matter simply as relating to a piece of land in the city of Quebec, and tell me how, under these circumstances, the title was ever to be cleared of this dispute. Obviously not by compensating first one party and then the other, because under those circumstances the Legislature would have had to pay twice the value of the claim. It could be only settled by getting the two parties to arbitrate and to leave it to some person to settle their mutual,

dispute, or by saying: "You must conform to the decision of some person who has authority over you both." Let me argue this question throughout, if we can, without feeling that we belong to different religious persuasions, without feeling that a religious question is mixed up with it at all; and, therefore, let us leave out for the moment any name which might excite the prejudices of some portions of the community. The Bishop of Quebec and the other contesting parties who struggled for compensation for this moral claim were all members of the same church, and by their membership recognised supreme authority in the head of that church to settle their disputes, even though the settlement should be against their will. The head of their church had that authority—not by any provision of the law of Quebec mind, not by any provision recognised by English law mind, but by the consent of the parties who were free to belong to that church and free to leave it, and while they did belong to it were subject to a spiritual superior. He had that power by their choice; he had the right to say to one or the other, no matter how small or how great the proportion might be that was divided between them: "You must submit; it is a fair settlement between you, and I, as your supreme arbiter bind you by my decision." The Government of Quebec, therefore, having made up its mind to recognise the moral claim, if for no other purpose, for purposes of public policy, found that they could not arrive at a solution of the question without some person to act between the claimants and to bind them both. It was only by a method like that that they could reach a solution—paying once, and once only, the value of this moral claim. Now, that being so, let me see what was done in pursuance of that method of settlement. The head of that church, so possessed with power to preclude the Jesuits from making any further claim, so possessed with power to preclude the bishops from making any further claim, authorised, in 1884—and this is an important fact, as the House will see when I proceed a little with the argument—authorised the Archbishop of Quebec to act as his attorney in the negotiations for the settlement. On the 7th of May, 1887, a document appears which has been one of the means of exciting hostility to this Act. On the 7th of May, 1887, the head of the church *reserved to himself* the right to settle the question with regard to the value of that moral claim and the division of the proceeds—reserved it to himself in virtue of his prerogatives as a potentate? Not at all. Reserved it to himself simply in the withdrawal of the authority which he had given to the Archbishop of Quebec, and left himself unrepresented in the Province by any attorney whomsoever. And, therefore, when it is said that the Pope reserved to himself the right to settle the question, he was not by any means claiming to reserve any right in the public domain in the Province, or any right to the appropriation of money of the Province. He was simply withdrawing the power which he had given to another person to settle the question, and saying: "Until a new authority is given, you will negotiate with me." The next step, Sir, was on the 17th of May, 1888, and that was in a letter which was written by Mr. Mercier, the First Minister of Quebec, and which, without an undue desire to defend the propriety of these negotiations, the policy of the Act, or any other step of the transaction, I think has been very much misunderstood in this discussion. That letter recites, among other things, that the Holy Father, by reserving to himself the settlement of that question, virtually had cancelled the authority, the only authority, which existed in the Province of Quebec, to negotiate with the Government. The First Minister said:

"My predecessors in the Government deemed it their duty, in 1876, believe, to order the demolition of the college and the division of the property into building lots, in view of an immediate sale, which, however, did not take place, owing to certain representations from exalted personages at the time.

"To avoid further difficulties, as I supposed, my predecessors let the matter lie and allowed the property to be so neglected that it has become a grazing ground and a receptacle for filth, so much so that it is openly said in Quebec that the matter has become a public scandal.

"Under these circumstances, I deem it my duty to ask Your Eminence if you see any serious objection to the Government's selling the property, pending a final settlement of the question of the Jesuits' estates."

My hon. friends so far misconceived that request as to represent it to be a petition on the part of the Government of the Province to a foreign potentate for permission to sell the property—a permission which they did not need, because by the law of the Province they had the power to sell it, and they had from year to year sold portions of it, and put the proceeds in the public Treasury. But in asking his consent to the sale of the property, they were asking that, when they brought it to the market again, they should not be met by the protests of the bishops whom he had the power to control; and, therefore, when the First Minister said: "Will you permit this property to be sold, pending a final settlement of the Jesuits' estates?"—he was simply asking that that protest should no longer be made, and that there should be a consent to the sale on the part of all who asserted any claim whatever, even though it were only the shadow of a moral claim. He said: "This is a receptacle for filth, so much so that it has become a public scandal; let us all agree that it shall be sold, pending a settlement of the Jesuits' estates." Surely that is only the ordinary transaction of everyday life, when a man has possession of real estate to which another sets up even an unfounded claim. He will say: "Rather than that this property should go to waste and be a public nuisance, better that we should all consent to sell it." Yet we are told that the First Minister went to the feet of a foreign potentate to enable him to exercise power which he ought to have found in the statutes of his own Province. He was not denying his legal title or power; but he was simply saying: "Give me your consent, so that this claim, whether little or much, shall no longer stand in the way of a sale for the benefit of all concerned." He said:

"The Government would look on the proceeds of the sale as a special deposit to be disposed of hereafter, in accordance with the agreements to be entered into between the parties interested, with the sanction of the Holy See."

Simply this, that all parties claiming the property, or any rights in respect of it, shall agree that the property shall be sold and the proceeds shall be kept inviolate, so that anybody having any claim against the property shall not be prejudiced, but shall have the same claim as before—precisely the same arrangement as any business man having property to sell would make with his adversary. The letter goes on to say:

"As it will perhaps be necessary, upon this matter, to consult the Legislature of our Province, which is to be convened very shortly, I respectfully solicit an immediate reply."

We were told in sarcastic tones to-day that it was *absolutely necessary* to go to the feet of the Sovereign Pontiff, but it might only *perhaps* be necessary to consult the Legislature of the Province of Quebec. I say when we know the facts with regard to that property, the criticism becomes unfair. The Government of the Province had already power to sell the estates by law, and, therefore, unless it were agreed upon with the head of the church that the property should be sold under these conditions, and an agreement were made to value this very claim, and to put aside the funds to meet it, there was no necessity to consult the Legislature at all. If the personage to whom that letter was addressed had declined the negotiations, it would not have been necessary to consult the Legislature, because the Provincial Government had all the legal authority the Legislature could give them. It was only in the event of a compromise being arrived at and the payment of money being involved, that it was necessary to consult the

Legislature. And yet this letter has been put to the House, as if, forsooth, the fair and true meaning of it was that it was only *perhaps* necessary to consult the Legislature, but at all events it was necessary to consult the Holy See. Now, the answer to that letter was in these words:

"I hasten to notify you that, having laid your request before the Holy Father at the audience yesterday, His Holiness was pleased to grant permission to sell the property which belonged to the Jesuit Fathers before they were suppressed, upon the express condition, however, that the sum to be received be deposited and left at the free disposal of the Holy See."

The claimant representing this moral claim says: "I agree that you shall sell that lot in the city of Quebec, but if you sell it, place the fund to my credit in order that we may know where it is, when we arrive at a satisfactory conclusion as to what shall be done with it." The answer of the First Minister was that he declined to accede to that, but he proposed a reasonable alternative, that the Government retain the proceeds until this dispute should be settled. Thus what is declared to be an assumption of authority on the part of the Pope, actually in contravention of the Supremacy Act, and what we are told actually trails the Queen's honor in the dust, is that the Pope consents to the Quebec Government retaining the proceeds of the sale of the Jesuits' estates, subject to a future settlement of the dispute. The Government of Quebec, pending the settlement of the claims of these two litigants, which were to be held in suspense to be settled, not before the sale of the property but afterwards, retained custody of this fund; and when the authority representing these rival claimants agrees to this proposition, it is asserted, forsooth, that because he uses the word "allows," meaning evidently "consents," he has encroached on the prerogative of the Queen. In agreeing to the Government retaining the proceeds of the sale of the Jesuits' estates, he acted simply as the arbiter between the two contesting claimants. He allows this simply as the person who, as the head of the church to which the claimants belong, has, by their own choice, a right to give this consent; and yet when he consents to that, it is actually declared that he is asserting the prerogative of a foreign potentate in derogation of the prerogative of the Queen. I repeat that when we know the facts with regard to the situation of this property, and with regard to the position of the two rival claimants, it is impossible to misunderstand, and almost impossible for ingenuity to misrepresent, the preamble of this Act, as unfortunately it has been misrepresented during the long discussion which has taken place, since the Act was passed, in various parts of the country. The letter of Cardinal Simeoni, of the 27th March, 1888, contains this passage with regard to the conclusion arrived at:

"Affirmatively in favor of the Fathers of the Society of Jesus and in accordance with the method prescribed in other places, that is to say, that the Fathers of the Society of Jesus treat in their own name with the Civil Government, in such a manner, however, as to leave full liberty to the Holy See to dispose of the property as it deems advisable, and consequently that they should be very careful that no condition or clause should be inserted in the official deed of the concession of such property which could in any manner affect the liberty of the Holy See."

As I have said, down to that time, the power of attorney which enabled any one to negotiate with regard to this question had been withdrawn, and then there was simply a new authority given to a new attorney, namely, the fathers of the society, to treat with the Government of Quebec, and the stipulation, not that the property of the Province should be subject to any conditions, but that if there should be a conveyance made of it to any parties—to the Jesuits on the one side or the hierarchy on the other—in settlement of the claim, these parties should not take a deed which would preclude the Pope from giving a final decision as to the way in which the proceeds should be divided between them. Then, in his letter dated 1st May, 1888, the First Minister of the Province of Quebec distinctly stipulates that he is not recognising any civil or, as we would call it, any legal obligation, but merely the moral obligation in this respect. He says:

"6 That you will grant to the Government of the Province of Quebec a full, complete and perpetual concession of all the property which may have belonged in Canada, under whatever title, to the Fathers of the old society, and that you will renounce to all rights generally whatsoever upon such property and the revenues therefrom in favor of our Province, the whole, as well as in the name of the old Order of Jesuits, and of your present corporation as the name of the Pope, of the Sacred College of the Propaganda and of the Roman Catholic Church in general."

Then follows the clause to which above all others, exception is taken, and to which I shall ask the special attention of the House:

"7. That any agreement made between you and the Government of the Province will be binding only in so far as it shall be ratified by the Pope and the Legislature of this Province."

Now, when we look at the Act itself, when we see what the Government of Quebec asked the Legislature to do, when we see them ask the Legislature to vote, in extinction of this moral claim, whatever it was worth, the sum of $400,000, we cease to be surprised and to be deceived as regards the effect of that provision of the statute. The Ministry of Quebec were dealing with two rival claimants—the hierarchy and the Jesuit Society. They were dealing also with a third party, the Pope, who occupied the position of mediator by consent between these two, and the First Minister of Quebec stipulated that before the Province should be asked to pay one dollar of the money, it should have a conveyance, in the first place, from the fathers of the society, in the second place from the Pope himself, and, in the third place, from the Sacred College of the Propaganda and the Roman Catholic Church in general. He stipulated that before he should be bound to pay a dollar of that money, nay, even before he should ask the Legislature of Quebec to authorise him to pay a dollar, he should be in a position to say: "I have obtained a complete release from all the parties who forever after can assert the slightest right or title or the slightest claim, legally or morally, in regard to these estates." Why could he not do this? Could he have said: "I ask the Legislature of the Province of Quebec for authority to pay this money on obtaining a conveyance from the fathers of the society?" Would he not have left outstanding the rights of the hierarchy, who contested, every inch of the way, the rights of the fathers of the society to the proceeds of the settlement? Would he not have left outstanding still the possible claim of the authority superior to them all? I assert it, without fear, that the contention will not commend itself to the good sense of the House, that that provision No. 7, which is taken such great exception to, is a distinct provision *against* the authority of the Pope and not in favor of the authority of the Pope. In fact by that provision, the substance of the agreement was this: "While I am willing to offer to you $400,000, I am not willing to be bound by my offer until your master ratifies your agreement to accept it. I will not only not pay you a dollar of that $400,000 until every one of you gives me your conveyance, but until the greatest superior you have on earth gives me his deed; and until I get all that, I will not ask the Legislature of Quebec to give me authority to pay you a single dollar." And yet, because the Legislature of Quebec demanded, before it should put that money even at the disposition of the Governor in Council, that they should have everybody's rights foreclosed, and that the highest authority the claimants recognised on earth should give his deed also, and more, that the College of the Propaganda should also give its release, and that every step down to that point should be without prejudice to the rights of the Province of Quebec, we are told that this is an assertion of the prerogative of a foreign potentate. I am dealing with

no merely legal theory upon this question. I am not devising any excuse for the legislation of Quebec. I say that the Legislature of Quebec so understood it. It was so explained to them. I hold before me a statement which the First Minister who introduced that Bill into the Legislature made to that Legislature, and upon which they passed the Bill. He says:

"In the first place we must not mistake the bearing of this declaration nor forget that it was inserted as a protection."

The Legislature of Quebec passed it as a protection on the statement of their First Minister. They passed that provision unanimously as such protection, and yet months after we are to put a different interpretation upon what their intention was, and to ask that His Excellency, a stranger to that Legislature, a stranger to their motives, should decide that that was not their true motive at all, that it was not a protection but a distinct challenge of the supremacy of Her Majesty Queen Victoria. Mr. Mercier said:

"Any serious objection to it, however slight, may disappear, for it is we, the Ministers, who insisted on it, in order not to give effect to the transaction, unless it was sanctioned by the religious authority, in the person of the Pope. And it is easy to understand why. In all important treaties made by mandatories (agents as we understand) ratification must be made by the principal, *i.e.*, the mandator. Thus, for example, take what concerns me personally, what concerns Ministers,—what is it usual to state in resolutions and letters?—that the transaction will not avail unless sanctioned by the Legislature. Well, the Rev. Father Turgeon, who was charged by the Holy See to settle this question with us, is only an agent, a mandatory, an attorney. And so that there may be no misunderstanding, so that the transaction may be final, so that the settlement may no longer be open to discussion by the religious authorities, we insist that the Pope shall ratify the arrangement. There is no question of having the law sanctioned by the Pope. Let us not play upon words. The law will be sanctioned by the Lieutenant Governor, and it will take effect in the terms of the agreement. That is to say, Sir, that if the Pope does not ratify the arrangement there will be neither interest nor principal paid, but we shall then say to the religious authorities: 'You appointed an agent to settle this question; we came to an understanding, and if you do not ratify the act of your mandatory it is your own fault, for we, the inhabitants of the Province of Quebec, through the constituted authorities, have done our part, have kept our promise.' I am pleased to believe that the importance of the precaution taken by us will be understood. But once more, if there is any serious objection to that part (of the matter) it is very easy to come to an understanding. But in that case we must substitute something equivalent. What shall we put? We must, after all, put something to express that the transaction will not avail till the Pope ratifies it. Well, Sir, we said 'the Pope' intentionally. We did not say the Congregation of the Propaganda. We did not say the Secretary of State. We said the Pope. We desire that the ratification be given by the head of the church, in order that all those interested may be bound."

When we know that that was the intention of the Legislature of the Province, when we know it from the statutes, from the correspondence, and from all that we know of the facts regarding these estates, and when we know it also from the declaration of the First Minister of the Province in which the Act was passed—an explanation which was accepted by both sides of the House, for be it remembered, as the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) said last night, the Act was afterwards passed unanimously, and the First Minister was not asked, after his explanation, to substitute anything for that provision—we are now actually asked to advise His Excellency that all this had a different and an occult meaning, and that the Legislature of Quebec did not mean what the First Minister of that Province said it did in passing this Act. Then, in the letter of the 1st May, 1888, he goes on to say:

"That the amount of the compensation fixed shall remain in the possession of the Government of the Province as a special deposit until the Pope has ratified the said settlement, and made known his wishes respecting the distribution of such amount in this country."

Before I leave this stage of the transaction, I repeat that this was distinct legislation against any possible rights or claims on the part of the Pope, and that any Protestant Legislature in this country—I say more—the Parliament of the United Kingdom, if it had been called upon to pass a statute affecting property in regard to which there were foreign claimants, high or low, would have passed a provision to that effect, and achieving that result. I admit

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

that the words which give offence to persons of various other persuasions throughout Canada and make distinct reference to the Pope, might not have appeared in the preamble to an Act of the United Kingdom. I admit that it would have been in better taste, in view of the great difference of opinion which exists in this country on matters of that kind, if that language had not appeared in the Act, and if the same result had been obtained, as the First Minister of Quebec says it might have been, in a different way; but the result, whatever may be the form of words used, is a proper result, guarding all the rights of the Province until everyone else had given up his claim. And, when it comes to a question of disallowance, we are here to advise disallowance or allowance, not upon the form of words, not upon the question of the draftsman's taste, but according to what we believe was the true meaning and intent of the Act itself. Now, let me again, before I leave the subject of the Act, call the attention of the House to the fact that all the argument which has been made with regard to the necessity for disallowance is based on objections to the preamble of the Act. In the history of disallowance in this country, in the history of the disallowance of our own statutes in the mother country—and we know that scores of them were disallowed—the records will be searched in vain to find one which was disallowed because the preamble was not agreeable to anybody. I do not pretend to dispute the statement of my hon. friend from Muskoka, (Mr. O'Brien), that the preamble is a part of the Act. So is the title a part of the Act, and so are the head-notes of sections; but has anyone ever heard of a Government being asked to disallow an Act because they did not like the wording of the title or of the head notes? The preamble is understood to be a part of the Act, for the purpose of interpreting the Act, but there is nothing in this Act for which interpretation is needed, and I distinguish, in referring to this, the most trivial and technical objection which could be taken to a statute, between those parts of the preamble which assert that certain correspondence has passed, such as this between the Premier and the Cardinal at Rome, and those preambles which recite certain agreements which the statute validates. Who can doubt that nine tenths of the agitation, and nine-tenths of the trouble, in reference to this measure have arisen from the fact that in March, 1888, there came from Rome a telegram stating that the Pope allowed the Government to retain the proceeds of the sale of the Jesuits' estates as a special deposit, forgetting that this was a part of other negotiations, which gave it an inoffensive meaning. Yes, nine-tenths of the agitation for disallowance has arisen from the fact that that telegram came from Rome and that this Act asserts that such a telegram did come, although within the four corners of the Act there is not a word based upon that telegram; and although all the statute does is to ratify and confirm an agreement between Father Turgeon and the Government of Quebec—the terms of which were that $400,000 should be paid as between the two litigants, and that, before any money should be within the power of the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec to dispose of, the two litigants should give up any claim whatsoever on the estates—I assert, without fear of contradiction among people who will consider this matter in a calm and business-like way, that that part of the preamble, which is the only part relevant to the purposes of the Act itself, is utterly harmless, entirely business-like, free from the slightest suspicion of derogating from any right of Her Majesty, and from the slightest suspicion of infringement of the Constitution. Now, it is said, and the House will remember with what gravity, and force, and eloquence it was urged upon the House this afternoon, that this statute denies the supremacy of the Queen. I have read to you all the passages which refer in the slightest degree to any person outside of Her

Majesty's dominions. I have stated the facts, in regard to the position of this property, the negotiations which were had in regard to it, and I will leave it to the dispassionate judgment of the House, or of any man, Catholic or Protestant, in this country, whether the Act in the slightest degree, considered in the light of the surrounding circumstances, affects in any way the authority or the supremacy of Her Majesty, spiritual or temporal. Let me ask: What rights Her Majesty had in this property—as the spiritual or as the temporal sovereign? Absolutely none whatever—absolutely none whatever, excepting that she stood as the trustee for the Province of Quebec. Her own personal rights were not affected, her sovereign rights were not affected. These were no part of Her Majesty's domain, they were no part of Her Majesty's revenue. If they were, under this Act, all sold and turned into money to-morrow, not one dollar will ever pass into Her Majesty's Treasury, public or private, not one dollar will ever be disposed of under the advice of Her Majesty's Ministers. Her Majesty, with regard to those lands, had no interest, either as the spiritual or the temporal sovereign. Let me ask then in what particular that Act derogates from the authority of Her Majesty as head of her church, or as head of any religion in the British Empire? None whatever. It is purely a question of temporal concern, purely of the public domain of the Province of Quebec. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Barron) said last night that it derogated from her authority, inasmuch as it placed a portion of the public money in Quebec at the disposal of a foreigner. It does not, I submit, place the public money of the Province of Quebec at the disposal of a foreigner; it sets aside a sum of money for the extinguishment of a claim upon the public property of Quebec, and then calls upon those which are litigants in regard to it, to abide by the decision of their arbitrator in the matter. When that $400,000 shall have been paid from the Treasury of the Province of Quebec, Her Majesty has not the slightest right or interest with regard to the distribution of it. In the ordinary course it would be paid to one of the claimants on the property; but as there happen to be two, it is paid into the hands, or held subject to the order, of the person who has to settle the disputes between them. By what right can it be claimed that Her Majesty, or that her Government, either in England or the Province of Quebec, has a right to distribute a single dollar of that money? Surely the rights of the Crown and of the Province end when the Government there is able to say: "We have received the deed of all these outstanding claims for which we consent to pay the money;" and to contend after that that there is any royal or legislative right to control the subdivision of the money, would be like saying that after a grant of public lands had passed under the great seal, the Province had a right to say who should have interest in the land for all time to come. Now, I would be content if so much had not been said upon this subject as to mislead the judgment of hundreds of persons in this country, whose judgment upon any public question is well worth having—I would be content to rest the case there, and to say that no right of Her Majesty either as a temporal or a spiritual power, is in the least degree involved; but when we are taken so far afield upon the question as to go back into the legislation of 300 years ago, when we are asked to apply to this question the Supremacy Act, which could not have the slightest bearing upon it, even if it be in force in the Province of Quebec, I feel bound to follow out that argument to some extent for the purpose of showing how unreasonable the demand is that, under the British North America Act, and in this day of colonial rights and of self government, the federal authority in Canada, should undertake to control the legislation of one of its Provinces, according to the coercive legislation which used to exist in the mother country 300 years ago. I have reminded the House what privileges were, even as regards the Act of Supremacy, ceded to the people of Quebec by the Terms of Capitulation, by the terms of the treaty and by the terms of the Quebec Act. I have shown that absolute freedom of worship was extended by the Treaty of Paris and by the Quebec Act; I have shown the House, I think, what is the meaning of the reservation as to the laws of Great Britain as regards religion. Sir, in the year 1765, the law officers of the Crown made this statement on their responsibility to the Government:

"Her Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects residing in the countries in America ceded to Her Majesty by the Treaty of Paris are not subject, in the colonies, to the incapacities, deprivation of rights and penalties to which the Roman Catholic subjects in the Kingdom are subject."

The First Minister of that country, Lord North, then said the same thing in debate, a brief extract of which I will read to you:

"It has been the opinion of very many able lawyers that the best way to establish the happiness of the inhabitants is to give them their own laws, as far as relates to their own possessions. Their possessions were marked out to them at the time of the treaty; to give them those possessions without giving them laws to maintain those possessions would not be very wise. As to the free exercise of their religion, it likewise is no more than what is confirmed to them by treaty, as far as the laws of Great Britain can confirm it. Now, there is no doubt that the laws of Great Britain do permit the very full and free exercise of any religion different from that of the Church of England, in any of the colonies; therefore, I apprehend that we ought not to extend them to Canada."

Well, Sir, let us not, in dealing with this question of supremacy, be more restrictive on the people of our own country in favor of the authority of the sovereign, whom we all revere and whose powers and prerogatives we all wish to maintain, than the sovereigns of Great Britain have been themselves. What has been their action in respect to this question of the supremacy? Let me read to you a passage in Lord Thurlow's statement in the debates of 1774:

"I stated in the beginning that it did not affect to relate to Canada; but I said that the capitulation did reserve all their effects, movable and immovable. But even if it were otherwise, is it to be supposed that the tithes would accrue to the King? The tithe is collateral to the land, not sunk in it. To give the right to it is giving to the secular body as well as the regular clergy all they were in possession of before. It was always in my opinion an established fact, that the clergy (in Canada) were entitled to tithes though they might not have use for them." (Debates, 1774, page 71).

So that the people in the Province of Quebec, who are said to-day to be under the provisions of a Supremacy Act so severe, that they cannot recognise the superiority of a foreign bishop, were, in 1774, by Her Majesty's Attorney General, declared to be subject to their own laws so far that their clergy were entitled to collect tithes from the people, although perhaps not by authority of law. Well, seventy-six years ago, by a solemn Act of State, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Quebec was recognised by the Governor of the Province under royal instructions. We are told that the Act of Supremacy was in force; and yet that man was a bishop simply by the superiority of the first bishop of his church. He was a bishop because he had received from Rome the bulls which, under the statutes of Queen Elizabeth, it was high treason to bring into the country at all. That was the way in which the religious restrictions of the people of this country were treated upwards of seventy-five years ago by the Imperial authorities; but after the lapse of three-quarters of a century we are to be wiser and we are to enforce against a great section of our free people legislation reserving rights to the Crown which the Crown deliberately chose to ignore seventy-six years ago. In 1817 the Roman Catholic Bishop of Quebec received a mandamus, calling him as a bishop to the Legislative Council of the Province. He held his see by the will and under the bull of his superior bishop, and he was called by virtue of his office to be one of the rulers of the Province of Quebec. In 1839 Governor Colborne issued letters patent to incorporate the Roman Catholic Bishop of

Quebec and all his successors, whomsoever they might be, appointed by the foreign superior and under bulls, which, according to the legislation that these hon. gentleman ask us to apply to Quebec to-day, it would be high treason to introduce into the country. In 1838 a Roman Catholic college was incorporated in the Province of Prince Edward Island, and the question was submitted to the law officers of the Crown fifty years ago, whether it was a violation of the supremacy of the Crown. It was a violation of the supremacy of the Crown fifty times over if anything within this Act of Quebec is a violation of that supremacy. But the law officers of the Crown advised that it was within the competency of the local powers as they then existed, and that it was no derogation of the Act of Supremacy, if that Act could be held to apply to that Province. But since that period, since the period when the officers in this country charged with the maintenance of the rights of the Crown began to be infinitely less restrictive than we are asked to be to-day, three-quarters of a century later, what a change has taken place in the colonies of British North America. We have been placed upon a different footing. We have received free institutions, we have received legislative powers, and by the voice of our Sovereign, by the voice of Her Parliament, by the policy of Her Ministers, as expressed in every act of State, it has been declared that, subject only to those matters which are of Imperial concern, we shall be as fully clothed with the rights of self-governing freemen in every part of Canada as are the subjects in the heart of England. Yet we are told now that we are under, not only the restrictive legislation of 300 years ago, but that no Legislature of Canada has power to repeal any such restrictive legislation, and that any restrictive legislation of that kind is beyond the competency of a Provincial Legislature. Why, we heard last night the singular statement that a Provincial Legislature has only a derived or delegated authority. I deny that statement as explicitly as it is courteous to deny any statement made by any hon. member of this House. I go further and I say that, within the limits of its authority and subject only to the power of disallowance, a Provincial Legislature is as absolute as is the Imperial Parliament itself. The Imperial Parliament is not restricted as to the subjects over which it can legislate, the Provincial Legislatures are restricted in regard to the subjects on which they can legislate, but in legislating upon these subjects a Provincial Legislature has all the rights which it is possible for the Imperial Parliament to confer. I say more: I say that a Provincial Legislature, legislating upon subjects which are given to it by the British North America Act, has the power to repeal an Imperial statute prior to the British North America Act affecting those subjects. It has been urged upon the House these two days that we had no power, and that the Act of 28 and 29 Victoria, called the Colonial Enactments Act, provided that no statute of a colony should have force as against an Imperial statute. But after the statute of 28 and 29 Victoria, the British North America Act was passed, and it gives us, as I have said, a division of powers between the two bodies, but it gives the two bodies in legislating in their respective spheres all the powers that the Imperial Legislature possessed. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron) was misled, I think, last night in his reference to the British North America Act. It is true that the British North America Act seems to contain in the 129th section a reservation in that behalf; it reads:

"Except as otherwise provided by this Act all laws in force in Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick at the union and all courts of civil and criminal jurisdiction and all legal commissions, powers and authorities and all officers, judicial, administrative and ministerial existing therein at the Union, shall continue in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick respectively, as if the Union had not been made; subject nevertheless (except with respect to such as are enacted by or exist under Acts of the Parliament of Great Britain or of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland) to be repealed, abolished or altered by the Parliament of Canada or by the Legislature of the respective Provinces according to the authority of the Parliament or of that Legislature under this Act."

The hon. gentleman read it as being a restriction by the British North America Act against our repealing or modifying an Imperial statute relating to any subject under our control. I do not so regard it. I regard it as containing neither a grant of power nor a restriction as to our legislating upon Imperial statutes. But since that Act was passed, in which the Imperial Parliament virtually said: "We say nothing as to Imperial statutes;" we have had three distinct decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in regard to legislation by a Province upon a subject within its control, and declaring that the Provincial Legislature has power to repeal a statute of the Imperial Parliament. The first is the case of Harris against Davies, page 279, which was an appeal from New South Wales, and in which this was held with reference to a statute of James I, which had distinct force in that colony:

"Held that the Legislature of New South Wales had power to repeal the statute of James I, which according to its true construction placed an action for slander for words spoken, upon the same footing, as regards costs and other matters, as an action for written slander."

The statute of James I made distinct provision as to the amount of costs which the litigant could recover when he only obtained a verdict for a certain amount for slander; the Legislature passed an Act repugnant to that and the provisions of the Colonial Enactment Act were cited. The judgment of their Lordships was delivered by Sir Barnes Peacock, who said:

"Their Lordships are of opinion that there are no sufficient grounds for reversing the judgment of the court below. Their Lordships are of opinion that the Colonial Legislature had the power to repeal the statute of James I if they thought fit, and they are also of opinion that looking at the first section of 11 Victoria, No. 13, it was the intention of the Legislature to place an action for words spoken, upon the same footing as regards costs and other matters as an action for written slander."

Mr. BARRON Have they a statute in that colony corresponding with the British North America Act?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. I have examined that, and it conveys no larger grant of legislative powers than the British North America Act does to us. If the hon. gentleman will look in the same volume to the case of Powell *vs.* Apollo Candle Company, Limited, in which the law of New South Wales came up likewise, he will find that the conclusion which he urged as to the Colonial Legislature being a mere delegate of the Imperial Parliament was fully considered and discussed, and principally on reference to the case from Canada of Hodge *vs.* The Queen. The Judicial Committee said:

"Two cases have come before this board in which the powers of Colonial Legislatures have been a good deal considered, but these cases are of too late a date to have been known to the Supreme Court when their judgment was delivered. The first was the case of Regina *vs.* Burah (1), in which the question was whether a section of an Indian Act conferring upon the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal the power to determine whether the Act, or any part of it, should be applied to a certain district, was or was not *ultra vires*. In the judgment of this board, given by the Lord Chancellor, the legislation is declared to be *intra vires*, and the Lord Chancellor lays down the general law in these terms: 'The Indian Legislature has powers expressly limited by the Act of the Imperial Parliament which created it, and it can of course do nothing beyond the limits which circumscribe these powers. But when acting within those limits it is not in any sense an agent or delegate of the Imperial Parliament, but has, and was intended to have, plenary powers of legislation as large, and of the same nature, as those of Parliament itself.' The same doctrine has been laid down in a later case of Hodge *vs.* The Queen (2), where the question arose whether the Legislature of Ontario had or had not the power of entrusting to a local authority—a board of commissioners—the power of enacting regulations with respect to their Liquor License Act of 1877, of creating offences for the breach of those regulations, and annexing penalties thereto Their lordships held that they had that power. It was argued then, as it has been argued to-day, that the Local Legislature is in the nature of an agent or delegate, and, on the principle *delegatus non potest delegare*, the Local Legislature must exercise all its functions itself, and can delegate or entrust none of them to other persons or parties. But the judgment, after reciting that such had been the contention, goes on to say: 'It appears to their lordships,

however, that the objection thus raised by the appellants is founded on an entire misconception of the true character and position of the Provincial Legislatures. They are in no sense delegates of or acting under any mandate from the Imperial Parliament. When the British North America Act enacted that there should be a Legislature for Ontario, and that its Legislative Assembly should have exclusive authority to make laws for the Province and for provincial purposes in relation to the matters enumerated in section 92, it conferred powers, not in any sense to be exercised by delegation from or as agents of the Imperial Parliament, but authority as plenary and as ample within the limits prescribed by section 92, as the Imperial Parliament in the plenitude of its power possessed or could bestow. Within these limits of subjects and areas the Local Legislature is supreme and has the same authority as the Imperial Parliament."

(1) 3 App. Cas., 889. (2) 9 App. Cases, 117.

Well, Sir, later on we had the not forgotten case of the Queen against Riel before the Privy Council in which this state of affairs was shown. There had been three Imperial statutes passed expressely for the regulation of the trial of offences in Rupert's Land, now known as the North-West Territories. The statutes of Canada contained provisions repugnant to those, and on the appeal to the Privy Council it was decided that the Parliament of Canada had the power to pass legislation changing those statutes and repealing them if necessary. I infer from this that in touching on a question of religious liberty, which is surely a civil right of the people of the Province, the Provincial Legislature is untrammelled in the exercise of its power by the Imperial legislation of centuries ago. I say, therefore, that, even though it can be contended that this statute was in any degree a derogation from the restrictions of the Supremacy Act—from the oppressive restrictions of the Supremacy Act—and if it should be seriously decided that the Supremacy Act prevails in British North America, that we have no freedom of religion, that no man has a right to dissent from the Church of England, that no man has a right to exercise the Catholic religion, that no man has a right to exercise submission to a superior, whether that superior be the president of a conference, the moderator of an assembly, or the first bishop of his church, then, I say, the first duty of this House, the first duty of every Legislature in the Provinces of Canada, would be to declare that we have in this 19th century the rights of freemen and the rights of religious liberty according to our consciences, and to say that that Act, 300 years old, and for 200 years and upwards ignored in the United Kingdom, shall not restrict the people of these Provinces in their right of belief, and freedom of worship and their right under the British North America Act to have a constitution similar in form to that which our fellow subjects in the United Kingdom enjoy. Let me see how far the Provinces, from time to time, in the exercise of their right of self-government conferred upon them, have insisted on that policy, and have insisted upon that right with the full recognition of the Imperial authorities, for let it be remembered that before 1867 our statutes had to go home and be revised by the Colonial Office under the advice of the Crown officers. Why, Sir, in the year 1850 the Roman Catholic bishops in the Province of Upper Canada were incorporated, and their successors from time to time canonically appointed. "Their successors," our friend from Simcoe will tell us, "oh, yes, but not successors recognising any authority from a foreign superior." Read the statute, and I will give up the argument if it does not say:

"In communion with the Church of Rome."

Therefore, in 1850, the Legislature of Upper Canada incorporated those bishops and gave them corporate powers, on the one condition which, according to the hon. member for Simcoe, it is unconstitutional we should allow in this country at all, namely, that they should be in communion with the See of Rome. In 1854, Sir, the same thing was done for all the bishops for all time to come in Lower Canada; and an Act for the division of the parishes of that Province for the purposes of public worship, under the supervision of those bishops, was authorised by the Province. In 1862 all the bishops of the Province of New Brunswick for all time to come were incorporated. You can look at the statutes of every Parliament in British America, and you will find precisely the same legislation; and the main of those corporate powers is that those who are to exercise them shall be bishops in communion with the Church of Rome. We have heard to-night, and we heard last night, about the laches of the people, who, we are told, were not to be precluded, not having objected to the Jesuits' Incorporation Act of 1887, from objecting to it now. Perhaps not. We were told that a great evil had been done, that a great class of public sinners in this country had been given powers of incorporation in 1887, and that it was not too late to rise in indignant protest. We were told that a people does not lose its right to object to provisions which are repugnant to an English statute of 300 years ago, which they contend and we deny, has any force, or ought to have any force, in this country, in regard to people of other religious beliefs at any rate. It is perhaps not too late. But they are not only a year behind the time; they are 37 years behind the time, because 37 years ago the Parliament of Canada incorporated a body of these Jesuits, for the actual purpose of teaching what the hon. member for North Simcoe calls their wicked tenets, in the Province of Quebec. In 1852, Sir, St. Mary's College, in the city of Montreal, to be taught by Jesuits, and the corporators of which were Jesuits, was incorporated by the Legislature of Canada; and in turning to the division list on that Act, as one of my hon. colleagues did last night, he showed me that 29 Protestants and 27 Catholics voted for it, and only 7 voted against it altogether in that whole Legislature. We had, Sir, 37 years ago religious toleration which would have frowned down the argument which was presented to this House this afternoon, if it had been clothed in ten times the ability and force with which we saw it paraded before the House to-day. Then, in 1868, a college for the same purpose at Sault au Recollet, in the Province of Quebec, was incorporated; and I ask members on both sides of this question, whether, down to a few weeks ago we have ever heard any remonstrance against the powers which were conferred on those bodies, or whether any section of the people of this country, or any one, high or low, of one denomination or another—and I speak of those who have been appealing to public opinion on this question from the pulpits with the profoundest respect—has ever objected to the teachings of those institutions, or uttered any reproach with regard to their conduct in this country, with regard to their loyalty, or with regard to the effects of their instruction or example on the youth of this country. Again addressing myself to the argument that it is not necessary for us in British North America to be more restrictive as regards the rights and powers of the Crown than the Crown has been in England, let me call the attention of the House to the fact that 80 years ago, in the heart of England, a magnificent institution of learning was placed under the control of this same order, in which they have been carrying on, every year since, the education of hundreds of English youths, and that that institution at Stoneyhurst has had added to it other like institutions all over England. Are we to say that the Act of Supremacy, the keen edge of which is not to be applied in Great Britain, or that the prohibitory legislation with regard to the Jesuit Order, which is not to be applied in Great Britain, must be applied to one section of the people in British North America, and applied under our federal system by the arbitrary power of disallowance with which His Excellency is entrusted? I might well reiterate, but I will not do further than refer to the eloquent and forcible argument which you, Sir (Mr. Colby) addressed to the House last night, in which you pointed out that we had lived to too late an age for any section of the people of this country to be willing to live under a government by

which that kind of legislation would be applied. In the exercise of the immense powers, limited though the range of subjects may be, which are given to the Provincial Legislatures, there is no Provincial Legislature in Canada, which, legislating upon the subject of the civil and religious liberties of its people, would consent to have its powers curtailed by the Federal Government taking from the wall a rusty weapon which had hung idly there for 200 years. I will spare the patience of the House and not do what I intended to do, namely, quote legislation still in force with regard to all Her Majesty's domain, but a dead letter for scores of years—legislation which, if it were in force would put one-third of the people of this city into prison to-morrow, for the offence of heresy, the offence of non-conformity, the offence of not taking the sacrament, or for daring to profess the belief of Unitarians, some of these statutes being still actually unrepealed. But what is the use? The greatest writer on the subject of criminal law which the century has produced, Sir Fitzjames Stephens, has put the story well in two paragraphs, and his authority upon it will not be denied; the acceptability of his sentiments with regard to the United Kingdom will not be questioned; and he says this:

"For 200 years Government has been carried on——"

And he is speaking of government in the United Kingdom——"without prejudice to differences of opinion which in previous times were regarded as altogether fundamental."

For the last 200 years in England, I venture to say, government could not have been carried on if it had not been by practically ignoring legislation which previously was levelled at differences of opinion which were considered altogether fundamental. At that time a man who did not conform to the religion of his neighbors and the religion of the law was put out of the pale of the law altogether and treated as a public criminal. A great body of that legislation has never been repealed to this day; a great body of it is just as much in force in the Dominion of Canada against our freedom of opinion, against our freedom of worship, as the statutes which have been invoked yesterday and to-day; and yet when we read this lesson that for 200 years it has only been possible to carry on government in England by ignoring those differences of opinion which used to be aimed at by the criminal law and were considered as fundamental, we are, in this country, to look still at the old fundamental differences and curtail our liberties by the strong arm of the federal authority; and, in the exercise of federal power, we are to curtail the rights of our Legislatures to infringe upon, impugn, or make any enactment repugnant to this legislation which has been buried under the weight of public opinion for upwards of two centuries. Well, I forget to say, and I will digress from my argument for a moment to mention it, that, in 1871, by a statute of the Province of Quebec, there was an Act passed incorporating the whole Society of Jesus in the Province. The order was precisely the same society which was incorporated by the Act of 1887; and the only difference is the difference of legislative provisions as to the method of working their incorporation. From 1871 to 1887, no word of objection was raised in any part of the country to that incorporation, as to its constitutionality or effect, but because in 1889 we did not advise disallowance of an Act of precisely the same kind, we are to fall under the censure of this House. I have referred to the statement of Sir Fitzjames Stephens as to the value of this legislation to England, and I will cite another passage which, for its terseness and its force, is worthy the attention of hon. gentlemen. He says, referring to the legislation against the Jesuits in the year of George IV:

"These powers, I believe, have been considered, ever since they were passed, as an absolutely dead letter."

Later on, he says, as to ecclesiastical legislation:

"Our ancestors walked in darkness, and we have solved the problem, which was too hard for them, by recognising liberty of conscience as a principle of universal application."

Before I close my argument, I must address myself for a moment to a view which was put forward by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) as regards the effect of the statute on the fund for higher education in the Province of Quebec. He put forward as a reason why this Act should be disallowed, if no other reason existed, that it was a breach of trust, and that it misapplied, or, to use his own words, misappropriated the property which it related to. I think the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier) was quite right in challenging him to read any part of the Act which sustained his argument, and the House observed that he did not respond to the challenge. Let me remind the House at the outset that, in regard to the sale of the property, the statute gives the Province no greater power than it had before. It is a statute as its title implies, for the settlement of the Jesuit claims. But the Province of Quebec before that, had, under its existing legislation, ample power of sale, and the Act makes no provision different from that which did exist as to what is to be done with the property or the money. One would suppose, listening to the argument of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) although he did not state it in so many words, there was a provision in the Act which declared that that trust should no longer apply to the property, that it might go into the consolidated revenue and be disposed of as the Government pleased. Not so. The last clause of the Act provides that when these properties are sold, they are to be subject to the disposition of the Legislature. Are we to infer and to advise disallowance on the ground of that inference, that the Legislature of the Province is going to betray its trust with regard to any property, when it has never made that declaration or never sought power to desert the trust? I will tell the House what is the absolute fact on this point: That the minority in the Province of Quebec, that those interested in higher education, that those interested in any way in the execution of the trust, have not suffered one whit or jot by the passage of the Act. The fact has been that the revenue from those estates has been paid from year to year into the consolidated revenue fund and not into the fund for higher education. The fact is likewise that the proceeds of large portions of that property which have already been sold have, from year to year, been placed to the credit of the consolidated revenue, and spent for the general purposes of the Province. From year to year, the Provincial Legislature, not out of the revenues of the Jesuits' estates or the proceeds of the Jesuits' estates, which were too small for that purpose, but out of its consolidated revenue, has made ample provision for the higher education of the Province; and after the argument made this afternoon about the way in which the minority would be prejudiced, and the supineness of the minority in submitting, as it was said they would be willing to submit, to this legislation, and the breach of trust, which was apparent on the Act itself, in the diversion of the only fund that exists for the higher education of the Province, the House will be surprised to learn that from year to year—I speak in general terms—the allowance in the Province of Quebec for the higher education made out of the consolidated revenue fund has been, on an average, more than three times the annual proceeds of the Jesuits' estates. Not a single school, high or low, in the Province of Quebec, has been sustained from those estates so far, because the fund was utterly insufficient. Ample provision was made out of the consolidated revenue fund, and yet we are told that when these estates disappear and go into the market, they go free from any trust, and that neither the majority nor the minority will have any security for higher education in the Province. It is sufficient for me to have shown the House that the Act purports to do nothing of the kind,

that it sanctions nothing of the kind; but I think the argument has irresistible force when I show that these properties have not been considered a security for these purposes at all. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) challenged the propriety of my report upon this Act, when, after favoring the House with his long and interesting theological discourse, and after having excited to some extent the feelings and sympathy of the House, he declared that I had presented that statute to His Excellency as of no more importance than the eleven others accompanying it, which I had recommended should be left to their operation. Now, upon the importance or unimportance of the statutes it is not necessary for me to advise His Excellency, but I take the responsibility of having advised His Excellency that that Act was no less within the powers of the Legislature of Quebec than the other eleven which accompanied it. And when I have reminded the hon. gentleman that it is not a question of trust, that there is no diversion of trust by the authority of that Act, and that these estates have not been the source from which higher education has been supported, I think he will be almost inclined to agree with me that I was right after all in saying this was a fiscal matter within the control of the Province. But this is not the first time, although it is the first time this excitement has been raised with regard to it, that this society, who have been spoken of so severely in this debate, have been dealt with by the Province of Quebec. I have in my possession a list extending back over fifteen years of appropriations in the Supply Bills made by the Legislature of Quebec to support the higher education carried on by this society within that Province, and, according to the statement we have heard this afternoon, all that has been unconstitutional, and every one of these Supply Bills ought to have been disallowed, because, forsooth, they were ignoring the distinction between Church and State. I think it is rather late to treat this question as anything other than a fiscal question, and that the difference between the Supply Bills in all those fifteen years, and the Act which is now being discussed is simply a question of degree and of amount. The principle of supporting the higher education carried on by that society in that Province has been recognised, as I have said, every year in the Supply Bill, and, yet, for the first time, because this is a larger sum which is being dealt with, and larger because it deals with the rights or claims of that society to lands, we are asked to assert a principle which we were never asked before to assert in regard to them. Now, I desire to call the attention of the House for a moment to two other branches of the argument which were presented to it this afternoon. We were told that there was a restriction in the Act as regards the expenditure of the $60,000, but that there was no restriction as regards the expenditure of the $400,000. The $60,000 has been appropriated to a body which had no claim, legally or morally, and had never asserted any as regards the title to the Jesuits' estates. They have claimed to be interested in the appropriations which are made from time to time for higher education, and rightly so, and those claims have always been considered. I am not prepared to say, whether the proportion allotted to them in this Act is right or not. That is a question upon which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), if he had a seat in the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, might have addressed the House with great force, but for us here to discuss the appropriation of money, and the proportions in which it is appropriated by a Province would be as absurd as for us to take the Supply Bill of the Province every year, and enter into a discussion of its different appropriations. The reason why, as I presume, the restriction has been imposed in regard to the $60,000, and not in regard to the $400,000, is that the $60,000 is voted for educational purposes purely and simply, and, while the $400,000 has every prospect of being so applied, because it is voted to a body whose business it is to teach, still it is paid to them in extinction of a claim which they had made to a part of the public domain of the Province. But we were told, and this is almost the last argument used by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) but one to which I must advert, that the grant of money to this corporation was a church endowment which violated the principles of the separation of Church and State in this country. I pass by at this moment the position which any church occupies in this country. I do not intend to discuss how far, in any portion of the country, any church may be considered as now established; but I do say that it passes the power of ingenuity to show that the grant of money to a corporation of teachers and preachers is the endowment of a church in Canada. It is true that a church may be in part a society of preachers and teachers, but this society is not a church, and in the most illogical way in which a fallacy could be put on paper, this resolution asks the House to come to the conclusion that, because a society incorporated under a statute of the Province and employed in preaching and teaching the tenets of a certain religion receives a grant of money, that is the endowment of a church within the Province. I venture to say that there is no one in this country, who knows the facts upon which that resolution is based, and who reads that resolution, but must be surprised that it should receive the support, as it has done, of able and intelligent men in this House. Let me say to my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that this is no more the endowment of a church, and that it is no more an interference with the separation of Church and State in this country than would be the endowment of a hospital or an orphanage or an asylum which was under the care of a religious organisation. We all cherish the principle that there should be no Church control over the State in any part of this country, but my hon. friend proposes something worse than that control. He proposes that we shall step into the domain of a Provincial Legislature, and shall say that no Provincial Legislature shall have the power to vote any money to any institution if it partakes of a religious character. It may profess any other kind of principle. It may profess any objectionable principle, and it is lawful to endow it, but, if it professes the Christian character, it is, forsooth, unconstitutional to allow such an Act to go into operation. I listened to the remarks which the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) addressed to the House on the third branch of his argument, as to the objectionable teachings of this society with some surprise, though I do not intend to-night to challenge his ample liberty to differ from me as to the correctness and propriety of those observations. I hoped that, in this discussion, he and those who will vote with him will not prove themselves any less friends of religious liberty than they have professed to be in the past, but I assume—I think I have a right to assume—that, when the case of the gentlemen who are opposed to the allowance of this Act is placed in the hands of an hon. member who is so able and so skilled in argument as he, we are not to be condemned for not asking His Excellency to disallow this Act, unless the reasons which he urged with such great force this afternoon are reasons which I could use in addressing His Excellency on the subject. Surely I have a right to assume that the hon. gentleman has put forward the best case he could, and I am not to be condemned unless I could avail myself of his reasons in asking His Excellency to disallow the Act. If I could picture myself going to His Excellency and asking for the disallowance of this Act, for the reasons which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) presented in the latter part of his address, I would imagine myself just fit to be expelled from His Excellency's presence as quickly as possible. What would be the reasons which I should urge? I am not finding fault now with the strictures that the hon. gentleman made in regard to the society, but,

forsooth, I am to go to His Excellency and ask him to disallow this Act because, in the year 1874, a *Quarterly Review* published an article denouncing the Jesuit Society and its teachings. Am I not right in taking the argument and the evidence which he produces to-day as the argument and the evidence which I should produce to His Excellency? If I were to go to His Excellency and say that the *Quarterly Review*, published in 1874, denounced in language as strong as could be the tenets and teachings of these people, His Excellency might ask me a number of perplexing questions, one of which was levelled at the hon. member for North Simcoe this afternoon without much profit to him. Let me suppose that His Excellency asked me: "Mr. Minister of Justice, who is the author?" My answer would have to be—surely I cannot do better than take the answer of the hon. member for Simcoe—my answer would have to be: "I really do not know who is the author; but, your Excellency, I am sure that nothing would be published in the *Review* which would not stand criticism." I am afraid that His Excellency might not be satisfied with that answer, and that he might put me another rather more puzzling question: "Mr. Minister of Justice, are you aware that these able and eloquent, but anonymous, publications in that *Review* have been refuted time and again until the slanders have been worn threadbare?" I would ask my hon. friend from Simcoe what I should answer to that question?

Mr. McCARTHY. Refuted where?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would like to ask him, has he ever read the answers to them? I would like to ask him, has he ever sought the answers to them? Because these are questions which His Excellency may ask me when I go to him with this advice. The hon. member asks me, where? Well, I tell him, in the first place, in publications so voluminous that I shall have to give him a catalogue of them; but in order to be precise, and not to be suspected of evading the question, I will tell him that in an English publication called the *Month*, step by step, as every one of these articles came out, the answer and the refutation came out, and that in the opinion of a great many people, these men were able to refute the articles triumphantly. I am not to pass judgment as to whether they were successful or otherwise, I have no right to speak my own opinions here, I am speaking for those with whom I am acting in concert. His Excellency might ask me whether having read these articles what conclusion I had come to as to the balance of arguments *pro* and *con*. If he did so, I should be unable to find, in the course of that admirable three hours interesting theological discussion which we had to day, a single hint as to my reply, and having read the attack in the *Review*, and the replies which were made, answer as I have done. I should have to tell His Excellency that unless he were to be guided by the opinion of a partisan on one side or the other, the best thing he could do would be to leave it either to his own conscience or to that conscience which the Constitution has provided for dealing with the subject—the conscience of the Legislature of the Province which had to deal with it. If His Excellency were to ask me: "Sir, in advising disallowance on the authority of the *Quarterly Review*,"—which I am afraid to the Colonial Office would not be a sound authority, would not be a satisfactory constitutional authority—"have you verified the quotations for yourself?" I ask the hon. member for Simcoe what I should answer then? What answer could he give to the House if I asked him now, whether he has verified a single one of those quotations—and I tell him that on the verity of the quotations half the controversy has turned. I tell him that it is claimed by those who have undertaken—I do not say they have succeeded—to refute them, that the tenets which they are accused of teaching, they have not taught; that the passages put forward as proofs were problems—doubtful cases, cases to distinguish between that which is the sin, which the confessor has to deal with, and that which, though against public morals or public propriety, the confessor has not to deal with. In dealing with casuistry, and when dealing with moral theology, some of the old writers quoted have suggested difficulties, and problems, and questions, and have given advice to confessors upon such subjects; but they have not put forward the tenets as to be taught to the youth of the country. I might be told by His Excellency that I might find in the studies of my own profession a similar case; that I might find the leading writers in my own profession, eminent men, stating that things which we recognise from day to day as hideous wrongs, are not offences against the criminal law of the country—some of them I could name, but which it would be almost indecent to name in a mixed assembly. And, Sir, could it be said of these writers who declared that such was the law, that these things, however abominable they may be, however contrary to public morals, are not against the law—could it be said that these eminent writers like Sir Fitzjames Stephen and others are teaching that such things are lawful and ought to be done in the country, and are putting them before the youth of the country as things that are right? Is there not a broad distinction between the two ideas? If the hon. member for North Simcoe had read the answers which have been made to the publications, which he quoted he would not have dared, as he is an honorable man, to have presented to the House the argument that he made this afternoon, without, at least, presenting the other side of it. If I were to advise His Excellency to disallow this Bill because of the objectionable teachings of this body, His Excellency might fairly say to me: "The Legislature of the united Provinces of Canada, 37 years ago, erected the society into a corporation to hold lands and to teach the youth of the country. Now, in looking over that 37 years of record, can you point me to one of the teachers or one of the taught who has been disloyal to his country? Has anyone been able to say: "This or that father has taught me immorality, this or that man is guilty of immorality in his teaching, this or that tenet was objectionable?" What reply should I have to give him? Well, Sir, if His Excellency went on and reminded me that the rules and constitutions of that order have been published for 45 years, and that before giving him advice of that kind I ought to be able to put my hand upon the passages of the rules and constitutions of that order which are objectionable on the grounds of public policy, I am afraid I should be unable to do so to an extent to justify the disallowance of this Act, and I am afraid I should not find in the speech of the hon. member for Simcoe much comfort in that respect. If I were to advise His Excellency to disallow the Act on the ground of the expulsion of the Huguenots, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the Franco-German war, the expulsion from France in 1818, the expulsion from other countries, I am afraid His Excellency might tell me that all the statements of fact were disputed, and that he might read me a lesson in ancient and modern history of which one of the deductions could be that in some of these countries, to say that the court was opposed to the Jesuits, or to say that the court was opposed to the Protestant reformers, was no discredit to either the Protestant reformers or to the Jesuits. I do not think, Sir, that I need dwell on that branch of the subject any longer. I think that whenever we touch these delicate and difficult questions which are in any way connected with the sentiments of religion, or of race, or of education, there are two principles which it is absolutely necessary to maintain, for the sake of the living together of the different members of this Confederation, for the sake of the preservation of the federal power, for the sake of the good-will, and kindly charity of all our people towards each other, and for the sake of the prospects of making a nation, as we can only do

by living in harmony and ignoring those differences which used to be considered fundamental—these two principles surely must prevail, that as regards theological questions the State must have nothing to do with them, and that as regards the control which the federal power can exercise over Provincial Legislatures in matters touching the freedom of its people, the religion of its people, the appropriations of its people or the sentiments of its people, no section of this country, whether it be the great Province of Quebec or the humblest and smallest Province of this country, can be governed on the fashion of 300 years ago.

Mr. McNEILL. I am very reluctant to prolong this debate, but I feel that it would not be right if I did not say a word in explanation of the vote which I shall give. I repeat that I do not wish to prolong this debate, and have but a very few words to say, and in what I do say I hope I shall endeavor to say not one word that can add bitterness to the debate. We are here differing in race and differing in religion. We cannot see eye to eye in all things; we must differ and differ widely in our views upon many subjects: that is inevitable. But if we mean to do our duty by our country, if we mean to make this country, this Canada of ours, a great and prosperous nation we must first endeavor as far as in us lies to bear and forbear with one another and endeavor to act together as an united people. And, therefore, it was that I listened with a great deal of gratification to the speech of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) last night when he assured us of the kindly consideration with which our Roman Catholic friends, in the Province of Quebec, treated our Protestant friends there. I believe that speech going abroad in this country will do an immense amount of good. I believe it will remove a great many misconceptions, I believe it will cause a warmer feeling of friendship to exist between our Protestant friends and our Roman Catholic friends throughout this Dominion, and that, I think, will be a matter of incalculable benefit to this Dominion. We have no quarrel with our Roman Catholic friends, and, therefore, I was, I must say, surprised at the extraordinary statement made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) last night when he said that those members who were discharging in this House a very onerous and painful duty desired to prevent their Roman Catholic fellow-countymen exercising their religion in this country, and in point of fact that they almost desired to drive them out of the land. That statement was not altogether what I would have expected from my hon. friend, and I think it was a statement hardly worthy of him.

Mr. RYKERT. I made no such statement, you cannot show it.

Mr. McNEILL. I am glad to find from what the hon. gentleman says that I misconceived him. I listened with a great deal of attention and I understood that was what he said, but I am only too glad to learn that that is not what he intended to say.

Mr. RYKERT. I did not say it.

Mr. McNEILL. If the opposition on our part to the endowment of the Jesuit Order be of any such character, if it be an attack upon the Roman Catholic faith and an attack upon our Roman Catholic friends in any shape and form, as I certainly think my hon. friend will admit he said it was, I would suppose that opposition to the incorporation of that body would be equally an attack upon the Roman Catholic religion and upon our Roman Catholic friends. But if that be the case, what are we to say of the conduct of His Eminence Cardinal Taschereau and the six bishops and archbishops of the Province of Quebec, who joined with him only the other day so to speak, in 1887, in petitioning the Legislature against the incorporation of this body. They, surely, are not to be looked upon as enemies of the Roman Catholic religion; they, surely, are not to be looked upon as persons outside of the pale of the Church and as persons who desired to prevent the Roman Catholic people of this country from the due exercise of their rights and privileges. But we find that Cardinal Taschereau and six bishops and archbishops of the Roman Catholic Church did petition the Legislature of Quebec not to incorporate the Jesuit Order. If that be the case, and it is a fact which cannot be gainsaid, I think these statements which have been made with respect to the course of my hon. friends who have felt it necessary to support the amendment, these accusations of intolerance against them, because they object to the further strengthening of the power of that body in this country, are somewhat far fetched. I do think that when the Minister of Justice, in the very able, the magnificent speech which he has just addressed to the House was dealing with this question, it would have been a little more seemly had he refrained from the statements in which he indulged in the latter part of his speech, and in which he seemed to assert that those who objected to the endowment of the Jesuit Order desired to have recourse to the prosecutions of the middle ages. The argument which my hon. friend the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), addressed with regard to the propriety of disallowing this Act, I do not speak of the legal argument, but I refer to the arguments which he presented in reference to the effect which the endowment of this body inflicted on the Dominion, and which were not founded on a reference to an article in the *Quarterly Review*, but included the statement that this was a society which had been found by almost every civilised state to be incompatible with the proper government of the country in which it existed—I think that this argument is one which should be met seriously, and not merely by the assertion or the implication that in every case in which those governments, Roman Catholic as well as Protestant, had found it necessary to suppress this society, the society was right and the government was wrong. I think the argument requires to be met more seriously. Now, Sir, the agitation and the excitement which has arisen in the Province of Ontario in reference to this matter is very natural. The people of Ontario have begun to feel in that Province of late years the ever increasing power of Jesuit pressure and influence. We have begun to experience in that Province some effects of the unceasing aggression which history shows to be one of the leading characteristics of those trained spiritual warriors of which we have heard so much during this debate. I give them all credit for their ability, I give them all credit for their many deeds of self sacrifice and heroism and for their learning and culture, but I beg to say that the Dominion of Canada is a Protestant country, and I think that while we give to all and desire to give to all who differ from us, the fullest rights and liberty for the exercise of their religious opinions, we have a right to remember that the Protestant majority in this country have some few rights and privileges also. I think that we have a right to expect that if the Jesuit Order find an asylum here in Canada which has been denied to them in many Catholic States, they should have at least some consideration for the religious sentiments of those who have extended this kindness towards them. But, Sir, I wish to ask what has been our experience in reference to this matter in the Province of Ontario. You cannot deal with this as a purely local question, for it is not a local question. The Jesuit Order is not confined to the Province of Quebec and because you endow the headquarters of the order there that does not make it a local matter. You cannot limit the operations of this order to the Province of Quebec, there is nothing local about it. What has been our experience in the Province of Ontario, which is not the Province of Quebec. What has been the conduct of this order of Jesuits in that Province? We have every reason to believe that they have

not scrupuled in that Province to attack our Protestant institutions and to dictate as to the education of our Protestant children. Only a few years ago we were startled to learn that a work which is one of the best known, one of the most generally admired, and one of the most beautiful compositions in the English language, a work, too, by an author who is preeminent for the purity and morality of his writings—had been, as we believe at least, at their instance, struck from the curriculum of our high schools. Only so recently as the year 1886 we find that the same influence was at work in our common public schools and that an attempt was being made and successfully made to banish from those schools that which is the very sign and symbol of the Protestant faith, the Protestant bible; and to substitute for the book itself a collection of attenuated and mutilated extracts from it. We find, in fact, that an astute and subtle attack was being made against the very character of that book and that an attempt was being made to poison the minds of our children against it, and to represent it as a book unfitted to be placed in their hands. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask my Roman Catholic friends in this House and in this country, to place themselves in our position and to ask themselves whether they would not have resented such an attempt to interfere with the educational system in the Province of Quebec, and whether they would not have resented such an insidious attack upon their own religion? I would ask them to put themselves in the place of the Protestants of Ontario, and to tell me if they would not have viewed with alarm any action on the part of the state which was calculated to strengthen the hands of a society which they believed had been in this way interfering with the education of their childere and endeavoring to subvert their religious faith. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up the time of the House longer. I will only say that I intend to record my vote in favor of the resolution of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), and I will do so not so much as an expression of censure upon the conduct of the Government whose general policy I support with so much pleasure, and whose conduct in reference to this particular matter has been circumscribed by conditions of such deep importance to the Dominion; but rather because I disapprove altogether of the kind of legislation which we have had under our consideration. I believe it to be improper and dangerous legislation. I believe, in the first place—and as this debate has proceeded my opinion in that regard has been strengthened—that there has been a deliberate setting aside, with pomp and parade, of the principle that His Holiness the Pope of Rome should not interfere in our affairs of state. I think this is dangerous legislation for another reason. I think that in these days of party Government no more dangerous precedent could very well be laid down than that a political party should be enabled—it may be for purely party reasons—to endow a religious body with large sums of public money. It seems to me that if we admit such a principle as that, we open a door which it will be difficult to close; and it seems to me that the dangers against which the Act of Mortmain was levelled were insignificant as compared with the dangers which may be incurred if we admit such a principle as that—the principle that a political party shall be permitted at any moment that it pleases to endeavor to secure the assistance of a religious body by conferring upon it large sums of public money. I say that is a dangerous principle, and that is a principle which is involved in the legislation we are discussing. I shall support this resolution also as a solemn protest by a humble member of this House against consolidating the power in this Dominion of a society which, however able and however devoted its members may be, is yet a society which throughout all Christendom has proved to be unscrupulous and aggressive, a fomentor of discord, and a stirrer up of strife, and which I am afraid, from what we have already experienced in the Province of Ontario, is prepared to pursue here in Canada those self-same tactics which rendered necessary its suppression in almost every European state.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I beg to move the adjournment of the debate. There are many gentlemen on this side yet to speak on the subject.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope hon. gentlemen will not have any objection to this motion. We adjourned rather early yesterday, and I think we can agree that the debate will be ended to-morrow.

Mr. MULOCK. We cannot promise.

Mr. LAURIER. We cannot promise, but I think we can do our best.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman knew that the hon. member for North Simcoe was going to speak a couple of hours, which would run the debate very late, and there would have been no opportunity of a reply by the Minister at two o'clock in the morning. That was the reason of adjourning yesterday. Surely we can go on to-night.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend will speak at some length also, and it cannot be hoped that we shall reach a conclusion this evening.

Mr. MULOCK. I am sure the hon. First Minister will be consulting the wishes of a great many members if he will yield to the request of the hon. member for Bothwell. I doubt if persistence in the debate at this hour of the night will accomplish what he appears to desire to accomplish, a speedy termination of the debate. We are engaged now, irrespective of all party consideration, in dealing with a question of vast importance. Parliament has been spoken to by the country on the subject, and it is the duty of Parliament to give, and the country demands from Parliament, a full expression of opinion upon it; and at a quarter to twelve to-night, half an hour later than the hour last night, at which the First Minister said it was time to adjourn, is surely late enough. I, therefore, hope he will allow the debate to be adjourned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think as a matter of fair play the request made by my hon. friend from Bothwell ought to be granted. We raised no objection to the request of the hon. Minister last night that the House should adjourn at an unusually early hour, in order to accommodate the hon. member for North Simcoe, and the same courtesy should be extended to a gentleman occupying the position in the House of the hon. member for Bothwell.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think under the circumstances, and under the pressure of the hon. gentleman who has moved the adjournment and of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, if it is understood that we will sit it out to morrow night——

Mr. LAURIER. We will sit as late as possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is understood we close to-morrow night.

Mr. MULOCK. We must not gag the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then we must go on, or make an arrangement of that kind.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, is quite certain that we have no desire to protract the discussion. We will do everything possible on our side to meet his views, which are to close to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Under these circumstances, the hon. gentleman will feel that we intend no dis-

courtesy if we ask the House to sit to-morrow night until the debate is concluded.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not wish to have the debate protracted any longer than necessary, but if it should happen to-morrow night that any hon. gentlemen desire to speak, I think they should have that privilege, and no arrangement should be made which will deprive them of the opportunity of doing so. No arrangements should be made which would have the effect of preventing them having an opportunity to do so. It is my intention, irrespective of any arrangement, to speak to the question briefly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will be very glad to hear the hon. gentleman now.

Mr. MULOCK. I have no doubt. But it seems to me on a question of this importance every opportunity should be given to hon. members to give their views before the vote is taken.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I shall ask the House to sit to-morrow night until a vote is taken.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think we had better go on to-night. If the hon. gentleman had taken my suggestion last night and had one of his Cabinet make a bold statement of their policy and the reasons for it, the debate would have been closed last night.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 28th March, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 119) for the relief of William Gordon Lowry (from the Senate).—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 123) for the relief of George McDonald Bagwell (from the Senate).—(Mr. Brown.)

Bill (No. 124) for the relief of Arthur Wand (from the Senate).—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 125) for the relief of William Henry Middleton (from the Senate).—(Mr. Small.)

OFFICIAL DEBATES COMMITTEE.

Mr. DESJARDINS moved that the second report of the Special Committee of the Official Debates be concurred in. He said: The report is to recommend to the House that the prices charged to members for extra copies of *Hansard* be not the same prices as were charged under the contract by Messrs. MacLean, Roger & Co., but that the extra copies be furnished at cost price.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman let this stand until to-morrow? There may be some discussion on it.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Very well.

WESTERN COUNTIES RAILWAY.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 127) in reference to the Western Counties Railway. He said; The Minister of Railways is authorised by agreement with the company, which was confirmed in 1887 by statute, to construct the 20 miles between Annapolis and Pictou, if the company fail to construct it in the meantime. That authority is, no doubt, amply sufficient, as far as the company is concerned. This Bill is to make applicable the Expropriation Act and the other Railway Acts to that work. By the surveys which have been recently made, some slight diversion is made at two or three points, in order to straighten the line and make it more safe, and it may be necessary at certain points to expropriate property.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It has been a subject of general comment that with regard to the extension of the road, only eleven days have been given to parties to appear here, and to enter their contracts. Eleven days is too short a time for such an important contract.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

LABORERS ON THE CAPE BRETON RAILWAY.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria, N.S.) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to pay the laborers who worked on the Cape Breton Railway for Simms & Slater and their subcontractors?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not. The surety, upon receiving the deposit, gave bonds to pay all legal claims for wages.

BEHRING'S SEA.

Mr. PRIOR asked, 1. Whether the Government has received any official notification from the Government of the United States in regard to the proclamation alleged by the public press to have been issued by the President of the United States, closing Behring's Sea to all but Americans? 2. If so, whether the Government has entered its earnest protest against such action on the part of the United States?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have received no official notification from the Government of the United States in regard to this proclamation. The Government have not entered a protest against such action on the part of the United States, as they do not think that the question affecting the navigation of Behring's Sea is involved in the proclamation. On that point, I must correct an error which I made yesterday in answering the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). I stated then that the proclamation which was issued was merely a repetition of the proclamation required by law. I was at that time under the impression that the Act had been passed some years ago, and that it was an annual proclamation issued by the United States. I find on enquiry that the proclamation has been issued under the Act approved on March 2nd, 1889, which requires annual proclamation hereafter, and is merely to warn their own fishermen as well as others.

DERBY BRANCH, INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that, in pursuance of the answers he gave to the questions I asked yesterday, in relation to the extension on the western end of the Derby Branch to the Northern and Western Railway—a distance of about eight miles—I am very anxious that the hon. gentleman should bring down the papers, so as to enable me to get at the real merits of the transaction and discuss the matter intelligently when the estimates relating to railways are up. My hon. friend will observe that since the 20th of February, I have had a notice on the Notice Paper for these papers. We are not likely to reach it in time to have any such discussion as I desire upon it, and I trust the right hon. gentleman will order the papers to be brought down. They are very brief, and their production will facilitate matters very much.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Had the hon. gentleman, when he brought up the question the other day, moved for these papers, his motion would have been granted. The answer from the department is that this section of the road was, at the time the last inspection was made, in good running condition, and that the Intercolonial Railway officials had many times informed the company that they are prepared to exchange traffic within convenient time. There is very little, if any, correspondence on the subject, as the matter has been discussed by personal interviews, but I will bring down what papers there are.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman will see how important it is that I should be able, as representing that county, to give an intelligent account of how the thing is being done.

TRENT VALLEY COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. BARRON. Will the right hon. gentleman inform the House if the Trent Valley Canal Commissioners have yet reported, and if they have not, when they are likely to report? Will he also state whether he is aware that one of these commissioners has left this country on a long visit to the old country, notwithstanding the fact that the work was finished some time ago?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No report has yet been received. I do not think there is any chance of a report being transmitted to the department this Session. How long after that it will be presented, I am not able to say. I am aware that one of the commissioners is now on the other side of the water, and how long he will be there I cannot tell.

SUPPLY—THE JESUITS' ESTATES ACT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply; and the motion of Mr. O'Brien in amendment.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have watched with attention the proceedings in this debate, not with more attention to what has been said by hon. gentlemen who have taken part in the debate than to the manner in which it has so far been conducted. Since I have had a seat in Parliament, I do not remember any subject which has come before the House that has exhibited the tactical skill of the hon. the First Minister to greater advantage than this discussion. The hon. gentleman finds himself face to face with what may become a dangerous agitation, involving the Administration of which he is the head. That agitation was begun by a journal conducted with more than ordinary ability, and characterised by what may be called a spirit of aggressive Protestantism; and it has gradually drawn to its side a large portion of the press of this country, and a very great deal of discussion adverse to the conduct of the Government has taken place in public meetings at several places in the Province of Ontario. Well, the hon. gentleman, in order to meet the dangers of the position, seems to have divided his forces that he may be in a position to control both sides. He has appointed his lieutenants—the hon. the Minister of Justice to lead one section of the hon. gentleman's forces, and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to lead another section of those forces. So the hon. gentleman has made such arrangements as to bring back to the support of the Government any that might be inclined to go astray. If they are dissatisfied with the conduct of the First Minister, they are at all events not dissatisfied with the position taken by his ardent and faithful supporter, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). Now, the business of each of these two distinguished lieutenants is to look carefully after his own division of the grand Conservative army, and I have no doubt that these two hon. gentlemen have, in the estimation of their friends, discharged the duties assigned to them by their chief with a great deal of ability and a great deal of skill; and I am sure that the hon. gentleman must feel equally grateful to his colleague, the Minister of Justice, and to his supporter, the hon. member for North Simcoe. This is not the only feature of this discussion worthy of notice. There is the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), who moves this resolution, and makes a very ardent and somewhat unreasonable Protestant speech, and there is another hon. gentleman, who, so far as I know since I have been in Parliament, has never been found voting against the Administration, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), who is put up to answer the other ardent supporter of the Government, the hon. member for Muskoka. Then, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), speaking after these hon. gentlemen, and after the hon. the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Colby), tells the House that he will not take the trouble to answer the arguments which were addressed to the House by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). He tells us that that hon. member does not fear his constituents, because he never expects to return to them, that he is soon to go to his reward, that he has in this House no abiding-place, that his labors as a supporter of the Administration, in this House, are drawing to a close, and that every day he is pitching his tent a day's march nearer the place where he expects to be. The hon. gentleman expects, according to the information afforded to the House by the hon member for North Simcoe, soon to be gathered, not to his fathers, but to the fathers, where scrap books will be no longer required, and where all anxiety, as to the future of an election, will be dispensed with. That is the position presented to the House by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in regard to the hon. member for Lincoln. Then the hon. member for North Simcoe told us of the position of another supporter of the Government, the Deputy Speaker of this House (Mr. Colby). He told us that the roseate speech of the Deputy Speaker, in regard to the perfect harmony existing between the two sections of the population in the Province of Quebec, was due to thankfulness either for favors received or for those which were to come. The hon. member said the Deputy Speaker was expectant of future promotion, but the hon. gentleman did not wish to hear from a Minister *in futuro*, but from one who was actually in possession of the Treasury benches.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He did hear it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In fact, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) gives a representation of the Deputy Speaker which reminds me of a statement in Lord Beaconfield's "Endymion." In describing one of the characters in that book, the author says he had a feeling in his bosom which he was not very sure whether it was gratitude or indigestion; and so the hon. member for North Simcoe says that the able speech made by the Deputy Speaker was the outcome of some motive, either of favor already received or of favor to be received from the Government, but he was not very sure which. Now, the hon. member for North Simcoe, while he described the motives which actuated those with whom he is associated on that side, and the feeling which induced them to speak in support of the position of the Government, failed to give us any information as to the motives by which he was actuated himself. I do not say that the hon. gentleman was looking forward to a seat upon the Treasury benches. I do not know that such a position would have any attractions for him. It is quite possible that it might not have; but I remember very well the support which that hon. gentleman has given the Government in past Sessions. I remember that Railway Commission

Bill which was introduced and supported by one who stood so near the Prime Minister, year by year, by which the Grand Trunk was paralysed and the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway were promoted, and I cannot bring myself to believe that the hon. gentleman would have taken the position he has in support of the amendment of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) if he thought the Government had any serious objection to the amendment. The hon. gentleman not only failed to give us any information with regard to his own motives of action, but he failed to make any allusion to the speech of an hon. gentleman who supported the amendment—the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). Now, that hon. gentleman has been in this House a very ardent supporter of the Administration. How is it that the hon. gentleman on this question arrays himself, along with the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), in opposition to the course that the Government has seen proper to pursue upon this Bill? Sir, rumor has gone abroad that the hon. gentleman is not without aspirations for a seat upon the Treasury benches; rumor has gone abroad that a round robin has been sent along the back benches, on that side of the House, in the hon. gentleman's interests, asking the Government to find a place for him upon the Treasury benches. It is said that the scarlet robe of the Minister of Customs has become somewhat faded by his long sitting upon the Treasury benches, and that he is no longer a fitting representative of a very large section of the Protestant population of the Province of Ontario; and so it is proposed—at all events, such is the rumor—to recuperate that section of the Government by adding the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). Well, Sir, the hon. member for West York is opposing the Administration of which so many of his friends desire that he should become a member. The hon. member shakes his head. I have no doubt that he is sincere in that shake. I do not think the hon. gentleman feels that he is opposing the Administration; I do not think he feels that by giving the vote he intends to give in support of the motion of the hon. member for Muskoka, he is doing any detriment to the Government of which he wishes to become an important member. The hon. gentleman, no doubt, feels that, as it is said all roads lead to Rome, so all lines of action upon this motion, on that side of the House, will lead towards the Treasury benches, because they are alike intended to protect and strengthen the right hon. gentleman and those associated with him in the Government of this country. I think the hon. member for West York is quite right, and perhaps quite consistent, in his support of the Administration by supporting the motion of the hon. member for Muskoka rather than the motion of the Minister of Finance. We have had the two sides of the Government presented on this question. The hon. member for North Simcoe talked of the two sides of the shield, and I never saw an instance in which there were two sides to a political shield more manifest, and, I may say, more admirably presented, than they have been on this occasion. Although we may admire the hon. Minister of Justice for the very able speech he made on one side, and the hon. member for North Simcoe, for the very ardent speech he made on the other, I think we must after all give credit to the skill and generalship of the Von Moltke who leads the Government, and who leads this House. This, Mr. Speaker, is a sort of introduction to the new plan of campaign——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The preamble is not part of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS—which the Government have presented. The introduction is not without interest. Of course when, in a novel play, the actor is introduced to an audience, it is always interesting to those who understand it, and who are looking on, and who are anxious to see how it will end. Sir, the Minister of Justice last night made a very exhaustive speech in defence of the action of the Government, a speech in almost every word of which I cordially concur. When the hon. gentleman had completed that speech the hon. Premier was ready for a division. He did not see any necessity for any further discussion upon the subject. It had been fully and exhaustively discussed. Both sides of the Government shield had been presented to the House. The Government had made their defence before the country, and they say to the electors, You can follow the Minister of Justice and support the Government, or you can take the other side, and follow the hon. member for North Simcoe, and support the Government; and so, whichever way the matter may be arranged, it comes to supporting the Government after all. It is like the trade between the hunter and the Indian. It is: you take the owl and I will take the turkey; or, I will take the turkey and you take the owl. It goes to the Government, no matter what the choice may be. Well, Sir, the Prime Minister was no doubt ready for a division, but we were not, and is it to be wondered at? I expect, at all events, and no doubt the vast majority on this side of the House expect, to support the Government. But when one is in questionable company he always feels obliged to make some defence or explanation of his conduct; and I feel it necessary, in view of the political character of the gentlemen with whom I am to be associated in this vote, to give some account and some justification to the public for the course I intend to pursue. Now, we, on this side of the House, feel that this is a very important question. It is one which is calculated to arouse religious feeling, and religious prejudice; it is one in respect of which men, if they once become permeated with it, are likely to throw reason to the winds; and, therefore, in this incipient stage—if the incipient stage of the excitement and controversy is not passed—it is important that the Opposition, as well as the members and supporters of the Government, should have an opportunity of assigning to the public what is a sufficient reason for their own justification, and which I think will be regarded as a sufficient reason by the great mass of those who support them, for the course which they intend to adopt on this occasion. We have had most of the speaking so far done on one side. Our business in this discussion, Mr. Speaker, is to stand up for the right, to allay, so far as we can, the popular excitement, to correct the popular misapprehension as to the nature of the question put in issue by this Bill—not to become mere weathercocks which will indicate the strength of the gale which may be blowing from this or that particular direction. I have, and I have no doubt that every gentleman on this side of the House has, too much respect for the good sense and the good intentions of the people to undertake to convert this Jesuits' Estates Bill into a sort of "Ginx's Baby" for the purpose of creating religious excitement and for arousing religious animosities throughout the country. So, for these reasons, we propose fully to discuss this question, and I think the time occupied in such a discussion is not wasted. There is one advantage, amongst the many disadvantages of popular excitement, that under it people are more likely to listen, with attention to what is said, and you have an opportunity of imparting to them information upon a subject which they would not be likely to receive under other circumstances. That being the case, I think we are justified, notwithstanding our anxiety to bring this Session to a close, in taking whatever time may be necessary, to enter fully into the discussion of this subject, and to give to the people who sent us here all the information necessary to enable them to form an intelligent conclusion on the merits of the question in issue. Sir, this is a most important question. The motion that has been placed in your hands by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) is, in

some respects, one of the most important that has ever been brought before Parliament. We have in this motion, in the name of toleration, a demand for intolerance, and we have, under the pretext of resisting encroachments upon constituted authority and the maintaining of the supremacy of the Crown, a motion asking for a violation of the Constitution. This motion is, in my opinion, laden with mischief, because it mingles religious prejudices and religious animosities with the consideration of the question. It mingles up stories of wrongs done and wrongs endured, as narrated in history, with fables and romances. I did not know when I heard the speech, especially the latter portion of the speech of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the speech of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), whether they had derived their information from history or romance. I thought that the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment had studied the "Wandering Jew" more carefully than anything else, and that in all probability the political portion of his speech was derived from "Henry Esmond." In a country where you have 2,000,000 of Roman Catholics, and something less than 3,000,000 of Protestants, it is in the last degree mischievous to invade the political arena with religious discussions, and to endeavor to convert Parliament itself into an ecclesiastical council for the purpose of deciding what religious opinions ought to be encouraged, and what religious opinions ought to be suppressed. We must continue to be one people, or at all events a people of one country, and it is not desirable to make the people of Canada, like the Jews and Samaritans, the two sections of which would have no dealing with each other. There may be questions involving principles so vital to human progress, that the evils arising from undertaking to evade the question, the evils arising from acquiescence, would be greater than those which would flow from converting the country into two hostile camps; but it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is not one of those occasions. In this case no such disagreeable choice is forced upon us. We have in this motion simply the question of the right of local self-government on the one side, and the assertion of a meddlesome interference and oversight on the other. We have in this motion, a proposition to set aside the judgment of a Province upon a question within its own jurisdiction, and to replace that judgment with that of a majority of the people, or a section of the people, in another Province. I do not think we can permit any such course to be adopted. If we were to do so, it would be practically an end to the system of federal government The hon. member for Muskoka and the hon. member for North Simcoe have quoted history upon this question. But the history or the controversial papers written by men of strong polemical tendencies, the more they are studied the more the readers are likely to be led astray, and especially is history misleading when it relates to a remote period and when the surrounding circumstances and the environing influences of our own day are altogether different from that of the age about which they were writing. The past never repeats itself. The hon. gentleman assumes that it does; his speech was based on that assumption. I say the present is always being taken up into the past in the form of permanent results, and the future will differ from the present by all the influences that are to be found in the events of the age immediately preceding. Were it not so you might take a thousand years out of the history of a people, without any change in its subsequent history. The thousand years before and a thousand years afterwards would fit together, for the intervening period would be of no account. That is not the course of historical events, and when an hon. gentleman undertakes to tell us what this and that party believed or did 100 years or 500 years ago, without taking into consideration the circumstances under which those doctrines were laid down, or those principles enunciated or undertaken to be applied, he is giving information which is calculated to mislead rather than to enlighten the people of the present day. I have no doubt that this question also is dangerous to public tranquility, from the consideration that it is a religious question. Men always feel they can go a long way when they think they are supporting their religious dogmas, or the religious dogmas of somebody else, and they will employ in the defence and in the promotion of those views, and those religious opinions and preferences, means which they would altogether set aside in the affairs of civil life. In order to consider with profit some of the legal and constitutional features of this question, and some of the legislation to which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has referred, we have to take into account the limits of government in former periods. We must remember we have largely circumscribed the field of government. There was an age when the Government undertook to control the whole domain of human action, when private domestic relations, the religious and political affairs, were all brought under the control of Government, and when the affairs of life, whether private or public, were regulated by the united authority of Church and State. Sir, in order to fully understand the legislation to which the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) referred, we must remember that in the rise of the Teutonic kingdoms on the ruins of the Roman Empire, provincial churches were superseded by national churchs, eccclesiastical persons were included in the government, and while men came there with spears and shields, there came also bishops and leading men of the church, and they sat in council together, and legislated together, and dealt with ecclesiastical and religious, as well as with civil matters; and so the legislation in a large degree covered everything relating to questions of religion and conscience, as well as to political affairs. Under the circumstances it was as much an act of wrong-doing and as much a violation of the law of the land to dissent from the rites and the polity, the doctrine and the discipline, established by the laws relating to the church, as it was to disregard matters of civil authority. And so every case of dissent was regarded as a case of sedition. Men and churches, whether they were Protestants or whether they were Roman Catholics, under those circumstances, were intolerant. It was a necessary condition of the state of society then; they could not well be otherwise. If a man sought to set up a separate church establishment, it was as much against the law as if he had undertaken to set up a separate political tribunal, or a separate judicial institution; and so, as I have said already, the domain of government was extended over almost the entire field of political and religious opinion and action. This was the condition of things during the Tudor period in England, and it was the condition of things, in a large degree, though not to so great an extent, in the period of the Stuarts. Now, let me call the attention of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side, who have dealt with this Jesuit question to some facts of history—and I am not going to say anything in defence of this order, I am not going to enter upon any such discussion, but I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentlemen to the past, and I would like to ask them, would they be willing that their rights should be governed, and their action controlled and circumscribed, by the intolerant acts of the church or of a religious society of that day, with which they are now connected. Take the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and in her reign there were upwards of 200 Roman Catholics executed for sedition or treason. The charges against them were political charges. I am speaking now of those who were put upon trial, and the records of whose trials exist, and we find that fifteen were executed for denying the Queen's supremacy in ecclesiastical matters, that one hundred and twenty-six of those were executed for undertaking to exercise priestly functions, and that eleven were put to death for the pretended plot of Rheims. Every one of those parties were tried, as Sydney Smith points out, for a political offence; but what was the

political offence? There was the established church; the Queen's advisers had stated what the doctrines and discipline of that church ought to be, and those men, by remaining members of another communion, set the law in regard to that establishment at defiance. But they were not the only ones who acted in this way. We find that the Nonconformists, Joan of Kent, and Peterson, and Tunwort and others, were executed on precisely the same principle, for holding opinions different from Elizabeth and her advisers. If hon gentlemen will refer to some of the histories of that period they find these parties are spoken of as conspiring against the Government, and as parties guilty of treason; both Nonconformists and Roman Catholics. But what was that offence? It was that they declined to accept the rites and discipline of the establishment that had been created by law. Cambden, in his Annals, mentions that, in his day, there were fifty gentlemen imprisoned in the Castle of York, the most of whom died of vermin, famine, hunger, thirst, dirt, damp, fever, whipping, and broken hearts, and that the only offence of those victims was, that they dissented from the religion of the Statute-book, and that of Her Majesty's spiritual advisers. Now, hon. gentlemen would not like to have the intolerance of that age quoted as a reason why they should not now be granted the rights of ordinary citizens. They would not like to have the religion of that period, and its enforcement by those who were of the same religious persuasion as they are, quoted, as an evidence of their intolerance. It was the necessary outcome of the age in which those people lived, for when you undertake to extend the authority of government over the religious and ecclesiastical, as well as over the civil affairs of life, when you insist upon conformity to the one, as well as the other, it was a necessary consequence, that those who dissented in their views from the establishment, should be in a very uncomfortable position. Now, one of those who was executed at that period for opposition, was the Jesuit Campion, and he, at his trial, said, that his only offence against the Government was that he had been guilty of holding a faith different from that held by the State. We would, no doubt, be ignoring history altogether it we did not see that many members of the Jesuit Order took an active part in the restoration of the Stuarts, and why was that? Because the Stuarts favored their religion, and the Stuarts would establish it. The universal opinion was that some religion or other must be established, and they did what was perfectly natural for anybody to do—they sought to establish their own religion. When James II became an avowed Roman Catholic, and when he was using his sovereign position for the purpose of the restoration of the Roman Catholic faith and for overturning that of the great majority of the nation, there were Protestants who were then as active as ever the Jesuits were in endeavoring to bring in King William and in effecting a change of government, giving to the country a parliamentary sovereignty instead of one based on the notion of Divine Right. So you find the Jesuits were in treaty again on the death of Queen Anne, or in the closing years of her life, to bring back the Pretender, because the dynasty was at an end, a new family was to be established on the throne, and the question was as to whether it was to be the Pretender or some member of the House of Hanover. If you take the history of the Stuart period in Scotland, and if you consider the relations of Mary, Queen of Scots with Knox, or of James VI with Knox, you will see that that great Reformer's opinion of duty of the sovereign and of the connection between the Church and State are wholly different to anything what we entertain to day. No Presbyterian to-day would care to have his political views measured by the political standard of John Knox. He knows that the world has been changed since that date. He knows that society has undergone great changes, and that what was regarded as right and proper at that period would be a wholly improper thing to-day. Toleration is of later growth; toleration grew as the state authority was contracted. There is no place where we hear so little with regard to religious interference in the affairs of state as in the republic beside us. Why is that? It is because the Government is extremely limited, and because every subject of that sort is excluded from the domain of political authority. So, to-day, we have a far greater amount of religious toleration, we have a more tolerant spirit abroad amongst every religious community, than existed in the former period, simply because we more fully appreciate the importance of confining the sphere of Government operation within narrower limits than did our forefathers. Now let us look at some of the political views of that question. I regard it as extremely dangerous to our constitutional system. The hon. gentleman has put forward, as the first branch of this amendment, a proposition which I do not see how any hon. gentleman who favors a Federal Government can uphold. He says that this House regards the power of disallowing the Acts of the Legislative Assemblies of the Provinces, vested in His Excellency in Council, as a prerogative essential to the national existence of the Dominion. Why, Sir, the United States has a national existence; it has lived for the past 113 years, and the President has no power of disallowing a State law, or in any way interfering with the authority of a State Legislature. Every measure is left to its operation. If it is *ultra vires*, the courts, and the courts only, can say so. But the hon. gentleman asks this House to declare that the whole machine of government in Canada would go to pieces unless the Government exercised this veto. But, Sir, there is no doubt whatever that it would be a gross abuse of the trust committed to them by our Constitution if they were to exercise it on the present occasion. Our constitutional system is similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom. What is the meaning of that? The United Kingdom has no federal organisation. Why, Sir, these words refer to the relation between the Executive and the Legislature. Our Constitution is similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom, in giving us responsible government; it gives us a Cabinet controlled by a majority of the House; and it gives us a House subject to an appeal to the country at any moment that the Crown thinks necessary. There is a certain sphere of exclusive action assigned to the Local Legislatures, and a certain sphere assigned to this Parliament. Let us suppose that a Local Legislature, within its own sphere, had certain important questions coming before it; suppose this question were one; suppose Mr. Mercier had said the Jesuits have a moral claim upon the Jesuits' estates, and that he had been beaten in the Local Legislature; that he had gone to the country on the question, and that a majority had been returned with him to the Legislature to carry out that particular measure; how long would your system of parliamentary government endure, if the Government here should, after that measure was carried, take sides with the minority and disallow it? Sir, the Local Government have a right to go to the country upon a public question, if the country is the proper tribunal to decide whether they are right or wrong, it is perfectly clear that it cannot be the constitutional rule that this House is the proper tribunal to decide. How long could parliamentary government endure if the Administration here were to exercise that species of supervision over the Legislatures upon whom responsible Government has been conferred. If we should act the part of ancient Downing street, and undertake to decide what is wise or unwise, why, Sir, your Government would be at an end. If you have local self-government conferred upon the people of the different Provinces, it is clear that the electors of those Provinces, within their constitutional authority, are the ultimate court of appeal for the purpose

of deciding whether the political course of their Government is what it should be. They are the proper parties, and they alone. It is not to the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, but it is to the electors that the Local Legislatures are responsible for their acts within constitutional limits; and while they keep themselves within those constitutional limits, I hold that we have not, according to the spirit of our Constitution, a whit more right to interfere—to use this prerogative for the purpose of disallowing their acts—than we would have to interfere with the acts of the Legislature of the State of New York. They are a distinct political entity for all the purposes for which exclusive power is given to them; they are constitutionally beyond the control of this Government and this Parliament; if they have acted wisely, their own electors will sustain them; if, in the judgment of the electors, they have acted unwisely, they will condemn them, and will send to Parliament representatives who will repeal the law. By the judgment of their own masters they must stand or fall. But, Sir, it was hinted by the hon. member for North Simcoe, that these people were not fit to be trusted fully, and, therefore, this meddlesome oversight is necessary. If you take that position, your whole system of government is at an end. That system is based on the theory that the people of each Province are fit to be trusted, that they are competent, and that if the Government do wrong, the people will set them right. I see statements in the press and elsewhere, that this Government ought to exercise this power of disallowance. Have we a beneficent power given to the Government here, by which they may act absolutely and upon the theory that they never err, that the Local Legislatures are not to be trusted, and that this power is to be frequently exercised, in order to keep them right? What would we say in this House, if the Imperial Government were to interfere on any question wholly within the purview of our authority? Would we submit to that interference? You would have the whole country aroused; you would have it declared, that we would not submit to the meddlesome interference of Downing street; you would have the old question about parliamentary government revived again. I say, that what would be improper to be done by the Imperial Parliament against us would be improper to be done by us against the Local Legislatures. Now, we never can proceed upon the assumption that this Parliament is wiser, in matters within the purview of the Local Legislatures, than the Local Legislature or the Local Government are. The assumption in our Constitution is that authority is vested in those who are most competent to exercise it. Certain general matters are entrusted to us, because it was believed—in the public interest—that we could do better for the whole community than each section of the community could do for itself. It is upon that ground that the Union is established; but it is also assumed, in the reservation of certain powers to the Local Legislatures, that they are the most competent to discharge the duties connected with those powers. If they are the most competent, upon what ground can we interfere? What right would we have to interfere? Why, the very ground on which interference is asked in this case would, if it had been put forward when the Constitution was framed, have been sufficient to have kept the Province of Quebec out of the Union. Are you going to entrap them into a union by a form of constitution which seemingly gives them exclusive control over certain subjects, and then, after they have become members of the union, exercise a meddlesome oversight over their domestic affairs? That is what is proposed. I say that is an improper thing, and I repeat that you never can safely undertake, even where a Local Legislature goes wrong, to correct their errors, instead of leaving the correction of those mistakes to the electors where it constitutionally belongs. Now let me call your attention to a precedent or two on this subject.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

When this question was raised in connection with the New Brunswick School Bill, Lord Carnarvon said:

"That the Constitution of Canada does not contemplate any interference with provincial legislation, on a subject within the competence of the Local Legislature, by the Dominion Parliament, or, as a consequence, by the Dominion Government."

There is the limit Lord Carnarvon sets for that authority to disallow. He asks: Is the question one competent for the Local Legislature to deal with? If it is, your jurisdiction is excluded, your right to interfere is excluded. The Act may be unwise, but that is for them to judge, and not for you. You are not made a sort of second body to represent the people of a particular Province in provincial matters. In that same case, the law officers of the Crown, Sir J. D. Coleridge, the present Lord Chief Justice, and Sir George Jessell, afterwards the Master of the Rolls, one of the most distinguished judges of this century, said:

"Of course it is quite possible that the new statute of the Province may work in practice unfavorably to this or that denomination, and, therefore, to the Roman Catholics but we did not think that such a state of things is enough to bring into operation or restrict the power of appeal to the Governor General."

Now, here was an Act which, he said, might work unfairly and injure a particular class of the people who were complaining, but with which, as it was within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Province, although injustice might be worked, it was not the business of the federal authority to interfere. That is the doctrine clearly laid down in this case. In 1875, when the then hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) brought this matter before the House, we refused to comply with his wishes, we refused to seek to set aside the provincial legislation upon the subject; and when Bishop MacIntyre, of Prince Edward Island, asked the Government of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) to disallow the School Bill of that Province, which, he complained, was unfair to his people, we refused to interfere because we believed the matter to be wholly within the jurisdiction of the Legislature and Government of Prince Edward Island. What we then declined to do for the Roman Catholics we now decline to do against them. We are acting consistently; we are seeking to uphold on this, as on that occasion, the principle of provincial rights. The First Minister, in discussing the report on the School Bill of New Brunswick, laid down this proposition, that there were only two cases, in his opinion, in which the Government of the Dominion was justified in advising the disallowance of a local Act. The first was that the Act was unconstitutional and *ultra vires*, and the second, that it was injurious to the interests of the whole Dominion. Now, there is no doubt whatever about the soundness of the hon. gentleman's first proposition, and there is no doubt about the soundness of the second proposition, if there is no possibility of disputing the facts. The Government of the Dominion could not act, and they would have been guilty of a violent breach of the constitution if, because they held a different opinion from the Local Legislature, they should set up their judgment against the solemn decision of the Province in a matter entirely within the control of that Province. That was the position of the hon. gentleman on that important question, and with that position we never quarrelled; to the principle laid down on that occasion we unreservedly subscribed, and to that we have ever since adhered. Let us look for a moment at the federal principle. If the Government were completely federal, there would be no power of disallowance, and I have always been of opinion that the power to disallow was an unfortunate provision of our Constitution. I have always been of opinion that it would have been, on the whole, very much better to have left the question, as in the neighboring republic, entirely to the courts, rather than take the risk of the pressure which may be brought on an Administration, from time to time, to interfere in a way detrimental to the rights of

the Provinces. The first question to be asked is: Is the Act in controversy within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Province? If it is, upon what grounds can its disallowance be called for? Where the Minister of Justice thinks an Act is *ultra vires*, and that serious wrong might be done by allowing it to come into operation, he may make it a subject of correspondence with the law officer of the Province, and if, after full discussion with that law officer, he is still of opinion that the Act is *ultra vires*, he may disallow the Act, instead of leaving it go into operation until pronounced void by the courts. Now, what the hon. gentleman who has made this motion proposes is to convert Parliament into a Court of Appeal. He proposes to make this House a court for the purposes of deciding the limits of local and federal jurisdiction. Well, this Parliament may have a question of that sort, when it undertakes itself to legislate, forced upon it, and it must, for its own purpose, decide whether the question is *ultra vires* or *intra vires*. The House, it seems to me, is a body ill suited to exercise judicial functions, and to undertake to say, in any question or proposition of this sort, what is the exclusive jurisdiction of the Province, and the exclusive jurisdiction of the Dominion. Now, when we look at the Constitution, we find that everything relating to property and civil rights is under the control of the Local Legislature, except in so far as the control of property and civil rights is specifically given to the Dominion in the provisions of section 91. I am inclined to think that we often forget how comprehensive those words are: "property and civil rights." Civil rights, barbarians of course have none. The civil right is a right regulated by the State. It is the exercise of a right, that belongs to the individual, in a way consistent with the rights and liberties of another individual. It may embrace religious as well as political creeds. The relations between parent and child, between guardian and ward, between master and servant, are all civil rights. The relations between the Churches and the State are civil rights. It is possible for a Local Legislature to say this religious body may be endowed by the State, and another shall not be endowed. There is nothing in the Constitution to prevent a Local Legislature endowing a church, if it sees proper to do so. In the exercise of those powers over property and civil rights, it may do so. It may regulate the observance of the Sabbath and the observance of holidays. It may make our school system secular or denominational, in so far as it is not prevented by a specific provision of the Constitution. It may make the school system wholly religious. The Province of Ontario to-morrow might make a provision doing away with public schools and adopting a system of denominational schools in its stead. I do not know any ground upon which we could interfere on the subject of the relations between Church and State in a Province, except it would be in saying that a person belonging to one denomination may have the elective franchise and another not. The hon. gentleman told us yesterday that the connection between Church and State was entirely abolished by the Act of 1854. The hon. gentleman sought to leave the impression on the House that that Act was a finality, that the Provinces were restrained in some way by that Act. Why, the Province of old Canada, which passed that Act, might the next year have repealed it, and have established the old Church of Scotland as the Established Church of Canada, or the Church of England, or the Methodists, or some other body. Of course, in my opinion, as an opponent of the connection of Church and State, it would be unfortunate to do any one of these things, but the power is not taken away simply because it would be unwise, or inexpedient to use it. Now, the Local Legislature in any Province may very widely depart from the order of things which existed at Confederation. Everyone who knows the history of this Union knows right well that, at the period of Confederation, there was a disposition on the part of Ontario to take one view of public policy, and on the part of Quebec to take another view. There were a number of questions upon which there was friction; and what was one of the objects of the dissolution of the old Legislative Union, and the establishment of the Federal Union in its place? It was to get rid of those difficulties, by allowing each Province to take its own course. Whether that was wise or unwise, whether it was the best in the interests of civilisation, or whether it would lead to a different result, each Legislature was free to decide for itself, within the limits fixed by the Constitution, what course it would adopt. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) yesterday concluded his speech by a quotation from a speech of Prof. Caven. I have not the pleasure of knowing Prof. Caven personally, but everything I have heard in regard to him has led me to the conclusion that he is one of the ablest thinkers in the Dominion, and that he is not a gentleman likely to form an erroneous conclusion when all facts are properly before him; but he lays down in that speech three propositions. One was that the appropriation of these funds in the Province of Quebec was a malversation of public funds. Now, that is not so. That is a total misapprehension of the state of the question. Quebec may have acted very unwisely in dealing with the funds as she did, but the Legislature of Quebec was as free to deal with the funds under the control of that Province as this Legislature is, or as a private party is to deal with the moneys and property belonging to him. Whether Quebec has used the moneys wisely or unwisely it is not necessary here to discuss. The fact is that the money was her own to do as she pleased with. It was under her sovereign control—for, for this purpose, she is sovereign—and it was no more a misappropriation of her money than it would be if we were to take moneys which we have been in the habit of devoting to one purpose, and were to withdraw them from that purpose, and to use them for some other and different purpose. We have had discussed here these three questions: To whom did this property belong? how was it acquired? how was the ownership lost? In part it is said to have been granted by the King of France, in part it consisted of private benefactions, and in part it was property purchased by the society with its own money. Now, as to the first two classes of property, they were given to the society to propagate the Roman Catholic religion. The society itself was not an end. It was not for the advantage of the society, as a society, that it was given, but it was given to the society as a means to an end, and that end was the propagation of the Roman Catholic faith, the society forming a part of that church. If the views of that society were in any respect at variance with the views of the church, then the property was not given for the promotion of those views. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said that the church to which he belonged had been despoiled of its estates when the Clergy Reserves were secularised. Why, the Clergy Reserves never belonged to the church. They were reserves, not grants. They belonged to the State. The State held them during its pleasure for a particular purpose, and, while that pleasure continued, the State applied the proceeds to that purpose. But there were 57 rectories, and those were grants, and, when the connection between Church and State by the Act of 1854 was declared to be abolished, those 57 rectories were not taken from the church. The church retained those rectories because they were its private property at the time this Act of 1854 was passed. Let me state some of the analogies which I think may be fairly used to illustrate the position of this Jesuit Society. That society had very much the same relation to the Roman Catholic Church in New France as the trustees of Queen's College have to the Presbyterian Church, or Victoria College to the Methodists, or the trustees of McMaster Hall to the Baptists.

Now, if any of these corporations failed, and the Crown took possession of the property which belonged to the extinct corporation, would any one of these denominations be quite satisfied with the result? For instance, if Queen's College was taken possession of by the Crown and its property sold, and the moneys put into the Consolidated Revenues of Ontario, would not the Presbyterian body assert a moral claim, in spite of the legal right which might belong to the Crown in respect of those properties? That is very much the position which the Jesuits and the Roman Catholic Church in Lower Canada took towards the Crown when the Crown appropriated these estates. It is said by the hon. gentleman that these are very improper people, that they have been intriguers, political intriguers, in every country in Europe, and that they are not to be trusted. Well, speaking from the ethical point of view, that reminds me very much of the position of a man who owes another and does not want to pay what he owes, and he says: I will not pay the man I owe because he is a drunken rascal and beats his wife, and, if I paid him the money, he would get drunk and would beat her again, and, as I am a moral man, I prefer to keep the money. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) yesterday went on to state the origin of the title of the Crown to this property. I do not attach any importance to this, for this reason, that the legal title of the Crown is not disputed by the Prime Minister of Quebec, although, historically, it is an interesting question as to how the Crown came into possession of these estates. The hon. gentleman yesterday stated four theories, three of which must be erroneous, as to the way in which the Crown acquired possession. He cites two of these from two separate reports of the Judge Advocate General, Marriott. The one was that the property had been confiscated by the King of France before the Conquest, and was part of the public domain belonging to the King of France at the time of the Conquest. The law officers of the Crown, the Attorney and Solicitor Generals, did not concur in that opinion, and did not act upon it. Then Mr. Marriott gave another opinion that these estates belonged to the General of the Order, and that as proprietor there was no provision made for his selling or disposing of them, that the only parties who had a right to hold estates in Canada were those who were British subjects, that the General of the Order was not a British subject, that no provision was made for selling except by those who wished to leave the country, and as the General of the Order had never been in the country, he could not sell, and so the property necessarily belonged to the Crown. This may be ingenious but it is not sound. Then there was also the title set up based on the Conquest, and there is the title set up by the extinguishment of the corporation by the Pope's bull. When we look at the papers we find a proclamation, dated in 1774, in which the Crown declares its intention to take possession of these estates in consequence of the dissolution of the order, and the proclamation seems to have been repeated again in the Royal Instructions given in 1791. It is said in the Royal Instructions:

"It is our will and pleasure that the Society of Jesus be suppressed and dissolved, and no longer continued as a body corporate or politic, and all their possessions and property shall be vested in us for such purposes as we may hereafter think fit to appoint, and direct and appoint."

That was in 1791, 30 years or more after the conquest. Now, I do not see myself on what legal principle the King could, at that time, or at any time after he had established a government in the country, assert any such title as that to the estates. He did not assert it at the Conquest. There was no formal possession claimed or taken. I find at a still later period, the next year, another and different ground is put forward as the ground of the King's title. It is in the fiat issued by the Governor of that day, and he says:

"Whereas all and every of the estates and property, movable or immovable, situated in Canada, which did heretofore belong to the late Order of Jesuits, have, since the year of our Lord 1760, been and are now by law vested in us."

So we find in that fiat the title is dated back to 1760, although in the Royal Instructions it is dated in 1791. But there is no doubt that the Crown went into possession in some way or other, and if the title was not a legal title, it in the first instance became a title by prescription against the order. I don't see any ground for asserting a title in the Crown, except by prescription. Mr. Mercier does not admit any legal title in the Order of Jesuits, but their moral claim he admits to exist. Now, let me call the attention of hon. gentlemen to certain articles in the capitulation of Montreal. I think it is clear, from these Articles of Capitulation, that the King was precluded from asserting any legal title as conqueror:

"Art. XXXII. The communities of Nuns shall be preserved in their constitution and privileges. They shall be exempted from lodging any military, and it shall be forbidden to trouble them in their religious exercises, or to enter their monasteries; safeguard shall even be given them if they desire them.

"Answer.—Granted.

"Art. XXXIII. The preceding article shall likewise be executed with regard to the communities of Jesuits and Recollets, and to the house of the priests of St. Sulpice at Montreal. This last, and the Jesuits, shall preserve their rights to nominate to certain curacies and missions as heretofore.

"Answer.—Refused till the King's pleasure be known.

"Art. XXXIV. All the communities, and all the priests shall preserve their movables, the property and revenues of the seignories and other estates which they possess in the colony of what nature soever they be, and the same estates shall be preserved in their privileges, rights, honors and exemptions.

"Answer.—Granted."

Now, I ask the attention of hon. gentleman to this, that all the communities spoken of are the Nuns, the Jesuits, the Recollets, and the priests of St. Sulpice. These are the four orders, and it is said in this article that all the communities and all the priests shall preserve their movable properties and revenues, seignories, &c., on this ground. Then this construction of this article is further confirmed by article 35:

"Art. XXXV. If the canons, priests, missionaries, the priests of the Seminary of the Foreign Mission, and of St. Sulpice, as well as the Jesuits and the Recollets, choose to go to France, passage shall be granted them in His Britannic Majesty's ships, and they shall all have leave to sell, in whole or in part, the estates and the movables which they possess in the colonies."

Now, there were two things allowed to these orders: To remain in the country and to remain in possession of the property under the 34th article, or to leave the country and sell the property before they left under article 35. If the property had been confiscated to the Crown, or had been taken possession of by the Crown, by the virtue of the Conquest, no such article as this would have been granted. But in both these cases there is a provision in the Articles of Capitulation preserving to these parties their rights, which made it impossible for the Crown to acquire a legal title to their estates any more than to the estates of any other portion of the community of the Province of Quebec. It is true the Crown did come into possession. That was largely due to the undue influence of General Amherst, who desired to get possession of these estates as a personal endowment for his services during the war. Now, it may be the Crown acquired a legal title to these estates by holding them, and if it did so, and the right of the Jesuits to assert their title was gone, then there remains only, as Mr. Mercier has spoken, a moral right to any interest in the property. I think that is a very proper question to consider in the Legislature of Quebec, it is not a question, it seems to me, with which we are called upon to deal, and I would not have referred to it if the hon. member for North Simcoe had not denied altogether any moral right in the matter, and treated this as an act of spoliation which justified our interference. Sir, if it were an act of spoliation, still I do not think that we have anything to do with it. From my point of view, from my in-

terpretation of constitutional rights, from my notion of the use of this prerogative, it does seem to me that if it were a Protestant community, if it were an English Church, or a Presbyterian, or a Methodist, or a Baptist Church, that was in exactly in the same position, I do not think any Protestant member of this House would be disposed to deny that there was a moral right to some compensation for property which had been once owned and which had thus been taken away. The hon. gentleman has also pointed out that, we, he says, declared in favor of the absolute separation of Church and State. And if you pay a church anything, no matter if it is only a claim rightfully due, you have connection between Church and State. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Act of 1854, he will see that if that rule were admitted, the very Act which declares that it is desirable to disestablish or put an end to the connection between Church and State does the very thing he says should not be done. There was provision made for existing life interests of parties in the fund, and the present First Minister was the member of the Government who introduced that Bill and carried it through the Legislature. There was a proposition at that time that, in order to secure the immediate separation of Church and State so far as that question was concerned, there should be a commutation of the salaries or compensation due to the different parties, and this proposition was submitted; and the right hon. gentleman, so far as I can recollect, in the discussion said this in reply: If you pay those Ministers the amount to which they are entitled, computed upon their probability of life, they might take the money and go to Australia and South Africa, and might cease to perform those duties which entitle them to receive this money, and you pay over the money upon which the church has a moral claim by its claim to their services. You must take some means of securing the performance of those duties in behalf of which the money is voted. That was the position taken by the right hon. gentleman, and, I think, he entered into a correspondence—he will remember the matter better than I do, as he was the active party in the case—with the bishop of the Church of England, and with the moderator, or somebody else, on behalf of the Presbyterians, and arranged the commutation of those sums due to the clergy, and paid the money over to the church and not to the individuals.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, that is so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the sum was $400,000 or more.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. More.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Very much more, I think And that very Act, under which the money was paid and which was declared to be for the purpose of putting an end to the connection between Church and State, upon the theory of the member for North Simcoe, actually established connection between Church and State. Then there is another consideration. So far as I remember the provisions of that Act, the right hon. gentleman made its provisions depend upon the successful carrying out of the arrangement by those parties who were interested in the matter. If it was treason for Mr. Mercier, and contrary to the Act of Supremacy, to enter into discussions with any outside person as to the settlement of the disputes in regard to the Jesuit matter, was it not equally improper to enter into a commutation arrangement with a party who was not a member of Parliament, who had not a seat in Parliament, and was not in any sense a representative? The right hon. gentleman entered into correspondence with the bishop and with other parties, and it was for the purpose of deciding—what? It was for the purpose of deciding whether commutation should be had with the church or not. The Legislature confirmed in advance what was done. Now, so far as this case is concerned, my point is this: No one pretends that the bishop or any other church dignitary was made a party to the enactment because he was a party to the terms of settlement. No more is the Pope a party in this Bill, but a party to a contract, which this Act subsequently brought forward was intended to carry out. Let me take another case. Supposing, in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Government had entered into a contract with Sir George Stephen, Sir Donald Smith, Mr. McIntyre, and Mr. Kennedy of New York, and certain parties in Paris. The right hon. gentleman might have set out the correspondence in the Bill, and then we would have a Bill in exactly similar terms to the provincial Act respecting the Jesuits' estates, and the right hon. gentleman would have had in that contract and Act the names of parties who were non-residents of this country. He might have had in it the name of some party at Frankfort.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Reinhardt.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, and the parties in Paris. The right hon. gentleman might have had all those names in the Act, and according to the view of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), if it had not been a violation of the Act of Supremacy to have dealt with foreign parties who might be regarded as capitalists, the right hon. gentleman might have been open to the suspicion of legislating for Canada not simply by the Queen and the two Houses, but by the aid of German, French and New York bankers. It is said by a writer in the *Law Journal* that this Act is *ultra vires*. The writer says:

"It is *ultra vires* the constitutional power of a Colonial Legislature to confer on or delegate to any foreign Sovereign, Potentate or Tribunal lawful jurisdiction or authority to determine or ratify the distribution of the moneys or properties of the Crown, or how money grants to the subjects of the Crown within its Colonial jurisdiction are to be distributed."

This, I have no doubt, is intended as a legal proposition, embracing this particular case or Act before us. Let me say that it is wholly beside it. There is here no foreign potentate; there is a foreign party interested. The foreign party is claiming a property, and that foreign party negotiated with Mr. Mercier prior to legislative action. Those negotiations were simply a contract with the Crown, prior to any legislation, and prior to the meeting of the Legislature. He did just what the bankers in Paris did in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway, with this difference, that the Pope, as the head of the church, acting not personally, claimed the right, the moral right at all events, to this property. Mr. Mercier said: You have no legal right; I can only recognise a moral right. So there was no question of sovereign right, and there was in no way a violation of the Queen's supremacy by Mr. Mercier, who entered into negotiations and dealt with the Pope in the same way as he would deal with any other party having a claim against the Government, whether foreign or native, and Mr. Mercier, after an agreement was arrived at, went to the Legislature and sought to give effect to it. The Legislature, with its sovereign authority over the question, confirmed the agreement which thus had been entered into. Let me call the attention of the House to an opinion given by Lord Selborne on this point. In the case of Brown *vs.* Curé, &c., de Montreal, 6, Privy Council Appeals, 173, counsel said appeals to the Pope were in contravention of 1 Elizabeth. Lord Selborne observed:

"That statute is not understood to make it an offence at law for Roman Catholics, in this country or in Ireland, to carry appeals to the Pope. The Pope is a sort of arbitrator, taking a legal view of their position, whom they may consult upon the question."

That is the position, and the Roman Catholics in Canada do not violate the Supremacy Act in appealing to the Pope for the purpose of settling any ecclesiastical or spiritual question in which they are interested. I will place the

dictum of Lord Selborne against the authority of the Toronto *Law Journal*, and I think those hon. gentlemen who were converted to that side by the powerful argument of the Toronto *Law Journal*, may be converted back again by the still higher authority of Lord Selborne. The *Law Journal* says:

"But the statutes of Elizabeth, the express words, abolish the usurped jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, heretofore unlawfully claimed and usurped within the realm and other the dominions to the Queen belonging."

I ask the indulgence of the House for a moment while I call its attention to the position of this question. It is necessary to look to some extent to the history of the question in order thoroughly to understand the pretensions of the Pope, and his relation to the church in questions of this sort. I will refer to the views that are expressed by Lord Selborne in his book on the English Establishment. He says it was the practice in various times, in order to maintain the ancient privileges of the church, not to permit of appeals to Rome, that it is shown by the constitution of Clarendon, and by earlier provisions of the law, that this was then the practice; but that when Stephen came to the Throne, and his brother, who was the Pope's Legate, was also the Bishop of Winchester, he introduced another practice and they permitted, and in fact authorised appeals to Rome, which were at fitful intervals continued down to the time of Henry VIII. The statutes that are found in the period of Henry VIII (and which were repealed under Mary), which put an end to the appeals to Rome, were re-enacted by this statute of Elizabeth. Let me call your attention just for a moment to indicate in a brief summary the provisions of these Acts. Henry the Eighth legislated in favor of ecclesiastical emancipation in this particular. Before his day, and up to the middle of his reign, appeals were taken to the Pope in testamentary acts, and on the questions of matrimony, divorce, tithes and oblations, and by the statute of the 24th year of Henry VIII, chap. 12, those appeals were abolished, and it was declared that hereafter they were all to be adjudicated by the King's temporal and spiritual courts. It will be seen that in every one of these cases there was involved some material interest. They were not purely spiritual cases, they grew up because the ecclesiastical law was applied to parties who made their wills, and so on, at the period of their deaths; and as the ecclesiastical law was not understood by the English lawyers, appeals were frequently taken on civil cases from England to Rome. By an Act of the 25th year of Henry VIII, cap. 19, it provided for the settlement of all those cases by the King's Majesty. It forbade the clergy, under penalty of fine and imprisonment, to make a constitution without the King's assent, and it forbade appeals to Rome other than those that were permitted by cap. 12 of an Act passed in the 24th year of Henry VIII. By an Act passed in the 25th year of his reign, cap. 20, he prevented the payment of annates, and the first fruits that were allowed still to continue after the former statute; that is, that the persons entering into an ecclesiastical office, to which a salary was attached, were obliged to pay the first year's salary to the Pope as apart of his revenue. After that it was declared that the archbishops and bishops were to be elected, presented, and consecrated within the realm of England. In the 25th of Henry VIII, cap. 21, exoneration from exactions by the See of Rome was secured, and they were declared to be independent of all foreign interference. The same statute forbade the payment of Peter's pence, and declared that neither the King, nor his subjects, shall sue to Rome for any dispensation or license. The Archbishop of Canterbury was to grant such in future, but he was never to do so unless he obtained the approval of the King in Council. The 5th and 6th of Edward VI, cap. 1, enacted the principle of uniformity, the use of the Book of Common Prayer, and enforced attendance at church on Sundays. All these statutes were repealed in the reign of Mary, and they were all re-enacted by this Act. The 1st of Elizabeth, cap. 1, declared that "All foreign jurisdiction is abolished, and all spiritual jurisdiction united to the Crown." All these measures amount simply to this, that as the Church was connected with the State, the administration of the affairs of the State, executive and judicial, were declared to belong to the Sovereign. They were vested in the Sovereign, and not one of them was to be invested in any other tribunal. As long as the power of the Sovereign extended over the religious community, and as long as strict observance of the laws of the establishment were enforced, those Acts of Supremacy, and all those other Acts, were rigidly enforced against the Roman Catholics. But, when it was once admitted, that dissent might be recognised as possible, without treason, sedition, revolution or disloyal intent, variation in divine services, in church polity, and in church rites, were overlooked, and were ultimately tolerated, and they were admitted not to fall within the penal provision of this statute of Elizabeth. It was so held by Lord Selborne, in the case I have mentioned. It is true, that the judgment of the Pope has not, in England, nor in Ireland to-day, so far as the Roman Catholics are concerned, the force of a judgment of an ordinary civil tribunal. There are no means, except those which belong to him, as the moral head, to enforce his conclusion; there are no means of enforcing obedience to his judgments, except excommunication or exclusion from the church's privileges, but that he may (as Lord Selborne said) be appealed to, and that he is a moral arbitrator, acting according to certain judicial principles, and that he has the right so to act, and that the Roman Catholics of the United Kingdom have a right so to appeal to him, is beyond all question. We have here submitted to us in this amendment, and in the speeches which have been delivered in its defence, a proposition as to whether the law is in that respect the same in this country, or whether the Roman Catholics of the Province of Quebec are more restricted in their rights than the Roman Catholics in the United Kingdom. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the rule which I have quoted from Lord Selborne came into being after the statute of Elizabeth was relaxed, when the dissent from the Establishment was permitted, and when a large portion of the population of the United Kingdom were privileged to worship in some other form or way than according to the Establishment without having their civil rights impaired or their liberties interfered with. Now, Quebec received its law from the King, subject to the terms granted in the capitulation. There was no statute of Elizabeth in force and that statute was not carried to any one of the colonies. I might quote the view of Lord Mansfield, whose authority is unquestioned both in judicial decisions and in a letter addressed to Mr. Grenville, the Prime Minister, in 1764, in which he says that the penal laws of the United Kingdom are never carried to a colony as part of the common law they take with them. If that is so in a colony settled by the people of England, it is much more so in the case of a colony that is secured by conquest. Such a law cannot operate, as the hon. the Minister of Justice pointed out last evening, unless it would be by the abrogation of all those rights that were ceded by capitulation and contained in the Treaty of 1763. Now, we have in the Act 14 George III, chapter 83, this provision:

"For the more perfect security and ease of the minds of the inhabitants of the said Province, it is hereby declared, that His Majesty's subjects professing the religion of the Church of Rome, of and in the said Province of Quebec, may have, hold, and enjoy the free exercise of the religion of the Church of Rome, subject to the King's supremacy, declared and established by an Act made in the first year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, over all the dominions and countries which then did, or thereafter should belong to the Imperial Crown of this realm; and that the clergy of the said church may hold, receive and enjoy

their accustomed dues and rights with respect to such persons only as shall profess the said religion."

The whole Act of Elizabeth is not introduced by this, but only those provisions, I think sections 7 and 8, which relate solely to the question of the Sovereign's supremacy, and that supremacy is not affected, as Lord Selborne points out, by an appeal to the Pope as the spiritual head of the Roman Catholic Church, who, in deciding questions relating to the church over which he has jurisdiction not incompatible with the civil law, acts as a moral arbitrator. Of course, the position of the Roman Catholic Church in the Province of Quebec is not altogether that of a voluntary association; it has certain connections with the State. It is not true that we have an entire separation between Church and State in all the Provinces of this Dominion. The Roman Catholic Church in the Province of Quebec occupies a somewhat anomalous position. Under the Quebec Act and ever since, that church has been allowed to collect tithes from its members, but not from members of other religious persuasions. The collection of those tithes, for the purposes mentioned, imposes on the church certain obligations. For instance, a case has been decided in the Quebec courts in which a resident of a parish who had paid his church rates, insisted on the curé, with whom he had some difference, baptising his child, and the curé refused; and a judgment was given enforcing the rights of the parishioner as against his ecclesiastical superior. And so with regard to other matters, in so far as the church enjoys certain special advantages, the civil authorities have a right to see that the corresponding obligations are properly enforced whenever the question is raised. It was on this ground that judgment was given for the burying of Guibord within the ground usually regarded as consecrated. In discussing this question the court said:

"Nor do their Lordships think it necessary to pronounce any opinion upon the difficult questions which were raised in the argument before them touching the precise *status* at the present time of the Roman Catholic Church in Canada. It has, on the one hand, undoubtedly, since the cession, wanted some of the characteristics of an established church; whilst, on the other hand, it differs materially in several important particulars from such voluntary religious societies as the Anglican Church in the Colonies or the Roman Catholic Church in England. The payment of *dîmes* to the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church by its lay members, and the ratability of the latter to the maintenance of parochial cemeteries, are secured by law and statutes. These rights of the church must beget corresponding obligations, and it is obvious that this state of things may give rise to questions between the laity and the clergy which can only be determined by the municipal courts. It seems, however, to their Lordships to be unnecessary to pursue this question, because, even if this church were to be regarded merely as a private and voluntary religious society, resting only upon a concensical basis, Courts of Justice are still bound, when due complaint is made that a member of the society has been injured as to his rights, in any matter of a mixed spiritual and temporal character, to enquire into the laws or rules of the tribunal or authority which has inflicted the alleged injury.—207-208. Their Lordships conceive that if the Act be questioned in a Court of Justice, that Court has a right to enquire, and is bound to enquire, whether that Act was in accordance with the law and rules of discipline of the Roman Catholic Church which obtain in Lower Canada, and whether the sentence, if any, by which it is sought to be justified was regularly pronounced by any authority competent to pronounce it."

And so far, on account of its special rights, making it to a limited extent a State Church, it has imposed upon it certain obligations, and so far these may be brought before the ordinary civil tribunals for the purpose of their enforcement. But, beyond this, there is no connection; beyond this, it is purely a voluntary association, and it has the same right of appeal to the Pope as the spiritual head of the church that any other church would have to appeal to the constituted authority of that church. It is not a national, it is a Catholic Church, that is, its authority extends, regardless of political boundaries, over all those who profess its faith. Now, to deny that right, so far as Lord Selborne lays it down—and that is as far as it is asserted in this particular case—would be to say to those of the Roman Catholic persuasion: Although you may have

8

your notions of church polity, which are not the same as ours, yet you are not at liberty to assert them; because you believe that a church may have boundaries wider than those of other churches, you are to be limited by political considerations to the limits of a particular state. I say that would be an intolerable rule. If the Presbyterian Church of Canada to-day chose to connect itself with that of the United States, I do not know any law that would prevent it establishing its ecclesiastical courts to which both bodies would be subject; and, in so far as the civil tribunal might be called on to adjudicate on questions relating to those courts, those questions might be disposed of in so far as they might be connected with the material affairs of either country. Now, let me call the attention of the hon. member for North Simcoe to this. The Government of England has legislated upon this subject. At the time of the American Revolution there was no Episcopal bishop in the colonies now the United States. After the revolution, the Episcopal churches of the independent colonies required spiritual heads; they required bishops in the Episcopal churches of the United States. How were they to get them? They were separated from England, and the English Parliament had no longer any jurisdiction over them. The result was that, after a good deal of hesitation, Parliament legislated, and passed the Act 26 George III, chapter 84, authorising the Archbishop of Canterbury to ordain bishops for the Episcopal churches within the independent Republic of the United States. There was Parliament itself, on account of the connection between Church and State, undertaking to exercise what might be regarded as a legislative and spiritual jurisdiction in a foreign country; and they hesitated so long, if I recollect rightly, that the Scotch bishops ordained the first bishops before the Act of Parliament came into operation. The United States never took any offence, so far as I know, at that Act, and never claimed that it was a usurpation of supremacy or an interference with their sovereignty. The Archbishop of Canterbury, in this respect, did everything that the Pope has done throughout Christendom in the ordination of bishops in the Roman Catholic Church. Now let me take another case. There was the appointment of a bishop at Jerusalem, for Syria and the countries of the east, by the English Church. Parliament authorised that appointment. It was the exercise, according to the hon. gentleman's view, of sovereign authority within the dominion of the Sultan of Turkey; and the only ground of embarrassment with them was whether the Greek Church, as well as the Church of England, being part of the general Catholic Church, would be offended and think that the English Church were interfering with their jurisdiction; and so the Archbishop of Canterbury addressed a letter to the Bishop of Jerusalem, warning him that he was to cultivate a spirit of Christian charity and of good understanding with the authorities of the Greek Church in that particular section of the country. But to set up the doctrine laid down by the hon. gentleman here, based on the Act of the Queen's supremacy, would be to deny to all churches having a particular form of church polity, the privilege of extending their views of Christianity over the habitable world. I would like to know, according to his view, how it would be possible to obey the Divine command to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. The hon. gentleman would arrest every minister of the Gospel under that theory, who would undertake to preach beyond the limits of the country to which he belonged. I dare say some hon. gentleman will remember when the Methodist Episcopal body in this country formed a part of the Methodist body of the United States, when they had no bishop in Canada, when their conference was held in the State of New York——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I remember that well.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell)—when their ministers were sent to the Province of Ontario, and when, on account of the sympathies of those ministers with liberal views and their opposition to the connection between Church and State, they were charged with being American emissaries in this country. But I never knew any one who pretended to say it was an act of sedition on their part to come into this country for the purpose of preaching the Gospel. If there had been a State Church in the United States, and had they been sent here by the President, the hon. gentleman might, perhaps, argue as he has on this question, but where are the estates of the church? Where are the possessions of the Pope that give him anything like temporal dominion? His authority rests solely upon the implicit acceptance of his teaching and his views by those who profess to be members of the society of which he is the head, and to say that he shall not ordain a minister or send him to this country, to say that the Roman Catholics in this country may not make him their arbitrator to decide questions of difference, to decide how property, which the only party competent to decide says rightly belongs to them, shall be distributed, would be to place Roman Catholics, not on a footing of equality, but on a footing of inferiority to those who are members of other churches. The hon. gentleman argued, from opinions expressed by a writer in the *Quarterly*, that the views entertained by the Jesuit Order were such as they are represented to be. Now, I do not know what their views may be. I do not care. I am not a keeper of their consciences, and so I do not interest myself in them; but I deny altogether that this Parliament has a right to constitute itself an ecclesiastical tribunal or council for the purpose of seeing whether their views are right or wrong. We may decide for ourselves in our individual capacities, but we are not endowed with any power of that sort, and I do not think any Protestant would care to be judged by any such rule. I was interested, in looking over the speeches made many years ago in the House of Common (England), when it was said that certain members of the Church of England were adopting Armenian views, and one speaker, Mr. Rouse, declared that these persons were emissaries of the Church of Rome. He said:

"I desire it may be considered how the See of Rome doth eat into our religion, and fret into the very banks and walls of it, the laws and statutes of this realm. I desire we may consider the increase of Armenianism, an error that makes the grace of God lackey after the will of man. I desire that we may look into the belly and bowels of this Trojan horse, to see if there be no men in it ready to open the gates to Romish tyranny, for an Armenian is the spawn of a papist, and if the warmth of favor come upon him, you shall see him turn into one of those frogs, that rose out of the bottomless pit: these men having kindled a fire in our neighbor country are now endeavoring to set this kingdom in a flame."

Now, we know that a large portion of the Protestant community in this country are Armenians; and if we are to judge by the public meetings and the discussions which have taken place on this question, they are as far from Roman Catholicism as any other section of the community. Anyone who remembers something of the history of Holland, will remember how Grotius, because he was an Armenian, was carried out of the country in a cask; and how John Barnaveldt was carried into another world on a scaffold because he was an Armenian, and for the very reasons given by Mr. Rouse that the doctrines they were teaching would necessarily lead to the restoration of Roman Catholicism. There is nothing, in my judgment, more mischievous than to undertake to pass judgment upon the religious opinions of any portion of the community in a popular assembly and make those opinions the pretext for withholding rights and for imposing disabilities. We have, irrespective of religious opinion in this House, occasionally given aid to Mission Schools. We have aided the Presbyterian Mission Schools, the Methodist Mission Schools, the English Church Mission Schools, the Roman Catholic Mission Schools, and I have never heard any one say that because we did so, as a matter of expediency for the present, and becauseit was better to establish these schools among the Indians, for the time being, than public schools, that this Government was connected with a church or in favor of any particular church on that account. I am not the least afraid that, if we have an open field and fair play, Protestantism is likely to suffer in this country, in consequence of the aggressions, or attributed aggressions of the Roman Catholic Church. I have no doubt whatever, that in a fair field Protestantism will be able to hold its own, and it will succeed just in proportion as it is actuated by the spirit of toleration and fairness, which will serve rather to draw men towards it and secure a favorable consideration for those religious views that it seeks to enunciate, rather than the spirit of intolerance which will repel men from it. How can we secure a fair hearing for our dogmas from our Roman Catholic friends if we do that which they think is unfair to them, and if we undertake to deny to them privileges that we maintain for ourselves? I am not disposed to confer upon any Roman Catholic institution in this country privileges that I would withhold from any Protestant institution of a similar character. I believe that the more clearly the line of separation is drawn between Church and State, the better it will be for all classes in this country, but I admit that I am unable to interfere or to assist in drawing that line in any Province except in the Province of which I am a member. I have the right to exercise my privileges as an elector, and if the policy that has been carried out is one that I think detrimental to the public interest I may, in that capacity, oppose it; but I have no right, from my place in this House, to undertake to do for the people of another Province what I can only do legitimately in my own Province, as an elector of that Province. And so, the more clearly we have impressed upon our minds the fact that each Province must take care of itself, that it must entirely separate the Church from the State for itself, that with that we have nothing to do, that, except by usurpation, we cannot interfere, the sooner we can have clearly impressed upon our minds this line of action, and the more steadily we adhere to it the better it will be for all parties concerned. The early founders of our Christian religion were men in rather poor circumstances, and occupying very humble social positions. Their influence, at the beginning, was with the humbler classes, with Jewish hucksters and with slaves of the Roman Empire. They gradually, in the course of three centuries, worked their way up through every grade of society until the Emperor himself became a convert to the Christian system. At first they had the best organised Government the world has ever seen, hostile to them. If they were able, by their industry, their zeal, their self-denial and their devotion, to what they believed to be the cause of religious truth, to overcome such obstacles and conquer such difficulties, there is no danger that Protestantism in this country, if its ministers are true to the profession of their faith—and, remember, that they are to know nothing else except Christ, and Him crucified—if they are true to their faith and their high calling, and preach the Gospel instead of politics, I am perfectly satisfied that Protestantism will have nothing to fear. I am as ready as any member of this House to resist encroachment. Why should it be otherwise? If I, as many others here are doing at this moment, take a position which many of our friends may not concur in, because they have been misinformed, if I would not be disposed to do wrong to serve the interests of my own friends, and those with whom I sympathise, why should I endanger my political position to promote the religion of a portion of the community which I believe to be, in many respects, erroneous? Let those answer who accuse us of pandering to the Roman Catholics. I do not pretend to judge for them.

I judge for myself. I accord to them the same freedom I claim for myself, and I would rather, a hundred-fold, be the victim of the wrongful judgment of others, than myself become the instrument of wrong to any portion of my fellow-countrymen.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CHARLTON. I feel called upon, before recording the vote I shall give upon the motion now in your hands, to explain the reasons that will actuate me in voting for that motion. I feel that, in doing this, I am separating myself from the majority of my friends in this House, that I am acting with a minority, and probably with a very small minority, of its members; and, were I to look at this question purely from the standpoint of its value in votes, I should no doubt feel perfectly content to give a silent vote, and a vote with the majority. My convictions, however, forbid my voting in this way. I realise that the position I take is an unpopular one in this House. I realise, also, that the position I take will quite possibly send me to private life after the expiration of this Parliament but I feel bound from conviction of duty to take the course I propose to take in reference to this matter. Many of the gentlemen who have addressed the House upon this question have professed to be able to do so entirely independent of all feeling of a religious character. They have professed to be able to divest themselves of all prejudices or bias resulting from their religious belief. I do not know that I will claim to be able to do this. I presume that I am swayed and influenced in the course I take in this matter by my education, by my religious belief, and I approach the consideration of this question, I am free to admit, from the standpoint and influenced by the belief of a Protestant; and, although I shall endeavor to be, and I believe I shall succeed in being, impartial in this matter, I do not, I repeat, believe I shall be able to divest myself entirely of all influences that religious training and religious belief may be calculated to exert in reference to it. I feel that this is a question of very great importance, and one of far-reaching consequence, and I feel that it is a question upon which men should act from conviction, upon which men should act in the way they believe they are required to act in the best interests of their country and for the purpose of securing the best results as to the future welfare and the future well-being of that country. This question has been discussed from a legal standpoint fully and ably. The views of those who are opposed to the action of the Government in this matter, the views of those who will support the motion of my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), were most ably presented to the House and to the country by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). The defence of the Government was made in a brilliant and able effort by the Minister of Justice, and the effort of the Minister of Justice was ably seconded by the scholarly and profound argument of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I shall not attempt to traverse the ground traversed by these gentlemen. My education perhaps does not fit me for an exhaustive disquisition upon the character of this measure from a legal standpoint, and I shall endeavor to present the case from a layman's standpoint, and to present the reasons which influence me in the course which I shall take upon this great question.

There is one feature of this case that has not yet been dwelt upon, at least, to any considerable extent—I refer to the peculiar ethnologic conditions of this Dominion. When the younger Pitt, in 1791, erected the two Provinces in Canada, granting to one Province the use of the French language, French laws, French customs and institutions, giving to the other Province the English language, English laws, and English institutions, avowedly for the purpose of creating two rival, jealous, and, in a sense, hostile Provinces, that the catastrophe that had occurred a few years before, when the thirteen colonies revolted from the British Crown, might not recur again; when, I say, that he erected these two Provinces upon these divergent lines for this avowed purpose, he certainly succeeded most admirably in creating two Provinces with mutual contrasts in language and in the essential characteristics of nationality. These Provinces are not only diverse in race and in language, but also in religion, and the dominant church in the Province of Quebec is a political factor of the very highest importance in this Dominion. It naturally exercises its power and its great influence for the purpose of forwarding its own interests and designs. It does this, Sir, with sleepless vigilance, it does it with consummate ability, and it has been enabled to exercise a most powerful influence upon the destinies and upon the politics of the Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, as I say, this power is exerted for the furtherance of its purposes, as is most natural. I do not complain of this, I do not say that it is to be expected that any other course would be taken by the French Catholic Church of Canada, I would not say that it was in the interest of Canada, but it is not unnatural that the church should do this. The Minister of Justice last night, in the course of his speech on this question, in defending Mr. Mercier in the course he has taken in regard to the Jesuit estates, alluded to one fact which exemplifies, in the most vivid light imaginable, the great influence and power of that church in the Province of Quebec. He told us that the Jesuit estates held by the Government of Quebec to be Government property, held by them to be a property in which the Jesuits' fraternity had no legal right, to which they had no legal claim, notwithstanding the position of the Government in regard to these estates, the Government was unable to sell this property, that it had been offered for sale and no purchasers could be procured. Why, Sir? Because the power of this church was so great that men did not dare, or would not, as they were deterred by the influence of the church, purchase this property; the power of this church was so great that estates held by the Government to be the property of the Crown, to be a property to which the church and the Jesuit fraternity had no legal claims, could not be sold in consequence of the opposition of the church to their sale. Well, nothing could exemplify more vividly the great influence of this society than this fact referred to by the Minister of Justice.

Sir, I referred, a moment ago, to the peculiar ethnologic conditions of this Dominion. Now, no man, I presume, in this House or in this country, would for a moment assert that it was not in the interest of the country that homogeneity, that assimilation, should be promoted. But the question is, how can this result be obtained? How can the diverse races of this Dominion be made homogeneous, how can they be made to assimilate? It is desirable that such should be done. Every man who wishes to see the Dominion of Canada become a great nation, must desire to see the races occupying this country acting in concert, acting in harmony, and to a much greater extent than at present made homogeneous. I hold, Mr. Speaker, that any measure that will retard the realisation of this desire for the assimilation of these races, that any measure that will, on the contrary, have a tendency to set them wider asunder, that will have a tendency to create and foster animosities and the jealousies that are natural to the existence of two such races, is a measure that should be deprecated, is a measure that should be opposed by every lover of his country in this Dominion. Now, events as they are developed have hitherto had a tendency, in some respects, to put these two races wider apart, and this very tendency, in face of the desire of those who wish to see a homogeneous people and a great nation, this very tendency to drive

these two races apart, awakens alarm in the breasts of tens of thousands of people in this country; and the desire to avert this tendency, the desire to bring the races nearer together, to secure greater harmony and action between them, is a patriotic desire, by whomsoever it may be entertained.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As in Ireland.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not as in Ireland, but as in Canada, with the hopes of the future before us, with the desire to create a great nation, with a desire to have a nation, not inhabited by two races pulling in different directions, jealous of each other, and seeking, the one to crowd the other out of the race, not as in Ireland, but as we hope to see it in Canada, with every influence set aside that would work against the realisation of this dream. Now, Sir, there are in the agitation that exists to day, great forces beneath the surface; there are undercurrents that we do not see, the power of which, perhaps, we do not realise; there is an undercurrent that is proceeding from this very desire that this should be a homogeneous people, a desire to lift this nation up to a higher plane with a common purpose, to create a great free state. The question that agitates the mind of the people, that creates the interest in this matter which we are discussing here to-day, is, shall the Dominion of Canada be Saxon or shall it be Celtic? Or shall it be both Saxon and Celtic for all time to come? Shall the two races live together in harmony, or shall they live apart? Shall this be one country, or shall there be a disruption? The question is one of great magnitude, the question is one the importance of which cannot be over estimated, and the issue, Sir, is one that cannot be shirked. Now, these are British Provinces. The design was that these should be Anglo-Saxon commonwealths, and the tendency to foster an intense spirit of French nationality, a tendency made more pronounced by the fact that that nationality has a national church which naturally fosters that feeling in the promotion of its own interests, is a tendency that we must all deprecate, is a tendency that we do not wish to see aggravated, is a tendency that those who have the good of their country at heart would rather see mitigated if not removed.

Mr. AMYOT. Oh! oh!

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend on my left laughs. Well, perhaps he would not wish to see it removed, perhaps he would rather see the difficulties intensified. I would rather see them removed; I would rather see these two races live in harmony, I would rather see them drawing closer together. I have every respect for the institutions of Quebec; I realise that the character of its institutions, the nature of its laws, and the cast of its society is, in some respects, mediæval rather than modern, but I have every sympathy for Quebec, and I have no desire to interfere with that Province in the least.

Mr. CURRAN. You do it all the same.

Mr. CHARLTON. Sir, I do not propose to do it all the same. I feel that if we desire to promote harmony between these races, the introduction of a society that sedulously fosters the seeds of discord, the history of which in every state of Christendom has shown that it is in its nature an organisation against constituted authority is a great misfortune—Sir, as a lover of this country, as a man desiring to see harmony in this country, I deprecate the introduction of that society into the political circles of Canada. It is for that reason that I, and thousands in this Dominion, deprecate the introduction of that society, deprecate the action of the Government in permitting the incorporation of that society and in permitting its endowment, foreseeing, as they believe they do foresee, in those actions future mischief and future disaster to this country. This is my belief.

Now, Sir, it is true that the Protestants of this country have been supine and nerveless for many years past as regards public questions. They have been for many years past without organisation to guard their own interests and liberties, and until quite recently there has been no distinctive and pronounced Protestant organ. Both the great political parties in this country have sought to obtain French Catholic support. The solidarity of the Catholic French party has enabled them to hold the balance of power; they have held it, they have exercised it for the advantage of their race and for the advantage of their religion, to some extent at least; and in the manipulation of this element, and in the influence wielded by this element, it reminds me at every turn of the history of the United States when the slave power—I make the comparison in no other sense except that they were a minority, and acted for their common interest—controlled the United States for 40 years, although they possessed only about one-third of the votes in the House of Representatives, controlled the United States because they acted in their own interests at every turn, and supported first one party and then the other as circumstances incident to their own requirement made it necessary to do. We have had the Protestants, as I have said, without an organ, without an organisation, and not awake to their interests, and it is only of recent days that the people are awakening to the danger which, in the estimation of many Protestants, threaten them in this country.

I make no apology for being an Anglo-Saxon. I do not consider it a disgrace, I do not consider it even a disadvantage. I look back to the history of the race with pride, I look back to the history of that mother of nations—England—and I think it is a glorious history. I think her institutions are good institutions and that she has been a blessing to the world, and I have no apology to make for saying that I believe it. I make no apology for saying that, so far as my own Province is concerned, I would resist the introduction of that system which is peculiar to your Province, Mr. Speaker. I make no apology for saying that, in my belief, civil and religious liberty should be carefully guarded, and any encroachment upon that civil and religious liberty should be resisted, resisted strongly, resisted vigorously, resisted with courage and resisted without compromise. As regards Quebec, of course there are certain things there that I would not select as a matter of choice. I do not, for instance, think it a very great advantage to pay tithes; I am unable to see any advantage in fabrique assessments, in a church absorbing the wealth of the country and in its property being exempted from taxation; but it is none of my business. I do not propose to interfere with it.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. gentleman can see any blessing in that, he is at liberty to enjoy it. But I would interfere and resist any attempt to impose it upon a country where it was not in existence at the time; I would feel that to be my duty. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not say this in any offensive sense. Men disagree, men have different opinions, men differ in politics, and in religion, and in what they believe to be for the public interest, and they have a right to do so, and they will continue to do so until the end of time.

The Minister of Justice, last night, in referring to old English law, dwelt at very great length on the subject of obsolete laws. I almost imagined before he had concluded that there was scarcely a law in existence that was not obsolete, and that we were scarcely bound by anything on the Statute-book of England. But I think the Great Charter is not obsolete, that charter upon which we have built our liberties, upon which we have constructed British institutions, that charter under which we have responsible government and parliamentary representation, with the

people, through their representatives, controlling the expenditure of the country. The Bill of Rights is not obsolete; it is in force yet. The supremacy of the Crown, as the embodiment of the power and majesty of the people, is not obsolete. The safeguards of liberty designed by our forefathers to preserve us from encroachments are not obsolete, and the spirit of liberty is not obsolete among the English-speaking race. And it is for this reason, that the spirit of liberty exists, that the safeguards of liberty are in force, that tens of thousands of men have risen in Canada within the last two months to oppose the endowment of that order, whose interests and character we are discussing in this debate, and whose character and record I hold it proper and necessary to discuss and examine in the broadest sense possible. I hold that the incorporation of this order lies at the root of all this trouble. And it is owing to the fact to which I called attention a few moments ago, that there existed among the Protestants a great degree of supineness, and nervelessness, and of blindness to their own interests and the interests of their country, that the incorporation of that order was not resented at the time and was not prevented. Why, a few years ago, in 1873, the Orange Order was incorporated by the Legislature of Ontario. The Lieutenant Governor of that Province, who was appointed by the right hon. gentleman opposite, withheld that Bill from assent; I am unable to say whether by private advices he was instructed to do so or not, but he withheld it. But we had here the incorporation of the Order of Jesuits two years ago without any withholding of the Bill from assent, without any interference on the part of the Government, and it seems to me a monstrous thing that so loyal an order as the Orange Order, for it is unquestionably loyal, should be denied incorporation and the Jesuits should be permitted incorporation. It reminds me of a story, to the effect that an Irishman, on landing in New York, was attacked by a dog, and endeavored to pick up one of the paving stones, whereupon, on failing to do so, he said: It is a queer free country this, where the dogs are let loose and the stones are chained down. This is a queer sort of justice that incorporates the Jesuit Order and denies incorporation to the Orangemen; and I think, while I opposed at the time the incorporation of the Orangemen, on the ground that it would produce dissensions and troubles, the same reasons should have held good in the case of the Jesuit Order as well. The Minister of Justice, last night, held that the Jesuit Order had, in effect, already been incorporated. He instanced the case of the incorporation of the St. Mary's College, which had Jesuit professors, and he contended that because the clergy, forsooth, were Jesuits, this was incorporation, in point of fact, of the Jesuit Order. If a college happened to have three or four infidel professors, would it be the incorporation of the infidel order, or if the college had a few Presbyterian professors, would it be the incorporation of the Presbyterian order? The assumption was preposterous. The Minister of Justice also said that the order had previously been incorporated. If the society was incorporated in a surreptitious manner it affords me reason for saying that it should not have been done, whether it was done or not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the character of the Jesuit Order is a matter, in my opinion, which should receive the attention of this House, and the attention of this country. My hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, last night spoke somewhat sneeringly of Parliament resolving itself into a committee for the examination of theological questions, and my hon. friend, the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), asserted that Parliament had not the right to constitute itself an ecclesiastical council, to judge the Jesuits. Well, Sir, Parliament, in this matter, is neither constituting itself into a committee for the trial of a theological question, nor into an ecclesiastical council for the trial of the Jesuit Order, but Parliament is called upon, under the circumstances, to examine into the moral and the political tendencies of the order that is on trial before the people of this country. It has the right to do so, it has more than the right to do it; it is the bounden duty of Parliament to enquire as to the character of this organisation, to enquire as to whether those various charges made against this organisation in history for more than 300 years are true, or if any of these charges are true, whether it has proved to be an organisation detrimental to the interests of liberty, in every generation and in every age, or not, and if its antecedents are such as they are represented to be, it should be the duty of Parliament to examine thoroughly the question of whether that order is now what it was before. It is a question of the utmost importance; it is not a theological question; it is not an ecclesiastical question, but it is a question of the highest moment to the State. It is a question which should engage the attention of every statesman in the country; it is a question that has an intimate bearing upon the welfare of this country, and I propose, Sir, to examine that question. I propose to examine it, not that I think I am making myself a member of a committee to examine into theological tenets, not that I propose to make myself a member of an ecclesiastical committee to try a religious order, but I propose to look into the antecedents and character of this order, in order to see whether I believe that their establishment in Canada would be detrimental to the political interests of this country. I propose to examine the question in its political bearing, and in its political bearing alone. Now, Sir, this order had been in existence for nearly 250 years, when it was suppressed by the authority to which it professed to owe allegiance. I suppose the Pope was infallible then, and if Pope Clement XIV was infallible and if he suppressed the order of the Jesuits he probably had good reasons for doing so, and I think he had. I do not propose to call into question his infallibility. I do not propose to look into the question of the propriety of the step he took in dissolving that order, but I do propose to ask the attention of this House to some portions of the celebrated brief which Pope Clement XIV issued, and by which this order was disbanded. After declaring in his brief the purposes for which the order was instituted, and the various privileges granted by Paul III, and subsequent Popes, the brief of suppression goes on to say:

"Notwithstanding so many and so great favors, it appears from the Apostolical Constitutions that almost at the very moment of its institution there arose in the bosom of this society, divers seeds of discord and dissention, not only among the companions themselves, but with other irregular orders, the secular clergy, the academies, the universities, the public schools, and lastly, even with the princes of the states in which the society was received. These dissensions and disputes arose sometimes concerning the nature of their views, the time of admission to them, the power of expulsion, the right of admission to holy orders without a title, and without having taken the solemn vows, contrary to the tenor of the decrees of the Council of Trent, and of Pius V, our predecessor; sometimes concerning the absolute authority assumed by the General of the said order, and about matters relating to the good government and discipline of the order; sometimes concerning different points of doctrine, concerning their schools, or concerning such of their exemption privileges, as the ordinaries and other ecclesiastical or civil officers declared to be contrary to their rights and jurisdictions In short, accusations of the gravest nature, and very detrimental to the peace and tranquility of a Christian commonwealth have been continually brought against the said order. Hence arose that infinity of appeals and protests against this society, which so many sovereigns have laid at the foot of the Throne of our predecessors, Paul IV, Pius V, and Sixtus V. * * *

"After so many storms, troubles and divisions, every good man looked forward with impatience to the happy day which was to restore peace and tranquility. But under the reign of this same Clement XIII, the times became more full of difficulty and storm; complaints and quarrels were multiplied on every side; in some places dangerous seditions arose, tumults, discords, scandals which, weakening or entirely breaking the bounds of Christian charity, excited the faithful to all the rage of party hatred and enmities. Desolation and danger grew to such a height, that the very sovereigns, whose piety and liberality towards the society were so well known as to be looked upon as hereditary in their families—we mean our dearly beloved sons in Christ, the Kings of France, Spain,

Portugal and Sicily—found themselves reduced to the necessity of expelling, and driving from their states, kingdoms, and provinces, these very companions of Jesus; persuaded that there remained no other remedy to so great evils; and, that this step was necessary, in order to prevent Christians from rising one against another, and from massacreing each other in the very bosom of our common mother, the Holy Church. They said, our dear sons in Jesus Christ having since considered, that even this remedy was not sufficient for reconciling the whole Christian world, unless that society was absolutely abolished and suppressed, made known their demands and wishes in this matter to our said predecessor, Clement XIII. They united their common prayers and authority, to obtain that this last method might be put in practice, as the only one capable of assuring the constant repose of their subjects, and the good of the Catholic Church in general. But the unexpected death of the aforesaid Pontiff, rendered this project abortive.

"As soon as by the Divine mercy and Providence we were raised to the chair of St. Peter, the same prayers, demands, and wishes were laid before us, and strengthened by the pressing solicitations of many bishops, and other persons of distinguished rank, learning, and piety. But, that we might choose the wisest course in a matter of so much moment we determined not to be so precipitate, but to take due time; not only to examine attentively, weigh carefully, and take counsel wisely, but also by unceasing prayers to ask of the Farther of lights His particular assistance; exhorting the faithful to co-operate with us by their prayers and good works in obtaining this needful succor."

After remarking on what the Council of Trent had decided, with respect to the clergy who were members of this society, the brief proceeds:

"Actuated by so many and important considerations, and, as we hope, aided by the presence and inspiration of the Holy Spirit; compelled also by the necessity of our office, which strictly obliges us to conciliate, maintain and confirm the peace and tranquility of the Christian Commonwealth, and remove every obstacle which may tend to trouble it; having further considered that the said Society of Jesus can no longer produce these abundant fruits and those great advantages, with a view to which it was instituted, approved by so many of our predecessors, and endowed with so many and extensive privileges: that, on the contrary, it was difficult, or to say impossible, that the church could recover a firm and lasting peace so long as the said society subsisted; in consequence hereof, and determined by the particular reasons we have alleged, and forced by other motives which prudence and the good government of the church have dictated it, the knowledge of which we keep to ourselves, conforming ourselves to the example of our predecessors, and particularly to that of Gregory X, in the General Council of Lyons; the rather as in the present case we are determining upon the fate of a society classed among the mendicant orders, both its constitution and privileges; after a mature deliberation, we do, out of our certain knowledge and the fulness of our apostolical power, suppress and abolish the said society; we deprive it of all power of action whatever, of its houses, schools, colleges, hospitals, lands, and in short, every other place whatever, in whatever kingdom or Province they may be situated; we abrogate and annul its statutes, rules, customs, decrees and constitutions, even though confirmed by oath and approved by the Holy See, or otherwise; in like manner we annul all and every its privileges, favors general or particular, the tenor whereof is, and is taken to be as fully and as amply expressed in this present brief, as if the same were inserted, word for word, in whatever clauses, form or decree, or under whatever sanction, their privileges may have been conceived. We declare every authority of all kinds, the General, the Provincials, and Visitors and other superiors of the said society, to be forever annulled and extinguished, of what nature soever the said authority may be, whether relating to things spiritual or temporal."

This, Sir, is a portion of the brief of Pope Clement XIV suppressing this order. Now, Sir, I want to enquire whether it will be asserted that His Holiness the Pope of Rome, in thus suppressing this order, and in using the language he did with regard to it, was acting in ignorance—whether in his infallibility he was mistaken as to the character of this order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, I am not very well posted as to the tenets of the church, if the Pope is not held to be infallible there is a popular misapprehension upon that point. If any one in this House wishes to cast discredit on his judgment or on the motives which actuated him in issuing this brief, I have nothing to say; but I believe the Pope, in suppressing this order, acted from reason and knowledge in saying what he did in this brief, and that, in issuing it, he acted in accordance with the desire of every king and every statesman in Europe. This order has been arraigned at the bar of history, and has been condemned; I believe it deserved suppression; and I believe that Pope Clement XIV, acting at the solicitation of the various kings of Europe, suppressed it for good and sufficient reasons. Now, my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), the other night, read an extract from Macaulay regarding this order, and, as in the case of a good many other extracts, stopped just where he should have gone on. I will take up the thread of the hon. gentleman's discourse, and proceed from where he left off. At that point Lord Macaulay proceeded to say:

"But with the admirable energy, disinterestedness, and self devotion, which were characteristic of the society, great vices were mingled. It was alleged, and not without foundation, that the ardent public spirit, which made the Jesuit regardless of his ease, of his liberty and of his life, made him also regardless of truth and of mercy; that no means which could promote the interest of his religion seemed to him unlawful, and that by the interest of his religion he too often meant the interest of his society. It was alleged that, in the most atrocious plots recorded in history, his agency could be distinctly traced; that, constant only in attachment to the fraternity to which he belonged, he was in some countries the most dangerous enemy of freedom, and in others the most dangerous enemy of order. The mighty victories which he boasted that he had achieved in the cause of the church were, in the judgment of many illustrious members of that church, rather apparent than real. He had indeed labored with a wonderful show of success to reduce the world under her laws; but he had done so by relaxing her laws to suit the temper of the world. Instead of toiling to elevate human nature to the noble standard fixed by Divine precept and example, he had lowered the standard till it was beneath the average level of human nature. He gloried in multitude of converts who had been baptised in the remote regions of the East; but it was reported that from some of those converts, the facts on which the whole theology of the Gospel depends had been cunningly concealed, and that others were permitted to avoid persecution by bowing down before the images of false gods, while internally repeating paters and aves. Nor was it only in heathen countries that such arts were said to be practiced. It was not strange that people of all ranks, and especially of the highest ranks, crowded to the confessionals in the Jesuit temples; for from these confessionals none went discontented away. There the priest was all things to all men. He showed just so much rigor as might not drive those who knelt at his spiritual tribunal to the Dominican or the Franciscan Church. If he had to deal with a mind truly devout, he spoke in the saintly tones of the primitive Fathers; but with that very large part of mankind who have religion enough to make them uneasy when they do wrong, and not religion enough to keep them from doing wrong, he followed a very different system. Since he could not reclaim them from guilt, it was his business to save them from remorse. He had at his command an immense dispensary of anodynes for wounded consciences. In the books of casuistry which had been written by his brethren, and printed with the approbation of his superiors, were to be found doctrines consolatory to transgressors of every class. There the bankrupt was taught how he might, without sin, secrete his goods from his creditors. The servant was taught how he might, without sin, run off with his master's plate. The pander was assured that a Christian man might innocently earn his living by carrying letters and messages between married women and their gallants. The high-spirited and punctilious gentlemen of France were gratified by a decision in favor of duelling. The Italians, accustomed to darker and baser modes of vengeance, were glad to learn that they might, without any crime, shoot at their enemies from behind hedges. To deceit was given a license sufficient to destroy the whole value of human contracts and of human testimony. In truth, if society continued to hold together, if life and property enjoyed any security, it was because common sense and common humanity restrained men from doing what the Society of Jesus assured them that they might with a safe conscience do, so strangely were good and evil intermixed in the character of these celebrated brethren; and the intermixture was the secret of their gigantic power. That power could never have belonged to mere hypocrites. It could never have belonged to rigid moralists. It was to be attained only by men sincerely enthusiastic in the pursuit of a great end, and, at the same time, unscrupulous as to the choice of means."

Now, Sir, I spoke of this order having been banished from various countries. It was banished from England in 1579, again in 1581, again in 1586, again in 1601, again in 1604, and again in 1791; and, Sir, in view of the character of British legislation with regard to the Society of Jesuits, its existence and its presence in any part of the British realm is a contempt of law. By the Catholic Emancipation Act, 10 George IV, chapter 7, certain political disabilities were removed from the Catholics of Great Britain. The Act recites the oath which Catholics were required to take before being invested with the rights of citizenship and the right to hold office; and this Act of 1829, which is not an obsolete law, but a law still in force, which is a law paramount over all colonial laws, contains an enactment with regard to the Jesuits; and I shall take the liberty of reading sections 28, 29, 30, 31, 33 and 34. I shall read them because they have an important bearing upon the

case under discussion, because these articles, of this Emancipation Act, clearly prove that the incorporation of the Society of Jesuits is an unconstitutional Act in this country or in any other part of the British realm:

"Section 28. And whereas Jesuits and members of other religious orders, communities or societies of the Church of Rome bound by monastic or religious vows, are resident within the United Kingdom, and it is expedient to make provision for the gradual suppression and final prohibition of the same, therein, therefore be it enacted that every Jesuit and every member of any other religious order, community, or society of the Church of Rome, bound by monastic or religious vows, who, at the time of the commencement of this Act shall be within the United Kingdom shall, within six calendar months after the commencement of this Act, deliver to the clerk of peace of the county or place where such person shall reside or to his deputy, a notice or statement in the form and containing the particulars required to be set forth in the schedule to this Act annexed; which notice or statement such clerk of the peace, or his deputy, shall preserve and register amongst the records of such county or place without any fee, and shall forthwith transmit a copy of such notice or statement to the Chief Secretary of the Lord Lieutenant or other Chief Governor or Governors of Ireland, if such person shall reside in Ireland, or if, in Great Britain, to one of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, and in case any person shall offend in the premises, he shall forfeit and pay to His Majesty, for every calendar month during which he shall remain in the United Kingdom, without having delivered such notice or statement as is hereinbefore required, the sum of fifty pounds.

"Section 29. And be it further enacted, that if any Jesuit, or member of any such religious order, community or society as aforesaid, shall, after the commencement of this Act, come into this realm, he shall be deemed and taken to be guilty of a misdemeanor and being thereof lawfully convicted shall be sentenced and ordered to be banished from the United Kingdom for the term of his natural life.

"Section 30. Provided always, and be it further enacted, that in case any natural born subject of this realm, being at the time of the commencement of this Act a Jesuit, or other member of any such religious order, community or society as aforesaid, shall, at the time of the commencement of this Act be out of the realm, it shall be lawful for such person to return or come into this realm; and upon his return or coming into the realm, he is hereby required, within the space of six calendar months, to deliver such notice or statement to the clerk of the peace of the county or place where he shall reside, or his deputy, for the purpose of being so registered and transmitted, as hereinbefore directed; and in case any such person shall neglect or refuse so to do, he shall for such offence forfeit and pay to His Majesty for every calendar month during which he shall remain in the United Kingdom without having delivered such notice or statement, the sum of fifty pounds.

"Section 31. Provided also, and be it further enacted, that notwithstanding anything hereinbefore contained, it shall be lawful for any one of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, being a Protestant, by a license in writing, signed by him, to grant permission to any Jesuit or member of any such religious order, community, or society as aforesaid, to come into the United Kingdom, and to remain therein for such period as the said Secretary of State shall think proper, not exceeding in any case, the space of six calendar months, and it shall also be lawful for any one of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State to revoke any license granted before the expiration of the time mentioned therein, if he shall so think fit; and if any such person to whom such license shall have been granted shall not depart from the United Kingdom within twenty days after the expiration of the time mentioned in such license, or if such license shall have been revoked, then within twenty days after notice of such revocation shall have been given to him, every person so offending shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and being thereof lawfully convicted, shall be sentenced and ordered to be banished from the United Kingdom for the term of his natural life.

"Section 33. And be it further enacted that, in case any Jesuit, or member of any such religious order, community or society, as aforesaid, shall, after the commencement of this Act, within any part of the United Kingdom, admit any person to become a regular ecclesiastic, or brother, or member of any such religious order, community, or society, or be aiding or consenting thereto, or shall administer, or cause to be administered, or be aiding or assisting in the administering or taking any oath, vow, or engagement, purporting, or intended to bind the person taking the same to the rules, ordinances, or ceremonies of such religious order, community, or society, every person offending in the premises, in England, or Ireland, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and in Scotland shall be punished by fine and imprisonment.

"Section 34. And be it further enacted that, in case any person shall, after the commencement of this Act, within any part of this United Kingdom, be admitted, or become a Jesuit, or brother, or member of any other such religious order, community, or society, as aforesaid, such person shall be deemed and taken to be guilty of a misdemeanor, and being thereof lawfully convicted, shall be sentenced and ordered to be banished from the United Kingdom for the term of his natural life."

Now, that is the statute which imposes penalties and a fine upon any foreigner who is a Jesuit for coming into the United Kingdom, and which imposes penalties and a fine upon any person who inducts a person into the order, and upon any person who becomes a member of the order. That is taken from the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829. Now, I am unable to see, in the face of the provisions of that Act, how the incorporation of this order can be legal or constitutional either in Canada or in any other part of Her Majesty's realm. This case was referred to, some years ago, in a debate in the House of Commons. Mr. Disraeli who was then the First Minister of the Crown, stated, on the 10th of July, 1875, that:

"Although no proceedings had been taken against the Jesuits under the Act of 1829, he begged it to be understood that the provisions under the Act are not obsolete, but on the contrary are reserving powers of the law of which the government will be prepared to avail themselves if necessary."

And Mr. Gladstone, who was asked his opinion upon this matter, as to the legality of the residence of the Jesuits in England, referred his correspondents to this Act of Parliament, the provisions of which with regard to the Jesuit I have read. And the *Law Journal* of England, which contains an account of this matter, then adds:

"This Act, while it carried out the well known reform commemorated by its name, imposes restrictions on 'Jesuits and members of other religious orders, communities or societies of the Church of Rome bound by monastic or religious vows,' of which it recites it is 'expedient to provide for the gradual suppression and final prohibition.' Any of these persons, not including nuns, coming into the realm without a license which can last only six months, are, by section 29, declared guilty of a misdemeanor and may be sentenced to be banished for life. Similarly, any persons admitted within the kingdom to membership in any of the orders in question may, by section 34, be sentenced to banishment for life. If, although banished they do not go out of the country, the Sovereign in Council may have them conveyed to some place abroad. Moreover, if they are found in the country at the end of three months they may be convicted again and transported. Penal servitude is now substituted for transportation. Will this law be now enforced? Or will a charitable reserve be shown, entailing, as it naturally will do, further lawlessness."

Now, the treaty ceding Canada in 1763, provided for the freedom of the Catholic religion in this country, so far as the laws of Great Britain permitted the exercise of that religion, and the Act 14 George III, chapter 83, provided that the French Catholics in this country may exercise the religion of the Church of Rome subject to the King's supremacy. The right to exercise this provision is thus subject to the provisions of the law, and one of the provisions of that law I have called the attention of the House to with regard to the Jesuit organisation, contained in the Emancipation Act of 1829. It was claimed last night by the Minister of Justice that, at the time of the Conquest, the property of individuals was not forfeited or confiscated. It was claimed that the property of the Jesuits was not subject to forfeiture or confiscation under the terms of the Treaty of Paris ceding Canada to Great Britain. But I think it must be held that the Jesuit organisation would not be treated upon the basis of individuals, but as a corporation, and I find that the Act says:

"And be it further enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that all His Majesty's Canadian subjects within the Province of Quebec, the religious orders and communities only excepted——"

Are to have these privileges. So that the religious orders and communities were, by the terms of the cession, expressly excepted from the privileges granted to the inhabitants of the Province of Quebec, or the Province of Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What are you reading from?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am reading from 14 George III, chapter 83, the Quebec Act. All the rights possessed by the citizens of the Province of Quebec, or of old Canada, were rights delegated by the British Crown, rights expressly granted, rights clearly defined, and rights, in every case, subordinate to the supremacy of the Crown, and subordinate to the supremacy of Imperial law; and, if that Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829 contains, as I have shown, express provisions, making it a misdemeanor for a foreign Jesuit to come into England, making it a misdemeanor to induce a British subject into the Jesuit Order, making it a misdemeanor on the part of the person who

inducts him and on the part of the person who is inducted, in face of the provisions of that law, I hold that it is simply preposterous to say that the incorporation of the Order of Jesuits in British America, is a constitutional Act. If the incorporation of this order is unconstitutional, it follows, as a matter of course, that all the Acts based upon that incorporation, are unconstitutional. If the incorporation is unconstitutional, the endowment is unconstitutional, and the Jesuits' Estates Act is an unconstitutional Act, if the Incorporation Act is so.

It has been made by British law, upon more occasions than one, an unconstitutional Act to procure judgments or determinations, &c., from the See of Rome, or any foreign potentate. This legislation was first initiated under Edward III, it was continued under Richard II, again under Henry VIII. By 24 Henry VIII, chapter 21, penalties are imposed for procuring inhibitions, judgments and other processes from the See of Rome within the King's dominions—not alone in England Ireland and Scotland, but in any part of the King's dominions The 24 Henry VIII, chapter 21, prohibits the King, his heirs and successors, kings of the realm, and all subjects of the realm or of the dominions of the Crown, for suing for licenses, dispensations, compositions, faculties, grants, rescripts, delegations, or any other instruments in writing from the Bishop of Rome, called the Pope, or from any person or persons having or pretending to have any authority by the same. "The King, his heirs and successors," being expressly named in the Act, the reigning sovereign is bound by the prohibition; and it is not within the constitutional power of a Colonial Legislature or Governor to absolve the Crown from its provisions, or to enact or assent to any Bill violating this or any other Imperial statute in force in the colony. The Crown can only be relieved from the prohibitions of the Act by the power that imposed them, namely, the Imperial Parliament. And in 13 Elizabeth, chapter 2, and 1 Elizabeth, chapter 1, it is provided in more express terms that:

"The usurped power and jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, heretofore unlawfully claimed and usurped within this realm, and other the dominions to the Queen's Majesty belonging,"

Shall not be exercised. Neither the Treaty of Surrender, nor the Act of 1774 did more than to grant the free exercise of the Catholic religion in Canada, so far as the laws of Great Britain permit. But we are told by the Minister of Justice that a Provincial Parliament can repeal Imperial statutes as concerns itself, if I understood him aright. I do not accept this definition of the law. I do not hold that the thing formed can say to that which formed it: what doest thou? and can set aside the mandate of the power which formed it. I find in the British North America Act a provision which is antagonistic to the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. The 129th section of that Act contains the following:—

"Except as otherwise provided by this Act, all laws in force in Canada, Nova Scotia or New Brunswick at the Union, and all courts of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and all legal commissions, powers and authorities, and all officers judicial, administrative and ministerial, existing therein at the Union, shall continue in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick respectively, as if the Union had not been made; subject, nevertheless (except with respect to such as are enacted by or exist under Acts of the Parliament of Great Britain, or of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland) to be repealed, abolished or altered by the Parliament of Canada; or by the Legislature of the respective Provinces, according to the authority of the Parliament or of that Legislature under this Act."

So that, by this Constitution of British North America, by section 129, special exception is made as to this power in regard to such Acts as existed by the authority of the Parliament of Great Britain or the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland. I have here a case, if it is necessary to quote it, *ex parte* Renaud, which bears out this view. The judgment is too long to read unless it is desired, but I can send it to the Minister of Justice if he desires. I have laid down the premises, and I think they cannot be controverted that the recognition of any foreign potentate, prince or ecclesiastical, in any statute enacted within the dominions of the Crown of Great Britain, which recognises that power or its inhibitions, decress or processes, is an unconstitutional act. Now, the Estates Bill which we have under consideration does recognise His Holiness the Pope as a potentate. It treats with that potentate as to the terms of the settlement of a domestic matter in a Province of this Dominion. The Bill is passed subject to the approval of that potentate, as is shown by the language in this return of correspondence in connection with this matter. I find in the letter of Mr Mercier to Father Turgeon, dated the 1st May, 1888, in the seventh paragraph, the following language used:—

"That any agreement made between you and the Government of the Province will be binding only in so far as it shall be ratified by the Pope and the Legislature of this Province"

"By the Pope and Legislature of this Province". Sir, the Legislature not only passes a Bill subject to the Pope's approval, but this Act places public money at the disposal of His Holiness the Pope, as is shown in the same letter, in paragraph 8, which reads as follows:—

"That the amount of the compensation fixed shall remain in possession of the Government of the Province as a special deposit until the Pope has ratified said settlement, and made known his wishes respecting the distribution of such amount in this country."

Now, Sir, the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) told us the other night that this provision was a very bitter pill for the Protestants of Quebec I do not wonder that is the case. A pill that treats with His Holiness as to the terms of a domestic matter, that passes a Bill subject to the approval of His Holiness, that places public money at the disposal of His Holiness, must have been a bitter pill, as the hon. gentleman expressed it, for the Protestants of Quebec to swallow. But not only is the Bill open to these objections, but it distinctly submits the legislation of the Province of Quebec to the ratification of the Pope, as is shown by this return on page 13:

"It is also one way of commemorating, in the political history of the country, that glorious concordat, the effecting whereof would be associated with the name of your Government, as soon as the Holy Father has ratified it; that is, that the establishments of the Jesuit Fathers in this Province are always allowed, in accordance with their deserts, and if they ask for it, to participate in the grants which the Government of this Province allows to other institutions to encourage teaching, education, industries, arts and colonisation."

Now, Mr. Speaker, any law which is open to these objections, any law which calls in a foreign potentate to dictate with reference of the settlement of a domestic matter, which places moneys at his disposal, which submits legislation to his ratification, leaving him to accept or reject it—any Bill, I say, subject to these conditions, liable to these objections, is a Bill which, under the law I have quoted bearing upon the question of the Queen's supremacy in the British realms, is clearly unconstitutional and clearly contrary to the spirit and to the letter of the English law. The Minister of Justice told us last night that the only objections to this Bill were contained in the preamble. He did not deny that there were some objectionable features in the preamble of this Bill, but the preamble, he said, was not really a portion of the Bill, and consequently the Bill was not subject to that objection. But I find, Sir, that the Bill itself refers to this preamble, and if the hon. gentleman will turn to sections 1 and 2 of that Bill, he will find that those sections read as follows:—

"1. The aforesaid arrangements entered into between the Premier and the Reverend Father Turgeon are hereby ratified, and the Lieutenant Governor in Council is authorised to carry them out according to their forms and tenor."

Section 2 says:

"2. The Lieutenant Governor in Council is authorised to pay out of any public moneys at his disposal, the sum of $400 000 in the manner and under the conditions mentioned in the documents above cited, and

to make any deeds that he may deem necessary for the full and entire execution of such agreement."

So the objectionable features contained in the preamble are embodied in the Bill, specially referred to in the Bill, confirmed in the Bill, and form in point of fact a portion of the Bill itself. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is asserted by Mr. Mercier, it is admitted, I believe, by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, it is not disputed, so far as I am aware, by anyone, that the Jesuits had no legal right to these estates. My hon. friend the member for Bothwell sought to break the force of the arguments with reference to the want of any legal claim on the part of the Jesuit Society, sought to break the force of the payment of money to the order of the Pope, by referring to the Clergy Reserve case, by speaking of the commutation of the Clergy Reserves having been paid by the Government of Canada to certain ecclesiastical bodies. Well, Sir, the cases are not parallel. No claim was set up in that instance that these ecclesiastical bodies had not a legal claim. On the contrary that claim was admitted, there was a commutation of this claim, and the money was paid to them under that commutation. But that is not a parallel claim to this present case, where there was no legal claim, where no legal demand could possibly be made on the part of the Jesuit organisation for the payment of money. Now, I have referred before to the fact of these estates being the property of the Crown. I have referred to the Act of 1774, which specially exempted the ecclesiastical corporations from participation in the rights and annuities that pertained to individuals, and the property of the corporations was undoubtedly the property of the Crown. Foreign corporations could not hold property in Canada; they could not hold property then, they could not hold property in Canada till a very recent period. The fact that this was a religious order that had been endowed with its lands by the King of France, places this corporation in such a position that its rights were forfeited when the conquest took place, and the forfeiture was completed when the order was expelled. We have an instance recorded, a case brought to trial within recent years, where it was decided that a foreign corporation could not hold property in the Province of Quebec except by virtue of special legislative action, the case of the Chaudière Gold Mining Co. *vs.* George Desbarats which was before the Privy Council in 1873. It was held:

"That, by the law of the Province of Quebec, corporations are under a disability to acquire lands without the permission of the Crown or the authority of the Legislature, that a foreign corporation could not purchase lands in said Province without such permission or authority, and had no action for damages against the vendor."

There can be no question about the loss of title by the Jesuit Order. In 1841, when this property was dealt with, it was the property of the Crown, and there can be no doubt that between 1841 and 1867, when the Provinces entered into Confederation, this particular property was appropriated to the schools of the Province of Quebec, and there can be no doubt that this property having been appropriated to the school funds of the Province, it was unconstitutional to divert it to other sources and use it for other purposes.

Now, there is another objection to this settlement which leads me to believe that it cannot be a final settlement. Other demands may be made. Subsequent events may show that the lands were sold for more than was anticipated The Jesuits may fall back on the estimation of the value made at one time which was about $400,000, and may claim more if the property sells for more. The correspondence, if carefully scrutinised, will lead one to the conclusion that we are not by any means in a position where we can be sure that this case is finally closed. There is one piece of property which is considered as part of the Jesuits' estates, the Champ de Mars, which is Dominion property. There is Laprairie Common, which has been passed over to the Jesuits but held to be Dominion property. It has been occupied by the Dominion Government as a parade ground for many years, and they have the right of possession at least. I assert my belief that the common of Laprairie is Dominion property, which has been granted to the Order of the Jesuits by the Province of Quebec. The correspondence with regard to this matter, if it is carefully scrutinised, will lead us to the opinion that it is far from being settled. I find in the letter from the Premier of Quebec to Father Turgeon, dated 1st May, the following clause:—

"That you will grant to the Government of the Province of Quebec in full, complete and perpetual concession of all the property which may have belonged in Canada, under whatever title, to the fathers of the old society, and that you will renounce to all rights generally whatsoever upon such property and the revenues therefrom in favor of our Province, the whole, as well in the name of the old Order of Jesuits, and of your present corporation as in the name of the Pope, of the Sacred College of the Propaganda and of the Roman Catholic Church in general."

To this letter the Rev. Father replied on 8th of May as follows:—

"The Government of the Province of Quebec will receive a full, complete and perpetual concession of all the property which may have belonged in Canada, by whatever title, to the fathers of the old society, and the Jesuit fathers will renounce all rights generally whatsoever upon such property and the revenues therefrom in favor of the Province, the whole, in the name of the Pope, of the Sacred College of the Propaganda and of the Roman Catholic Church in general."

What does that amount to? The Society of Jesus gives a quit claim for all its property to the Province of Quebec. Part of that property, the Champ de Mars, valued at $1,024,000 is the property of the Dominion; and we shall have in due time, perhaps, Mr. Mercier coming to Ottawa with a demand for the settlement of his claim against the Dominion Government for the value of the Champ de Mars because of this transaction, and because a quit claim was given by His Holiness the Pope in behalf of the Jesuits. If the argument of the Minister of Justice is correct, if the Jesuits have a title to this property that claim would be good; and if this Bill becomes law we are exposing ourselves to the possible contingency of having the Province of Quebec make a claim on the Dominion for the value of that portion of the Jesuits' estates known as the Champ de Mars. And then we have the other possibility of the Society of Jesus coming to the Dominion and demanding the value of the Laprairie Common, which has been granted it by the Province of Quebec, but which is probably the actual property of the Dominion of Canada. We are leaving ourselves open to further demands with respect to this matter; and I believe for this consideration, if there were no others, it would be proper and prudent to disallow this Bill. The other objection I have to this Bill is, that I hold it to be in the highest degree dangerous and improper to make grants to religious bodies. If you once open the door, if once you permit that species of operation to be commenced in this country, there is no human wisdom that can tell where it eventually will end. Can any one believe that this grant made to the Society of the Jesuits by the Province of Quebec has no connection whatever with political exigencies? Can anyone doubt that seeking political influence has something to do with this matter, and if it has been the motive in one case, may it not be the motive in another? Are we not opening the door to great evils that will be introduced if we permit this sort of influence to be inaugurated, if we permit an arrangement made between the Premier of the Province of Quebec and the Society of Jesus, by which the Jesuits are endowed with $400,000 upon a most doubtful claim—what may be the next thing? I believe upon the ground that this Bill paves the way to further demands for religious grants that may be successfully pressed when votes and influence are badly needed by some political party that it endangers the interests of this country, and for this, if for no other reason, this Act should be disallowed.

I have now concluded with the constitutional aspect of this case. I hold that the incorporation of the Society of Jesus is unconstitutional because the existence of that society is probibited by English law. In England the Jesuits' society is an illegal body; the initiation into the Society of Jesus of a member is illegal, it is illegal on the part of the man who does it, and it is illegal for the one initiated. They are under pains and penalties, it is an unconstitutional society, it is under the ban of English law; and that being the case, it is not an order that can be constitutionally incorporated in any part of the British realm. Then I hold that the Jesuits' Estates Act, being predicated upon, that Act, is itself necessarily unconstitutional. It is unconstitutional further in the fact that it calls in a foreign potentate, recognises him, places money at his disposal, places a piece of legislation at his disposal to ratify or to set aside, and in that respect it is clear that it is in contravention of British law and British supremacy. For these reasons I hold that the measure is clearly unconstitutional, and as such should be without delay disallowed by the Government of this Dominion.

But even if it was constitutional, even if the whole argument I have constructed so far was baseless and was swept away, and if this measure was shown to be constitutional, constitutional as regards the Bill, constitutional in being founded on a constitutional Act, permitting the incorporation of the Society of Jesus, yet I hold that, as a question of public policy, the measure should be disallowed. The position which the Liberals of this country occupy in this case is briefly this: They take high ground in defence of provincial rights; they take high ground upon the question of the Dominion Government interfering with provincial legislation. And I suppose, with their views upon this case, with their record, even though they did not approve of this Bill, even if they considered it was an improper Bill, they would not counsel and support the proposition to disallow the Bill, on the ground that it was interfering with provincial rights. But whether it is desirable that the Government should be debarred from the exercise of the prerogative of this disallowance, is an abstract question; whether it would be a good thing to reconstruct our constitution and to bar the Government from the exercise of that privilege or not, I do not venture to say, but I do say that the right exists and is clearly conferred on the Government. And further, the right has been repeatedly exercised. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in the course of his argument said that the prerogative of disallowance was not essential to the maintenance of our constitution, and he said that in the United States no such prerogative of disallowance was permitted on the part of the Central Government, that the remedy there lay in an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. That is perfectly true. But the hon. gentleman is aware that there is a vast difference between the structure of the Dominion constitution and that of the United States. The principle of the United States Government I believe is that the State is sovereign, within its own proper sphere, and all the powers exercised by the Government of the United States are powers delegated by the States, which in their individual capacity as States ratified the original constitution, and must ratify all amendments to the same, and every power not thus specially delegated to the Central Government by the constitution is reserved to the States. What is the case in the Dominion of Canada? All powers not specially granted to the several Provinces by the British North American Act are reserved to the Dominion and any Act passed by a Provincial Legislature may be disallowed by the Privy Council. That is the difference between the two. We had in this country a Legislative Union and we parted with that and entered into Confederation, and whether it was wise or whether it was unwise to invest the Government at Ottawa with the power of disallowance or not, this Government can exercise the power, it has exercised the power, and it has in repeated instances put that power into operation. It has done it in the case of railway legislation in Manitoba, and it has done it in the case of the Streams Bill, and numerous other cases. I am willing to admit that this power should be exercised with the utmost caution; I am willing to admit that the plainest and most palpable reasons should exist for the exercise of this power, but I am ready to assert, Sir, that there has never been a case in the history of the Dominion of Canada where, upon broad constitutional grounds, and having due regard to the general interests of the great mass of the people of this country, it was more proper to disallow a Bill, than in this particular instance; and that the settlement of the Jesuits' Estates Act was, above all other measures that have ever come under the cognisance of this Government, a measure that should be disallowed. My hon. friend the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that there are two classes of cases where disallowance is warrantable, and one is the case where the Bill is clearly unconstitutional. This is a case of that kind; this Bill is clearly unconstitutional in my opinion. He says the other case is where a Bill is not in the interest of the entire Dominion. Well, this case covers this Bill also. The Bill is clearly unconstitutional and it is clearly not in the interest of the Dominion, and so, by the hon. gentleman's own logic, this Bill should be disallowed. This power of veto is clearly a constitutional power which may be exercised by the Government, which the Government has the right to exercise, which the Government has exercised in former cases, and which, in my opinion, in view of the character of this Bill, and of the probable future consequences of allowing this Bill to become law, the Government ought, upon the highest ground of public interest, to disallow.

Now, as I said some time ago in considering this question of disallowance, in considering as to whether it is proper to do so or not, the Government were warranted in investigating the character of the Jesuits. I have a list here of the countries from which this order had been expelled before its suppression by Clement XIV. They were expelled from the following countries at the dates mentioned:—

Saragosa	1555	Moravia	1619
La Palintine	1555	Naples and Netherlands	1622
Venice	1568	China and India	1623
Avignon	1570	Malta	1634
Portugal and Segovia	1578	Russia	1723
England	1579	Savoy	1729
England	1581	Paraguay	1733
England	1586	Portugal	1759
Japan	1587	France	1764
Hungary and Transylvania	1588	Spain	1767
Bordeaux	1589	The Two Sicilies	1767
France	1594	Parma and Malta	1768
Holland	1596	All Christendom by the Bull of Clement XIV.	—
Tournon and Berne	1597	Russia	1776
England	1601	France	1804
England	1604	Grisons, Swiss Canton	1804
Denmark	1606	Naples	1806
Venice	1612	France	1810
Japan	1613		
Bohemia	1618		

The order was restored by Pius VII on 7th August, 1814, and since that date this self same order has been expelled from the following countries:—

Belgium	1816	Switzerland	1847
French towns	1819	Bavaria	1848
Russia	1820	Naples and Papal States, Parma, Arch Duchy of Austria, Galica, Sardinia, Sicily	1848
Colleges in France	1828		
France	1831		
Portugal	1834	Paraguay	1858
Spain	1835	Italian towns	1859
France	1845		

Now, we are told that the character of this order has changed, forsooth; that it is not the order it was when Clement XIV suppressed it; that it is not the order it was

when nearly all the potentates of Europe agreed in demanding that it should be suppressed. "Oh, no," they say, "it is not the same order." How is it, then, that the States I have mentioned have expelled this order since it was restored in 1814? and be it remembered that fifteen of these States were Catholic States or communities. I think that is a significant fact. I doubt very much, whether, in view of that fact the argument can be made successfully, that the character of this order has been changed. What was the opinion of Cardinal Taschereau with regard to this order, when it was proposed to incorporate it two years ago? What was the opinion of Mr. Gladstone in regard to this order, so late as 1876? I find in the *Contemporary Review*, of June, 1876, that Mr. Gladstone has indicted the principles of which they are the professional exponents on these counts:

"(1) Its hostility to mental freedom at large; (2) its incompatibility with the thought and movement of modern civilisation; (3) its pretensions against the State; (4) its pretensions against parental and conjugal rights; (5) its jealousy, abated in some quarters, of the free circulation and use of the Holy Scripture; (6) the *de facto* alienation of the educated mind of the country in which it prevails; (7) its detrimental effects on the comparative strength and morality of the States in which it has sway; (8) its tendency to sap veracity in the individual mind."

Now, that is an arraignment by Mr. Gladstone of this order, the character of which we are considering to-day. In 1879 a discussion took place upon the character of this order in the French Chamber, and that discussion was referred to by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) last night. Now, Sir, I do not intend to detain the House with the speech of M. Ferry and M. Bert (since Minister of Education), M. du Bodan, M. Le Prevost and others, but the substance of it amounted to this: that the Minister of Education sent and had examined the character of the Jesuits' text books, and the character of their teachings in their schools and colleges, and the investigation made in regard to the character of that order was such as to satisfy the French Assembly, and the Department of Education in France, that the Jesuits were an order that ought not to be allowed to have anything whatever to do with education in that republic. Their principles were recognised to be incompatible with the independence of every government. They were proved to hold the same doctrines that they had held during the last 300 years. They taught the Divine right of Kings; they taught that the liberty of the press was a dangerous thing; they advocated religious wars; they attacked the Revolution and glorified the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes; they calumniated Necker and Burgot; they rejected the principles of national sovereignty; trial by jury was denounced, and liberty of conscience and worship was condemned. In one of these works, by Charles Barthelemy, the following passage, in the chapter dealing with Protestant people, disposes of English morality:—

"In London and all over England, the holiness of marriage is destroyed, bigamy is frequent, the wife is not the companion but the slave of her husband; the conjugal tie is dissolved; the children are poisoned or sold."

The subjects treated in Father Humbert's work, published in 1840, "Instructions chrétiennes pour les jeunes gens et les jeunes filles," were found to be so monstrous and filthy, according to Mr. Bert, that though the work was put into the hands of young girls—objectionable passages could not be read in the French Assembly with ladies in the gallery. Without detaining the House with the evidence placed before the Legislative Assembly in France, by the Minister of Education and others, suffice it to say that upon that evidence the Jesuits were expelled from the educational institutions of that republic. I think, Sir, I am warranted in saying that we will consult the interests of this country, present and future, if we do not permit to be established in this Dominion that organisation whose whole history is a history of turmoil, of intrigue, of mischief and of attempts to pull down and destroy constitutional authority wherever they have been placed. Sir, we do not want an organisation in this country that will widen the breach that exists between the two great races in Canada; we do not want an organisation in this country, the influence exerted by which will be so detrimental to the best interests of this country present and future.

I have been requested, Mr. Speaker, before closing to read this resolution placed in my hands; a resolution adopted at a special meeting of the Protestant Ministerial Association in Montreal held this morning, it says:

"At a special meeting of the Protestant Ministerial Association of Montreal, held this morning, attention was drawn to certain statements made on the floor of the House of Commons, during the debate on the Jesuits' Estates Act, by the hon. member for Stanstead (C. C. Colby), who is reported to have stated that he represents the feelings of the Protestants of Quebec; that they have made no complaint; presented no petition and sought no redress from supposed wrongs, that, in fact, the Protestants have no grievances, but are treated with more justice, liberality and generosity than any minority in the world.

"Therefore be it resolved—

"That the Ministerial Association repudiate the hon. member's claim to represent the feelings of the Protestant community of the Province of Quebec. That it is entirely incorrect to say that no petitions have been presented against the measure in favor of the Jesuits, inasmuch as this Association presented a petition against the incorporation of the Jesuits in 1887, to the Legislature of Quebec, and petitions to the Governor General in Council for the disallowance of the Jesuits' Estates Act, have been presented from this Association, from the Rev. the Presbytery of Montreal, from the Dominion Evangelical Alliance, and by some 6,000 citizens from the city of Montreal and other parts of the Province of Quebec. The matter also engaging the earnest attention of the Evangelical Alliance at its Conference in Montreal in October last, and strong resolutions in protest were adopted.

"And so far from having no grievances, the Protestant minority has serious cause of complaint in relation to many matters, among which the following are specified: The division of taxes for educational purposes; the recent unsettling of the foundation of the Superior Education Fund; in the degradation of degrees conferred by Protestant Universities; in the matter of the marriage laws; in the law of compulsory tithing, and the erection of parishes for civil purposes, both creating motives for the removal of Protestants, and generally in the virtual establishment of one church to the disadvantage of all other churches.

"Furthermore, we declare that the Protestant community of the Province of Quebec are unwilling to be indebted to the generosity or liberality of their Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, but demand simple justice and their equal rights as subjects of the Queen.

"It was resolved to transmit the foregoing statement to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Col. O'Brien), with the request that it be read to the House of Commons by himself, or some other member he may select.

"J. COOPER ANTLIFF, D.D.,
"*President of the Montreal Protestant Association.*
"WM. SMYTH,
"*Secretary-Treasurer.*"

This is the communication, Sir, of the Protestant Ministerial Association of Montreal, duly signed by its officers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have but few words to say in conclusion. I wish, Sir, to refer to a statement made by my hon. friend the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that if ministers would preach the gospel instead of preaching politics, it would be very much more in the line of their duty, and more conducive to the public interests. I have heard this charge brought against ministers before—the charge of preaching politics. I remember, Sir, in the great struggle in the United States, when the life of the nation was at stake, and when the slave power was making gigantic efforts to strangle liberty in that country, that the ministers of the country who stood up in defence of righteousness and right, were accused of preaching politics, one of the charges brought against them was that they were stepping outside of their legitimate province. When they were preaching opposition to slavery and exhorting men to patriotism, whether they were preaching politics or not, they were performing a good work. I hold that, in every emergency, when the liberties of a country are at stake, the minister is a dumb dog who does not raise his voice, warning his fellow citizens, and seeking by every influence he possesses to promote the right and combat the wrong; and if ministers in this country to-day see it to be

their duty to warn the country of dangers impending, to warn it of the crisis threatened to be precipitated upon it, I say let them do so; if they do not do so, they are recreant to their trust and duty.

Sir, I conclude what I have to say to-night by asserting that I believe this Jesuits' Estates Act is an unconstitutional Act, because the society is under the ban of British law; I believe further that it is an unconstitutional Act by reason of the reference contained in the Bill to His Holiness the Pope; I believe further that it is unconstitutional by reason of the diversion of school funds in the Province of Quebec from their legitimate and proper purpose. And in addition to these three counts of unconstitutionality, I believe that upon the highest grounds of public interest and public good, upon the ground of due consideration of the public weal, present and future, in this Dominion, that this Act should have been disallowed in conformity with the power possessed by the Government of this country.

Mr. MULOCK. I admit, Mr. Speaker, that it is with some hesitation that I venture to address this House, as I will but very briefly, upon a subject so grave and important as that now receiving our attention. I cannot conceive of any question that might be fraught with more serious consequences to the welfare of Canada than the question which is now agitating the country, and which ought to receive the best consideration of the people's representatives. When I think that the solution of this problem may, according to the determination of this House, have such different results, I have been amazed to find that hon. gentlemen, who I believe in their calmer moments are as true patriots as are to be found, should for the moment allow themselves to be carried away by bigotry or fanatical zeal and should suggest to this Parliament the adoption of a course that would in my judgment destroy the Union of the Provinces that now constitute Canada. What proposition has the hon. member for Muskoka laid before this House, and with what arguments and with what evidence has he sustained that proposition? Have his arguments and those of his friends justified them, and would they justify this House, in adopting the conclusion which he asks by this motion to adopt? Sir, the motion that has been placed in your hands by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) alleges that the Bill under discussion for the settlement of the Jesuits' estates, passed by the Legislature of Quebec, was beyond the jurisdiction of that Legislature, and the motion goes on to give reasons in support of that proposition of law. So we have the hon. member alleging, and undertaking to prove conclusively to the House and the country, that this Bill is *ultra vires*, and on that ground he asks us to recommend to His Excellency the Governor General to wipe it off the Statute-book. Now, Sir, has he proved beyond all reasonable doubt the premises on the truth of which, and only upon the establishment of the truth of which, Parliament would be justified in coming to the conclusion which he asks? His able chieftain, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) laid down this doctrine for our guidance. He said: I admit that Parliament should not on this occasion ask the Governor to disallow this Bill if there is a shadow of a doubt that it is not *ultra vires*. The hon. member for Muskoka says it is *ultra vires*. Now, I ask hon. gentlemen who call on Parliament to adopt this resolution, is it admitted beyond doubt that the Act is *ultra vires?* We listened last night to the able address of the Minister of Justice. Will anyone say that he did not do more than establish a doubt? Will anyone say that he did not cite authorities which convinced the vast majority of this House that the position taken by the hon. member for Muskoka and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is an untenable one, both in regard to the law of the case and in regard to the alleged facts on which they founded their charges. Taking the advice of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and applying it to what we have heard in this House, and without, and to what we know, of our own knowledge, of the law as well, I think we can fairly conclude that it has not been established beyond all doubt that the Bill is *ultra vires*. Even if it had been established beyond doubt that the Bill is *ultra vires*, there would, in this particular case, have been the very strongest possible reason why Parliament should not intervene and take the case out of the proper tribunals of the land. Is Parliament, a body of 215 men, representing widely different views, depending more or less upon the fickle populace; is this Parliament, composed of persons more or less prejudiced upon a question of this kind—and no 215 men could be gathered together in any country in the world among whom there would not be found prejudiced men when a question of religion is concerned—is this Parliament, I say, a fit tribunal to find on the law and the facts clearly and unmistakably in order to arrive at an absolute conclusion on a question such as this? Is there a man in Canada who would assert that it would be fair and just to submit such a question as this to the arbitrament of even my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), for whose honesty of purpose no one has a higher opinion than I? I might say, also, that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) indicated a bias which would hardly qualify him to be selected as an independent juryman to deal with this question. I might run over the list and point out many of the members who have expressed a strong bias on this question, and, therefore, I doubt whether Parliament would be safe in following their views and in determining how it should find on questions of fact and law. For these reasons I am of opinion that under no circumstances should Parliament determine this question, unless there is no other tribunal in the land that can deal with it. Could there be a tribunal more unfit to deal with such a question than an assembly such as this? I would ask the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) if he has thought of the consequences which would follow the adoption of this motion should it be carried. Suppose to-night the majority of the House should decide to carry this motion, that would be a withdrawal of the confidence of the country from the Government. What would then have to be the next step? The Government have taken a certain position upon this question, which I am glad to be able to endorse. They would have to tender their resignations to His Excellency, and either they would go to the country or the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) would be called upon to form a Cabinet. In either case there would have to be an appeal to the country upon the new issue. Has the hon. gentleman thought of what the issue would be which would be presented to the country on that occasion? Is any man in this House prepared to present to the people such an issue, and to say that it is in the interests of the people that there should be an issue raised of race and religion to determine who shall and who shall not prevail in this House? It cannot be denied that that would be the very next step if this motion were carried, and that step would mean the dividing of this country into two great camps. Who would be found in these camps? Our Roman Catholic brethren, as a whole, would take their place in one camp, and our Protestant friends in another. This is the inevitable issue if this proposition be carried. My hon. friend may pretend that he is but attacking a community of the Roman Catholic Church; but if he appreciates the true sentiment of the people of Canada to-day, he will find that it is not a question of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and his little band against the Order of Jesuits, who perhaps may enjoy some degree of unpopularity, but it will be a question of Roman Catholics against Protestants. Could any one conceive an issue more disastrous to the country than that? I cannot. It would destroy Canada. And are we to precipitate such a condi-

tion of affairs when there is relief at our hands, when there is a fit tribunal to deal with this case whose judgment will be accepted loyally by all classes and creeds. Does the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) suppose that by the carrying of this motion he would accomplish the suppression of the Jesuits, if that is what he seeks? It would mean the defeat of this particular Bill, but what would follow? Do you not think, Sir, that the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, which enacted that measure nine months ago, if it were disallowed under the circumstances, would not be called together again, under the inspiring influence of this racial and religious war or at least religious war? Would they not, the Quebec Legislature, be assembled together again as quickly as the constitution admitted, and would not the first Act they would pass be a re-enactment of the Jesuit Bill? Then the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), if he carried the country, would rally his forces here, and would not his first duty, in obedience to the mandate of the majority of the people, be to call upon the Governor General to disallow the Bill again. So the repetition would go on, the public mind being more and more inflamed, and what the end would be no one can tell. Is that statesmanship? Is that patriotism? Is that in the interest of British institutions in Canada, or in any country on God's earth? I have heard the hon. gentleman speak of his love for the British flag and institutions. I know he is honest in every sentiment he expresses in that regard, but I grieve to think that he has forgotten he is living in the 19th century. He has forgotten that he has come to free Canada, he has forgotten that the greater Ireland is on this side of the water, and he thinks he still lives in old Ireland, where a minority wielded the power and where a minority was able to exercise its sway. Could he not have been generous enough to have told us at least one little consoling feature in connection with Roman Catholic institutions? Sir, I am no Roman Catholic, but I think the truth should be told, I think the whole truth should be told in discussing a question like this, and yet it did not occur to him to utter one word of justification on behalf of any of the Catholic Church, but he, and those who are with him, declared in all their arguments that the Catholic Church endangered every representative institution.

Mr. O'BRIEN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me for a moment, I defy him, from any word which I have uttered in this debate, to justify the statement he has just made.

Mr. MULOCK. I am only too glad to think that I misunderstood the hon gentleman. If I have not correctly interpreted his arguments, I would be only too glad humbly to apologise to him, and I wish I could say of all who have discussed this question that they have shown the same liberality as, in intent at all events, existed in the mind of my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien); but I think we must all admit that those who have advocated the measure he asks us to adopt, and even the last hon. member who spoke, my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), asserted that the Roman Catholic Church endangered civil liberty. If that is the case, could not one man among them all have given credit to the church for having at times been, as I submit, perhaps even too loyal to institutions, the *de facto* governments of the day, in times gone by? We have only to look back to the history of England in the last few months, and we find that His Holiness the Pope, who has no friend amongst them to day here, found the Marquis of Salisbury, or the Conservative Administration, only too glad to receive assistance from him in the form of the rescript he issued to the people of Ireland in order to induce them to submit to the constituted authority of the land. When His Holiness did that, he did an act which did not commend itself to his own clergy and his own flock in Ireland. He did it against the interest of the church itself in Ireland. He weakened his influence in that island, but he did it, as I understand, according to the well understood doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, to be true and loyal in the support of the *de facto* Government of the day. I am no apologist for the Roman Catholic Church, but, when I hear a charge like this made, some little circumstance comes to my mind, and as a matter of justice I take the liberty of reminding those hon. gentlemen of doubtful memories of such a redeeming feature. Would our loyal friends who propose to set the heather on fire, to add to the inflammatory condition of the public mind to-day, who instead of meeting here in a judicial frame of mind and temperately telling the people what is best, be good enough for one moment to think of the grave trust cast upon them when Her Majesty placed in the hands of the people of Canada the British North America Act. Does not that Act say—I ignore clauses and technicalities—does not a broad minded, a liberal and a fair interpretation of that Act say that, whatever we do and whatever we legislate, we shall do all things to promote the peace, the order and the good government of the people of Canada? When Her Majesty gave us that constitution, she expected us to work out that constitution, and not to exercise our majority powers on the floor of Parliament to destroy peace, to destroy order, to destroy good government in Canada, and to destroy Canada. Under these circumstances, I say in conclusion what I said in the beginning, that I am amazed that, when there is one simple possible solution of this question, an appeal to the proper courts of the land, anyone should seek to solve it in this unfortunate way, in a way that would not be a solution but only an aggravation of the evil complained of. For a moment, look at the consequences of the other course. An appeal to the courts takes place, and, if anyone is dissatisfied with the result of that appeal, he can carry that appeal to the foot of the Throne, and there get the advice of Her Majesty, the fountain of wisdom, of justice and of truth. A judgment is then delivered which will be accepted with satisfaction and resignation by all classes and all creeds, a finality will be given to this question, and then peace, order and good government will prevail in the land. Therefore my voice and my vote are in that direction. Without sacrificing a bit of my Protestant sentiment, without sacrificing peace, order or good government in Canada, but assisting to place Canada on a sure, stable and sound foundation, I shall vote against the motion of my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr O'Brien), and I ask him and all those who desire the permanent peace of the country to transfer this case to the proper tribunals, the duly constituted courts of the land.

Mr. SCRIVER. After the very able and exhaustive discussion which has taken place in the House upon this very important question, and feeling my own unfitness to deal with it from a constitutional or legal point of view, I should not have presumed to say one word upon the subject, but for one fact. I should have contented myself with giving a silent vote, but for the fact that the evening before last my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby) in the very admirable and eloquent speech he made to this House, gave utterance to some sentiments with which I could not altogether agree, and which I consider it my bounden duty, as one of the representatives of the minority, which he also has the honor to represent, to controvert or to attempt to controvert. That hon. gentleman, not without due reason, spoke for the Protestant minority of the Province of Quebec—I say not without due reason, considering the distinguished position which he occupies in this House, considering the fact that he has long and honorably represented the County of Stanstead, considering his high character for candor, for honesty, for integrity, for intelligence, and the opportunity he has had to acquaint himself,

not only with the minds of his constituents upon public questions generally, but with the minds of the people in that part of the Province—I say considering these things, the hon. gentleman spoke with an assumed authority, and an authority which he had a right to assume. More than that, his words were clothed in such beautiful language, and the sentiments which he uttered were so admirable, that I have no doubt they carried weight with them in this House, as they would in the country at large. With some things with which the member for Stanstead said the night before last, I can cordially agree. I agree with him in his statement that the relations between the two elements of population in the Province of Quebec, have been very cordial and pleasant. They are so still, and I would fain wish them to continue so. I think, perhaps, he painted the picture in somewhat roseate hues; the entire cordiality of which he spoke may not prevail in all parts of the Province, but certainly in the constituency which I have the honor to represent, and I believe in the constituencies known as the Eastern Townships, this cordial and friendly state of feeling prevails. I have the honor to represent a constituency divided almost equally between Protestants and Catholics, and they do not live in separate communities, Protestants in one section and Catholics in another, but with the exception of the western part of the county, they are very largely intermingled and in close neighborhood, and they are able to live in the friendly and cordial relations of which my hon. friend so eloquently spoke. If I might be permitted to say one word of a personal character, I would refer to the fact that although I am known, I think, as a good Protestant, I have had the honor to represent that constituency without interruption almost since Confederation, and I have enjoyed the almost unique honor, during that time, of having been elected five times by acclamation, which fact, I think, is a good evidence that the Catholics in my constituency are not governed by sectarian prejudices. I would agree further with my hon. friend from Stanstead that upon the whole the Protestant minority in the Province of Quebec have no reason to complain of their rights being invaded by any legislation resulting from the action of the majority in that Province. During two years from 1867 to 1869 I had the honor of representing the county which I now represent, in the Legislature of the Province of Quebec. Certainly during that time nothing transpired, either in the character of legislation or in the utterances of the members of that body, of which the most rigid and sincere Protestant could complain. Since that time until at least very recently, the same state of affairs has continued. But I regret to say that during the last two years events have transpired in the Province, perhaps not so much actual legislation on the part of the governing body, but at all events there have been utterances by representative men in that Province, disquieting to Protestants, and a disposition, as Protestants think, to give to the clerical authority an influence and almost a direction in the legislation of that Province, which has led to an uneasy feeling on the part of the Protestants generally, and a feeling that if they had not already been exposed to some trespass on their rights, there was danger in the future of a violation of some of the principles which they hold dear. They think they have seen in the character of some of the legislation, of some of the proceedings of the leading men of the Province of Quebec, a disposition, as I said, to give to the clerical power an influence which could only lead to one result and that is a closer union between Church and State than has hitherto existed or ought to exist in a colony of the British Empire. This feeling, I may say, has been intensified by something which has transpired in my own county. Municipal government has been interfered with in the county in which I live, in a manner which gives not only offence to the Protestants residing in that county, but causes them to fear that their rights of municipal self-government are in danger of being seriously interfered with. Under the law of the Province of Quebec (at all events in the French speaking counties of the Province) a Roman Catholic bishop has the right to erect territory into a parish in contradistinction from townships, and in consequence of that action, municipal division follows. This right was never attempted to be exercised in English speaking Protestant counties until very recently. But not very long ago this power was exercised in the county which I represent. The parish of St. Anicet was a part, originally, of the township of Godmanchester; it was erected, by ecclesiastical authority, into a parish, and, following that, it was constituted a parish by the Legislature of the Province of Quebec. Until that time, at all events, this clerical authority that I speak of had not been exercised in the Townships with the result that followed, in that particular instance. But more recently a portion of this parish of St. Anicet was erected into a parish and the electors of that parish, called St. Barbe, proceeded upon the supposition that it had, by that Act, been constituted a separate municipal organisation. They elected their mayor. Their mayor was refused a seat in the county council of the Province. He appealed to the courts, and his right to sit in that council as the representative of this new constituency was sustained by the courts. This fact has given rise to a great deal of dissatisfaction and uneasiness among my constituents at all events. So far as I can learn, that power has not been exercised in the Eastern Township counties proper, but, in every instance where an ecclesiastical parish has been erected in a township an Act of the Legislature of Quebec has been secured to constitute it into a municipal parish. And then we cannot conceal from ourselves that, during the past two or three years, there have been utterances on the part of some of the public men in the Province of Quebec, which were not in the direction of supporting the rights of the minority, and which were of a character to lead them to feel a great deal of uneasiness; utterances of this kind have been made over and over again which have led the Protestants of these counties, at all events of my county (and I think the same is true, though not to so great an extent, perhaps, of the other townships and counties), to entertain feelings of uneasiness and disquiet. And following upon this has been the legislation which we have been considering during two or three days past. There is a general feeling, an almost universal feeling, on the part of the Protestants I represent, that this legislation is not only unwise, not only in some of its features exceedingly offensive to their feelings as Protestants, but that it is for several causes, which have been set forth by those who have discussed the question and which I need not therefore repeat, unconstitutional. It is true, as the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) said, that remonstrances against this legislation were not sent to the Legislature of Quebec at the time the Bill was under discussion. But it is to be remembered, that large bodies proverbially move slowly. The Bill was introduced rather suddenly and carried through the House very quickly, and there was hardly time for anything like united action. Indeed the people seemed not to have awakened to the character and possible results of the legislation until some time after it became law. But my hon. friend was mistaken in saying that no remonstrance against this legislation had been made to the authorities here or to the authorities of the Province of Quebec.

Mr. COLBY. I did not say that; I think I did not intend to say that. My statement was simply this, and if you will allow me I will take this opportunity to interject a remark. The resolution which was read by the hon. gentleman just now from the Ministerial Association of Montreal put into my mouth words I never said, and passes strictures upon some sayings which they suppose I

uttered. I made no statement with respect to representations being made or not being made to any Legislature at any time except during the pendency of the discussion of this Settlement Act in the Province of Quebec. I did not state, as they said I stated, that no representations were made against the Jesuits' Incorporation Bill. I did not state as those Ministers say I stated, that no representations had been made to this House in favor of disallowance. I simply did state that no representations that I was aware of, that no petitions and no representations had gone to the Legislature against the particular act of legislation which we are now here considering.

Mr. SCRIVER. I think in that statement the hon. gentleman was perfectly correct. So far as I know, no petitions or remonstrances were sent to the Legislature of Quebec when the Act was under discussion. The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), alluded as a proof of the disposition of the Protestant minority to accept this legislation, which he himself has characterised as a very bitter pill for them to swallow, and with that statement I fully agree, and I am afraid the bitterness will stay there for some time—that there was no general disposition on the part of the Protestant minority of the Province of Quebec not to accept this legislation, as at all events something not to be prevented or helped, to the fact that no vote was taken in the Legislature when the Bill was under discussion, that not a voice was raised against it, except the voices of two members of the House who spoke briefly on the question from the constitutional and legal point. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not consider it my place to criticise the conduct of those members of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec representing the same class of people as I represent with respect to that Bill or any other Bill, and whatever their motives were and whatever their views were, it is not my place here to pronounce any opinion with respect to them further than to say this: that I think they would have much better expressed the sentiments of the people who sent them there as their representatives if they had at all events raised their voices in remonstrance against the passage of such a law. But I do not propose to prolong my remarks on this occasion. I rose mainly, as I said at the outset, because I thought it my duty to state what is the fact, in opposition to what might have been inferred from the statement of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), that there is not a disposition on the part of the Protestants of the Province of Quebec generally—I think I may say that much—to accept this legislation as satisfactory or as a finality. I think there is a general disposition to consider it not only unwise but wrong, as in some sense an invasion of their rights, and as fraught with danger to their position as a minority in the Province. But I am quite sure of one thing, that they will not agitate the question of disallowing or nullifying this law in any other way than in a strictly constitutional manner, and if it does become a finality by reason of the failure of the Federal Government to disallow the Act, or by a decision of the highest legal tribunals of the land, should they be appealed to, as I trust they will be, to test its constitutionality, I say I have no doubt they will as good, loyal, peaceful subjects accept the law, and make the best of the situation. I would have preferred, had I had my choice in the matter, that the motion of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) had been couched in somewhat different language: indeed, I would have preferred that such a motion as he has made should not have been made at all. I would have greatly preferred that the motion should have assumed the character of advising this House, or moving that this House should express the opinion that the question should be submitted to the proper legal tribunal to decide as to its constitutionality or otherwise. I should have preferred voting for such a motion to voting for the motion which the hon gentleman has submitted, not that I do not agree mainly with its provisions, but because I think it was inexpedient, and that it cannot possibly result in anything practical, fated, as I believe it to be, to defeat in this House by a large majority. But holding the view which I do with regard to the legislation aimed at by the motion, I cannot see it to be anything else than my duty to vote for the resolution of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien).

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is not my intention to detain the House longer than a few moments with an explanation of the vote which I intend to give on this question. With the member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) I regret the manner in which this question has been brought before the House, and I would much rather that it had come in the shape in which that member has stated he would like to have seen it brought up. While I may say that I do not agree with portions of the resolution, I do not believe that differing from some of the recitals in it, is any reason why I should not vote for the main portion. I also regret the manner in which it has been brought before the House, because I cannot see that possibly any good effect or result can come of it, and if the suggestion made by the member for Huntingdon had been the substance of this resolution or if the subject had been treated in the manner he indicated, I think that the unfortunate turn of religious discussion which has apparently been brought around in this House and in the country by this question being brought up as it is at the present moment, would have been avoided. Now, Sir, I do not intend as I said to discuss this question at any length. We have heard the ablest legal minds in the House speak as to the constitutionality of the Act, and we all must see from the different opinions laid before the House by those able legal gentlemen that there is room for a layman to doubt whether or not this is a constitutional Act on the part of the Quebec Legislature. While I agree personally with the substance of most of the remarks made by the Minister of Justice, with regard to the treatment of Acts passed by the Provincial Legislatures, in the able speech that he delivered to this House last evening, there is one very material point to my mind, on which I do not agree with him and that is with reference to that portion of this Act appropriating the money, as he says, for educational purposes. That portion of his statement and argument I do not agree with. It does appear to my mind, from reading the Act and from the explanations that have been given, that this money has been given to a religious body and it is not stated in the Act to be for educational purposes. Then, as I understand it, the main portion of the resolution brought before the House is announcing the principle of religious equality and the complete separation of Church and State. That is a principle that I feel is necessary to be carried out to the fullest extent in this country for the material welfare and best interests of the people. Settled as it is by people of all nationalities and religious denominations of all kinds, I think it is very desirable that this principle should be carefully adhered to. As I cannot agree with the Minister of Justice in his statement with regard to that, I certainly feel called upon to vote for the motion now before the House. I regret, as I say, the religious aspect that this discussion has taken. I feel that it is unfortunate because throughout this country, for many years at least, we have had very little experience of religious cries or differences. In the section of the country in which I live, the Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and members of all religious denominations, live together in the greatest harmony. I do not see why this aspect of the question should be introduced here. It would make no difference to me, if this grant of money had been to an Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist or Baptist body, I would feel compelled to take the same position

on it if it was brought before the House. It is not because the money is granted by the Local Government to the Catholic Church that I object, but it is against the principle of granting money for any sectarian purposes that I wish to protest. That is the chief and almost the only reason why I cannot support the Government, but have to support the resolution of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien).

Mr. McMULLEN. It was not my intention to address the House, but I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion so far as it has gone, and I may say that I fully endorse the remarks of the hon. member from North York (Mr. Mulock). I regret exceedingly that the discussion has partaken of a character which is likely to cause very serious division between two great classes in this Dominion. Had the motion of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) been one that did not embody objectionable features from a Reform standpoint, I would have much preferred it. In the shape it is in now it is undoubtedly objectionable to those who sit upon this side of the House. As far as I am personally concerned I am just as strongly opposed to some of the doctrinal views of the Jesuit Order as any man that sits within this Chamber. I have no sympathy for them owing to their traditional record, which I believe is not very good. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we live under a written constitution in this Dominion, and while I have sat and listened with a good deal of attention to the arguments that have been presented on both sides, I have failed to see that it has been clearly proved to the satisfaction of my mind that the Bill which we have under consideration is unconstitutional. Of course I am not a lawyer, I am but a layman; but when I consider that I have on one side the hon. the First Minister who, I have reason to believe, says that this Act is constitutional, that we have the Minister of Justice who declares that it is constitutional, and that we have also other legal gentlemen supporting the Government who have declared that it is constitutional;—I come to my own side of the House, and I find that I have the hon. the leader of the Opposition who, I believe, says that the Bill is a constitutional Bill, and within the power of the Province of Quebec to pass, I also have the ex-leader of the Reform Party who says he believes it is a constitutional Bill (I believe he is of that opinion), and I think I am correct in saying that the hon. the leader of the former Government, the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), is prepared to say it is a constitutional Bill. I also have the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) who declares that the Bill is a constitutional Bill and within the powers of the Provincial Government to pass; I have the opinion of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) a man of extended experience and a cultured legal mind who says the Bill is constitutional, and I think that I am also correct in stating that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) considers it a constitutional Bill. I find all these legal gentlemen who have seats in this House, some of the best legal minds this Dominion contains, saying on the one hand that this is a constitutional Bill, within the powers of the Legislature of Quebec, and, on the other hand, I find the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) saying that it is not a constitutional Bill. But when I look over the legal history of that hon. gentleman I find that in almost every case in which he has argued upon constitutional principles he has failed, and I am bound to accept the opinions of the men who say that it is within the powers of the Legislature of Quebec to pass that Act. Now, as I said, I have no sympathy with the Jesuits, but at the same time, if the Legislature of Quebec has the right and the power to pass that Bill, I claim to be a loyal British subject, I claim to live under the written constitution that we have got, which permits the passage of an Act by the Local Legislature, even if it is an objectionable Act. I am perfectly willing to agitate for a revision of our Constitution, so that it would not permit the passage of Acts of that kind, but that is the only constitutional way to go to work. With regard to the effects of disallowance I agree heartily with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). I can easily see that if the Government were forced to reconsider their Order in Council allowing the Bill we would not then reach the end of the trouble. The probabilities are that the Legislature of Quebec, if they are acting within their constitutional rights, would re-enact the Bill next year. Are we to have all this agitation again next year? Are we to meet and have the important time of this House spent in discussing whether the next Bill is within the power of the Quebec Legislature, or whether we should disallow it or not? I think it is better, under the circumstances, that we should settle this question as quickly as possible, and I believe the best and the constitutional way of settling it is to relegate the whole question to the courts, and let them decide whether the Act is constitutional or not. Some say there may be a difficulty in getting it before the courts I can see no difficulty whatever in doing so. I understand that the *Mail* newspaper of Toronto has had an action brought against it by the Jesuit Order for certain statements which it has made with regard to that order. The *Mail* newspaper, if it chooses, can carry that action to the Privy Council in England; it can force the Jesuit Order there and test the whole question in that very action. I must say I sympathise a great deal with its course myself; I am just as strong an advocate of religious liberty as any other member in this House; and if it is found that the Act is unconstitutional, that is an end of the whole difficulty. If the hon. member for North Simcoe, who is a man of extended legal knowledge, will show me that we can reach the object of our ambition in disallowing this Bill by the course he proposes to take in this House, I would not hesitate a moment to support him; but I cannot see that we can reach that point, because disallowance now means re-enacting in the Province of Quebec, which would bring disallowance again, and where would that stop? Are we to go on with this, like the Streams Bill, which was enacted and disallowed, enacted and disallowed, enacted and disallowed, three times. The result was that it had to go to the Supreme Court before it was settled after all. This is a question which would cause a tremendous amount of trouble in this country if it were carried on in that way. I must say, although I have no confidence in the Government—I say, in the interest of the country, not in the interest of the Government at all—the best course is to send this Bill where it will receive judicious handling at the hands of the Privy Council, which will settle the whole question at once, and relieve this House year after year from the discussion of a question, which is certainly a very awkward one for the House to deal with, and which we should not be called on to deal with. We make laws in this House; we do not administer them. This law has been made in the Province of Quebec; and if it is within the constitutional rights of that Province, much as we may deplore its results and its peculiar characteristics, it is not for us to say that the Province shall not have it. If it improperly imports the name of the Pope into this provincial enactment, or if anything else in it makes it unconstitutional, the courts will decide, and will rid the House of the question, and settle all the difficulty in the country. Under these circumstances, I shall not vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Muskoka unless before this debate is closed I can be convinced that by passing that motion we will be settling the whole difficulty. If I cannot be convinced of that, I cannot take the responsibility of what I see will inevitably follow, a condition of things such as has been pointed out by the hon. member for North York, and also by myself.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that we on this side of the House can have the privilege of supporting the policy of the Government. In this instance, when the action of the Government is assailed by a number of their supporters, when their action has already caused an agitation which unfortunately is not unmixed with religious bitterness, not one word certainly will fall from my lips which would tend to fan those religious flames; and I may say at once, repeating what was said this afternoon by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in the admirable speech he delivered, that the course of the Government receives, with a few exceptions which I respect, the entire support of the Liberal party. No other course, Mr. Speaker, than the course which we intend to take on this side of the House, would be consistent with the policy which we have been advocating for the last fifteen or twenty years—nay, ever since Confederation has been in existence. And, Sir, I hasten at once to congratulate the Government upon the fact that at last they have come to the true policy which they have often fought against, that the only basis upon which we can successfully carry on this Confederation is to recognise the principle of provincial rights. And I cannot but say also that if the Government to-day have to face this trouble in their own camp, if they have to meet this agitation which is now going on in the Province of Ontario, and of which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said yesterday, we have not seen the last, it is due altogether to the vicious policy which has been followed by the Administration, and before the consequences of which they have at last to recede; it is due altogether to the manner in which they have governed this country, and to the means they have used to obtain a majority to support them. Sir, this is not a party question; it is at most a family quarrel; it is simply a domestic disturbance in the ranks of the Conservative party. A section of the Conservative party now require the Government to stand up or to stand down, whichever it may be, to the exigencies of the doctrine of disallowance, such as the Government has taught it, and such as the Government more than once called upon them to act upon. Well, there must always be a day of retribution, and that day I think is coming for the Government. The two chief Provinces of which this Confederation is composed are vastly dissimilar. One is French in origin; the other British. One is Catholic in religion; the other is Protestant. And in each are to be found the prejudices peculiar to the creed and race of each I say prejudices, and I use the word advisedly, nor do I use it in any contemptuous sense, for everybody must recognise the fact that wherever you find strong convictions, you generally find an exaggeration of feeling very apt to carry men beyond the legitimate consequence of their convictions. Now, ever since the year 1854, I charge against the Government and against the Conservative party that they have been able to retain power, almost without interruption, largely by pandering to the prejudices of the one Province and the prejudices of the other Province. In the good Catholic Province of Quebec, to which I belong, the party supporting the Administration have always represented themselves as the champions of the Roman Catholic cause. They have always denounced their opponents, the Liberals of French origin like myself, as men of dangerous doctrine and tendencies. They have always represented the Liberals of Ontario as men actuated in all their actions and inspirations by a hatred of everything French and Catholic. At the same time, in the good Protestant Province of Ontario, the same party has always been held up to the front as the party of unbending and uncompromising Protestantism, and the Conservative press to-day, represent hon. gentlemen on this side as basely pandering to the influence of the French people and of the Catholic persuasion. Now this game has been for a long time successful, but, perhaps, before going further, I may recall this fact, known by all those who are now listening to me, that the attitude of the Conservative party of Ontario has always been just what I represent it to be. It may not be so well known that, at the same time, the Liberals of Ontario are charged by the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec, not with pandering to the Catholic influence but with being hostile to Catholic influence—and so the charges work both ways. In one Province the Liberals are charged with one offence, and in the other with another. I could quote columns upon columns of the press which supports the right hon. gentleman to prove what I say, but I shall limit myself to one short paragraph. The school question in Ontario is a burning question. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) yesterday spoke almost of nothing else. A few days ago there was in the Legislature of Ontario a debate upon this very question. The Government of Mr. Mowat were charged by the Conservative party with unduly favoring the teaching of the French language in the schools of Ontario. The debate was commented upon in the Province of Quebec, *La Minerve*, one of the papers which support the Administration, an organ of the Conservative party, referred as follows to this very debate:—

"The motion of the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) was followed by a most brilliant reply strongly conceived, broad in view and conclusive from the Hon. G. W. Ross, Minister of Public Instruction. Mr. Ross is a Grit of the clearest water, but we are too much accustomed to the gallophobic denunciation of that party and to the intemperance of their language, when the Province of Quebec is in question, not to rejoice at anything which remotely or approximately can look like a conversion."

You see the gist of this statement. It was charged that the language of Mr. Ross was an exception, whereas the charge made by the Conservative party in Ontario against the Administration for which Mr. Ross spoke, was the very thing which is given him here as an exception. So it has always been. The party has always had two faces—a rigid Protestant face turning towards the west, and a devout Catholic face turning towards the east. In the Province of Ontario, the rallying cry of the party has always been: "Protestants, beware! these Grits are weak Protestants!"

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, never.

Mr. LAURIER. Among the Protestants of Quebec, their cry has always been: "Catholics, beware! the Liberals are weak and bad Catholics!" This game has been successful for a long time, but it cannot always be successful, and I say the day of retribution is now coming. I say that this motion which we now have is in many senses much to be deprecated, and I endorse every word which fell the other day from the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). It seems to me that all he said then were words of wisdom, but at the same time I cannot resist the conviction that the Government of to-day are only reaping what they have been sowing. They have allowed a large class of the Protestant population of Ontario to look upon them as the champions of Protestantism. They have affirmed the doctrine of disallowance among that section of the party and now that section cries out: We have always looked upon you as the champions of Protestantism; here is legislation which we deem offensive to the Protestant interests and to the interests of the country at large, and we call upon you to exercise those powers of disallowance which you have so often exercised in the past. Well, as far as the Liberal party is concerned, their attitude upon this question was known before it was explained in this debate. The Liberal party always endeavors to meet those questions, not from the point of view of Catholicism or Protestantism, but from a point of view that could include all different religious interests. Among the many questions which divided the two parties, there is no one upon which the policy of the two parties has been so clearly cut as upon this. The Conservative party, led by the right hon. gentleman, have always held the doctrine

that they have the right to review the legislation of any Local Legislature. We, on the other hand, have always pretended that the only way to carry out this Confederation is to admit the principle that within its sphere, within the sphere allotted to it by the Constitution, each Province is quite as independent of the control of the Dominion Parliament, as the Dominion Parliament is independent of the control of the Local Legislatures. On the contrary, the hon. gentleman has maintained again and again upon the floor of this House and by administrative acts that he claimed the power to review local legislation, to see whether it was right or wrong, and, if he found it clashing with his ideas of right, to set it aside. We all remember the famous Streams Bill. What was the language used on that occasion by the hon. gentleman? He claimed that it was a question of purely provincial character, that it was one which was clearly within the competence of the Legislature of Ontario, and yet the hon. gentleman took it upon himself to disallow it, and for what reason? For no other reason than that the Act clashed with his own opinions of what was right and what was wrong. He spoke as follows in regard to it:—

"But here, where we are one country and all together, and we go from one Province to another as we do from one county to another and from one town to another, is it to be borne that laws which bind civilised society together, which distinguish civilisation from barbarism, which protect life, reputation and property, should be dissimilar; that what should be a merit in one Province should be a crime in another, and that different laws should prevail."

Upon that occasion the hon. gentleman took upon himself to review the law of the Province, and, finding it was not consistent with what he believed to be right, he disallowed it. It shocked the tenderness of the right hon. gentleman's conscience that the Legislature of Ontario provided that Mr. Caldwell could not pass his logs through Mr. McLaren's improvements without paying toll, though the Privy Council afterwards decided that, without the law, Mr. Caldwell could have used those improvements without paying any tolls at all. The hon. gentleman now comes to the doctrine which has been very many times advocated on this side of the House, that he has not to consider whether this provincial legislation is good, bad or indifferent; it is altogether within the competence of the Local Legislature of Quebec, and therefore, says he, let it pass. Let us read the report of the Minister of Justice of the day on the Streams Bill and compare it with the report of the Minister of Justice upon the present occasion. The Minister of Justice then said:

"I think the power of the Local Legislature to take away the rights of one man and vest them in another, as is done by this Act, is exceedingly doubtful, but, assuming that such right does, in strictness, exist, I think it devolves upon this Government to see that such power is not exercised, in flagrant violation of private rights and natural justice, especially when, as in this case, in addition to interfering with private rights in the way alluded to, the Act overrides a decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, by declaring retrospectively that the law always was, and is, different from that laid down by the court."

Now, let us look at the report of the Minister of Justice in this present case. It is extremely short and sweet. The Minister of Justice simply says, referring to some petitions asking for disallowance:

"Before the petitions in question came before him for his consideration the undersigned had already recommended to Your Excellency, that the Act in question should be left to its operation. The memorials referred to have not convinced the undersigned that that recommendation should be changed. The subject-matter of the Act is one of provincial concern only, having relation to a fiscal matter entirely within the control of the Legislature of Quebec."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is sound Liberal doctrine. This is the very doctrine which has been always maintained and supported on this side of the House, and once more I beg to tender my thanks and my congratulations to the hon. gentleman on having at last come to the true and only basis upon which this constitution of ours can be satisfactorily maintained and supported. It takes a long time, however, for a true principle to penetrate the perverted minds, as I might say, of the hon. gentlemen opposite. No' I beg their pardon, it does not always take so long a time; sometimes the operation is as fast as at others it is slow. Only three weeks ago, we tendered advice to the Administration as to the manner in which they should treat our friends to the South in reference to the *modus vivendi*. Our advice was treated with contempt, and it was stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that the proposal would be received with scorn by the people of this country; and yet, within three weeks, they have changed their minds and accepted the policy which we suggested. I can only say that, as long as the Administration continue to act in that way, first to reject the policy of the Opposition and then to steal our clothes and dress themselves in them, the country will not be the loser. I had hesitated, before I resolved to speak on his question, whether I should confine myself to this statement and then sit down, but I cannot ignore, no one who has at heart the interests of this country, the peace and harmony of this country, can ignore the agitation which is now going on in the Province of Ontario. Coming as I do, from the Province of Quebec, being a member of the Catholic persuasion and a supporter of the Government which passed this legislation, I cannot but view with deep concern the attempt which is now being made to arouse our Protestant fellow-citizens in the Province of Ontario against that legislation. Let me say this, which must be obvious to every hon. member, that, if we approach this question, or any question, from the point of view of the religious opinions which any of us profess, we are apt to stand upon very narrow, very unsafe, and very dangerous ground. I say dangerous ground because it is a matter of history, that it is always in the sacred name of religion that the most savage passions of mankind have been excited and some of the most shocking crimes have been committed. In this matter, I cannot forget the fact, as I have stated, that an attempt has been made to arouse the feelings of the Province of Ontario, but I hope that that attempt will not carry, and that a better sentiment will prevail; I hope that the temperate language of reason which we have heard to-day will be understood, and, though this legislation may be objectionable to some people, yet that everyone will understand that in these subjects we must make allowance for the feelings of others. What is the cause of the agitation which is now going on? What is the cause of this legislation which has been the source of so much turmoil? Sir, it is simply this: It is a matter of regret that the European nations, France and England, when they came to this continent brought with them not only their laws and institutions, not only their civilisation, but brought also their hatreds. At this moment, and for more than seventy years past, France and England have been at peace, and it was given to our generation to witness a spectacle which would have seemed almost improbable, not to say impossible, a few years before. We have seen France and England arrayed together against a common foe; and to us British subjects of French origin, British subjects who have learned to love England, who appreciate her benevolent rule, who would not go back to the allegiance of France, but who still ever cherish in our hearts the love of the land of our ancestors, no spectacle could be more consoling than to see the banners of France and England waving together on the banks of the Alma, on the heights of Inkermann and amid the ashes of Sebastopool. Such is the case to day. Such was not the case, however, at the time of the discovery of America, at the time of the establishment of English and French posts upon this continent. On the contrary, at that time French and English had been arrayed for generations and centuries in deadly feuds. They brought over these feuds with them, they brought over with them the enmity which had divided them in Europe, and here on this continent they sought each other across lakes and rivers, mountains and forests,

and endeavored to inflict upon each other all the injury they possibly could. They had before them the boundless space of this virgin continent, but they entered into a deadly war for the possession of the miserable huts which constituted their first establishments. Well, the long duel, as we know, was settled on the Plains of Abraham. The war, however, was carried on for a year longer by the Chevalier de Lévis, and this continuation of the war had no material effect except to extract from the victor most generous terms of capitulation. These terms have been referred to, I need not refer to them again. The religious communities were granted all their possessions as freely as if they had remained under the domain of the French King. It was stated by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) when he opened this debate, that the Terms of Capitulation had been modified by the Treaty of Paris. For my part I am not able to see the difference, but if difference there be, I am quite willing to admit the interpretation of it which was given by the British Government itself. Respecting the treatment by the British Government of those communities which were promised special immunity, I can see no difference between their position under the French régime and their condition under the English régime. The British Government treated those communities and the whole population, for that matter, in religious concerns with the greatest generosity. All the religious communities, with the single exception of the Jesuits, were maintained in possession of their estates. There was an exception made of the Jesuits. What was the cause of it? Was it by the right of Conquest as asserted by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy)?

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the hon. gentleman excuse me. I did not make that assertion. It was by the introduction of the law at the Conquest, not by virtue of the Conquest at all —the introduction of the English law whereby the estates became forfeited to the Crown.

Mr. LAURIER. So be it; I accept the correction. I do not intend to discuss the legal aspects of this question, because, in my judgment, the legal aspect does not come in here. But even if, as stated by the hon. gentleman, the British Government took possession of these estates by virtue of the introduction of the English law into this country, still that might have applied as well to the other communities as to the Jesuit estates. Why was that exception made? Why were these other religious communities maintained in possession of their estates, and the Jesuits excepted? I think that the Minister of Justice yesterday gave the real key of the difficulty when he stated that it was the covetousness of Lord Amherst, who, in 1770, obtained from the King an actual promise of the grant of these estates. Had it not been afterwards for the abolition of the order by the Pope, I firmly believe the Jesuits would have continued in the enjoyment of their estates in the same manner as the other religious communities. But the order was abolished, and after the last Jesuit had departed this life, the British Government took possession of the estates. Then, as we know, the heirs of Lord Amherst claimed these estates in virtue of the promise which had been made in 1770 by the King. But the protests were so strong, not only from the old inhabitants but from the new inhabitants as well, not only from the old subjects of the King, but from the new subjects of the King, that the Government could not carry out its intentions of making a grant of these estates to the heirs of Lord Amherst. On the other hand, though the Government had taken possession of these estates, and though they were promised to General Amherst, the Government could not put them into the general fund, and they erected into a special fund. But there is this to be remembered, whether the laws of England were introduced into the colony or not, whether the old laws continued to be in force or not, the old French laws continued to prevail in the country just as before. And there is this also to be remembered, that under the laws of Quebec as they existed under the French régime, property of the nature of the Jesuits estates, when the order had been abolished, would have reverted to the Ordinary of the Diocese, property of that kind would have gone to the Bishop of Quebec or to the Bishop of Montreal. Such was the contention of the church at that time, and from that day up to this, the ecclesiastical authorities of the Province of Quebec have never ceased to claim that property as rightly belonging to them. There has been a continuation of the protests from that moment to the present. Protests were made in these dates:

"1. 4th February, 1793, by the citizens of Quebec. 2. 18th November, 1799, by His Grace Jean François Hubert, Bishop of Quebec. 3. About the year 1835, by His Grace Joseph Signaï (?), Bishop of Quebec; His Grace Pierre Flavien Turgeon, Bishop of Sydimo, Coadjutor of Quebec; His Grace Jean Jacques Lartigue, Bishop Telmasse, Grand Vicar of the district of Montreal. 4. January, 1845, by His Grace Joseph Signaï (?), Archbishop of Quebec, and by the Bishops of Montreal, Kingston and Toronto. 5. June, 1847, by the clergy of the dioceses of Montreal and Quebec. 6. January, 1874, by the Rev. Father Théophile Chavaux, Superior General of the Jesuits' Mission in Canada. 7. 9th October, 1878, by the Archbishop of Quebec and Bishops of Three Rivers, Rimouski, Montreal, Sherbrooke, Ottawa, St. Hyacinth and Chicoutimi. 8. 2nd January, 1885, by the Archbishop of Quebec."

So you see that from the moment the British Government took possession of these estates, the church authorities of the Province of Quebec never ceased to claim them as their own. Now, could that matter have remained in that condition? Could it be said in a Catholic country like the Province of Quebec, that such protests would remain unheeded? Time and again, as you are aware, the Government of Quebec attempted to dispose of these estates and to settle the question. Mr. Mercier is not the first man in office who attempted to deal with this question. Time and again his predecessors attempted to do the same thing. There was a reason for that. Those estates are valued to-day by Mr. Rivard, superintendent of the estates, at the sum of $1,200,000. They yield a revenue of only $22,000, less than 2 per cent. Some of the property is without any annual value. Take for instance, the old college of the Jesuits in Quebec, right in the centre of the city, opposite the Basilica. That property to-day does not give one cent of revenue, on the contrary it is a burden upon the Exchequer of the Province, whereas, were the property disposed of it would sell to advantage. Time and time again, the Government of Quebec have attempted to dispose of it, but every time the Government placed it in the market, the religious authorities came forward and claimed the property as their own, and rendered the attempts at sale abortive. Was that forever to remain thus? The question was opened more than once. Mr. DeBoucherville, in 1876, endeavored to enter into negotiations to settle the case with the religious authorities of the Province. He did not succeed. It has been asserted many times in the press, though the fact has never been stated officially, that Mr. Chapleau, when in office, entered into negotiations with the religious authorities, and went so far as to offer $500,000 for the removal of the claims of the religious authorities on these estates. Of this I do not know the exact truth. I can only speak from the rumors published in the press. But it is quite certain that Mr. Ross, who succeeded him as Premier a few years afterwards, entered into negotiations for the settlement of the estates. Nothing came of the negotiations, and why? Because it required some courage to deal with the question and to settle it, because it was certain that whoever dealt with it, would have to face much prejudice, as these events have proved. Mr. Mercier had the courage to grapple with this question and to settle it, and if nothing else in the career of Mr. Mercier remained to stamp him as a statesman, there would be this, that he had the courage to deal with this question, and this would give him that title. The question,

I think, had to be settled. In what manner was it settled? It was settled just in the manner which was most fair to all: it was settled by compromise. Mr. Mercier in effect said to the religious authorities: I hold these estates as the representative of the Crown; the right belongs to the Province of Quebec; our title to them is legal; I do not admit that you have a legal title to them, while on the other hand you pretend you have a legal title. Be that as it may, he said, let us make a sacrifice each of our pretensions; I hold the property and the whole of the estates, and you claim the whole of them; let us compromise, and let us settle the question forever. Now, I ask every man in this House, no matter what his prejudice may be, I ask the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) himself, in whose fairness I have the greatest confidence, was there ever a more fair method adopted of disposing of a public question than that which was adopted in this case? Of course, it is quite easy for the editor in his easy chair, it is quite easy for the publisher in his office, it is quite easy for the clergyman in his study to settle questions according to fixed theories; but the public man in office or in Opposition cannot settle a question according to fixed theories, but he has to consult the wishes, not only the wishes, aye, but the passions and the prejudices of the people with whom he has to deal. And, in a country like the Province of Quebec where there are more than 1,000,000 of Catholic inhabitants, with a regularly constituted hierarchy, with such a claim as the Catholic ecclesiastical authorities could present, was it to be said that this question should ever remain open and these lands never be disposed of for the advantage of the exchequer of the Province? It seems to me that upon that question I can appeal again with confidence to the testimony of all those who will approach the question with an unbiassed mind. After all, Mr. Speaker, there is but one way which has been invented yet to govern men satisfactorily, and it is to govern them according to the wishes which are expressed by public opinion. I do not mean to say that public opinion is always right, that public opinion always comes up to the standard of eternal justice or truth; I do not mean to say that public opinion always comes up to the standard of wordly wisdom, but if you govern the people according to public opinion you are sure to have peace and harmony in the land and when this question was settled it was settled according to the wishes of public opinion in the Province of Quebec and by so doing you have peace and harmony in the land. Now, if you are to attempt to override the well known wishes of the population of the Province of Quebec, instead of harmony and peace, you will have probably discord, the consequences of which I would fear to look at. Such is the reason why this question has been settled in the manner in which it has been settled. But it has been insisted by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and by some other hon. members also that this legislation was offensive from a Protestant point of view. Well, strange to say, the Protestant minority is represented in the Legislature of the Province of Quebec. They have, if I remember rightly, some 12 members of the Protestant persuasion in the Provincial Legislature. When this question came to be discussed two members only protested, and they protested very mildly. And they protested against what? Only against one single feature of the Act, against the fact that the name of His Holiness the Pope appeared in the preamble of the Act. Mr. Mercier gave them at that moment the very answer quoted yesterday by the Minister of Justice, and he told them: If you do not want the name of the Pope in this matter, will you suggest the name of any one to put in his place. It was a compromise with the religious authorities of the Province of Quebec, and I think Mr. Mercier acted fairly and prudently in dealing direct with the head of the Roman Catholic church. His arguments were so convincing that those objections were not pressed, the Act passed unanimously, and Mr. Mercier was enabled to speak in the following terms of the attitude of his Protestant colleagues:—

"I thank the Protestant members for the moderation with which they have discussed this question. It is a good omen. The unanimity which now prevails is a proof that the different races of which our population is composed, has lived in peace and harmony and approaches the most delicate question with that spirit of conciliation which accomplished wonders when it is properly directed."

Well, this legislation is not satisfactory to our Protestant friends, or to some of them at least from Ontario. Still if the Protestants of Quebec are satisfied, who can object? I understood that it was said a moment ago by the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), that the Protestants of Quebec are not all satisfied. They may not all be satisfied indeed. It is very seldom that upon any question that may come up men of the same creed of the same race, will be entirely satisfied; but if anybody has a right to speak for the Protestant minority of the Province of Quebec, are they not those who are elected by the people of that Province to represent them in the Legislature, and if these do not choose to make any representation, if those on the contrary say that after all this question has been settled and approved, no one else has the right to complain. But the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), it appears has no confidence in those who represent his fellow countrymen in the Province of Quebec. If I am to believe what he said yesterday, he has but a poor opinion of those who have been entrusted by his fellow religionists in the Province to take charge of their interests in the Legislature. These were his words yesterday:

"Does this look as if the Protestants of the Province of Quebec were desirous, and willing, and anxious that this legislation should remain unchanged, or does it not look as if, if the Protestant minority in that Province were given reasonable encouragement, they would get justice—and no more than justice are they entitled to, and no more than justice I hope they will ever ask for—from the Parliament of this country. Then they will be up and doing, to get their share of this legislation, but in the Legislature of that Province, composed as it is now, they cannot expect it. There was no Protestant representative in the Cabinet of that Province until recently, and, when one was chosen, he had to be elected in spite of the vote of the Protestant minority."

Now, without going any further, I wish to take issue upon this point with the hon. gentleman from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), when he says here that Col. Rhodes was not elected in Megantic by the Protestant minority. The County of Megantic is a mixed county. Col. Rhodes, the Minister of Agriculture, was elected two or three months after this Act had been passed, and it was an issue upon which the electors had to pass. Col. Rhodes polled the majority of the French and Catholic votes, but I say that Col. Rhodes also polled the majority of the Protestant votes. As to this I do not give my own testimony. I have not yet had an occasion to look at the figures. But I give the testimony of Col. Rhodes himself, who, on the day of the election, telegraphed that he had been upheld by the majority of the Protestant electors of the County of Megantic. Then the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) goes on to say:

"I can understand that, if there were a fighting man in that House like the hon. member who leads the third party here, there might be a chance of obtaining something like justice, but men with that skill and ability, with parliamentary knowledge to back it, are not to be found every day, and we are not to judge the Protestant representatives of the Province of Quebec on that high standard."

And why not, Mr. Speaker, "of that high standard?" Can it be that the Protestants of the Province of Quebec, who have placed themselves at the head of the trade of the country, still are so backward in this respect that they cannot send to the Legislature a man of standing to represent them? Can it be that the Protestants of the Province of Quebec have to be taken under the fostering care of my hon. friend from Simcoe? Can it be that they cannot manage their own affairs? Can it be that they cannot look

after their own interests? I have more confidence than my hon. friend in the ability of the Protestant representatives in the Province of Quebec, because I happen to know them personally, and I know they are men of merit, men of ability, and some of the greatest ability. But, Mr. Speaker, if that is the opinion which the hon. gentleman entertains of his own countrymen and co-religionists in the Province of Quebec; if he believes that they are not able to take care of their own interests, but that the Protestants of other Provinces must come to their rescue, perhaps he would be interested to know what is the opinion which is entertained by some of the Protestants of Quebec of those too zealous Protestants of the Province of Ontario who want to take up the cudgels on their behalf. I hold in my hand an extract from a paper published in the Eastern Townships, the Waterloo *Advertiser*, edited by a disciple and a life-long friend of the late Mr. Huntington, as good and as strong a Protestant as ever lived. This is how the paper speaks:

"Every patriotic Canadian must deplore the intemperate discussion that has been provoked by the Jesuits' Bill The measure has become law, and no amount of controversy can alter the fact It is altogether the domestic concern of the Province of Quebec, and any outside interference is simply meddlesome and impertinent. The parsons and the Orangemen of Ontario have joined hands to make war on the Catholics of Quebec. The Legislature has settled the old dispute over the Jesuits' estates in a manner satisfactory to the people. A source of irritation and discontent has been removed once for all. The Jesuits' Bill passed the Legislature, practically, without a dissenting voice. The chosen representatives of the Protestant minority accepted it as a fair settlement of a vexed question. The basis of settlement called for an expenditure of public funds, and to obviate any possibility of jealousy on the part of the Protestant minority a proportionate sum was at the same time voted for Protestant education. That was fair and just and it was so understood by the minority. The Protestant minority in this Province is quite able to take care of itself. In the purely domestic concerns of the Province it asks no assistance and expects no sympathy from outsiders. Taking it all in all, the minority has been fairly treated by the majority. There may have been friction at times, but there has not been in the history of the Province an instance in which the powers of the majority have been used to crush or injure the minority. If the Catholics and Protestants are able to get along together peaceably, why should Ontario interfere? The Protestant minority as a whole has not and does not complain of the Jesuits settlement. It is recognised by broad-minded and patriotic men as being the best thing that could have been done under the circumstances." * * *

Such, Mr. Speaker, is the opinion entertained in the Eastern Townships at least by one section of the people. Now, my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) a moment ago referred to the treatment of the minority in the Province of Quebec. I have the greatest respect as my friend knows for everything which he utters, and I am sure he will agree with me in one thing—if the Protestant minority in the Province of Quebec have anything to complain of—and I listened to what might be called the list of grievances which we heard read to-day by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), but if the Protestant minority have anything to complain of, I ask: Are they not themselves responsible for it? In all that list of grievances which were read is there an act of legislation against which they have ever protested? Have they not always supported the Conservative party which has always been in power, and has not every one of these items in the list which we have heard recited as a grievance, been passed by the Conservative party which the Protestants of Quebec always supported. Sir, I have simply to say this, speaking as a Canadian of French origin, that if my fellow-countrymen of British origin have any grievances, real or imaginary, let them come before the Legislature of Quebec; and although I have not a seat in that Legislature I can claim that I have some influence there, nay I do not want any influence, I know that the majority of the members in that House, the Conservative minority as well, would be ever ready to give them what remedial legislation they may think for their benefit. But up to a few days ago, I never heard that the Protestant minority had anything to complain of in the treatment which they have received from the majority of the Province of Quebec, and if they had any serious grievances, can it be told upon the floor of this Parliament that these grievances would not have been ventilated before the representatives of the people? I repeat what I said a moment ago. It is quite easy for the editor in his chair, or the clergyman in his study, or for any party who has no responsibility to the public at large—it is quite easy for them to determine questions by fixed theories, but it is another thing to fix them according to the will of the people, and I do not admit that there is any serious grievance so long as these grievances are not ventilated upon the floor of the House of the Provincial Parliament. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) also said something yesterday about Mr. Joly. He claimed that Mr. Joly had been ousted from public life. I do not know by whom, but I suppose he meant by the Liberal party.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." Mr. Joly has been in power for some eighteen months and he was ousted from power by the most dishonest warfare which every public man had to suffer in this country. Mr. Joly was ousted from power largely by a violation of the Constitution, perpetrated by this Parliament, and in which the hon. member for Simcoe was himself instrumental. If Mr. Joly had had anything like fair play, I believe that to this day he would have been in power in the Province of Quebec. Mr. Joly never had anything to suffer at the hands of the Liberal party; on the contrary, Mr. Joly is a man for whom we have the greatest respect. We have differed from him upon one question, and one question only, the question which arose out of the rebellion in the North West. Upon that question Mr. Joly took one course, and we took a different course. I am not to argue this question over again, but I have simply to say this to the hon. member for Simcoe, that in the last election which took place in Megantic, where a Protestant representative of the Cabinet of Mr. Mercier was before the people, and when this very question was to be tested at the polls, Mr. Joly came down and supported the candidate and the policy of the Government. It is evident, Mr. Speaker, from the discussion which we have had in this Parliament since yesterday, that though the Act is objectionable to some people—and I find no fault with the hon. member for Muskoka, I find no fault with my hon. friend from Simcoe, for holding the views they hold; I would not attribute to them other than the motive of conscience, that they are doing what they think for the best, they are representing what they deem to be in the interest of the people at large—but it is manifest to me that their judgment has been considerably biassed by the fact that the name of the Jesuits has been introduced in that legislation. It seems to me manifest that the appearance of that name has evoked a fresh outburst of hostility which that celebrated order has been subjected to in many lands and in many ages. Now, it is said that they are dangerous men. Suppose all that has been said were true, would that be any reason to refuse them the justice to which they are entitled? Suppose they were dangerous men, as it is represented they are; that might perhaps be a reason to refuse them civil rights, to refuse them recognition. But they were incorporated by the Province of Quebec two years ago, and the Act which incorporated them received the approval of one of those weak Protestants, according to the member for Simcoe, who represent the minority in the Legislature of Quebec. Mr. Lynch, a fellow Conservative of the hon. member for Simcoe, speaking on that occasion, used this remarkable language:

"Mr. Lynch, on the Bill to incorporate the Jesuits, said that notwithstanding what might be thought in some quarters, there was nothing in the Bill alarming in its character. We were living in an age when wisdom prevailed, living in an age where freedom was supposed to exist the world over, and nowhere in the Dominions of Her Majesty did liberty prevail more than in the Province of Quebec. In Committee, with a consideration of fairness which characterised members of the House,

certain portions of the preamble were struck out. Now is it possible that the intelligent public opinion of the Province of Quebec should deny those Jesuit Fathers the civil rights which we have granted to everyone else? If there is any religious aspect to this question it should be settled elsewhere than in this House. If there is anything in this Bill against civil rights, let us strike it out. Until this is shown I am prepared to support this Bill."

And supported the Bill was, and became law. Under such circumstances, it seems to me that the explosion of bitterness which we have seen to-day and yesterday comes rather tardily. But, Sir, any man, be he friend or foe of the Jesuit Order, must at least give them credit for this, that they repel and deny all the charges which are made against them; they repel and deny the dangerous doctrines which are attributed to them. Now, I would not enter upon that question for one moment were it not for the remarks which fell to-day from my friend the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton); but I cannot allow such views as those which have been expressed to pass without some comment, though this is not the proper sphere or time either to defend or attack the Jesuits. Everyone familiar with French literature knows that Pascal, in his celebrated "Lettres Provinciales," has quoted several paragraphs, which he attributes to Jesuits, of very objectionable character. I have not been able for my part to discover those extracts; I have often sought for the text books; but could not find them, and I cannot say whether they are right or wrong. But I know this, that writers of as great eminence as Pascal have asserted over and over again that all the statements upon which Pascal based his accusations have been refuted, time and again, by members of the Jesuit Order. Now, the Jesuits, it is admitted, are a body of able men, and, it must be admitted also, are a body of pure men, and they are characterised by knowledge and high attainments; but they are men, they are fallible, and it would be strange indeed if in such a numerous order some were not found to write objectionable things. But suppose one of an order were found to write objectionable things, would it follow that the whole order ought to be held responsible, as was said by one member? So are you to conclude that, because one of the order happens to write objectionable things, the whole order are to be condemned? It would be just as it you were to condemn all the Protestant divines of Ontario because the Rev. Dr. Wild said, a few days ago, that to kill a Jesuit was no crime. I will not, Mr. Speaker, push this controversy any further. This is not the place, I say, to attack the Jesuits, nor the place to defend them. The place to attack the Jesuits, in so far as this Bill is concerned, was the Legislature of Quebec; but whether a man be a friend or a foe of the Jesuits, it seems to me that their history in Canada, whatever it may have been in other lands, has been such as to commend not only admiration, but the greatest admiration. They have been the pioneers of this country. In the language of a great historian, not a cape was turned, not a river was entered, but a Jesuit led the way. Every inch of the soil of Ontario was trodden by their weary feet at least 150 years before there was an English settler in that Province. Nay, the very soil of the Province has been consecrated by their blood, shed in their attempts to win over souls to the God of Protestants and Catholics alike. Of the Jesuits I have nothing more to say. The question, as I say, is not one fit for this audience; if it is to discussed it should be discussed elsewhere than here. But the resolution asserts that they have been expelled. The hon. member for Simcoe stated yesterday that they have been expelled from several countries; and the hon. member for North Norfolk stated to-day that they have been expelled from twenty different countries. Sir, this is true; but, what is equally true, they have never yet been expelled from a free country. They have been expelled from countries where the true principles of human freedom such as we understand them in British countries, were not understood. The hon. gentleman told us yesterday that they had been expelled from Germany in 1872. Why is it, in a British Assembly, that the example of Germany will be given to us to imitate? Does the hon. gentleman hold that because the Jesuits have been expelled from Germany—Germany ruled by a man of genius, but a despot after all—such an example should be followed here? We have been told that the Jesuits were expelled from France in 1880. Yes, they were; and to the shame of the French Republic be it said. But they are not the only men who were expelled by that Government. In 1880 six or seven different religious communities were expelled. Sisters of Charity were expelled—angels on earth, if there are any, women who renounce everything that life can give in order to give their life up to the daily maintenance and succor of those who are poor, helpless and suffering. Not only those religious communities, but the princes of the House of Orleans were also expelled from France—men who were the *élite* of France, men of whom more than forty years ago, Prince Metternich said, when they were in their boyhood: "They are young men such as there are few and princes such as there are none." The Duc d'Aumale, one of them, was expelled, one of the noblest soldiers of the French army, a man whose soul is so high that the only manner in which he requited the cruel treatment meted out to him was to make a gift to the ungrateful nation of the Chateau de Chantilly with all its art treasures. I have only this to say to an hon. gentleman who brings such arguments as these: I feel ten thousand times prouder of my native land, which can deal justly and generously with the Jesuits, than of the land of my ancestors, which though a republic, is to-day so retrogade in its constitution and practice of freedom, that it banishes those who do not come up to the standard of its own citizenship. In this matter, I am reminded that the hon. gentleman from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) yesterday stated that we of French origin sometimes forget that this is a British country. I have his words here and I want to quote them:

"We must never forget, said he, I am afraid that some of my friends from the Province of Quebec do sometimes forget that this is a British country, that by the fortunes of war that event was decided, and the greater half of this continent passed over to the British Crown."

What did the hon. gentleman mean by that? I wish he had said a little more or a little less. I wish he had not contended himself with making an insinuation, but that if he had a charge to make, he should have had the pluck and the courage to make it. I tell this to the hon. gentleman. I am of French origin and I am proud of my origin, and I know my fellow-countrymen of Anglo-Saxon race too well not to be aware that if I had not the pride of my origin in my heart they would never think of me but with the contempt which I should deserve. I am of French origin, but I am a British subject. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said, a moment ago, that there should be but one race here.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." Well, what would that race be? Is it the British lion that is to swallow the French lamb, or the French lamb that is to swallow the British lion? There can be more than one race, but there shall be but one nation. Scotland has not forgotten her origin, as far as I know, but Scotland is British. I do not intend to forget my origin, but I am a Canadian before everything. Let me state this further to my hon. friend, I have the pride of my origin; I feel the strength of the blood which flows in my veins, but, in the language of the Latin poet, I say:

"Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto."

"I am a man; nothing that relates to man is foreign to my sympathy;" but, at the same time, though I would never

forget the language of my race, the language which my mother taught me, I say to the hon. gentleman that if I had my choice to return to French allegiance, never would I consent to do so. I do not speak only my own feelings when I thus speak, but I voice the feelings of every one of my countrymen. I do not give utterance merely to the feelings of those who sit beside me, but I am sure I speak the feelings of those French Canadians who sit on the other side as well, when I say that if to-day a poll was taken in the Province of Quebec, or all through the Dominion of Canada, giving a choice between allegiance to England or allegiance to France, there would not be one single vote cast in favor of a return to the allegiance to France. We would remain British subjects; but because we are British subjects, is it to be expected that we shall turn traitors to our origin, traitors to everything that makes life valuable? What would be life if a man had not in his veins and in his heart a feeling for the blood of his own country? The hon. gentleman told us yesterday that he was an Irishman. Would he deny the land of his ancestors? Well, I would pity him from my heart if he would. But, after all, if ever we were to forget that we are of French origin I am sure we could not forget it in view of the agitation which is now going on in the Province of Ontario, because from day to day, from week to week, in a certain press, we have been appealed to—we of French origin—as Liberals of French origin—to vote for disallowance against the Jesuits' Act. From day to day in a certain press, the Liberals of the Province of Quebec have been appealed to to vote against the Government on this question; and in my hand I hold one of the last issues, in which after having recited all the villainies of which the Jesuits are accused, the editor continues as follows:—

"It is safe to say, therefore, that if the Liberals of England or of France were in the position of Mr. Laurier and his followers they would not hesitate a moment in killing this conspiracy in Quebec. Even if they did not hold the Acts to be absolutely unconstitutional they would certainly vote for their disallowance as being contrary to the public interest."

Well, as far as reference is made to the Liberals of France, I have no doubt the editor is quite correct. No doubt, if the Liberals of France had the power to vote on this question, they would certainly disallow this Act; but I have this to say, that I am not and we are not Liberals of the French school. I have not said it once but ten times and twenty times in my own Province, that I am a Liberal of the English school, that I and my friends have nothing in common with the Liberals of France. A short time ago, I was sorry to hear my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) express regret that there was no Protestant party, as far as I understood him. There are men in my own Province, men of my own persuasion, men of my own race, who entertain the same view as the hon. gentleman, and would desire to have a Catholic party. I have always raised my voice against that doctrine, and, as far back as 1877, speaking to a French audience in the French language in the city which I have the honor to represent now, the good old city of Quebec, I used to those who, like my hon. friend, would separate men upon the ground of creed, this language:

"You wish to organise all the Catholics in one party, without any other tie, without any other basis than the community of religion, but have you not reflected that, by that very fact, you will organise the Protestant population as one party, and that then, instead of the peace and harmony which exist to-day between the different elements of the Canadian population, you would bring on war, religious war, the most disastrous of all wars."

Those were my sentiments ten years ago; those are my sentiments to-day. My hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated that we should not allow this Act because the Jesuits are inimical to liberty. Such a statement would not surprise me in the mouth of a Liberal from France, but it does surprise me to hear it on the floor of this Parliament. Are we to be told that, because men are inimical to liberty, they shall not be given liberty? In our own doctrine and in our own view, liberty shines not only for the friends of liberty but also for the enemies of liberty. We make no difference whatever; and, as far as the Liberals of England are concerned, I am sure of one thing, that, if they were here, they would never vote as the editor of the *Mail* supposed they would. The Liberals of England have been for the last century and more the champions of freedom all over the world, and, if we have freedom to-day, as we understand it in this country, and in this age, it is largely due to the efforts of the Liberal party in England. They understood long ago that liberty is not only for the friends of liberty but for all. They understood long ago that the security of the State depends entirely upon the utmost freedom being given to all opinions; that no one is to be canvassed for his opinion, right or wrong, but that the utmost freedom shall be given to all opinions, and that the popular judgment will decide between the grain and the chaff, will select the one and reject the other. That is the principle which I have, in my humble way, endeavored to inculcate for many years amongst my fellow-countrymen of French origin. That, with a steadfast adherence to the broadest principles of constitutional freedom, is the guiding star which, in the station I now occupy and in any station I may have in life, I shall ever endeavor to follow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At this late hour, and after the subject before us has been so fully discussed, I do not feel myself warranted in addressing the House at any length, and I am too well pleased and satisfied with the course taken by my hon. friend who has just spoken in supporting the policy of the Government on this occasion to feel very indignant at the reproofs and reproaches thrown across the floor in the course of his speech. In fact it is a bitter pill for my hon. friend to be obliged to vote for us. He is obliged to do it. He dare not do otherwise. He could not face Quebec if he did anything else. So he takes his revenge by pitching into the Government generally, and that, I take it, is the means by which he reconciles it to his conscience to vote in favor of the Government. Like mine Ancient Pistol, "he eats his leek in earnest of revenge," and so he strays off to all kinds of irrelevant subjects. He brought in the Streams Bill, brought in the *modus vivendi*, he discussed the double-faced policy of the Conservative party, as he says, since 1854. As to that double-faced policy, I pardon my hon. friend for his great mistake in that regard. He is a young man. I cannot say of him, as the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) said of my hon. friend here, that he is a fledging politician, but he is a young man, and he forgets the history of Canada since 1854. Why, he said that, while we professed to be the friends of Lower Canada and the friends of the French race and the friends of Catholicism in the Province of Quebec, we were equally strong as the advocates of Protestantism in the Province of Upper Canada, that we were avowing ourselves in that Province as Englishmen, as Anglo-Saxons, and as being opposed to French domination. The hon. gentleman has forgotten the history of his country. He has forgotten that, for years, I was in a minority in my own Province. The hon. gentleman knows that I was attacked by the organ of the Liberal party in Upper Canada year after year as being recreant to Protestantism, as being recreant to the British race, as succumbing to French influence, as being the tool and the subservient slave of the French people. Why, who opposed the cry of representation by population but myself and my party; who supported the separate schools against the whole weight of the Liberal party of Ontario, headed at that time by the late Hon. George Brown, but myself and my party? The opposition to both those cries was unpopular, especially in regard to representation by population, which seemed to be fair. My opposition to representation by population, in the interests of Lower Canada, was held out as being unjust and unfair to

my own race and Province. Why did I oppose it? The Liberal party and their leader—and he was a real leader of men—I mean the Hon. George Brown, was supported by his party in that policy, and he had at his command the able newspaper which he conducted and owned, the *Globe*,—abused and attacked me without stint because I opposed representation by population; and why did I oppose it? Because the leader of that party did not conceal the object for which he desired a majority in the United Legislature of Canada. He said that the French language must be put down. He said that the Anglo-Saxon race and English law must prevail, and that threat against our fellow-subjects in the Province of Lower Canada was so strongly pressed, and was so imminent, that I did not hesitate to incur the obloquy which was poured upon me for years, the result of which was that I was in the minority in my own Province during most of the time from 1854 to 1866. The hon. gentleman is rather ungrateful for the years and years during which I stood as the advocate for the Province of Lower Canada, of the French race, and of my Catholic fellow-countrymen. Aye, Sir, and more than that; although I was in a minority I had a very respectable Protestant Conservative support, and the main body of the Conservative support that I received in the Province of Ontario was from the Orange body. The majority of the Orange body was Conservative, and they stood by me. In the first place I had the Grand Master of the Orange body, the late George Benjamin, who, chief of the Orangemen as he was, never failed in voting with me for the protection of the Lower Canadians, their country, their race, and their religion, from the persistent and factious attacks that were made upon them by the Liberal party of Ontario. Well, after a while Mr. George Benjamin disappeared, I had the support of another Grand Master of the Orangemen in the present Minister of Customs. Orangeman as he was, chief of the Orangemen as he was, he never failed in doing full justice to Lower Canada, its rights, its religion and its interests. The hon gentleman then strayed off into the Streams Bill. Well, the hon. gentleman quoted what was said in the report on the Streams Bill. He forgot that the report and the action of the Government on the Streams Bill were based on the authority of a report of the Minister of Justice in the Government of which he was a member, which Government disallowed a Bill passed by the Legislature of Prince Edward Island on precisely the same grounds as the Streams Bill rejection was approved by us. Let the hon. gentleman look back, and he will find that the Government of that day notwithstanding their strong affection for provincial rights, disallowed a measure on the same grounds, first, because it was *ex post facto*, and, second, because it was *lis pendens*, and the subject already before the courts. Then my hon. friend says that although we are very slow in some things, we are very quick in others; that, for instance, there was the *modus vivendi*, which we had to decline to grant, although my hon. friend had moved it, and then a few days afterwards we had agreed to continue it. The hon. gentleman must not lay the flattering unction to his soul that his motion had anything to do in the world with the action of the Government on that point. I can prove it in the easiest and clearest possible way. The hon. gentleman will, perhaps, remember my speech on the occasion in answer to that motion. I asked the hon. gentleman to allow the matter to stand over, not to press that subject while a Government was just going out in the United States, and to wait and see—I only asked for six days—whether the incoming Government were going to be friendly or were going to adopt a non-intercourse policy. I said—the hon. gentleman must remember it—wait until we see if there is any evidence of hostility, if it is not going to be a non-intercourse Government, then it will be time enough to deal with that subject.

I could not tell the hon. gentleman at that time, but I can tell him now. His motion was made on the 26th of February. On the 4th of February the first communication to the colony of Newfoundland was made. My telegram was:

"Have temporarily suspended granting of licenses under *modus vivendi* until the course of new president known. Wish co-operation. Am writing."

So that the subject was under discussion between the Premier of Newfoundland and the Dominion of Canada long before we knew that my hon. friend was going to make his flourish. The papers I shall lay before the House, as I promised to do. The hon. gentleman held us responsible for a debate in the Province of Ontario the other day, when Mr. Craig made a motion and Mr. Meredith made a speech. Well, Mr. Speaker, all that I can say is this, those gentlemen are free agents, they can make speeches as they like. We are responsible here in the Dominion Parliament for what we do in the Dominion Parliament. Even here the hon. gentleman would not like to be held responsible for this resolution, because his great friend and supporter, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) happens to differ from him. These Conservative gentlemen in Toronto have taken their course. My hon. friend from North Norfolk is a supporter of the hon. gentleman, is a strong leader in the Liberal party. He has taken his course; the hon. gentleman was not bound by that, he has shown that he is not bound by it; and yet if we applied to him the same measure that he applies to us, we are to be held responsible, notwithstanding our own assertion, notwithstanding our own vote, notwithstanding our course of action—we are to be held responsible for the action of Conservatives in another and different sphere. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) the other day, in his very effective speech, a very satisfactory speech from my point of view, said that the Government ought to have spoken early in this matter. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we had disallowed the Bill, that would have been a true remark. If we had taken the responsibility of disallowing the Bill, of interfering with the legislation of the Province of Quebec, we ought to be called upon to state our reasons and to defend our course. But as a matter of course, the legislation of each Province is independent, subject to the restrictions in the Constitution It requires no defence for the Government of the day to allow an Act of the Local Legislature to go into operation. That is their duty as a general rule and there is no defence required. An attack must be made if they have improperly allowed an Act to go into operation. Now, in this case I have no doubt, notwithstanding the able arguments of the hon. member from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that that measure was within the competence of the Provincial Legislature. My hon. friend who is a much higher authority than myself, the Minister of Justice, came to the same conclusion. I may say that we, laymen and lawyers in the Cabinet, were unanimous on the point; and if I had any doubt upon the subject the able and well reasoned argument and speech of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) would have removed all doubts from my mind. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman seemed to intimate that there has been a change of front on this subject. He is wrong. We have carried out fully, in our opinion, the principles laid down in a report submitted by myself as Minister of Justice in 1869. That report was communicated to all the Governments of the Provinces, and it laid down what we considered were the principles which should govern the exercise of the power of disallowance by the Governor General on the advice of his Cabinet, and although that was not formally approved, it has really been acted upon and continually quoted by both sides of this House and by both parties in the press, as being a fair description of the instances in which the power and right of disallowance should be exercised. Now, this Bill, Mr. Speaker, was either within

the competence of the Legislature or it was not. If within the competence of the Legislature, it must as matter of course, be allowed to go into operation (I know some hon. gentlemen will not agree with the exception laid down in the report of 1868 and carried out ever since) unless in the opinion of the Government of the Dominion the Act, however much within the competence of the Province, was injurious to the Dominion as a whole. Of course, it is a great responsibilty for any Government to take that course and to decide that any provincial measure is against the interests of the Dominion. But the provision was put into the British North America Act to meet such cases, so that if in any case the Government of the Dominion should believe that an Act within the competence of a Province was injurious to the whole Dominion, it was their duty as well as their right to disallow that measure, and for doing so they are responsible to the Parliament of the Dominion, in which Parliament every Province has its representatives, who, of course, are prepared, as is their duty, to defend their provincial rights. That is the doctrine in pursuance of which we have assumed the responsibility of allowing this Bill, not disallowing it, and for which we are held responsible. If it is not within the competence of the Province, it does not at all follow that it is the duty of the Dominion Government to interfere. Look at the returns laid before Parliament, amounting now to two volumes. You see again and again reports in which the Ministers of Justice have stated that they believed certain clauses of different measures were *ultra vires*, yet as they had a beneficial tendency, or as they did not affect the interests of the rest of the Dominion, the attention of the Provincial Legislatures and Provincial Governments were called to it, with the suggestion that, if they thought well of it, they should amend the Act in those clauses and in those particulars where, in the opinion of the Minister of Justice and the Government here, they had exceeded their legitimate powers. It does not at all follow that because a Bill is *ultra vires* and is beyond the competence of the Legislature, it should be disallowed. On the contrary, as has been urged by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), and very correctly urged, it is just in those cases there is no necessity for disallowance, because there are the courts of law to appeal to. The allowance of a Bill which is *ultra vires* does not make it law. The courts can at once interfere and it is only in those cases where Acts are *ultra vires*, and where leaving them on the Statute-book would cause great injury to parties, that the right of disallowance should be exercised. Hon. members will readily understand that the moment an Act is passed by a Provincial Legislature people interested in the measure assume it is law, act on it, enter into large enterprises on it, and may be ruined if the Government did not immediately, with all convenient speed, interfere to protect those people from injury and ruin. In this case, as I have already said, we, the Government, including the legal members of it, had no doubt as to the fact that this Act was within the competence of the Local Legislature. And Sir, I think it was not left for us, we could not as a Government, against the decisions of the Legislature of Old Canada, and against the repeated legislation of the Province of Quebec since Confederation, set up our own opinion against the various Acts that have been passed. Why, 37 years ago, by the Legislature of United Canada, where the majority of the representatives of the people were Protestants, the St. Mary's College was incorporated with large powers. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says: because there were some few Jesuit professors, that did not make it a Jesuit college. Now, I tell the hon. gentleman that the corporators of the St. Mary's College were the Bishop of Montreal and six Jesuit priests. Just as Victoria College is a Methodist College and Queen's a Presbyterian institution, so St. Mary's College is a Jesuit teaching institution.

Mr. BLAKE. Everybody knew it was a Jesuit college.

Mr. BERGERON. It has never been disputed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let me call the attention of the House to the division on that occasion. Let the hon. gentleman remember that the majority that voted for the Bill was 54 and only seven members, on the third reading, were opposed to it. There was a larger vote against it in the second reading, but, after a full discussion, on the third reading the division was as I have stated. Of the 54 who voted for the incorporation of St. Mary's College 29 were Protestants and 25 Catholics. I will read to the House some of the names to show that, although it was known at the time that it was a Jesuit institution, although the objection was taken and arguments were used somewhat like the arguments used on this occasion, yet there was then no fear of the Jesuit body, no fear of their insidious attempt to unsettle the Constitution of Canada, no fear that the crown of Canada was trembling on the head of Her Majesty, no fear that this country was going to suffer any injury of any kind, and this will be shown when I read to the House some of the names. Judge Badgley, the leading lay representative in the Church of England of Montreal; Hon. M. C. Cameron, a Free Church Presbyterian; Mr. Clapham, a Church of England man from Quebec; Hon. George Crawford, a strong North of Ireland Protestant, and I believe an Orangeman; Mr. Dawson of London, who everyone remembers as a strong Church of England man; Mr. Gamble, the special agent of Bishop Strachan in Parliament when the Clergy Reserves question was settled; Sir Francis Hincks, whom we all know; Mr. Langton, whom the older members of the House will remember; myself, the member for Kingston; Mr. McDougall (not the Honorable William), also a Protestant; Mr. Hamilton Merritt, whom we all know as a Liberal in Parliament and afterwards a member of the Government; Mr. Morrison, I am not sure whether that is Judge Morrison or his brother, Angus Morrison; Mr. Page, a prominent representative from the Province of Quebec; Mr. Patrick, of Prescott, whom we all remember as being a good Liberal; Col Prince, of Essex; Sir William Richards, then the Attorney-General; Mr. Ridout, the Conservative member for Toronto; Hon. William Robinson, whom we all remember as the brother of Sir John Robinson, the leader of the old family compact party; Dr. Rolph; Sir John Rose; Mr. Seymour, afterwards a Senator; Hon. James Shaw, afterwards a Senator; Mr. Stevenson, of Prince Edward; the late Mr. Thomas Street; the late the Hon. George O. Stuart, of Quebec; Mr. C. Wilson, of Middlesex; Mr. Wright, of West York, a leading Orangeman, and, as my friend from London can vouch, a staunch Protestant; those were the gentlemen who voted for this Bill, and the members who voted against the Bill were all from Ontario. That is a sufficient answer to my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) that in 1852 not one single Protestant representative from the Province of Lower Canada—the Province of Quebec—voted against the Bill, and that is a full justification of the statement of my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby) when he said that Protestants of the Province of Quebec were not opposed to the legislation of that subject. We find that so long as 37 years ago the Jesuit college was established in Montreal. I voted for that, Mr. Speaker, and I never have had cause to regret my vote. That institution has gone on in its work of usefulness. We do not hear one single complaint of its teaching, or of any perversion of the youth, nor any disloyal doctrines, or any doctrines which have brought censure on the college. We hear that that institution has gone on and continues to go on doing its work well and devotedly. Now, Mr. Speaker, one would suppose from the speeches we hear now, and the

articles which we see in the newspapers, that this was a new invasion of the Jesuits, that they are coming in like the Huns and the Vandals over this country to sweep away civilisation. Well, 37 years ago they were in active and useful operation in Canada, and in 1871, 18 years ago, the Legislature of the Province of Quebec passed an Act incorporating the Society of Jesus. This Act of 1887 is not the first Act of incorporation. It is an Act altering the provisions of the Act of 1871, and, instead of enlarging their powers, it diminishes the powers given them by the Act of 1871. This Act of 1871 passed the Legislature of Quebec, and we find that there was no protest from the Protestants in Parliament or out of Parliament. We do not find or hear that there was any objection to this Act. Now, because an agitation has grown up in the country—I do not know how or why—it is found that the Act of 1871 ought never to have been passed, that the Act of 1878 limiting this Act of 1871 ought not to be passed, and that both those Acts, as well as the measure we are now discussing, is deeply injurious to the people of all the Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, this Act of 1871 provides:

"Whereas the Rev. Fathers Pierre Point, Superior, Firmin Vignon, Zéphirin Resther, and others, priests and religious members of the Company of Jesus, residing at Quebec, in the building of the 'Congrégation de Notre Dame,' form a body whose object is to perform the various functions of their office, in cities and in country places, such as the preaching of missions and retreats, and to assume the direction of religious congregations, brotherhoods and societies both of men and women; can also, at the request or with the permission of their lordships the Roman Catholic Bishops, or of any one of them, to devote themselves to other works for spiritual or moral purposes, by preaching, precepts and education; and, whereas, in order to consolidate their establishment and to favor its prosperity and progress, they have prayed for leave to form a corporate body enjoying civil and political rights; Therefore, Her Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Legislature of Quebec, enacts as follows:

"1. The above named petitioners and all other persons who may in future be legally associated with them in virtue of the present Act, are hereby constituted a body politic, and shall form a corporation under the name of 'Les missionnaires de Notre Dame, S. J.'

"2. The said corporation shall, under the same name, have perpetual succession, and shall have all the rights, powers and privileges of other corporations, and particularly of those having a religious, spiritual or moral object. It may at all times admit other members and establish them in one or more places. It may also at all times and places by purchase, gift, devise, assignment, loan or in virtue of this Act, or by any other lawful means and legal title, acquire, possess, inherit, take, have, accept and receive any movable or immovable property whatever, for the usages and purposes of the said corporation, and the same may hypothecate, sell, lease, farm out, exchange, alienate, and finally dispose of lawfully, in whole or in part, for the same purposes."

And it goes on to say there must be the limit of $10,000 as to the extent of immovable property they should hold. How could the present Government, in the face of the solemn legislation of United Canada of 1852, and in the face of the legislation of the Province of Quebec in 1871—how could they now set up their own opinion and declare that this was a body that ought not to have existence in Canada? But, Sir, let us look on it as a matter of common sense. What harm have the Jesuits done, and have they done any? In 37 years, if their principles were so void of morality, if their morality was so doubtful, if their ambition was so inordinate they would have shown some evidence of it in 37 years or since their incorporation in 1871. They have gone on in their humble way acting like other Catholic orders in the Province of Quebec, doing their duty according to their lights. When you talk of their doctrines I have nothing to say about them; all we know is this, their doctrines whatever they are are such as to meet with the approbation of the Head of their Church or they would soon be informed of it in the authoritative way which the Head of that Church can govern all such religious bodies within the Catholic religion. Under these circumstances I say we would have been acting with a degree of presumption that I do not think any Canadian Government or any sensible Government in any country would think of exercising if we vetoed this Bill. We had no ground for doing so, we had the sanction of United Canada,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

as I said before for this Act; we had positive legislation acted upon in the Province of Quebec for eighteen long years, and that we should set up our own opinion is absurd. If we did we would have been justly subject to the condemnation of every thinking man in Canada. But, Sir, we are told all about the expulsion of the Jesuits and the Act of Supremacy, and the unfavorable legislation that took place in England long long ago. It is too late for us to discuss this subject to-night, or I would like very much to do so. But those laws practically have been obsolete in England. England is a very Conservative country, and its general policy has been, in the change of manners, in the advance of education and liberal ideas, not to rub out statute after statute whenever it may apparently infringe upon or be adverse to the thought of the day, but to allow them quietly to drop; and what is the consequence: Look at England. Are the people of England afraid of the insidious attempts of the Jesuit body to attack the supremacy of England? Are they afraid that the Queen's crown would tremble on her head? Sir, one of the greatest and finest educational institutions in the world is that of Stoneyhurst, which is altogether conducted as a Jesuit institution, where all the English Catholics, from the Duke of Norfolk down, are educated; and anybody who knows the situation of parties in England must know that if there be a loyal body of men in the whole world, if there be a loyal body of men within the dominions of Her Majesty, it is the English Catholics, headed by the Duke of Norfolk, their great chief. In England they are not afraid; and why should we be afraid? Why, Mr. Speaker, there are known to be at least 300 Jesuits in England, Jesuit priests teaching. The collateral body, I think, is above 1,000; and there are 180 in Ireland. Besides the College at Stoneyhurst, there is the College of Mount St. Mary, and Beaumont College; there are Jesuits teaching a collegiate institute at Canterbury; there is a collegiate school at Liverpool; and there is a Jesuit school in Jersey. The Jesuits are actively employed in educating the youth of England, and we do not find that there is a remonstrance anywhere. We do not find that the Acts which would affect their existence in England have ever been put in force. Why, it would be absurd. The Prince of Wales, the heir of Her Majesty, upon whose head the Crown of England will some day descend—though we all hope that Her Majesty may long continue to wear it—does not think his position as a Protestant sovereign will be affected by the fact that there are Jesuits in Canada or in England. At the requiem service at a Jesuit Church the other day, for the Archduke Rudulph, whose unhappy fate we all know, the Prince of Wales was present, and, strange to say, was so unconscious of the danger that he was running that after the service was over, he asked the superior, as a souvenir of the event, to make him a gift of his missal or mass book. And Canada is the only country in the world where there are Jesuits, which is afraid of their insidious attempts to unsettle the constitution. There are Jesuits by the thousands in the United States, and if Canada is in danger, they can overflow into Canada just as well from the United States as they can from England, or be educated in the country. And, as a Presbyterian clergyman said in the pulpit here, this, after all, is a mere matter of money; and that a religious excitement should be raised on a sum of money, and a small sum, shows how easily the public may be excited if only a cry is got up, especially on religious subjects. We know that public agitation may go on sometimes without reason, and to a great extent, one cannot but deeply regret that the hon. member for Muskoka felt it to be his duty to make this motion, which ought not to have been made—this motion which will be the cause of a great deal of discomfort in Canada. I look back, Mr. Speaker, and I remember the great social evils that religious evils have caused in this country. I remember when the whole country was roused on the Clergy Reserve question,

William Lyon Mackenzie said in the Parliament of Canada, after he came came back from his exile, that the proximate cause of the rebellion in Upper Canada was the Clergy Reserve question and the agitation upon it. One can also remember how neighbor was set against neighbor on the separate school question; and, therefore, I feel deeply that this country is injured, greatly injured—of course my hon. friend does not think so—by the projection of this subject in this popular assembly; and we cannot see what the result may be. I hope and believe it will fade away like other cries, and I am induced to do so when I look back at the events connected with the Papal Aggression Bill of 1850. I happened to be in England in 1850. Then the excitement was tremendous, caused chiefly by the letter written by Lord John Russell, the Durham letter, and by the very unwise conduct of Cardinal Wiseman in making the announcement in the way he did. I remember the excitement in England. Cardinal Wiseman, although having an English name, was a foreigner, a Spaniard; and when he flaunted the Papal decretals from over the Flaminian gate with a great deal of pomp and ceremony, it roused the sensibilities of the English people, and Lord John Russell took advantage of the excitement in order to make capital for himself. The agitation was so great in England that there was danger of a recurrence of the Lord George Gordon riots. As in those days, the streets and the doors were marked: "no Popery." Whenever I went along the streets I saw chalked on the houses: "No Popery." I think no one went so far as the celebrated clown Grimaldi in Lord George Gordon's days, when he wrote on his door: "No Religion." But we all remember the caustic cartoon in Punch, picturing Lord John Russell as a little boy in buttons, who wrote "No Popery" on the walls, and then ran away. What was the result of that cry? I was a younger man then than now, and I must say I was for a time carried away. The excitement was contagious, wherever I went, at the theatres and elsewhere, the cry was: "God save the Queen, and down with the Pope." You could not go in to a place of public amusement but the crouds would assemble, and it was found necessary to put guards on the banks and to protect Roman Catholic chapels. But Mr. Gladstone and some cooler heads——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Sir James Graham.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; Mr. Gladstone, Sir James Graham, and some others opposed the measure, which had a most ignominious ending. Not one single prosecution took place under that Act. Not one single proceeding was taken under it, and a few years afterwards, in 1871, the Act was repealed in silence. Not a single observation was made to continue it in its wretched existence.

Mr. BLAKE. Everybody was ashamed of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Everybody, as the hon. member for the West Durham (Mr. Blake) says, was ashamed of it. The Bill was scouted out of Parliament, although the excitement had been originally so enormous. I cannot convey to you the excitement that existed in England at that time. I hope and believe that when this matter is fully understood in the Province of Ontario, when the exhaustive speeches that were made upon it are read and discussed and weighed, the country will see that their apprehensions are unfounded, and that the country is safe. Why, there are in all the Dominion of Canada 71 Jesuits. Are they going to conquer the whole of Canada? Is Protestantism to be subdued? Is the Dominion to be seduced from its faith by 71 Jesuit priests? They are armed with a string of beads, a sash around their waists and a mass book or missal. What harm can they do? I told my reverend and eloquent friend, Dr. Potts of Toronto, that I would match him physically and spiritually, against any follower of Ignatius Loyola in the whole Dominion of Canada. Now, only think of it. The Jesuits claim, and claimed with an appearance of right, that the effect of their restoration should be to give them back all their own property. They contended for that, and they had the right to fight the best battle they could. Look at the papers. They said that the value of the property was $2,000,000, but they came down, however, graciously, and said they would take $1,000,000, or, to be accurate, I think, $900,000. But the Government of the Province of Quebec said: No, you cannot have that; you can only have $400,000—not a very large sum Why, Mr. Mercier has been granting, in the interest of his country, sums as big as that for railways here and there through Quebec. We do the same thing here. It is no very large sum. But not only did Mr. Mercier confine the vote to $400,000 but he said: You shall have not the whole of it; perhaps you shall have none of it. The other ecclesiastic institutions, Catholic colleges, said they had a right to their share. Now, it was a family matter, it was in *foro domestico*, and, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) truly said, it was their own money, it was the property of the Province of Quebec and they could do with it as they liked. There is almost nosubject to which the Quebec Government could not apply these moneys under the general phrase of "property and civil rights." The lands themselves, if they came to the old Province of Canada by escheat, the moment that Upper and Lower Canada were severed, those lands, by the terms of the British North America Act, became, like any other public lands in the Province of Quebec, subject to be sold or kept or retained or applied for any purpose the Government of that Province chose. You cannot bind any Province to carry out the original intentions of the donors. This land became their property, and the representatives of the people, the legislators of the Province, have a right to apply their own property and the proceeds of their property for any purpose they have a right to deal with under the powers of the Act. How does it turn out? It was left to the Pope to settle in what proportion the different collegiate institutions should have this $400,000; and His Holiness, instead of being the special supporter of the Jesuit Order, instead of pressing their interests on the people of Canada, instead of giving them wealth in order to advance their insidious designs against the Crown and dignity of Canada, cut them down to the miserable sum of $160,000. He has given the rest of it to the other collegiate institutions and to the bishops for the purposes of higher education. I hear the argument stated that it is not stated, in so many words, that the money going to the Jesuits shall be devoted to educational purposes. Why, they are a teaching body in Canada exclusively now. There is not a single parish in the whole Province of Quebec which has a Jesuit as its *curé;* there is not a single parish in which the Jesuits have any control. They are a teaching body in the Province of Quebec. They have a mission in which education and Christianity go hand in hand among the Indians and the Esquimaux on the Labrador coast, where they are doing a great deal of good, where they are suffering the hardships and miseries which we read in Parkman they were always ready to suffer in the cause of religion and humanity. And, strange to say, if we go west, leaving the Eastern Province of Quebec, to the Province of Manitoba, we find there the College of St. Boniface with Archbishop Taché at its head, and the professors are six Jesuit priests. We do not hear of Manitoba raising up a cry against that institution. We know how easily popular excitement in a young country like that, full of ardent spirits, can be raised. I have occasion to know something about that. Well, they submit to the enormous wrong of having six Jesuit priests teaching in Manitoba with as much apathy as the Protestants in the Province of Quebec; and more than that, strange to say, there is the Anglican clergy

under the charge of the Bishop of the Church of England, there is the Presbyterian clergy under the charge of the Presbyterian body, and they are so recreant to their Protestantism, they are so apathetic, that they have joined hand-in-hand in forming a common university, that common university giving degrees, and the governing body of that university is composed of Catholics, Presbyterians Anglicans. And all this cry is for some $160,000, which, at four per cent., amounts to some $6,000 a year. I cannot but remember the story of the Jew going into an eating house and being seduced by a slice of ham. When he came out, it so happened there was a crash of thunder, and he said: Good heavens, what a row about a little bit of pork. It is a little bit of pork, and as the poor Jew escaped being crushed by the thunderbolt, I have no doubt Canada will escape from the enormous sum of $6,000 a year. If this Bill had been introduced in other terms it would have been fortunate. I agree with those gentlemen who say that the framers of the Bill, by the way it is drawn and the insertion of these recitals, almost court the opposition of the member for Muskoka. I agree that that is so, and, if the Bill had not mentioned the Society of Jesus, it would have passed without any opposition. If the money had been given to the Sulpicians, the money had been given to the University of Laval, if if the money had been given to the bishops of the different dioceses for higher education, no one would have objected to it, this Bill would not have excited any attention; but, it is just because the Jesuits have got historically a bad name from Protestant history, and it was simply because their name was in the Bill that all this agitation has been aroused. This subject is not a new one. Years and years ago, long before Confederation, the subject was discussed in Parliament, and strong arguments were used against the recognition of the claim for Jesuits' estates, and the feeling of opposition was shown and emphasised in the sentence which was used by a worthy member of Parliament—a good Grit he was, by the way, and a very respectable and honest man, strange to say—but he exemplified the feeling of the country in one sentence. His speech was a very effective one. It was this: "Mr. Speaker, I don't like them there Jesites." That was the feeling. There was a prejudice against the Jesuits, and it is from that same prejudice that all this agitation has been aroused. Now, I can only repeat that the Government would have performed an act of tyranny if they had disallowed the Bill. Believing as we do that it is perfectly within the competence of that Legislature, and does not in any way affect any other portion of Her Majesty's dominions, there would be no excuse for our interfering, even according to the rigid principles which my hon. friend opposite thinks govern us. I agree strongly with the language used by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) Supposing this Bill had been disallowed, Mr. Mercier would have gained a great object. He would have been the champion of his church. The moment it was announced that this Bill was disallowed there would have been a summons for a meeting of the Legislature of Quebec. They would have passed that Bill unanimously, and would have sent it back here, and what would have been the consequence? No Government can be formed in Canada, either by myself, or by the hon. member who moves this resolution (Mr. O'Brien), or by my hon. friend who sits opposite (Mr. Laurier), having in view the disallowance of such a measure. What would be the consequence of a disallowance? Agitation, a quarrel—a racial and a religious war would be aroused. The best interests of the country would be prejudiced, our credit would be ruined abroad, and our social relations destroyed at home. I cannot sufficiently picture, in my faint language, the misery and the wretchedness which would have been heaped upon Canada if this question, having been agitated as it has been, and would be, had culminated in a series of disallowances of this Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I sympathise entirely with the desires of hon. gentlemen, and I do not propose to occupy the time of the House at any length, but this is not a question on which I intend to record my vote without explicitly declaring the reasons which actuate me on this occasion. As to the speech which has been made by the hon. the Premier, I think the hon. gentleman certainly had very little ground for charging my hon. friend the member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) with any irrelevancy in his remarks, at any rate as compared with the remarks in which the hon. gentleman himself indulged, for he most assuredly travelled over a wider range and went back over a greater number of years than my hon. friend required to traverse on his part. There is one remark which the hon. gentleman made, having reference to a gentleman who has long since departed from amongst us, which, to the best of my knowledge and to the knowledge of other hon. gentlemen here who knew him better than I did, was not a just or a fair remark for the Premier to have made. That was the statement that the late Hon. George Brown had declared—as I took down the hon. gentleman's words—that it was part of his policy to suppress the French language in Canada. If the hon. gentleman will show, if he will produce on the floor of this House any evidence that Mr. Brown did make use of such a statement, we will be willing to accept his assurance, but, although my acquaintance with Mr. Brown was not as long as that of the hon. gentleman, I knew him for a considerable number of years, and I cannot recollect having seen in his writings or heard from his lips any statement or any language at all warranting the assertion which has lately been made by the hon gentleman. In reference to some of the remarks made, and most justly made, by my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Laurier), that the policy of the present Government, in wantonly and needlessly interfering with provincial rights, was largely and principally responsible for the present agitation which we must all deplore, the hon. gentleman opposite took refuge in the old *tu quoque* argument that, in the time of my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mackenzie), certain Bills had been disallowed; and he referred especially to one from Prince Edward Island which he asserted had been disallowed by us. My recollection is—and I have consulted my hon friend the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) in regard to it—that it was reserved by the Lieutenant Governor of that Province, and that, as was done by the hon. gentleman himself, in a certain memorable instance, it was not disallowed, but was sent back to the Province to be considered by the Lieutenant Governor. Perhaps the hon. gentleman recollects that, on a certain occasion, a Bill for the incorporation of the Orange Order was sent to him under precisely similar circumstances, and that he—good Orangeman as he is—sent back that Bill because it had been reserved by the Lieutenant Governor who, he stated, had no business to act in that way without instructions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; that is the case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was exactly the case in regard to the Bill from Prince Edward Island.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My impression was that it was the other way.

Mr. BLAKE. It was the case of a reserved Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report was made by Mr. Scott?

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So that we followed the example of the hon. gentleman in that matter. Now, I have no objection whatever to say that I believe the report which the hon. gentleman made in 1869 gave a very full and fair account of the lines which we ought to have been

governed in dealing with provincial rights. But since that time, as we all know, the hon. gentleman fell from grace, but we are glad to see by the statements made the other night by the Minister of Justice, that here again the hon. gentleman is coming back to the identical principles, and is framing his policy on those identical lines, which were advocated from this side of the House. As my hon. friend truly said, we are getting used to these sudden extraordinary conversions on the part of the hon. gentleman. My hon. friend pointed out to him that before three weeks have elapsed from the time when we advised the *modus vivendi* to be put in force, we find the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, by their act in Council, giving effect to the proposition made by my hon. friend. Let me recall to the hon. gentleman's mind the language with which he received that proposition. Unless my recollection is wholly at fault, we were told that it would be to go down on our knees to the great American nation, it would disgrace Canada, it was unworthy of a free people, unworthy of a free Government; yet in three weeks he accedes to the proposition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, no. Look at *Hansard*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will not irritate or aggravate the hon. gentleman by reciting all the other summersaults that he has performed in the last few years. But that is very far from being the only case in which the hon. gentleman recently has chosen, for reasons of his own, to take a leaf out of our books and to put on the Statute-book the exact policy which we have over and over again pointed out to him, and pointed out to this country, as the only one which can be followed in the interests of the people of Canada. As my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mackenzie) reminds me, that is no new thing on the part of the hon. gentleman. Almost all his life his business has been to make capital by opposing as, long as he thought it safe, all the Liberal ideas, all the improvements, all the useful suggestions that were made; and then when there was a chance of obtaining a reasonable amount of profit, the hon. gentleman was prepared to adopt them; nor did he ever in all his life do so more remarkably than in the case of the adoption of the scheme of Confederation itself, which, to my certain knowledge—for I was a member of Parliament then—the hon. gentleman opposed with might and main, tooth and nail, until he was confronted with dissolution from which he knew he had not the ghost of a chance of emerging successfully. I will not spend any more time over the bygone proceedings of the hon. gentleman. I wish to say, however, a few words as to the question now in hand. I am in part disposed to agree with some of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this question in believing that this is not a light matter, that this may be attended with serious results indeed. I do not know, and none of us can tell, to what extent this agitation may ultimately spread. The vote that will be given to-night is a foregone conclusion, but it may well be that the end is not yet. Therefore, I hold that it is doubly our duty under these circumstances, speaking as men with a grave responsibility upon us, to declare why and wherefore we are not in a position at this moment to accept the motion recently made by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). As I have said, so far as the Government of Canada is concerned, this demand for interference with the legislation of the Province of Quebec is in a large degree due to the action which the Government have previously taken by their unjust interference with Acts passed by other Provincial Legislatures, passed by the Provincial Legislature of my own Province, passed by the Provincial Legislature of Manitoba, distinctly within their rights. The hon. gentlemen for their own reasons, and in pursuance of their own objects, chose to disallow these, and, therefore, they cannot blame their supporters if, under existing circumstances, they demand that they should put in force the same rule and law for the Province of Quebec that they have put in force for other Provinces of this Dominion. Sir, they chose to constitute themselves a court of appeal as to those Acts. I hold that the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was perfectly right in saying that when two gentlemen holding the position of the First Minister and the Minister of Customs and affiliating with the society to which they belong, believe that this Act was a bad one, if they thought there was anything objectionable in it, then they were bound by their own previous proceedings to disallow this Act and to take the consequence. Now, Sir, the position of three parties in this House is tolerably clearly defined. The position of the member for North Simcoe and his friends is clear enough. They maintain that we have a right to interfere and to sit in judgment on provincial legislation. They disapprove of this Act, and they consistently call upon the Government to disallow it. So the position of hon. gentlemen on this side is clearly defined. We have always declared that the Provinces had a full and perfect power to legislate on subjects which were formally assigned to them, and that on such subjects we ought not to interfere with them, even where some of us might believe that their action was unwise or indiscreet. But as to the Government, their position is wholly different. We find them on this occasion, as on almost all others, sometimes assuming one line and pursuing one policy, and sometimes on grounds, as they allege, of high moral conviction, disallowing an Act like that of the Province of Manitoba; but in cases like this, where there is too much at stake, we do not find the hon. gentlemen are troubled with any serious moral convictions which would lead them into collision with a powerful and united Province. Now, I do not in the least offer any opinion as to the legality of the proceedings. I am wholly in accord with the hon. member for West York (Mr. Mulock) and with other hon. gentlemen who have spoken here, in saying that if there be a question as to the legality of this Act, the proper place to settle it is the courts. I do not think this House is in any way constituted to act as a legal tribunal. I do not think the country would have confidence in us, acting as a legal tribunal, I am sure for one I would not. Now, we have two opinions from men eminent in their profession of the most possible opposite character on this question. There is no doubt whatever, I suppose, that there are very few questions of this nature on which legal gentlemen of the eminence of the Minister of Justice, or the hon. member for North Simcoe, or of the constitutional knowledge of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), cannot make out at first sight a very good and a very plausible case, but with that I have nothing to do. What we are concerned with here is the question whether it is advisable for us to make use of this extreme power which we possess, which the Government possess, under the British North America Act, to disallow this legislation. Sir, I have always observed this plain principle in respect to such proceedings: I say that the position which the Dominion of Canada and the Government of Canada occupy with respect to the Provinces, is identically the same as that which the Parliament and the Government of England occupy with respect to this Dominion Parliament, and that we should imitate the example of the English Government and English Parliament in abstaining from interfering with the Provinces. They have scrupulously abstained, in all but a very few cases, growing yearly less and less—almost none I may say within the last few years—from interfering with our legislation, and so we in turn are bound carefully to abstain from interfering with the legislation of the Provinces. The words used in the Act, as the hon. gentleman knows right well and as all hon. gentlemen I suppose know, are precisely and identically the same, and just the same powers are given to the English Government to disallow the Acts of this Parliament as is given to the Canadian Government to disallow provincial Acts, and it would be idle, it would be

needless for me to waste the time of the House by reminding hon. members how they would resent any interference on the part of the British Government in a matter which came clearly and distinctly, as these I think come clearly and distinctly, within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature. All I desire to say with respect to the Bill now in hand is this: With the incorporation of the Jesuits we have nothing to do. The hon. gentleman was perfectly right, as other hon. gentlemen were right, in calling the attention of the country and the House to the fact that over and over again other Acts of incorporation had been passed incorporating certain portions of this order. All, I say, we have to do with in these matters is the question, whether we were justified in interfering with this particular Act passed by Mr. Mercier. With respect to that question, I am bound to say that I myself entertain very great doubts of the wisdom and propriety of that Act. I doubt whether if I had lived in the Province of Quebec I would not have felt it to be my duty to have opposed it; but that is not the question, it is not what my opinion is and whether I approve of it or not, or whether it is justifiable on the whole. The question is this: Whether after the Legislature of Quebec has undertaken to deal with this subject, we, the Parliament of Canada, have a right to interfere with it? On that point, no more than the hon. gentleman do I entertain any doubt. I hold that it was fully within their constitutional rights, and I hold, therefore, that we have no business whatever to interfere with it or meddle with the disposal of the money entrusted to their care in any shape or way. If they have done wrong, let them answer for it to the people of the Province of Quebec, whom they specially represent. Let us not bring their Acts into controversy here, where, for various reasons, it is almost utterly impossible that we should come to a fair and equitable decision on the merits of any case passed on by a Provincial Legislature. More than that. Besides thinking it is beyond our right, I must add this, that I think it would be in the highest degree impolitic, in the highest degree contrary to good government, that it would impair the whole fabric of our Confederation if we took the advice of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and proceed to disallow this Bill. I have seen, as well as the hon. gentleman, what the result of these religious feuds and discords sometimes is; and I say that I believe, if you were to disallow this Bill, most assuredly two results would flow from it: one would be that you would have a solid and united Lower Canada occupying to us approximately the same position that Ireland unhappily still holds in the British Parliament; and the other (if the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) desires especially to achieve that end) that you would make the Order of Jesuits the most powerful religious body in Quebec, and probably in North America. These two results would flow from the adoption of the idea of the hon. member for Muskoka and the disallowance of the Act on the grounds set forth in his motion. I, for one, will be no party under any circumstances or for any consideration to stirring up religious strife among my countrymen. So far as my power goes, so far as my voice and vote can go, I desire to have the rights of my own Province respected, and I desire to see the rights of a sister Province respected. I desire to maintain my own rights, my own religious belief, my own right to act as a free man in this country, and these rights which I claim for myself I will also not merely give to my fellow-countrymen, but I am ready to champion and obtain for them in every shape and way that I can possibly do so. If I had any doubt as to the correctness of my conviction I would find it in the fact that we have to-night for the first time in many years my venerated friend (Mr. Mackenzie) coming here to record his vote against a proposition which would set man against man and kindle the flames of religious bigotry from one end of this Dominion to the other.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

House divided on amendment (Mr. O'Brien):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Barron,	Macdonald (Huron),	Scriver,
Bell,	McCarthy,	Sutherland,
Charlton,	McNeill,	Tyrwhitt, and
Cockburn,	O'Brien	Wallace,—13
Denison,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Mills (Annapolis),
Armstrong,	Ferguson (Renfrew),	Mills (Bothwell),
Audet,	Ferguson (Welland),	Mitchell,
Bain (Soulanges),	Fiset,	Moffat,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	Moncrieff,
Barnard,	Flynn,	Montplaisir,
Beausoleil,	Foster,	Mulock,
Béchard,	Freeman,	Neveu,
Bergeron,	Gauthier,	Paterson (Brant),
Bergin,	Gigault,	Paterson (Essex),
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Perley,
Blake,	Girouard,	Perry,
Boisvert,	Godbout,	Platt,
Borden,	Gordon,	Porter,
Bourassa,	Grandbois,	Préfontaine,
Bowell,	Guay,	Prior,
Bowman,	Guillet,	Purcell,
Boyle,	Haggart,	Putnam,
Brien,	Hale,	Rinfret,
Brown,	Hall,	Rinpel,
Bryson,	Hesson,	Robertson,
Burdett,	Hickey,	Robillard,
Burns,	Halton,	Roome,
Cameron,	Hudspeth,	Ross,
Campbell,	Innes,	Rowand,
Cargill,	Ives,	Rykert,
Carling,	Joncas,	Ste. Marie,
Carpenter,	Jones (Digby),	Scarth,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jones (Halifax),	Semple,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Kenny,	Shanly,
Casey,	Kirk,	Skinner,
Casgrain,	Kirkpatrick,	Small,
Chisholm,	Labelle,	Smith (Sir Donald),
Choquette,	Labrosse,	Smith (Ontario),
Chouinard,	Landerkin,	Somerville,
Cimon,	Landry,	Sproule,
Cochrane,	Lang,	Stevenson,
Colby,	Langelier (Quebec),	Taylor,
Colter,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Temple,
Cook,	La Rivière,	Thérien,
Corby,	Laurier,	Thompson (Sir John),
Coughlin,	Lépine,	Tisdale,
Coulombe,	Livingston,	Trow,
Couture,	Lovitt,	Tupper,
Curran,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Turcot,
Daly,	Macdowall,	Vanasse,
Daoust,	Mackenzie,	Waldie,
Davies,	McCulla,	Ward,
Davin,	McDonald (Victoria),	Watson,
Davis,	McDougall (Pictou),	Weldon (Albert),
Dawson,	McDougall (Cap Breton),	Weldon (St. John),
Desaulniers,	McGreevy,	Welsh,
Desjardins,	McIntyre,	White (Cardwell),
Dessaint,	McKay,	White (Renfrew),
Dewdney,	McKeen,	Wilmot,
Dickey,	McMillan (Huron),	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Dickinson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilson (Elgin)
Doyon,	McMullen,	Wilson (Lennox),
Dupont,	Madill,	Wood (Brockville),
Edgar,	Mara,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Edwards,	Marshall,	Wright, and
Eisenhauer,	Masson,	Yeo.—188.
Ellis,	Meigs,	

Amendment negatived.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

General repairs and improvements, Maritime Provinces..... $14,000

Resolution reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 29th March, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LANDS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 128) respecting the reconveyance of certain lands to the Government of the Province of British Columbia. He said: This is a short Act, by which it is proposed to reconvey to British Columbia 45,000 acres of land, about which there was some misunderstanding, in the railway belt of British Columbia. At the time the arrangement was made about the railway belt, all the lands which had been appropriated by British Columbia previous to the arrangement were to be made up in some other way. An arrangement was made by which 1,300,000 acres of land were given in the Peace River district for those which had been already appropriated in British Columbia; but with regard to these 45,000 acres there was a misunderstanding. The title of these lands it was thought remained in the hands of the Dominion Government. It was subsequently found that such was not the case, and consequently this Bill is introduced for the purpose of getting over the difficulty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where are the lands?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are on the south bank of the Fraser River, 50 or 60 miles north of New Westminster.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the quality of the land; is it agricultural land or timber land?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is part agricultural and part timber.

Mr. COOK. Is it all in one block?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; both Governments were dealing with a portion of this land, and a greater number of acres than 45,000 had been dealt with by the British Columbia Government. Mr. Robson was sent over this summer to endeavor, amongst other things, to arrange that matter, and we have agreed to transfer to them the 45,000 acres which they had already allowed settlement upon.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FISHERIES ACT.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 129) to amend the Fisheries Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to amend sub section 5 of section 8 of the Fisheries Act, and that amendment is introduced in consequence of recent litigation, or litigation which has been going on for a few years past, in which that section has been construed as excepting the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia from the power of the fishery officers to prevent the use of seines in the non-tidal waters of the rivers, so that, in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, under the decisions which have been given, we are powerless to protect the spawning grounds of the salmon. That is the only amendment proposed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 130) to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act. He said: There are two or three important provisions in this Bill. In the present Act we have embodied a formula in connection with the testing of boilers and engines, which is a peculiar feature of our legislation to-day, though, when it was adopted, it was applicable to the case. Under our present Act, the Inspection Board have no discretion to pass any boiler or engine that does not come within the corners of that provision. Everyone knows that, in recent years, great changes have been made in the construction of engines and boilers, but we are in this peculiar position to-day, because of the inability of our Board of Inspection to take any other course from time to time as the art of building these engines and boilers may progress, that vessels built in Great Britain, having a Board of Trade certificate, and being registered there, are unable to come under the Canadian flag because they are prohibited by this old rule in the statute in regard to the formula. The most important provision of this Bill is to enable the Governor in Council to make rules and regulations from time to time in regard to the inspection of boilers, and to provide that these shall have effect after publication in the *Canada Gazette*. Then it is proposed to repeal the clauses containing these rules and this formula, and this will place our Act in the same position as the Act in England, where the rules and regulations are framed under a general provision of that kind, and also in the position in which our Act was after Confederation took place. As regards other provisions of the Bill I may say, that in Halifax—and this is a case in point which suggested this amendment—we have a very fine steamship which was built in the old country and runs between Halifax and American ports in competition with American steamers, and this steamer is compelled, notwithstanding its possessing the British certificate, and notwithstanding its compliance with British laws, to submit to the inspection laws of the United States, dealing with steamers which are alleged not to be seaworthy, in the sense of our laws, when they run between ports in Canada and ports in the United States. I supposed at first that these foreign steamers could be brought under the general law, but I found that this was impossible, and therefore there is a provision to enable a steamship plying between ports in Canada and ports in the United States to be brought under the Steamboat Inspection Act. The other section is to change slightly the penal clause of one of the sections of the Steamboat Act, in reference to the carrying of a larger number of passengers than is allowed by the law.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In fact it is intended to make the Act more elastic.

Mr. TUPPER. Exactly.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMENDMENTS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 120) to amend chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes, intituled: An Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. Although the hon. gentleman explained, the other day, the nature of this Bill, I would like to hear again the reasons which induced him to introduce this Bill, and what effect it is intended to have.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Bill embodies the resolution which we adopted the other day, and the object of it is to have two persons to sign every cheque, a signature and a counter-signature. That rule has been established in all the departments of the Public Service. It is not sufficient that the Deputy Minister shall sign a cheque, but some officer in every department has been appointed to countersign.

The provisions are statutory in regard to the two Houses of Parliament.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose the object is to have greater security. Who is the second person who is to countersign the cheque?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object of the provision is to meet the case of sickness or temporary absence of the clerk, and with regard to all other cheques the appointment of such persons is with the Treasury Board.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

TOLLS ON SLIDES AND BOOMS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 122) respecting the collection of certain tolls and dues therein mentioned. He said: The control and management of the booms and slides, and all matters relating to that service, are vested in the Department of Public Works, and the collection of tolls, and the management of the canals and matters incident thereto, are vested, of course, in the Department of Railways and Canals. But the collection of the revenue for the booms and slides and for the canals, is vested by law in the Department of Inland Revenue. The result of that is that it necessitates in the Department of Inland Revenue the keeping up of a staff for that purpose, whereas the collection can be as well made in the department which has the management of the works. The object of this is to give the collection of the moneys to the department that has control of the works.

Mr. LAURIER. What will you do with the staff in the Inland Revenue Department? They will not have anything to do.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not intended, as the hon. gentleman will see by section 4, that this arrangement shall affect any appropriation made by Parliament during the present Session in respect of the service to which this Act relates, but every such appropriation shall continue in force and under the control of the proper Ministers. When we come to the item of the appropriation, I think the Minister will be prepared to explain to the House what scheme he has for dispensing with the present staff.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in Committee and reported.

SUMMARY TRIALS ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 121) to amend the Summary Trials Act (from the Senate).

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The present section makes this provision of the law extend to the Province of Prince Edward Island. I understand that those connected with the administration of justice there consider that, as regards the Summary Trials Act, the Province should be placed on the same footing as other Provinces, and, therefore, we propose to amend the section, so as to confine the provision that the jurisdiction shall be absolute and without consent to British Columbia and District of Keewatin, and Prince Edward Island shall stand in the same position as other Provinces.

Mr. LAURIER. I call the attention of the Minister to the fact that copies of the Senate Bills have not been distributed on this side of the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As the Bill has not been distributed, I ask that the Committee rise and report progress.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to enquire from the Minister of Public Works whether he has made any investigation into the matter in dispute between himself and myself touching East Pictou River? I have looked over the various items, and I see no sum for East Pictou River especially, and, therefore, I presume the sum to which he referred must have been taken out of the general vote for dredging. Is that the case?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have given orders to the accountant of the department to prepare a statement of the different sums that have been expended, but I have not yet obtained the information. No doubt I shall have the details of the different sums expended on the river when we next go into Supply.

Mr. TUPPER. I should like to say, and perhaps it will afford information to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that in 1875 there was voted for East River of Pictou, $10,000; for Fraser River, removal of rocks, $2,000; for Detroit River, removal of rocks, $5,000; in 1876, Neebish Rapids, $10,000; 1877, Neebish Rapids, $8,000. In 1877 the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) asked Parliament to vote $1,500 for the removal of obstructions in Cowichan River, British Columbia. That river is not a navigable river, but the expenditure was for the purpose of rafting logs down it.

Mr. JONES. The hon. gentleman should have explained to the House that the expenditure at New Glasgow was for dredging the river there and not for any other purpose.

Mr. TUPPER. I did not say that the $10,000 was for removing rocks. The $10,000 was for the East River of Pictou, quite near where Mr. Carmichael lives. The difference being that the $10,000 was for dredging the shallow portion of the river at New Glasgow town, and the $500 was for removing rocks at a portion of the river not navigable, in order to bring the timber down to meet the shipping.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The last appropriation is for a part of the river not navigable, and the expenditure is represented as to be of no value.

Mr. TUPPER. The only case of a similar expenditure which I can find from a cursory examination, is in the Cowichan River, in British Columbia. The hon. gentleman may distinguish between the propriety of making a river navigable for the purpose of shipping, and the other case of removing rocks to bring the timber down to the shipping, and in that way, assist commerce, but I do not think that the House will make any distinction.

Mr. KIRK. There is a good deal of difference: one is to accommodate shipping, and the other is to accommodate lumbering. It is quite easy to spend a million dollars cleaning out rivers in this Dominion, to drive logs, but I think the principle should not be adopted. I know that in other parts of Nova Scotia those who are interested in lumbering clean out the streams in which they drive the logs, at their own expense. They form themselves into companies and spend their own money for that purpose.

Mr. TUPPER. Take the case of slides and booms for which we spend money.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the case of slides and booms a revenue would be received, and the expenditure, in that event, would be justified. I would say to the

Minister of Public Works that it appears to me that the principle of expending money to improve unnavigable rivers, in order to allow logs to float down, is vicious to the last degree, and that the House should dissent from it by their vote. I think the hon. gentleman would do well if he would lay down the principle that he would not be responsible in improving rivers for such purposes; but we can consider that question at another time, as the item is not before the House.

Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c..... $463,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this very large charge of $463,000 for public buildings, which includes the expenses for the furniture, &c., in this place and at Rideau Hall, I dare say it will be in the recollection of the Minister of Public Works that, a year ago, the principle was advocated and partially assented to, at any rate, by the Prime Minister, that in our future relations we should endeavor to fix some special sum which should be assigned for the purpose of maintaining the grounds, &c, about Rideau Hall, and that probably it would be better if that were left to the nobleman who might be appointed Governor General. I desire, in the first place, to enquire whether any such understanding as was then hinted at, has been come to. It is, of course, extremely undesirable that we should be always criticising here sums which are alleged to be expended for the benefit of His Excellency and the comfort of his family, but, on the other hand, it is our duty as representatives of the people to see that the public money is not wasted, and there is no doubt whatever that the expenditure on account of these grounds and the expenditure about Rideau Hall, both for furniture and keeping the place in order, has assumed large proportions which require our serious consideration. I would like to know from the Minister of Public Works whether any sort of understanding such as I speak of has been arrived at, or whether he thinks it could be arrived at?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As regards the understanding which the hon. gentleman speaks of, I do not deny that he may have made that suggestion, but I must say that there has been no such understanding with His Excellency the Governor General. I have no doubt that an understanding of that kind could be made, but it will require some little time for consideration, and I intend, during the recess, to try to come to some arrangement on that point. The arrangement existing for some years is that an officer of my department and an officer of the Governor's household were to go together every two or three months and ascertain what were the wants of the building. If any repairs were required, or any articles destroyed, necessary to be replaced, that was examined by those officers, and then a report was made to my department. On that an estimate was submitted to me, and whenever something would creep up that was not considered should be paid by the department, some understanding was arrived at between the department and the officer in question and that item would disappear from the request, so that the request would be limited to the ordinary repairs, or to the ordinary articles that had to be furnished. I have no doubt that, by comparing the expenses of the last two or three years, we might come to an understanding, as the hon. gentleman suggests, that there should be a lump sum voted, out of which the Governor General might have any repairs and improvements made. With regard to the expenditure about the grounds, it has been limited to as low a sum as has been possible under the circumstances. The hon. gentleman must see that we have asked only a small sum for grounds and for public buildings. My intention is, instead of employing a number of people to look after the grounds, as we have done for years past, to try to get the work done by contract, so that we can have one party responsible to my department, who would undertake to keep these grounds in proper order. In that way, I think we shall be able to save some money. I think that covers the ground of the hon. gentleman's enquiry.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think it covers the ground at all, and I regret very much that the suggestion made in this House last year and the year previous, and, so far as I could judge, acquiesced in by the Government, has not been acted upon. In the last two years there has been a great deal of dissatisfaction expressed by members of this House as to the expenditure in and about Rideau Hall. It was thought there was a very large leakage there; it was thought there had been very great extravagance there last year and the year before. To such an extent did the dissatisfaction go that the matter was brought before the Public Accounts Committee, and the members of that committee endeavored to ascertain in what way the money was expended. The committee summoned before them the gardener, I believe, and a number of other officials about Rideau Hall, and tried to extract from them evidence to show what was the cause of these enormous expenditures, in order to find out whether there was any justification for them; and I express my own opinion only when I say that after the examination was at an end the committee was more in the dark than they were when it began, but the impression in their minds that very great extravagance existed was more than confirmed. Many hon. gentlemen were opposed to any examination at all; but the prevailing view in the committee was that the time had come when the expenditure should be thoroughly sifted. After the examination had taken place in the Public Accounts Committee, the matter was brought up in this House, and it was suggested to the Government that, inasmuch as there was about to be a change in the Governor General, it was a very good time to introduce a new and economical system. That opinion was very generally expressed on this side of the House, and was acquiesced in by the Ministers, and I thought it would have been carried out; but here we are entering upon the rule of a new Governor General, and the old system is to be continued. The hon. Minister of Public Works knows that this is not a pleasant matter to bring up; and everybody in the House knows, although the country may not know, that the Governor General himself is in no sense or way responsible for this expenditure. The charge was made in the Public Accounts Committee, that the Public Works Department made use of Rideau Hall as a cloak under which to hide a great deal of political expenditure, and I am bound to express the opinion, after hearing the witnesses before the committee, that that charge was true—that a large number of useless officials were kept in the employ of the Government for useless purposes, and their pay improperly charged to Rideau Hall. The expenditure last year, on Rideau Hall, amounted to $23.292, and the year before, to a very much larger sum; and, in the year preceding the elections, this expenditure is incurred very largely to further the political objects of the Government supporters in and about Ottawa. That was the charge made openly in the Public Accounts Committee; and I must say I feel grievously disappointed that the promise made by the Minister of Public Works, that he would see, before the new Governor General came, that some new and more economical system should be adopted, has not been carried out, but we are going on the same as before. Are we to go through another examination in the Public Accounts Committee? That is perfectly useless. The responsibility of this matter rests upon the shoulders of the Government, and, primarily, upon those of the Minister of Public Works. I very much regret that he has not carried his promise out, and it seems to me he does not intend to carry it out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister doubted the accuracy of my recollection of what passed last year. Now, I desire to read to him the express statement of the Premier made on the 22nd of May, 1888, and found in *Hansard* on page 1688. On concurrence I brought this matter up, expressing the opinion that a fixed vote for this purpose should be taken, and this is what the Premier replied:

"I go a great way with the hon. gentleman in his statement. I think the expenses have been increasing year after year. I do think they cannot do better than adopt the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman, that there should be some fixed sum for such supplies and works as ought to be defrayed by the Government. If any further sums are required by the Governor General, we can come down to Parliament."

Now, Sir, I think that is about as expressed a pledge as the Government can possibly make to the House, and I have a right to ask whether any steps were taken to fulfil it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to draw the attention of the House to this claim for the last ten years. I remember the discussion that took place in the Public Accounts Committee last year. The committee were given to understand that the Minister of Public Works, or some other member of the Government, would give this matter his serious attention and see if some change could not be made with regard to supplying Rideau Hall and curtailing the expenses of that establishment. As the hon. member for Queen's says, it is very unpleasant for the Opposition to be continuously called upon, in the discharge of their duty, to criticise this item; but we consider that a large amount of money is virtually thrown away in this expenditure. In order to place the House in possession of the facts in regard to the expenditure connected with that building for the last ten years, I will give the items commencing with 1879. On fire and light, including repairs of Rideau Hall, we spent each year as follows:—

1879	$ 61,975.32
1880	69,791.91
1881	24,851.60
1882	32,904.52
1883	39,787,86
1884	44,657.31
1885	39,791.45
1886	35,215.40
1887	38,260.70
1888	31,928.71
Total	$419,164 78

Before the present Governor General came to Canada, it was suggested by hon. members on this side that a decided change should be made in this connection. It was suggested that we should put the building in good repair, put the furniture, if necessary, in good repair, put everything in proper condition, and that the Governor General should be expected to keep everything in and around Rideau Hall in repair at his own expense, with the exception of the building. I admit that we should keep the building in repair, but there is no excuse for the changes of all kinds, unnecessary repairs of all kinds, and the number of hired men kept around there doing nothing. The evidence produced before the committee last year showed plainly a system of extravagance carried on in connection with Rideau Hall that is positively disgraceful. I press upon the hon. Minister the absolute necessity of his making some change in the system such as was suggested last year. With regard to attendance and servants. A flower gardener and an assistant flower gardener are kept, a vegetable gardener and an assistant vegetable gardener, and any number of other hands We should not be asked to bear this expense. If the Governor General wants a garden, he should engage his own gardener. It is unfair that the people should be taxed to keep a lot of men standing around there, hardly doing anything except raising flowers and fiddle dandles and other nonsensical things for the purpose of making the place look nice and pleasant to the Governor General, to whom we are paying $50,000 a year, besides $8,000 for fire and light and $5,000 for travelling expenses. I believe the Minister of Public Works allows himself to be imposed upon by people who are pressing him to give them something to do, and Rideau Hall is the old stall to which they are all sent, and there they draw upon the resources of the country while they are doing some frivolous unnecessary work which could be very well dispensed with. Last year we found, on investigating the accounts, that a number of people were drawing $1.50 a day, and were carried to Rideau Hall and back on the street cars. They would not even walk to their work, and they were paid $1.50 for Sundays also. There is a looseness in the way this whole expenditure is handled that is positively appalling, resulting, in ten years, in the expenditure of half a million dollars to keep the place in repair, so that it might be in a condition fit for the Governor General to live in. The whole system ought to be changed, and we ought to arrange that the only expenditure the Government should be called on to meet would be the repairs of the building itself. We should employ no gardeners, or other men, except those necessary to keep the building in repair. If the Governor General wants vegetables let him pay a man to raise them. We have as good a right to furnish him with the bread on his table as with his potatoes. We have as good a right to be called on to furnish him with his beef as with his vegetables. It is absurd that we should be called upon to spend this enormous amount of money, and I insist that some change should be introduced by which a fixed sum annually would be placed at the credit either of the Governor General or somebody else who would be responsible, and thus avoid this continuous unnecessary drain. The hon. the Minister of Public Works is not treating the House fairly, by calling on us this year again to revote this expenditure and continue the rotten and extravagant system which has been carried on for a number of years. I do not say that this system did not exist under the previous Government. I do not care when it began, but I say it should be put a stop to without delay. I hope, therefore, the Minister of Public Works will not come down another year and ask us again to vote expenditures of this kind.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It appears to me the mistake was made in not having considered this matter before His Excellency came here. That was the time the matter was referred to in this House. It is a delicate matter, discussing these expenditures, when there is a party in occupation, and he has been led to believe that the system which has hitherto prevailed would continue during his occupation. I think the House will generally feel a delicacy in that respect, but if the Government had dealt with this matter before the present Governor General came here, and if the amount had been agreed upon, as was suggested by this side, and apparently concurred in by the Government, then all this discussion might very well have been avoided. They would have known exactly upon what footing they stood and how much money they had at their disposal, and the whole thing would not be required to be brought up every year. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman altogether in saying that the property should be kept up by the Governor General himself, but I think the Parliament will be unanimously disposed to vote a sufficient sum to meet reasonable and proper expense in that respect, both for repairs of the house and incidental expenses. Now, with regard to the present expenditure there, I do think that anyone looking at the returns of the Auditor General, and seeing that 23 men are put down as working at Rideau Hall all the year round, will be forced to the conclusion that there is something wrong somewhere. It appears to me to be utterly ridiculous that 23 men can find

constant employment about Rideau Hall for the whole 12 months. I am afraid that there is a good deal in the contention which has been made on this side of the House that, whenever the Minister of Public Works finds himself pressed to give employment to a desirable supporter, he sends him in retreat for a while to Rideau Hall, where he can get fresh air and $2 a day as well. In this case, I think we might utilise the committee which the Government have appointed in reference to the more economical management of affairs in the two branches of the Legislature, which is composed of members of the Government and two members of the Opposition. I suggest that that committee should investigate the matter, present a report to this House and ascertain what would be required to bear all the proper charges which would fall upon the Governor General, and recommend a fixed sum which we would vote every year. I think that would be satisfactory and would be applicable to the next occupant of that position. At all events, it would remove this question from the arena of public discussion here year after year. I suggest to the hon. gentleman that the Government should take that course and should consider this whole matter before next Session.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must frankly admit that I do not remember what the hon. gentleman stated the First Minister said on this subject. If I had heard it, I would have taken notice of it, but I did not notice it. Of course, if I had, I would have been bound by it, and, now that my attention is called to it, I shall certainly give effect to the promise of the First Minister during the recess, in order to meet the objections which have been made by the hon. gentleman. Of course, I take what has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Jones, Halifax) as being more imaginary than otherwise, when he said that, if parties came to me and I could not find any refuge or any other employment for them, I would send them to Rideau Hall. That is very well said, but it is not so. There may be there, as in every other work throughout the Dominion, a leakage, and when that leakage is found, we try to stop it at once. This year I reduced the expenses there from $23,000 to $19,000, a reduction of $4,000, but I will take care to see what arrangements I may make with His Excellency with a view to his taking upon himself this expenditure, on a certain amount of money being paid to him, as we pay him now a certain amount for light and water and fuel, the Government, of course, taking care of the building and such portions of the grounds as we must take care of. The number of men employed has also been reduced, with the view of economising and of reducing the expenses. As to the large amount of money which has been expended on these buildings every year, I must say that it is owing to the fact that those buildings are old and require a great deal more expenditure to keep them up than would be required on a new building. Sometimes it is found that a portion of the paper, in one of the best rooms, has been torn or destroyed, and we have to restore that by putting new paper on. It is the same thing with the furniture. It gets soiled or broken, and new furniture has to be provided, or the old furniture, if it is still good, has to be repaired. All this costs a good deal of money, and, besides that, we have the water, and the allowance for fuel and light, which is granted to His Excellency. These, however, are fixed items, and I understand that hon. gentlemen would wish that we should make arrangements with His Excellency in such a way that a fixed sum would be paid for these items, and then, if something unforeseen occurred, we would come to Parliament for an additional sum, stating what it was for.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That would be the better way.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think so. I did not observe the statement of the First Minister. I am seldom out of my place, but I did not notice it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). We do not often find you asleep.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think, in 1868, there was a resolution passed by the House of Commons on this subject. The question was raised, whether the British Government had the right to fix the salary of any officer whom the Parliament of Canada had to pay. A proposition was made to reduce the salary of the Governor General to a smaller amount than that fixed by the British North America Act, ignoring the right of the Imperial Parliament to fix the amount of any salary, unless it undertook to pay it. Then a resolution was carried to pay the salary which had been fixed by that Act, but making a declaration that that salary should be in full of all the expenses of His Excellency's office. It was to that determination of the House at that time, that the First Minister referred last year. That is a standing resolution of this House, which, I suppose, is still binding on the Public Works Department.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not remember the second part of the resolution to which the hon. gentleman refers. Of course, I remember the first part, but, if the hon. gentleman says the other portion was carried, no doubt he remembers it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no doubt that, whether the resolution contained those terms or not, the House was induced to grant an increase to the Governor General's salary from £7,000 to £10,000, on the express pledge given by the Prime Minister that if the House agreed to the increase there would be no *et ceteras* or extras of any kind. My hon. friend from Huron read the pledge which the First Minister gave the House last year. The First Minister went on to say:

"I cannot forget that when the salary was increased from £7,000 to £10,000 I myself gave a pledge, in answer to Mr. Holton, that the £10,000 was to cover everything."

Very well, I am not saying that the £10,000 is or is not sufficient to cover everything; I am not in a position to judge. The hon. gentleman is, or ought to be, in a position to say whether it is sufficient. The position I take is that if the sum is sufficient no extras of any description should be allowed. I do not think there is a disposition on the part of anybody to cut the Governor down to a sum below what ought to be paid him. Let him have everything that is considered reasonable, and such a sum as the Government, on their responsibility, are prepared to recommend to the House, and when he gets that, do not let us have any more of these extravagant expenses. Now, I want to repeat here that the Governor General is improperly held responsible by many people in this country for this extravagance. The people are not in a position to know that the Governor General is not in any way responsible for that. It is the Minister of Public Works, and it is those under him who use the Governor's office and work upon the grounds around there, as excuses for spending larger amounts of money than they have a right to do. The First Minister went on, last year, to supplement the statement I have read by saying:

"I am not going to look back on who commenced the system of extravagance in increasing the supplies, such as furniture, glass and plate, but by degrees all those supplies were furnished, and I have heard that some of those supplies mysteriously disappeared on the change of Governors. All that kind of thing had to be ended. I am sure that the remarks of the hon. gentleman of the party opposite will be of very great assistance to us when we are making new arrangements in the manner we contemplate doing."

Now, in the face of the positive assurance given by the First Minister that a most disgraceful state of matters had existed heretofore, that there had been a system of pilfer-

ing by which public stores had been abstracted from Rideau Hall, and that the Government intended at once to carry out the suggestion made from this side, by which that system was to cease, I submit that it is rather cool, at this time of day, to ask us to allow that system to continue. The hon. gentleman says that he never heard that pledge given. I am surprised that the First Minister should give that pledge, and make such serious charges against people stealing property from Rideau Hall, and that the Minister of Public Works never heard of it. Somebody is seriously to blame. The First Minister has deliberately charged that, on the change of Governors, there has been property stolen from the Hall. I do not make the charge at all, I take the authority of the First Minister for it, and I assume he did not make it without good ground. I submit that the extravagance which has existed there is not on the part of the Governor General at all, but the responsibility rests on the Department of Public Works. We have spent nearly half a million there in the past five years, and I think this will be startling to the taxpayers when they come to hear of it. I, for one, will protest against voting small sums for these purposes, because we are merely perpetuating the system under which extravagance has crept in from year to year. I think that we ought to adopt the suggestion made last year that a fixed sum should be voted to the Governor General to include all expenses. My hon. friend from Bothwell says that this resolution of the House is standing to this day, but it has been broken from year to year. If the Government, on their responsibility, say that the sum is not sufficient, let them propose a larger sum, and I am sure the House will vote it if it is required. But the whole system, as it exists now, is disgraceful.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About the pilfering the hon. gentleman mentioned——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I merely quoted the statement of the First Minister.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At all events, he repeats it. I do not say there was pilfering, I do not know it, but my attention was called to the necessity of having an inventory made of the goods and furniture at Rideau Hall when there was a change of Governor. In the time of Lord Lorne an inventory was made by one of his officers and one of ours, and a copy of that was left with them and a copy with the department. Then when Lord Lorne ceased to be Governor, the inventory was made again, and what had disappeared was found to be breakages during the time that he had held office. When Lord Lansdowne came in, an inventory was also taken; likewise when the new Governor came in. So I think, if there had been leakage, or pilfering, a stop has been put to it. Of course I cannot do better than to say that the inventory was properly made, and that the amount of the property is now to be found there. As I stated just now, I think the change of system is desirable. In the meantime, of course, we require money to keep up the building until some better arrangements can be made.

Mr. McMULLEN. This question has been up now for several years, ever since I have been in this House. The Minister of Public Works is very courteous, and always replies to us, and gives us information in regard to matters in his department. I have always noticed his willingness to give any information that he can, and his forbearance in listening to all that we have to say. But although criticism has been made every year, we have just the same condition of things repeated over again. Now, last year the First Minister gave a solemn pledge to the House that some arrangements should be made whereby a decided change should take place in the matter of this expenditure. Now, here we are face to face with the same item, the same extravagance, the same thing over again. I would say that if there is anything more than another that is adding to the unpopularity of Her Majesty's representative in this country, it is the enormous extravagance that is carried on in connection with Rideau Hall. The Governor General is not at all responsible. It is unfair to think that Her Majesty's representative should be in the slightest degree held responsible; but, after all, there is the fact that over and above the salary of $50,000 paid to the Governor General, with $8,000 for fire and light and $5,000 for travelling expenses, the expenditure on Rideau Hall is about $30,000 a year. Every year there is evidence of extravagance in connection with this matter, and these statements being made to the people from every platform where questions of vital interests are discussed, questions with respect to the expenditure of money in regard to which the public have a right to obtain information, tend to make Her Majesty's representative unpopular and unsavory in the eyes of the people. simply because there appears to be such extravaga ce. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about a change of system and the adoption of a sum that would cover all the expenditure. I suppose if the sums spent during the last ten years were averaged, the Governor General would be perfectly willing to take that average and meet the expenditure himself. That, however, would be a very large sum. There was no necessity for one half of the expenditure to have been made, and to arrive at an average the annual sums voted during the last ten years is, I suppose, the basis upon which the calculation would be made, whereas I say that one-fourth the amount would have met all the necessary expenditures in keeping buildings and furniture in repair, and similar expenses. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works would state how many carpenters there are at present at Rideau Hall.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say, but perhaps two or three.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have a note in my hands addressed to me, because, I suppose, it was thought that I took an interest in this matter. From this note, it appears that there are no less than six carpenters employed there at the present moment. I cannot understand what six carpenters are doing there all the time. Why, the structure must be of basswood or some other rotten material that would not last a year. I understand there are six carpenters, 14 to 20 laborers, and one inspector at Rideau Hall. What are these laborers doing? There is no gardening or digging to be done at this season, but still there are from 14 to 16 men engaged there in laboring work, in addition to six carpenters. We are paying about $80 a week for carpenters alone. I consider it to be my duty to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to this extravagance. It is a positive disgrace to think that the public money is squandered in this manner, and that on Rideau Hall there is, on an average, $41,000 to $45,000 virtually thrown away. I see the First Minister has just come into the House, and I hope he will give some explana ion of the promise he made a year ago in regard to Rideau Hall. I am sorry the hon. gentleman was not in when the question was first brought up, but I hope, before the item is carried, he will give some explanation as to why a change has not taken place in the direction indicated in his promise to the House when the matter was brought up last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman had first better see what he stated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will look it up, and endeavor to keep my promise. I may say that, since the advent of the present Governor General, there have been communications between the Minister of Public Works and his department, and the officers connected with the Governor General's establishment, with a view to regulate the

expenditure. There has been no fixed arrangement made, but I know there is every disposition on the part of His Excellency, to aid in preventing the waste that has gone on, and which has occurred during some changes of the Governors General, by the disappearance of some of the appliances about the building, and some of the furniture, and so on.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister of Public Works told us he knew nothing about it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is very unfair on the part of the hon. gentleman. I did not say that. The hon. gentleman is putting words into my mouth that I did not use. I said, we had taken care, in the time of Lord Lorne, and during the term of Lord Lansdowne, and on the advent of his successor, to have an inventory made of every article in Rideau Hall, and we thus guaranteed that the articles would not disappear, and the articles that were missing, were found either broken, or they had been replaced during the incumbency of the Governors.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would be very sorry to mis represent the Minister of Public Works. When the question was brought up, and the hon. gentleman was reminded of the promise made by the First Minister, I certainly understood him to say—and I think it was so understood on this side of the House—that that was the first time he had heard of it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think there was a promise, and I will point out what passed. I stated that the only way of avoiding this very disagreeable altercation coming up from time to time in regard to the expenses of Rideau Hall, would be for the Government to bring down a fixed sum, as they do in the case of charges for lighting and for travelling, and if anything more was required the Government, on their responsibility, should ask Parliament for it. As the First Minister will see if he reads my remarks and then his own answer to that, he assented. He declared that he would adopt the suggestion, and it was for that reason that I sent the *Hansard* across to him. My suggestion was that the Government should, at their own responsibility, fix a sum each year which should be expended for those miscellaneous purposes, and if more was required they could ask it from Parliament from time to time and give their reasons. To that suggestion the First Minister assented and promised that it should be done, but on cross-examining the Minister of Public Works we found he knew nothing at all about the promise made by the First Minister, had never heard of it in fact, and that he understood nothing in the direction we indicated had been done, although he explained to us that there were some *pourparlers* going on with officers of the household so as to fix a sum. Our point was that the Government should take the responsibility of bringing down a regular annual sum for this purpose.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This matter was discussed in the first Parliament, in 1868. There was a proposition to fix the salary of the Governor General at $35,000 a year, and there was an amendment moved that it should be $32,000. A Bill was passed fixing the salary at $35,000, and at the end of the Session it was reserved for Imperial consideration. That Bill was sent home, and the next year the hon. gentleman, who was then at the head of the Government, proposed:

"That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient, after the strong desire expressed by Her Majesty's Government, that the salary of the Governor General should be maintained at the fixed sum of £10,000."

That was the hon. gentleman's proposition, and there was some amendments to the effect that the salary should be fixed at £7,500, or that it should be retained at the sum fixed by the Bill of the previous year. Those two amendments were voted down, and the proposition of the First Minister was carried, fixing the salary of the Governor General at £10,000. The First Minister then said that this would include all expenses. That is my recollection of his statement, but I have not the report here.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite right.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then, when we were discussing this question last year, I think the hon. gentleman referred to his report as having given his pledge at that time that that should be the amount of the expenses connected with the Governor General, and that he would see that this suggestion should be carried out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt the hon. gentleman is quite correct. At the time the sum of £10,000 sterling was fixed, it was understood across the floor, and stated in Parliament, that the $50,000 which was considered an equivalent to £10,000, should cover all expenses. I think that was pretty well carried out for some years, and up to the time that the Governor General before the last came here. With respect to the keeping of the grounds about Rideau Hall, which are expensive, the Governor General then said: "I do not want to keep them up; if the Government does not choose to keep them up, let them grow wild;" and it was thought by Parliament that was a reasonable request, and that the outside work should be done at the public expense, and not out of the Governor's salary. I think, with that exception, they kept pretty well within the limits, but I cannot say positively without looking back at the accounts. My hon. friend opposite (Mr. Mackenzie) knows how difficult he found it to restrain the esthetic tastes of some of the Governor Generals.

Mr. MACKENZIE. With reference to that, I think the right hon. gentleman will remember that after a circular was sent from Lord Carnarvon, furniture was supplied for the Governor General's house, at an expense of some $17,000. This was the commencement of the system, but I do not believe that it was intended to keep it up.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My friend, the Minister of Public Works was not here last year when we were discussing the matter, but now he will take a note of it, and endeavor to carry out the suggestion, which, I think, is a very proper one.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a promise now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is a renewal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, a renewed note.

Mr. BLAKE. Do we understand that the right hon. gentleman has got the Minister of Public Works to endorse him now?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do we understand that it is to begin next year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Time is not the essence of the contract.

Mr. BLAKE. When the Bill on notes comes up, we will abolish the days of grace for this promissory note.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman give the House any satisfactory assurance that he will adopt this policy which will prevent the expenditure of such enormous sums of public money in connection with Rideau Hall? I hold the Public Works Department responsible, and I wish to be understood as saying that neither the Governor General nor any of his staff is at all responsible.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If there is anyone responsible in the matter I am responsible, and there should be

no responsibility whatever on His Excellency about that. If the request comes from Rideau Hall, an estimate is made, and if found correct, the system is that we pay for it. I intend as soon as Parliament will be over (and I suppose the hon. gentleman will not begrudge me a little holiday for a few days' rest) to see about this arrangement which the hon. gentleman speaks of. I will take up the matter and see how far we can arrange with His Excellency in the line of the discussion of to-day. It will then have to be settled by an Order in Council, and that Order in Council will be communicated to Parliament next Session.

Grounds, Public Buildings, Ottawa..... $7,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Does that include the expense for the greenhouse and conservatory?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, the whole thing. I reduced the amount, as the hon. gentleman sees, because I think we will be able to do it by contract at a reduced expense.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There was a statement made by an hon. gentleman last year respecting the use made of the greenhouse. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works will bring down a return showing the Ministers who have the advantages of the greenhouse in getting the plants for their tables occasionally during the season. It would be interesting to know this, because it appears some of them get all, and some, I believe, the Minister of Public Works among others—get none.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know anything about that. The flowers are put in the beds in the grounds, in the winter they go into the conservatory, and in the spring they are brought out again and put on the grounds. That is all I can say about it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister to the expenditure on Major's Hill Park. It is becoming very much improved, but it is costing a large amount of money. I notice that last year $10,504.32 were spent upon it, and there are some very peculiar items, such as black slate, 1,515 loads, at $1.50 a load, $2,272.50. Will the Minister give us some explanation with regard to that item?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This was for the roads and avenues in the park. The hon. gentleman must remember that that park was got without improvements, that it was handed over by the city to the Government, and that the Government undertook to put it in order. This sum of $7,000 asked this year is to cover the balance of the improvements there, and next year we will only have to ask what will be absolutely necessary to keep the grounds in order.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is really a very expensive addition to the grounds which we have already, and one which we could very well have done without. I find that for gardeners and laborers $7,402.50 were spent last year. I fancy the expenses in connection with this are somewhat like the expenses in connection with Rideau Hall; a number of men must be put there who do virtually little or nothing. I have been through that place, and I notice that there is very good stone there; and if this stone had been broken up or gravel had been put down, it would have done as well as black slate. If that park were close to the grounds here it might be an advantage. I suppose the next vote the hon. gentleman will want will be for a bridge over the ravine to connect the park with these grounds. If we are going to use the Printing Department, we will have to have a more convenient way to reach it than by going around by Wellington street. Can the hon. Minister tell us about that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the plan there was a wire bridge to be put over the canal to connect Parliament grounds with Major's Hill; but we did not think the time had come to ask for a sum for that purpose. The intention would be to make it, not a carriage bridge, but only for foot passengers. It would really increase the value and the usefulness of both of these grounds; but we do not intend asking anything this year.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is the person who was in charge of these laborers?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The officers of my department visit these grounds to see if they are in good order, and if the men are discharging their duty. I think the man in charge is one Garello.

Mr. McMULLEN. What pay does he get?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $2.50 or $3 a day.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is he in charge all the year round?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. There is a little conservatory there, and he has to look after the plants during the winter.

Heating, Public Buildings, Ottawa ..... $60,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax.) The amount charged for heating seems large: 900 cords of wood and 1,100 tons of coal, for these buildings, which only require to be heated about six months, is a very large amount. A large portion of these buildings are only heated during the Session.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt that amount is large, but I have ascertained that this cordwood as well as coal is all required. Though Parliament be not sitting, the furnaces are kept at work, because it would not do to leave a large portion of the building without heat two or three months during the winter.

Water, Public Buildings, Ottawa..... $20,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is this increased?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is the water for different buildings in the city. With the new buildings we require a larger supply.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The increase is 50 per cent.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has water gone up so much as that, or do you intend adding 50 per cent. to the number of officials in order that the extra supply may be consumed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. You do not object to their drinking water? The parliamentary and departmental buildings on Parliament Hill, the Supreme Court, the Greenhouse, Rideau Hall, Geological Museum, the Post Office, the Custom House, &c., expend $12,000 in water. The new departmental buildings on Wellington street, Art Gallery and Fish Hatchery, cost $3,650. The leased buildings for the Indian Department, the Interior Department, Victoria Chambers, branch Post Office Department, Customs Department, Printing Bureau, &c., cost $4,000, making a total of $19,650.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How is it that while the parliamentary and departmental buildings, &c., cost $12,000, the same as last year, in all the other departments you have increased the amount from $1,500 to some $6,000?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Do the waterworks belong to the city of Ottawa?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I invite attention to the expenditure on Major's Hill Park, which I objected to last year. It seems that the Government spent $10,000 in ornamenting Major's Hill Park for the benefit of the citizens of Ottawa, and they are actually paying the city of Ottawa $199.54

for watering that place. It seems to me that when we spend such a large sum annually for the benefit of the city, the least the city could do would be to furnish the water free.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The charges that were lately shown to me for certain of these buildings amounted to $3,500. I had the matter examined by the Chief Mechanical Engineer, who reported that he thought $2,500 would be sufficient. That was offered to the Water Committee, but they were not disposed to accept it. The matter stood there until they finally sent word that they would agree to the amount we offered them. The hon. gentleman knows how difficult it is to get a water company or a city council to lower their rates. We are trying the best we can to reduce the rates, and, if last year we did not expend the whole of the grant, I do not think that should be brought against us this year when we are taking enough to meet the requirements of the different departments. If, after making the arrangements with the city, we find that, instead of $20,000, we can do with $17,000, so far so good; the money will not be expended, but we should have this vote at any rate.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister of Public Works has not answered my objection. I objected to paying the city for water for the Major's Hill Park, upon which we are spending a large amount of money for the benefit of the city. I think the Government should not pay $200 a year to the city of Ottawa for water for that Park, when they are expending a great deal of money in improving that Park for the benefit of the city.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The arrangement with the city was, that we were to take back that Park, and other properties in this town, and that arrangement was brought before Parliament a few years ago, and agreed to.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It was a very improper arrangement.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We did not think so at the time, and I think it was a very good arrangement. I am sure that the city will not give us the water for the Park.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Minister has not dealt with the subject which I brought before him. I pointed out to the Minister that, while the estimate for the main public buildings in Ottawa—the Departmental Buildings, Supreme Court, City Post Office, Custom House, Drill Hall, Geological Museum, and Rideau Hall—remains as it was last year, the amount for the smaller public buildings which are scattered through the town, the Interior Department, Indian Affairs, Savings Bank Branch, Examining Warehouse, Fish Hatchery, and Major's Hill Park, is increased from $1,500 to $8,000, or an increase of $6,500. I think there should be some explanation of this enormous increase for these smaller buildings, while the larger buildings, containing, I suppose, nine-tenths of the public employés, remain at the same cost for water. It cannot be that the price of water has gone up, because, in that case, the increase would be apparent in the estimate for the main public buildings.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is the statement which is given by my officers, who are responsible to me, as to what water is required, and what it will cost. If experience shows us next year that this is too large an amount, of course we will have to reduce it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman did not state what the estimate is for the new building.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We know what the estimate is, but we do not know what the expense will be.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The expenditure last year for that building was $488. Is the estimate for the new building $6,000?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; the estimate for the new building and the Art Gallery and Fish Hatchery is $3,650.

Dominion Emigration Buildings—Repairs, Furniture, &c..... $2,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where are these buildings situated? Are they on Wellington street?

Sir HECTOR LANGENIN. This is not for the buildings in Ottawa, but for the buildings all through the Dominion.

Harbors and Rivers, P. E. I..... $11,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not wish to detain the committee, but I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the unsatisfactory condition of the piers in Prince Edward Island, and it seems to me, from the sum which he is asking this year, that we are to go on the same way during the coming year as we have in the past. I regret that very much. I was in hopes that the hon. gentleman would have asked a larger sum from Parliament for this necessary work. I wish to remind the committee that some years ago the Government of this Dominion took over from the Government of Prince Edward Island a large number of wooden piers or structures—wharves, we called them—and assumed them as Dominion works. I am not going into the question whether that was a wise or an unwise policy on the part of the Government. The hon. gentleman then passed an Order in Council stating that $75,000 was the amount which the Government would allow, and that they would require a receipt in full from the Government of Prince Edward Island before they paid the money. The Local Government would not give the receipt, but the Local Government were in financial difficulties, and the hon. gentleman, with the commendable desire to extract the Local Government from their political difficulties, revoked the substance of that Minute of Council which he had passed, and granted an additional $50,000, conditionally on the Local Government signing a receipt in full. The Local Government would not sign the receipt in full, but my hon. friend, in the goodness of his heart, paid over the $50,000 at a critical moment, as he well knows, in order to get the Local Government out of their difficulties. So we stand now with $75,000 and $50,000 paid to the Local Government for these wharves. This settlement is unsatisfactory to all parties, but especially to the people of Prince Edward Island who use these wharves. What is the result? The result of the meddling and muddling is that the Local Government refused to acknowledge that the remaining piers which the Dominion Government refused to take over belonged to them, and that the piers which the Dominion Government have taken over have been kept in such a bad state of repair that they are of very little use to the people at all in some parts of the Island. At an early period of the Session, I pointed out to the hon. gentleman the condition in which these piers were. I did not go over them separately or in detail, but I have before me a statement which I will not take up the time of the committee by reading. The hon. gentleman does not appear to have any local officer to look after these piers, twenty-six or twenty-seven in number, and to keep them in reasonable repair. Now, whether the hon. gentleman was right or wrong in taking them over in the first instance, cannot now be questioned. They have become the property of the Dominion Government. The Dominion Government has received the fees charged for the shipping, paid by the people for landing goods on those wharves and shipping from them, which money goes into the Consolidated Revenue. I maintain it is simply disgraceful that these wharves, which are absolutely necessary for the exportation of the surplus crop the

people produce, are not kept in such a state of repair as enables the people to use them. The hon. gentleman has only put $6,000 this year in the Estimates, the same as last year. He knows the sum was insufficient last year. He cannot expect this kind of a thing to go on. I may say to him that the wharves are of that character that unless they are kept in repair, in a year or two he will have to rebuild them entirely. It is a very foolish and unwise policy to let them get out of repair, for the expenditure of a dollar one year may save the expenditure of $5 the next year, and if the hon. gentleman allows this thing to go on he will have no wharves at all to repair. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not desire that the people should have no wharves at all, but they will have none unless he keeps them in a reasonable state of repair. I asked him the other day the name of the officer whose duty it was to examine and report on those piers. The hon. gentleman said he had some officer in St. John who took charge of all the Island works. I do not know who he is. He has no office in Charlottetown or Prince Edward Island, that I am aware of. If he goes there at all, his going and his coming are unknown to me, or to any one of my hon. colleagues. I would like to know who this person is, so that his conduct may be reported and commented upon in this House, as I would feel it my duty to comment upon it. All I can say now is to tell the hon. gentleman that the state of the wharves and piers under his charge, paid for and owned by the Dominion, is not creditable to his department. Now, I am perfectly convinced that if we had the hon. gentleman down there for one summer—I think it would do his health good to come down next summer when he takes his holidays, where he can breathe the fresh air, and enjoy the luxury of fresh fish—if he could see personally the condition in which those wharves are, he would not leave without giving personal orders to have them put in proper repair at once. I have any amount of complaints from people who use these wharves; I need not read them separately because they are all to the same tenor, that the wharves are not kept in proper repair.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the wharf at St. Mary's Bay, a very important wharf, situated in a large agricultural district. Last year that wharf was in such a state of disrepair that the inhabitants had to get together and repair it themselves. But the repairs they made were only temporary, and unless the Minister does something this year the wharf will be unfit for use next season. There are some very important wharves or piers in the county of King's that were not taken over by the Dominion Government at the same time that the others were taken. I would refer the Minister, especially to the one at the head of Murray River, to another at Aiken's Shore, and the wharf at the head of Grand River, in King's County. Now, at the time we entered Confederation a solemn promise was made us that all our principal wharves and harbors would be taken over by the Dominion Government. This promise was made by the Hon. Mr. Pope, who was Minister of Marine and Fisheries in this Government some years ago. This gentleman was one of the delegates of Prince Edward Island to the Conference, and on his return, speaking in our House of Assembly of the terms under which we entered Confederation, he stated that we were promised that our piers would be taken over by the Dominion Government and kept in good repair. Now, I do not know why these valuable works that I have mentioned, the wharf at Murray River, and the wharf at Grand River, and that at Aiken's Shore, shall be permitted to run down. I think, if the Minister will refer to the Public Accounts, he will see that the wharfage collected at those points under his charge, is sufficient to pay a respectable interest on the money invested. I know that

two wharves in the village from which I come, must be paying an annual revenue of $250 or $300 a year, and that would pay a fair interest on the money that is put in the Estimates this year for repairing all the wharves in the Island. I am confident that if the hon. gentleman will take charge of the wharves at Murray River and at Grand River, the wharfage he will collect will pay him a very respectable interest on any sum that would be required to put them in repair, and unless he does take charge of them in a short time, they will be entirely gone. Now, before we entered Confederation we always had new works built when the necessity rose for the accommodation of the inhabitants of that Island. Let me point out to the Minister two new works in particular which are absolutely required. One is a work that has been carried on for some time at Bay Fortune, where a wharf or a breakwater is required. This place is situated in a large agricultural district, and if a pier was provided, it would save the farmers from going a long distance to reach another place where they can ship their produce. So necessary is that work that they have subscribed the sum of $500, which they have expended on this work, besides doing a great deal of other work themselves. A thousand dollars, or a couple of thousand additional spent upon this work, would be a vast benefit to the people, and I would ask the Minister to take this matter into his consideration and endeavor to help the people there in their efforts to get shipping accommodation. The second place to which I would draw his attention is Mount Stuart, at the head of the Hillsboro' River. A wharf is required at that point. The people have been petitioning the Local Government for years to build one there. The answer they get is that the Local Government have nothing to do with it, that it belongs to the Dominion Government. They have petitioned the Dominion Government for years, but they get no reply. Now we do not know which Government to approach. This is evidently a very unsatisfactory state of things. It is not a very great matter, and I am sure the two Governments might come to an arrangement, without any further trouble, and agree to which Government this work belongs, and keep the people no longer in suspense. A couple of thousand dollars would build a good pier there. I would like to see the Minister of Public Works build that pier this summer, or at least come to an arrangement with the Local Government so that the people would know which Government to apply to in the matter, and the money already expended could be refunded to the Government which takes charge of the work.

Mr. WELSH. I spoke in regard to this matter the other night, and I have little more to say. I think the management of affairs is disgraceful. The Marine Department receives the rents of the wharves, and returns are made to that department. These are pigeon-holed, and after six or twelve months the reports fall into the hands of the Minister of Public Works. I will give an instance. A report was sent to the Marine Department stating that so much money had been received from the wharf, and mentioning that it was of no further use for shipping purposes, for lack of repair, and desiring the order of the department to have it placed in proper repair. The Marine Department said: We know nothing about it; it is not true; we will not expend anything. Five or six months afterwards the report found its way into the Public Works Department, and of course it took some time for the red-tape to work before any action was taken; there has to be a great deal of consideration before any action is taken here. It is altogether a bad system. As to the amount I see in the Estimates, it will not do much more than pay the salaries of some of the fossils the department have round there looking after the wharves. I think it is a disgrace to the Government and the country that our piers and wharves should be in their present condition. On Wood Island

breakwater, for 20 years, the Local Government laid out a large sum of money, and after we entered into Confederation the Dominion Government undertook that work and built a large addition to the breakwater; and I must say they have done good work there so far as the breakwater is concerned. But they have never dredged the harbor. They sent the dredge there once; but after she had got into a capital position, they took her away. I subsequently asked why she was not sent there, and the Government said there was not water enough for her. But there is enough water; the dredge has been in the harbor, but she never performed any work. We might as well have no dredge at all. In 1887 she was brought down to Charlottetown for repairs; she remained there that autumn. There was a slip built for her, and she was hauled on it. During the winter nothing was done on her. In 1888 she was repaired; and so she has not done any work from August, 1887, to the present time. The expense of repairing that dredge was $12,600. If you add incidentals and the wages of the captain, engineers and hands, the whole cost will be nearly $20,000, and I understand and believe that the amount of the contract given for constructing her, in the first place was $7,000. Had proper judgment been used, the dredge would have been taken to Pictou, and put on the slip there, and all the repairs could have been done in one month, at a cost of less than $5,000. However, coming back to the piers, I may say that important piers have absolutely fallen into the rivers, whereas, if $200 or $300 had been expended a couple of years ago, a very small sum would have kept them in repair, while now a large sum will be required, and some piers will have to be rebuilt. I have very little hopes of any attention being paid to these complaints. I had faith in the Minister of Public Works, but I have been deceived so much by his promises that I have very little faith now. I will give an instance as to the amount of confidence to be placed in the hon. gentleman. This happened with respect to Red Point wharf. I asked, in 1887, as will be seen by *Hansard*, page 756, as follows:—

"Mr. WELSH asked, Has any money been expended by the Government in the repairs of Red Point wharf, Hillsboro' River, P.E.I., during the past two years? If so, how much? Has that wharf been taken over from the Island Government by the Dominion? If not, how came the repairs to be made by the Dominion?

"Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I may say that I am informed by the chief engineer that no money had been expended by the Government in the repairs of Red Point wharf during the past two years."

I hunted over the papers because I knew well that some money had been expended on this wharf, and I knew it had not been taken over with the rest of the wharves of the Island; but during an election contest, at a meeting which I attended, the Provincial Secretary of the Island produced a telegram from the Minister of Public Works stating that the wharf would be repaired. It was not then a Government pier. I found they had taken it over—for political purposes, I suppose; I wish they would take a lot more over for any purpose they please, so long as they keep them in repair. The Minister of Public Works said no money had been spent on Red Point wharf, but I afterwards found that during one fiscal year $199.97 was spent on necessary repairs, and the total sum expended on that pier since it was taken over from the Local Government was $799.07. Now, how are you to get at the facts relating to those piers? I asked the Minister of Public Works whether any money had been expended on that wharf, and he gave me to understand that no money had been expended. Twelve months afterwards, when certain sessional papers had been distributed, I find that there had been $700 expended. What confidence can I place in any statement of the hon. gentleman made to me across the floor, or in his promises, when he not only gave me the promise that that work would be done, but he gave me his handwriting that such and such a thing would be done, and yet these works are neglected. What am I to do? I have asked the Minister that certain work should be done, and he has given me his promise for two years, and he has given me his handwriting, but he has failed to carry out his promise; I have asked questions across the floor, but he has led me astray. What am I to do? I shall move for a commission or a committee to examine into these matters. If I had the hon. gentleman in a house under my command—I will not say what I would do with him; if I did my language might be more forcible than polite. I recommend the Government, even at this eleventh hour, for their own credit, to place the piers and public works of Prince Edward Island in a proper state of repair, and see that they are attended to properly. The hon. gentleman has no difficulty in bringing down a vote for $30,000 for cutting a few tons of hay for Government House, and this has to be done, even though the whole of the Province of Prince Edward Island has to be starved to do it. I hope the Minister of Public Works will reform in regard to the attention paid to the public works of Prince Edward Island. He should get rid of a few of the fossils he has around him and put in their place young and active men. It is also high time that we had an inspector of wharves resident in the Island, for we have as many piers as has New Brunswick.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I may say that I hope these are not the only sums of money that we shall have to ask Parliament to vote for Prince Edward Island. We have the Supplementary Estimates yet, and I trust that the hon. gentleman may keep his recommendations for that time.

Mr. WELSH. All right.

Committee rose, and, it being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the "Assiniboine Water Power Company."—(Mr. Ross.)

Bill (No. 107) respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdowall.)

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Moose Jaw and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr Macdowall.)

Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the Dominion Mineral Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Canadian Superphosphate Company.—(Mr. Colby.)

Bill (No. 86) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Harbors and Rivers, P.E.I $11,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister to a statement made by my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Robertson) this afternoon, relative to the construction of the new pier at Mount Stuart. The question is important, because it raises the larger question whether the Dominion should put up piers in places of that kind, or the Local Government. A very large and influential public meeting was held a year ago at Mount Stuart for the purpose of taking steps to memoralise whichever Government ought to build the wharf. I was unable to be present my-

self, but I wrote to the secretary of the meeting that, in my opinion, the Local Government was the proper person to build it. Mount Stuart village comprises 1,000 to 1,500 inhabitants, and is situated at the head of the Hillsborough River, about 18 miles from Charlottetown. Of course, the river is a tidal river. I was not aware that the Dominion Government had at any time, or in any Province, constructed piers in places like that. I shall be very glad to learn that I was wrong in my opinion. I think it is very desirable that a conclusion should be arrived, at at an early day. The desirability of constructing the wharf is a matter about which there is no dispute. Public men on both sides admit its necessity. The inhabitants are very much interested in it and are constantly applying to the local members and the Dominion members to take steps to have it constructed. The impression prevails in Local Government circles that, owing to the decision given by the Supreme Court of Canada in the case of Holman & Green, the Dominion Government have the duty thrust upon them of constructing all piers and wharves in all tidal rivers. In that opinion I do not coincide, but as the Local Government hold very strong opinions upon the subject, I want to bring the matter to the notice of the department and have a conclusion arrived at if possible at once.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Was a petition sent?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, about three or four weeks before this House met. As to the fact that the wharf when constructed will be a paying wharf, I do not think there is any room for doubt. The question is what Government should build it? I hope this debate will not close without some expression of opinion, and without our being informed what the practice of the department has been, whether wharves have been constructed in other parts of the Dominion in places situated similarly to the one I have mentioned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, I do not know that river well enough to answer the hon. gentleman at once. Is it a wide river?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is about 20 or 23 miles in length. The mouth of the river is at Charlottetown. It is a navigable river up to about Mount Stuart, which is about 18 miles from Charlottetown. At Charlottetown the river is a mile wide, and at Mount Stuart, a quarter of a mile wide. It is a navigable, tidal river, up to the spot where it is asked that the wharf should be constructed. The buildings cluster around this bridge, which was built very many years ago by the Local Government, and people cannot ship above the bridge. It is below the bridge, where the river is about a quarter of a mile wide, that the inhabitants seek to have this wharf constructed. It is of great importance, not only to the inhabitants of that village, but to the people of the district surrounding it, that this wharf should be built.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will postpone my answer to the hon. gentleman, until I have examined into the matter. Of course we have built wharves on the Saguenay River, but that is a wide and a large river. However, I will enquire.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman be able to give me his opinion before concurrence?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, Yes, I expect I may.

Mr. McINTYRE. I would ask the Minister a question in connection with the Souris breakwater. I would ask him why two foremen were employed in 1887 and 1888, and who was the timekeeper during the construction of this work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot answer that now. If the hon. gentleman will send me his question in writing, I will endeavor to answer it when we meet again.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr McINTYRE. I thought it would be easy for the hon. gentleman to inform us why, on the expenditure of $6,000 for the repair of the breakwater, two foremen were employed, when originally in the building of the breakwater only one foreman was necessary, when an expenditure of $70,000 was required. I thought it was strange that two foremen should have been employed for a small repair.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a foreman and an assistant.

Mr. McINTYRE. There was no necessity for an assistant.

Mr. FOSTER. The assistant was only there twenty-six days.

Mr. McINTYRE. Perhaps I can let a little light in on the matter. As far as I can ascertain, I believe it is a fact that there was a little unpleasantness among the party there at that time. They all thought they were as good engineers as Mr. John Cantwell, so the two were looking for the job, and there was likely to be a division in the camp; and, in order to compromise matters, they appointed Mr. Stewart as an additional foreman. I do not object, nor does anyone that I know, to Mr. Stewart, because he is a capable man, but for an expenditure of $6,000 I think it is altogether wrong to appoint two foremen, when the work was originally constructed, in 1876 or 1887, or thereabouts, at the expenditure of $70,000, with only one foreman being employed. I think that all that can be granted for these public works in Prince Edward Island should be expended on the work itself, instead of on men who are required to superintend the work. One foreman was quite sufficient here, and I trust that no more of this kind of thing will be done on this breakwater, or anywhere else, because it it utterly indefensible that amounts voted for the maintenance and repairs of this work should be expended for the purpose of soothing the feelings of political friends. With regard to the pier at Mount Stewart, which has been petitioned for, I agree with all that has been said by the hon. member for Queen's County (Mr. Davies). There was a large meeting held last fall. I was prevented from attending it, but I understand there was a large and enthusiastic meeting, at which my colleague was present. I understand that this is a work which is very much needed, because they have never had a real wharf in that section of the country. They used to load all their produce off the bridge. The river is a navigable river, where large ships are loaded from this bridge, and now it cannot accommodate all that is required. There is another pier, of which I spoke last year, that is at Bay Fortune, in King's County. The people in that locality have constructed a large portion of the work on their own responsibility and at their own expense, and for two years they have been asking the Dominion Government for a small amount of money to complete the work; but their petitions have not been listened to at all. As far as our piers and wharves in Prince Edward Island are concerned, they ought to be looked after particularly, because, as everyone knows, Prince Edward Island is purely a farming country. We have no mineral deposits of any kind whatever, such as are to be found in the other Provinces We have also in the surrounding waters magnificent fisheries, and it is a matter of the greatest possible importance to our farmers to have wharves and piers from which to ship their produce, and it is also requisite that our fishermen should have their boats protected by breakwaters. It appears that some $77,000 have been paid for the piers which were taken over by the Dominion Government some few years ago. As far as these piers are concerned, the Dominion Government took over some 24 or 25 and left the rest on the hands of the Local Government. If they took a portion I don't see why they should not take the whole of these piers. Those which were taken over are not looked after by this Government, and the Local Government do not look after

those which were left. They claim, either justly or unjustly, that all the piers belong to the Dominion Government, and between the two of them the piers are falling into ruin. Those taken over by the Dominion Government are not looked after much better than the others. There is a small expenditure made every few years on them, but really the total amount expended could be judiciously expended on one of those piers. As far as the piers are concerned it is a matter of the greatest possible concern to our farmers to ascertain whether this Government is going to take them or not, so that we may know whether they are to be kept up by the Local Government or the Dominion Government.

Mr. PERRY. I would like to ascertain from the Minister of Public Works if he can give the House any information as to the progress of the work commenced in 1885, in blasting rock in the harbor of Cascumpec, how much money has been spent on it, and the good that has been derived from it? I believe I am well informed when I state that some time last year they were obliged to abandon the blasting of the rock in which they had been engaged for two years, at an expense of ten or twelve thousand dollars, and they had to commence somewhere else. They found that they were wrong, and all this money was thrown away. There appears to me to be great neglect on the part of the department in allowing the public money to be squandered in that way. When I examine the report issued by the department of my hon. friend, I find that it gives no information at all; it is simply trifling with the public. Let me read what this report says of Cascumpec:

"Cascumpec, in Prince County, is on the north side of Foxley River, an arm of Cascumpec Bay, and is about 20 miles south of North Cape. The formation of a channel through the rocky bar obstructing the entrance to the harbor, which was commenced in 1885, was continued during the year."

It does not say what they have done, how many cubic yards have been taken out; it does not say whether this work, after two years experiment on it, at an expense of thousands of dollars, is likely to do any good or not. It does not say that they have abandoned the work and gone somewhere else. This report is trifling with the representatives of the people. It is not worth the paper upon which it is printed. I suppose my hon. friend does not know himself how many piers and wharves the Government of Canada have taken over from Prince Edward Island, and which are now the property of Canada. I asked him last year, and he did not know, and I do not suppose he knows this year any better. I find that out of the 24 wharves and piers taken over from Prince Edward Island, we have a report of only five or six. What has become of the rest? I suppose they are like that of West Point. After the Government has spent $5,000 on a public work they have abandoned it, and the work is broken up. Let me read what Mr. Perley, the Engineer in Chief, says. I do not suppose that my hon. friend even knows what Mr. Perley said:

"The wharf at West Point is of general benefit and of importance."

Well, I do not see that it is any benefit at all, because it is broken up, and the Government are too penurious to rebuild it. I suppose the Government is not very well pleased, because the tight little Province has sent no one here to help them. I cannot help that; I have no command over the political franchise of the people of Prince Edward Island. More than that, I find that my hon. friend the other day led me astray in this House, actually led me astray. That is a hard charge to make; but I was completely led astray by that hon. gentleman. I asked him the other day, if J. P. Brennan had been appointed assistant with Mr. Gillis as foreman in this blasting business. My hon. friend said no, Mr. Brennan had not been appointed assistant. I would like to know who is wrong, whether my hon. friend or the report of the Auditor General, because here is what the Auditor General says:

"Achille Jobin, foreman, five months, $450; John Gillis, foreman, one month, $90."

Pretty good pay, too—

"J. P. Brennan, assistant foreman, 15 days, $30."

Now, who am I to believe—the Department of Public Works, or the report of the Auditor General? If the Government have appointed Mr. Brennan as assistant foreman in blasting that rock, they have done wrong, in my opinion, because Mr. Brennan is already collector of Customs in Cascumpec. He is also owner and shareholder in several trading vessels, and the Department of Marine have thought proper to do away with the preventive officers there. They have done this, they say, on the score of economy. That is not the case. The $100 these two officers were receiving have been added to the salary of the Customs officer, and all this time there has been no preventive officer there to watch these vessels which this gentleman was trading with. The Minister of Customs told us the other day: We will re-appoint these men whenever the Customs Department requires it, whenever the safety of the revenue of the country requires it. I would like to ask my hon. friend, is it fair to have one of these deputy officers in that Island receiving the Customs dues of the Dominion of Canada, while he is an importer himself, while he is interested in vessels, and no preventive officer is there to see that the laws of the country are carried out? Instead of saving that $100, the money is paid to Mr. Brennan as deputy Custom house officer in Cascumpec. Now, we find that he has appended to his other title, that of assistant foreman to Mr. Gillis, at $3 or $4 a day. In looking over this account in the Auditor General's Report, we find that most of the articles which have been supplied in blasting this rock were got through this gentleman himself. No doubt the prices were pretty well up. He is a strong political partisan of the Government, and does a good business for the Government in times of election. Now, I would like my hon. friend to explain how it is that he told me the other day on the floor of this House that Mr. Brennan was not appointed assistant, while I find by the Auditor General's Report that he was actually appointed, was so employed and paid. Sir, my hon. friend's report in reference to these public works, is worthless. He does not know what position they are in; he cannot tell whether they require repairs or not; he has no officer there to examine and make a report upon them. I am not able to travel over the whole Province, small as it is, and ascertain in what condition these works are. I expected when I came here that documents would be laid upon the Table which would enable me to judge of the condition of the works. The $5,000 which he has placed in these Estimates is not nearly enough. The hon. gentleman knows very well that Tignish breakwater requires repair; he knows that there is a breakwater at Malpeque which requires repair; that the wharf at West Point, that will cost $6,000 or $7,000, ought to be rebuilt. He knows all that, and, forsooth, to repair 24 wharves, and to build one or two new ones which the Government have allowed to go to pieces, he asks this House to vote $6,000. I was almost going to say it was actually an insult. We have heard a good deal about the dredge. No doubt the dredge was at Tignish in 1886, and was busy there, it being the eve of the election; and it also did a little work there in 1887. However, it was taken away in August and sent to Charlottetown. It was hauled upon the blocks, and left there until last December, before it was prepared sufficiently to go to work. The repairs cost $12,000 while the original cost was $7,000. I should like to see detailed accounts, so that hon. members might have an opportunity of judging as to how much money has been wrung out of the people in repairing that vessel. It is, however, not

much use for representatives of the Island to ask for anything. It is very little use to ask the Government to place sums in the Estimates for the repair of wharves and piers; it is no use asking the Government to lay on the Table of the House proper reports by which hon. members can judge as to the condition of the piers and public works. Let me read some extracts from the Minister's report. Take New London. The report says:

"New London or Greville Bay, is in Queen's County, about 10 miles south-east of the entrance into Richmond Bay. The works in this harbour were repaired where necessary."

This is all the information we have with respect to the works there. We will go a little further, and take Tignish. I should know something about that harbor and breakwater, because I was mainly instrumental in commencing the breakwater there under the very able and patriotic administration of my old friend, Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. The report says:

"Tignish, Prince County, is at the mouth of the Big Tignish River, and about 8 miles east of North Point. The dredge *Prince Edward* was engaged until 27th August, in deepening the channel at this place."

It does not show anything as to the work done, as to how many square yards of mud and rock were taken out of the harbor, or as to where the stuff was deposited; but I can tell the House that it was mainly deposited so near the entrance of the harbor that the harbor afterwards had 15 inches less water than it should have. There is no report of that fact. There is no report with respect to the breakwater, which cost over $20,000. We have not one line in the report, showing its present condition. I say these books which are brought here, and are called Blue-books, should be known as blank-books, for they contain nothing. When I had a seat in the Local Legislature of the Island, I used to say that these books were composed of a good deal of "fat," because the blank pages are paid for, as well as those printed. If the Minister cannot see his way clear to put us right on this matter, to furnish a fair and intelligent report, and not make such sad mistakes as are made in regard to matters, which statements are actually contradicted in official reports, and if he cannot satisfy the people of Prince Edward Island that he is prepared to maintain the public works in a proper repair, I say the sooner the ties of Confederation between the Dominion and Prince Edward Island are broken, and the tight little island is allowed to go and do for itself, the better. We are told that we pay nothing to the revenue, or only $275,000 a year; but I can tell the hon. gentleman that we pay a million dollars a year, and receive only $650,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman must speak to the question.

Mr. PERRY. I am only seeking justice for the Island, and for the fishermen of Gloucester, N.B. A large number of the fishermen come to fish near the breakwater, and unless the Government spend $1,000 or $1,500 to place this work in proper condition, the safety of the fishermen will be endangered. This work is not merely for the Province of Prince Edward Island, but for the benefit also of fishermen who come from Caraquet, Shippegan, and other places in New Brunswick. I feel very much interested in the fishermen, who have to endure great hardships to obtain a living, and enable them to pay the high duties imposed on their goods. I hope the Minister will be able to explain all these matters, and will place in the Supplementary Estimates a sufficient sum to place all these works in a proper condition. Let me hear no more of our breakwaters being allowed to float across the strait. The people of New Brunswick warmed their houses for months out of stuff for which the Government of Canada had paid, and which drifted over from the Island, and the Government were absolutely too penurious and negligent to put even a chain to prevent the stuff floating away, but they allowed thousands of dollars worth of it to drift away across the strait.

Mr. WELSH. I would suggest to the Minister of Public Works the necessity of appointing a resident engineer on the Island to look after the works. It would be a saving of public money, instead of appointing overseers to the various public works. Besides, I would recommend the Minister to give out the repairs to piers by public tender and to the lowest bidder, and that the work be carried out under the inspection of a resident engineer. Every member of the Government will, no doubt, see that this would be a desirable change, and that it would save an immense amount of public money which is now thrown away in repairs to piers.

Harbors and Rivers, N. B..... $24,500

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What is done with this money.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is used for the removing of snags and for the keeping in good order of towpaths. The tow-path was repaired, the obstructions were removed between Eel River and Tobique, between Woodstock and Salmon River, and between Salmon River and Grand Falls. Obstructions were removed on the Girdon and the east side of the river was repaired. At Grand Falls the channel was cleared of boulders and sand bars, and the breakwater was planked. At the river below the Grand Forks the tow-path was repaired and other obstructions were removed.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems to me that there are enormous sums expended in this work. Is it done by tender or how?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. The removal of the snags is done by the steamer that plies between St. John and Fredericton and where the steamer does not run it was done by days' work, and we appointed foremen to look after that and to do the work.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I would like to know how this money was expended. I have been up there and I only saw a little blasting near the Grand Falls; that is the only work I have seen done there at all. I find that between Grand Falls and Tobique $2,050 were expended for work and only $10 for powder.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no further details than those I have given to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. GILLMOR. I hardly think that the Minister of Public Works understands the particulars of those appropriations. It just amounts to an expediture of the public moneys to clear out impediments in the river for people to drive their logs, and that has been going on from year to year. The principle of this expenditure cannot be made general all over the whole Dominion, because if it were the Government would have too much to do. This keeping up of tow-paths, blasting rocks, and building those side-booms is doing for those people on the St. John River what the people in the other parts of New Brunswick have to do for themselves. It is quite impossible to deal with all those rivers and spend the public money in that way. I am sure that if the Government understood the matter as well as those who live in that locality do, they will see that this is just an appropriation to help some private parties engaged in lumbering in those localities. There are other rivers all over the Provinces where those works have been constructed by the persons operating on the river. If the rule cannot be made general I think it would be well for the Government to withhold such appropriations as that, for if the expenditure is not made general it is unjust to other parties. It is unjust and unfair to tax lumbermen in other rivers and then have the taxes given to other localities for

the purpose of aiding private enterprise. I am satisfied that if the Government understood this they would not continue that sort of thing.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I have been told, but of course I speak subject to correction, that some of these works are more injurious than otherwise. I see here an item for Missonnette. It is not a navigable river at all.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is to provide for the completion of the works in connection with the wharf which is being constructed under contract for general landing and shipping purposes opposite the southern end of the highway bridge on the Kouchibougacis.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It is a river that I never heard of being navigated. I would like to know what shipping is done there?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The note I have is that this wharf is to be 120 feet long and 30 feet wide.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Is it to be near the highway bridge?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). You would have to dredge the channel to enable the smallest schooner to get up there. A vessel could not go up that river under any circumstances as it is at present. What is to be the cost of the whole structure?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Nearly $5,000.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope there will be a vote in the Supplementary Estimates for dredging the channel to make the wharf useful.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend from St. John says that vessels cannot navigate that river, and yet the Minister proposes to spend $5,000 in building a wharf which no vessels can approach. Really we ought to have some more explanation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The wharf has nine or ten feet of water at the end; that is all I can say.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This river is about six miles from Richibucto Harbor. There are mills on this river, and unless it has changed very much since I lived in that county, the logs coming down that river have to be brought to Richibucto Harbor to be loaded on vessels. I never heard of any vessel being in that river, and my own impression is that it is practically unnavigable owing to the lagoons at the mouth of the river. The people there are not a fishing people; they are farmers. I cannot, for the life of me, see what is the object of a wharf at that place.

Mr. ELLIS. What is the Minister going to do at the Negro Point breakwater in St. John Harbor? Was any money spent there last year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The present vote of $5,000 is a revote out of the $10,000 voted last year. It is to complete the work of depositing large stones around the outer end of the breakwater, recommended by the chief engineer, to replace stones which were washed away by heavy seas during the winter of 1886-87, with the view of preventing further damage.

Mr. ELLIS. I asked the Minister in 1887 whether he thought that work was completed, and he said he thought it was. Will this complete it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The stone at that period was washed away, and, of course, we had to ask more money, in order to prevent the damage being repeated. I may have said that it was completed then, but damage having occurred since, it was necessary to repair it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I see the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) here, and I would like to know if he can explain this vote for the wharf in the Kouchibougacis River?

Mr. LANDRY. I am not prepared to state what size of vessels can go up that stream; but I know that within the last year or two a company has been formed there and has built a mill in the vicinity of where the wharf is, and that company requires the accommodation of this wharf for the purpose of shipping its lumber, and it expects to ship it away by vessels that come in there.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). There are two mills on that river some distance above—water mills—and all the deals from these mills have to be floated down through the lagoons to the Richibucto Harbor. What mill is this?

Mr. LANDRY. It is a mill built below the bridge.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It cannot be a water mill, because there is no water power there.

Mr. LANDRY. I think it has water power, but I know it has been constructed because it is in operation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand, this expenditure of public money is to provide some private company with a convenient wharf to ship their logs from. All I can say is that if that be the practice of the Government, they will have their hands full. I know scores of lumber firms in the Province of Ontario, who have constructed works for the purpose of enabling them to ship their logs; and if this money is to be granted for the benefit of a particular logging firm in the Province of New Brunswick, it appears to me that all the lumber firms in the Province of Ontario who have constructed facilities for themselves will have reason to put in claims for compensation. Are these facilities to be provided for one Province and not for another?

Mr. LANDRY. I did not intend to convey to the House the impression that this wharf was built for the accommodation of this firm. All I said was that a mill had been built there, for the purpose of showing that the place was of more importance than the hon. gentleman who has spoken indicated, and the fact of a mill being built there was evidence that vessels do come up that stream. I have never lived there to the extent of knowing whether ships go up there or not, but there are several mills there, one not very far from the bridge, and the place is of considerable importance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How far is this from the sea?

Mr. LANDRY. It is at least two miles. It is a wide river, at least three hundred feet wide, and there must be quite a depth of water there. I am not in a position to deny the statement of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) that there is not sufficient water to float a vessel, but I think he is mistaken.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Did the hon. gentleman ever see a vessel there?

Mr. LANDRY. I cannot recollect that I did.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I lived there when a boy, and in the whole course of my life I have never seen or heard of a vessel navigating that river, and I am under the impression that it is almost impossible for any vessel but a small boat to navigate it. To what firm does that mill belong?

Mr. LANDRY. I do not know the name of the firm, but one of the gentlemen connected with it is Mr. Lassere.

Mr. KIRK. Surely the Minister of Public Works had a report from the engineer with regard to the necessity of the work before he undertook to spend this money. I

would like to know what trade has ever been there or whether trade can go there at all? The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) cannot tell us. What is the necessity for the wharf? The hon. member for Kent tells us there is a lumber mill which is built there for general accommodation, but I do not think that would justify the Government in spending this money. This is just in keeping with the $700 for clearing out rocks from a river in Nova Scotia, a grant which should never have been given at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. the Minister of Public Works tell us upon what report he made this representation to the House?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When a petition is sent in to have a public work done, an engineer is sent to examine the place and to report, and his report is submitted to Council. In this case, no doubt a report was made by the engineer who examined the place, and it was on his report this item is submitted.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What engineer reported upon that, what petition was there for the work, and what was the report?

Sir HECTOR LANGENIN. I have not the report here.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). As far as I can judge this is simply a wharf to pile lumber on, which may be taken down in scows or rafted down. I know that the mill-owner there has brought his mill down to Richibucto so as to be able to ship his lumber dry. The wharf would be nothing else than a lumber yard for this mill or for some other purpose of that kind.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hope the hon. gentleman will not press this vote until he is able to inform the House of the grounds on which he recommends it We are asked to vote a small sum, it is true, but it is a sum which involves a principle, and that principle is that the Government shall be bound to assume the construction of wharves, not only on navigable rivers, but in lagoons and bays not navigable, for the purpose of floating rafts down navigable streams. I submitted, not long ago, a question as to the duty of the Dominion Government to construct wharves on navigable streams, and I named a place where a large quantity of lumber is kept, and where a large number of schooners frequent. I thought that the place, being so far up a navigable stream, the Dominion would not construct a wharf there, but now I find the Government are constructing a wharf in a river which is not navigable but is nothing but a lagoon. The hon. gentleman would do well to let this item stand and inform himself of the grounds upon which he recommends the House to grant this sum.

Mr. LANDRY. It is hardly fair to call this a lagoon. Evidently the hon. gentleman has not seen the place. I have stated that it is a very wide stream, but I have never measured the depth. I would feel justified, however, in assuming, from what I have seen of it, that vessels can go up that stream. There are many mills there, and it is one of our important rivers. There are several mills at its head. The construction of the wharf was asked by a large number of people, and it is an important centre whose trade has much increased since the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) lived in that vicinity. There was a college a very short distance from there which had 100 pupils. There is a convent now in the vicinity, and it is quite an important district. It ranks second or third in importance in my county, and a large number of people requested me, by petition or letter, to urge the construction of this wharf, and it was done in the ordinary way by the proper request from the people themselves, through their representatives. I presented that not only one year but two or three years before I could get it, and I found that quite long enough for me. I feel confident that, if the facts are known, as they may possibly be ascertained by a report, it will be found that this is quite an important stream and quite capable of floating vessels of a reasonable size to come up there and take the lumber down. I do not state this of my own knowledge, but from information which I have.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he has been suing the Government for this grant for some years?

Mr. LANDRY. Yes, I have.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman says he never heard of any ships being in that river. Will he tell us what is the reason why he wants a pier built there, at a place where there have been no ships as far as he knows? He says there was a convent at the place. Is it for the convenience of the convent that the pier is to be built? If he has never heard of any ships going up to that spot, what is the reason for his asking the Government to place a pier there? Surely it cannot be to help navigation, and, if that is not the object, what is the object?

Mr. WELSH. The hon. gentleman from Kent (Mr. Landry) says he has known this place since he was a boy.

Mr. LANDRY. No.

Mr. WELSH. Well, in any case, I knew the place before he was a boy at all. I knew the Kouchibouguac in 1841, and I know there was a lagoon there where they used to raft the timber through from Kouchibouguac to Richibucto. There is only about 8 or 9 feet of water on the Kouchibouguac bar. If there is a harbor there, it is deserted. Is there anyone here who can spell the name of this place? The only way I could ever spell it was to chalk the letters over the beam. I have known no vessels at Miramichi and Richibucto.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Spell the word.

Mr. WELSH. No, spell it yourself. I have known vessels at Buctouche, and now I am coming pretty close to the hon. gentleman's home, and I think I know as much about his district as he does, and I can tell him the depth of water on the bar at Buctouche, and at Richibucto, and at Miramichi, and at Kouchibouguac. But what I want to know is what is the purpose of asking for money to build this wharf unless it is for the benefit of some lumberman to pile his lumber on. Is it to be for the benefit of the community in general? I say it is not; and I challenge my hon. friend (Mr. Landry) to show the contrary. I am very sorry to differ from him, but I shall oppose this vote unless it is shown that it is for the benefit of the taxpayers in general. I think it is a useless vote. I know there have been fishing boats in the lagoon, and, at one, time that was a great place for salmon. From my knowledge of the country nearly 50 years ago, when I was a boy—but what was he? I shall vote against this unless it is shown to be in the general interest.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). My hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Welsh) speaks of Kouchibouguac. There is a small river there where vessels go up to a place where ships were built, but there is the Kouchibouguacis, which means the small Kouchibouguac, and that is a stream on which I never heard of any vessel being. My hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Landry) has not only got this wharf, but he got a subsidy voted for a railway from Richibucto to St. Louis of about $50,000 from the Dominion, and I do not know how much from the Local Government, so I think this place is very well provided for, especially if we have to pay more for a wharf there.

Mr. LANDRY. I appreciate a good deal what the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh) has

said, but the only difficulty is that he was speaking of a different place altogether from that which we have been talking about. He has been speaking of a river several miles away from the one under discussion, and, of course, that makes quite a difference. I think what the hon. member from the city of St. John (Mr. Weldon) has said shows the additional importance of this place, besides what I mentioned as to the buildings there, including the convent, which occasioned some facetious remarks from the leader of the Opposition. The fact that a railway has been built there shows the importance of the place. If the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) went there now, he would find that the people of that county, which he knows so well, would not agree with him that they are getting too much, but would tell him that they have many requirements there which could be assisted by the Government, and that there is no occasion for being jealous in regard to what has been done. The railway to which he has referred was a necessity, and has been a benefit to the whole county. It was not bonused to any greater extent than other roads, and it was constructed immediately and has been in operation ever since. All this will show the Committee that this is a place of some importance. and that the expense of $3,000 for a wharf there ought not to be made so serious an objection.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Does this river flow into the sea or into the lagoon?

Mr. LANDRY. Into the sea. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by a lagoon, but certainly the river empties into the sea.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It goes into a lagoon which is formed by sand banks. Between the river and the sea is a sand bank which acts as a breakwater and protects this lagoon. No doubt at one time that was a great place for salmon and lobster fishing, but I can recollect, as long ago as my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Welsh), that deals were cut on that river, and more lumber was cut then than is cut to-day, and those deals were floated down to Richibucto and loaded there.

Mr. WELSH. If you build a wharf at that place, will there ever be a ship come there and load at that wharf? Will it be of any use for commercial purposes?

Mr. LANDRY. Yes.

Mr. WELSH. I say no, because the deals are floated down the river through the lagoon to Richibucto. I have had practical experience in this matter, and I will certainly oppose this grant when there are so many claims for public works in regard to which the public are crying out. When $40,000 and $50,000 worth of grain and oats and barley and pork and other cargoes have to wait at a wharf without any accommodation, as they have at Mount Stuart, it is a crying shame for the Government to pass this vote and neglect such a place as Mount Stuart.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In order to cut short the discussion, if the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to listen to what I say, we will withdraw this item, and if required, we will put it in the Supplementary Estimates, with the necessary amount.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Richibucto protection works, $1,000. Can the hon. Minister say what effect these works have had upon deepening the channel? That was one of the objects for which it was built.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was a dam commenced in 1885, which has been repaired and refitted with brush and stone. This vote is required for completing work, which the chief engineer considers absolutely necessary for the protection of the improvement of the entrance.

Mr LANDRY. The work has already had a beneficial effect, but some dredging is required. We had dredging done a year ago, and some more is being done, and the wharf is having a very beneficial effect. I think without the breakwater it would be apt to fill up entirely.

Harbors and Rivers, Quebec..... $96,250

Mr. LAURIER. Ice piers at St. Anne de Sorel, $2,500. What is that work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These piers were begun three or four years ago, and are intended to prevent the daming and flooding of the country by ice in the spring freshets. The result has been very beneficial

Mr. LAURIER. Rivière du Lièvre, $30,000. This is for the purpose of making the river navigable?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; and giving an outlet to the large country where the phosphate mines are situated. This river flows from the north some 18 miles below Ottawa, and may be claimed to be navigable in its present state, during its ordinary stages, for a distance of 20 miles. Its general width is from 300 feet to 600 feet. At low water it is navigable for vessels not exceeding 6 or 7 feet in draught. During the spring freshets the water rises nearly 15 feet.

Mr. LAURIER. River Nicolet, $8,000. We have had this in the Estimates from year to year, and I am afraid we are piling up a pretty large sum. I would not regret the money if there was any benefit.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is really a harbor of refuge, and also a commercial harbor. Two long piers have been built and we expect that with these additional works we will make the harbor useful for commercial purposes as well as a harbor of refuge for the vessels on the lake.

Mr. LAURIER. River Yamaska, stone protection to dam, $2,500. These Yamaska works have not produced any material benefit, so far as I am informed, though they have cost a good deal of money.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to place stone on the lower side of the dam. The fact is the work was not complete, and this will complete it and will make the dam water tight.

Mr. LAURIER. Sorel ice piers, $2,500. Are there two sets of piers at Sorel?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; at Sorel, the hon. gentleman will remember, steamers come from all quarters to winter, and he knows the importance of the harbor. We had some two or three of these piers built, and this will complete the scheme by which we expect to afford protection to the vessels.

Mr. LAURIER. In regard to the item of $5,000 for works at Three Rivers, I would ask the hon. gentleman if they are to be on the St. Lawrence or the St. Maurice.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. On the St. Lawrence. The hon. gentleman will remember the wharf or pier where the Richelieu boats come, and between that and the east side, next to it, there is a large vacant space and then the harbor commissioner's wharf comes. The object of this vote is to fill the gap between the two, towards the cliff, and thus allow the cars to come to the harbor commissioner's wharf, thereby facilitating the trade of the port.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the hon. gentleman will have something more to do. He will have to furnish trade, or the wharves will be empty; and to do this he will have to change the policy of the country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I) How much will be the total cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Just the amount of the vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many vessels, besides the Richelieu steamers, call there in a year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say, but perhaps 15 or 20. They come there and load timber. There is also a large depot for coal. I may say the trade is increasing.

Mr. LAURIER. I can say for the hon. gentleman's constituency that there is a very large lumber trade there, and I am glad to say it is increasing; although it has been suffering for some years past, I believe it is now reviving. But I was under the impression that the accommodation they had already was amply sufficient for the trade that was being done there. The hon. gentleman thinks otherwise; at least he is providing for a new wharf to be built. I think he will have to adopt the policy of unrestricted reciprocity. Under it, no doubt, Three Rivers would become a large trading centre, as it was under the old treaty. If this work is to be done with a view to the ultimate carrying out of that policy, I congratulate the hon. gentleman on the step taken.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) My views in regard to wharves have somewhat changed since this debate began. I told the hon. Minister frankly that I was of the opinion that it was not proper to construct wharves at such points as he had hitherto constructed them. I find I am altogether wrong. In the early part of the debate I referred to the Hillsboro' River, where there are five times as many craft as at Three Rivers, and where there is constant steam communication between Charlottetown and Mount Stewart, a large steamer running there carrying passengers and freight, and I was under the impression that as the work was twenty miles up the river it was a local work. I find I was altogether wrong, and I ask the hon. gentleman to rescind the request, if this is a Dominion work, and to place a sum in the Estimates for Hillsboro' River. I hope Supply will not go through without something being done at that place. The hon. gentleman sees that the House cordially votes money for the construction of wharves in all these places where they are necessary for the promotion of trade, provided it is a tidal river and navigable, and we went even so far as to vote money for the construction of works in a lagoon, but that has been withdrawn. I hope the Minister will recollect Mount Stuart as coming within all the provisions which seem necessary to give a claim for the construction of a wharf by the Dominion Government. The hon. gentleman will perhaps take a note of this and consider it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I not only will consider it, but I have taken a note of it.

Mr. ELLIS. As to the money voted last year for improvements on the Madawaska River, in the Province of Quebec, on what part of the river was it expended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Up to 31st December some $400 had been expended in improving the Madawaska River for the descent of timber by the removal of logs, rocks and clay, so as to obtain a depth of three feet at low water and a minimum width of 50 feet. That is the only sum expended out of that vote.

Public Works, Ontario..... $98,250

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would remind the Minister of Public Works that I called his attention last year and the year before and in the early part of this Session to the state of the winding ground on the banks of the Sydenham River at Dresden. I pointed out that the banks are slipping into the river, that it was affecting the warehouses on the bank and that the winding ground required to be supported in order to prevent serious damage being done to private property. Has the hon. gentleman undertaken any improvements there, or what does he contemplate doing? I am satisfied that the parties would have good cause of action by petition of right against the Government for damages if the winding ground is not properly protected.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the other day the hon. gentleman spoke to me on the subject. I took a note of it, and I have prepared some notes to be submitted to my colleagues.

Mr. CASEY. What is being done at Cobourg Harbor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The vote is to make provision for projected works of repair, on the superstructure of the western pier at Cobourg Harbor. The chief engineer reported that it would be necessary to put it into proper order for the general purposes of the harbor.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What has been the total expenditure for Cobourg Harbor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. From the 1st July, 1874, to the 30th June, 1888, the total is $163,000.

McGregor's Creek, to complete..... $2,250

Mr. CAMPBELL. Last year when this item was placed in the Estimates it also included Little Bear's Creek, and $7,750 was voted for that purpose. I notice this year that Little Bear Creek is struck out of the Estimate and only $2,250 asked for McGregor's Creek. I would like to ask the Minister why Little Bear's Creek has been excluded, and whether all this amount is to be expended on McGregor's Creek?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not see why the item has disappeared for Little Bear's Creek. McGregor's Creek is, I think, in the county of the hon. gentleman and the vote is to complete the projected pile works, 740 feet long, on the south bank of McGregor's Creek, as recommended by the chief engineer.

Mr. CASEY. I had the honor of being in the County of Kent during the last campaign, and I am aware that the projected works at Little Bear's Creek formed a considerable portion of the ammunition of the Conservative party in that campaign, and that my hon. friend from Kent had to face the proposed expenditure of considerable money there. I think that although my hon. friend was elected, the county should not be mulcted for the money that was promised during the campaign to be spent there by the Government. I would ask the Minister of Public Works if he has any plausible explanation to make for the disappearance from the Estimates of the appropriation for Little Bear's Creek.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My chief engineer asked me only for money for McGregor's Creek. He never spoke to me about the other place.

Mr. CASEY. You ought to have spoken to him about it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say why the vote for Little Bear's Creek is not here.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. Minister will see, if he looks at the Estimates last year, that Little Bear's Creek was included. As my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) says it was quite a subject of discussion in the county during the last election, and I may say that it is a work that ought to be done. Little Bear's Creek was dredged out some two or three years ago, and made a navigable stream, but owing to some reasons, with which I need not trouble the House now, it has become partially filled up. It is the bounden duty of the Government, having made it a navigable stream, to also see that it is kept navigable. I think that the hon. the Minister ought to put an item in the Estimates for that

purpose. I may say that it is a very important work. It lies in the Township of Dover, in the County of Kent, and opens up a very large and important section of the country. Boats of considerable size go up there, and it is a great convenience to people of that part of the country to be able to load their grain, logs and lumber on the banks of that stream. Last year there were over $100,000 worth of logs lying on the banks of that stream during the winter, expecting that the Government would do as they promised, dredge it out in the spring and make it navigable so that they would be able to get their logs down to market. Owing to the fact that the Government did not go on with the dredging as promised, this lumber could not be got out and it deteriorated in value to the consequent loss of the people. I do not think it is fair that this appropriation for Little Bear's Creek, after it having been placed in the Estimates last year and adopted by the House, should be withdrawn. Anyone knows that in that part of the country the lumbering interest is a very large interest, and it is of very great importance to the people to be able to get their lumber down that stream, and I trust, now that the matter has been called to the attention of the Minister, that he will see the necessity of placing $2,000 or $3,000 in the Supplementary Estimates for that purpose. I am sure it will meet the approval not only of this House, but of the country.

Mr. CASEY. I think the Minister of Public Works will have to account with the opponent of my hon. friend if he does not take his advice and put an item in the Estimates.

Belleville—to complete harbor works, the local authorities protecting the Island with cribwork to the extent of $6,000 ..... $4,000

Mr. CASEY. What is intended to be done?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This vote is for carrying on next year the works in connection with the dam 325 feet long which it is proposed to construct at the island in the River Moira, on the east side of the stream, on condition that the local authorities will undertake the protection of the island shores.

Toronto Harbor—work at eastern entrance, the city of Toronto having to contribute $100,000..... $20,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is this a vote on account of some great work we are beginning to undertake?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is to continue the works we have been carrying on there. We had to protect the island, and we had to construct works at the new entrance which had been opened there by the lake. We will probably require $25,000 or $30,000 more, so far as I can see now, but I do not ask the hon. gentleman to tie me down to that figure.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). When the grant of $50,000 was made last year, was there any provision that the city of Toronto should furnish a certain amount, and if so, did it furnish that amount?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, $100,000. We do not expect to be able to spend the whole $50,000 during the fiscal year, and we ask for a revote of $20,000.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). We were led to understand that on our furnishing $50,000, the city would furnish $100,000 to complete the work. Now we are paying virtually $70,000 or $75,000 instead of our $50,000 as formerly agreed upon between the Government and the city. I think we should have a fuller explanation.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us how the Government intend to protect the harbor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the harbor of Toronto is an exceptional one. The city is the largest in the Province of Ontario, and I thought, from the information of my engineer, that I should report that unless we made a large expenditure there to save the island the harbor of Toronto would be lost, which would be a great damage to the commerce of the country. The city had promised $100,000 as their contribution. There was some little difficulty in the matter, but as usual the city of Toronto showed that when they had made a promise they would keep it. They passed a by-law to provide the $100,000. We have expended very large sums since the beginning of this work. From 1875 down to 1877, $20,000 were expended; and from that period down to 1887, $575,000. In 1888, we spent $19,000, and the following year $14,400. We expect to spend about as much more up to the end of the fiscal year. That is the reason we now ask $20,000 more to continue the work.

Mr. CASEY. I do not wish to be understood as finding fault with the Government. I was simply asking information as to the plan on which the island is going to be protected.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We undertook these works on the plan the hon. gentleman knows well of the protection of the island—reducing the entrance on the east side and deepening the channel and the harbor. I have no doubt by next year we will have completed that work.

Mr. CASEY. What do you intend to do with the eastern gap?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. By building those two piers on either side, we will reduce the extent of the gap.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to draw attention to the difficulties which arose a year ago with regard to the expenditure of the money at the eastern gap. There was a breakwater built there, and I think the hon. gentleman will remember I drew his attention to the fact that blind bolts had been used, and the works were in such a flimsy condition that they were carried away by a storm. Who was in charge of this particular work, and how has the money been expended? The hon. gentleman will remember that a considerable amount of money was lost there, owing to the fact that whoever was in charge permitted the work to be done in an inefficient way.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is an officer of the Government there now, who, I know, has the confidence of the engineer.

Mr. CASEY. In two or three items the condition is that the locality would furnish a certain amount. Is it going to be the principle on which the Government will act in future regarding harbor accommodation and improvements, that the locality should pay something before the Government will do anything. I do not say that it is a bad principle; I rather think it is a good one. I remember that my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) established that principle when he was Minister of Public Works.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In many cases we call upon the authorities to contribute, and sometimes the works are larger and we think they are not altogether works which the Government should undertake alone. We said that as this was a mixed affair, the city should contribute a share of the expense, or if the revenue was not sufficient to allow us to undertake such a large work alone. We follow that plan not only with regard to ports and piers, but also public buildings, requiring the local authorities to give us the site.

General repairs and improvements—Harbors and Rivers, Ontario $10,000

Mr. CAMPBELL. You will notice that the $4,000 appropriated for the River Thames entrance is not asked to be re-voted this year. I think that the Government are not

treating the county properly in not going on with this work. It is a work of great importance to the town of Chatham, and has been asked for over and over again by the people there and also by the Board of Trade, Town and County Councils also Business Mens' Association. They have sent petitions asking that the bar at the mouth should be removed. Last year a deputation came down, and on former occasions deputations have come down and waited on the Government to urge that this work should be done. I have a letter from the Minister of Public Works addressed to Henry Smyth, as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 14th April, 1883.

"MY DEAR MR. SMYTH,—I am in receipt of your letters of the 15th, 17th and 24th of March, and the 2nd and 4th inst (the last enclosing a letter from Mr. Samuel Barfoot, president of the Chatham Navigation Company) on the subject of the improvement of the Thames River

"I have directed my officers to place a dredge at the mouth of the river not later than the first day of May, and as speedily as possible give your county the necessary navigation, and to forward me without delay, a report upon the other improvements which you ask, particularly those spoken of in the communication forwarded by you from Mr. Knight.

"You are aware that there will be no funds available for the permanent work to be done at the mouth of the river until the 1st July next.

"Yours very truly,

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN."

That is dated the 14th April of last year, and the hon. gentleman promised then that the dredge would be at the mouth of the river not later than the first day of May. I may state that the election took place on the second day of May. This letter was circulated broadcast all over the country, and it performed a very important work during that campaign; but I am very sorry to say that the 1st May came and the 2nd May came, and there was no dredge placed there. There was no dredge placed there at all. We never saw the dredge, and we did not know what had become of it; and, on the 21st May, when the Estimates were going through the House, I called the Minister's attention to it, and asked that the long looked for dredge should be placed there at the earliest opportunity; and the Minister of Public Works was then good enough to say in reply to me:

"When I wrote that letter I expected that this vote would have been passed in the House before the 1st of May, and I would have then felt that I had the authority to go on and make some arrangements, knowing how pressing this matter was; but, unfortunately, delays took place, and, not having the money, I could not go on with the work. Now that it is voted, I will go on with the work."

There was a distinct promise on the 14th of April from the hon. the Minister of Public Works, and again on the 21st May, that the work would be proceeded with at the earliest possible date, but I am very sorry indeed to say that the work has not been proceeded with, that nothing more has been done towards that except sending an engineer from the department up there in November last year to again look over the work. This work is of the utmost importance to the prosperity not only of the Town of Chatham but of the County of Kent. It is a work which is urgently required. I believe, from the best information I have at present, that there is only 6 feet or 6½ feet of water on the bar at the mouth of the river, while, for twenty miles inland, there is 18 feet or 20 feet—plenty of water to float the largest vessels on the lakes except on the bar at the mouth of the river which keeps them out I do not think it is treating the county right, after making this solemn and distinct promise on more than one occasion, that there is no vote for this work this year. The matter is of so much importance that a petition was sent down, and I had the honor to present it to the Minister of Public Works a few days ago, signed by 1,047 people of all shades of political opinion, and the most prominent men in that part of the county, asking that this work should be proceeded with; and so great is the necessity for proceeding with this work that the people there feel that the prosperity of the whole town and county depends upon the early completion of this work. Unless it is proceeded with at an early date, there will be very great disarrangement caused to the business of that part of the country. The passenger boat, *City of Chatham*, sailing from Chatham to Detroit, was compelled to lay up in the month of September last year, because she could not get across the bar; and during a recent visit to the town of Chatham, I was urged to ascertain from the Government some definite information as to their intentions. At present they do not know whether to fit up that boat for the season's work or not. Unless the bar is removed, it would be impossible for the steamer to get across the bar, and the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is extending its line from London to Detroit, has been compelled to bring all its rails and ties by the way of Wallaceburg and the Erie and Huron Railway. Otherwise it could have brought all its material and had it unloaded in Chatham, where it would be far more convenient, and that would give a great deal of employment to the laborers and mechanics who are depending upon the loading and unloading of this material, but that company has been compelled to bring all its material in by the way of Wallaceburg. I am sure the Minister of Agriculture can testify to the great importance and necessity of this work being done. Further, the lumbermen in the Town of Chatham are also interested. They require to bring in their stocks of lumber early in the spring, as soon as navigation is open; but they do not know what to do, and, unless the bar is removed, they cannot bring their lumber in by water, but will have to bring it by way of the Erie and Huron Railway, unship it at Wallaceburg and send it thence to Chatham. Then, we have large brick manufacturers along the banks of the River Thames. They have contracts for large quantities of brick. One of them showed me a contract which he could make with Messrs. Hastings Bros, of Winnipeg, for 400,000 bricks, and he told me the demand for brick at Port Arthur and in Manitoba was almost unlimited, but the trouble was that, if the bar is not removed out of the river, it will be utterly impossible for them to accept any of those contracts. You will readily see how necessary it is that the intention of the Government should be known upon this point. I hope and believe that the Minister of Public Works intends to bring down in the Supplementary Estimates a sum for this important work, and the reason I bring it to his attention now is to have a definite answer upon that point. It is of the greatest importance that the intentions of the Government should be known now, so that these men will know what to do, and, therefore, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works what is the intention of the Government in reference to this important matter. It has been before them for a long time, they know all the facts, they know the necessity of it, and they have promised it over and over again, and I hope it is not asking too much of the hon. Minister to ask him to let the House and the country know what they intend to do in the matter.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This work did not proceed, notwithstanding my letter or letters, because we could not obtain a dredge at a sufficiently early time in the season of 1888, and, therefore, we could not do it. But I may say that I have been examining the matter since, in order to see how far I could obtain the necessary dredge to do the work this year. Arrangements are now being made, and I hope the work will be begun in a short time, at all events at the proper season.

Mr. CASEY. Under this head of general improvements, I wish to call the attention to the Minister to the harbor of Port Stanley. He will remember that that harbor was leased to the London and Port Stanley Railway, which afterwards became the property of the Great Western Railway, and subsequently came into the hands of the Grand Trunk.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman would oblige me if he did not go into that matter now, as I am very tired, and he will have another opportunity.

Mr. CASEY. Will the hon. Minister say that he will give this matter his attention.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

General repairs and improvements—Harbors and Rivers, Manitoba..... $2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where does the hon. gentleman mean to spend that money, and what is it to be used for?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the ordinary vote to cover such expense as may be incurred in the fiscal year 1889-90.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that mean the Red River?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; and such small works as are not provided for in the general Estimates.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to call the attention of the Minister to the importance of some works that should have been gone on with for which this sum is far too small. The works are almost in a similar position, and of as much importance, as the dredging on the mouth of the Thames River. Something should be done with the St. Andrew's Rapids. Representations have been made to the Government, and deputations have visited Ottawa for the purpose of inducing the Government to do something for that work. They promised us some years ago to make a survey of the Red River, and to try, if possible, to put a sum in the Estimates to improve the St. Andrew's Rapids, and to improve the navigation of the Red River so as to allow lake vessels to come to the city of Winnipeg, which would be a great benefit, not only for the city of Winnipeg, but to the people interested in the lumber business throughout Manitoba. It would also be the means of assisting to develop the natural resources around Lake Winnipeg. There are some very good deposits of iron ore on islands in Lake Winnipeg, which could be developed if the navigation of the Red River was improved. The Americans on their side have spent a large sum of money improving the Red River up to the boundary line, but with the exception of one or two places between the boundary line and the city of Winnipeg, the St. Andrew's Rapids between the city of Winnipeg and Lake Winnipeg, the navigation of the Red River might be utilised from Fargo in the United States down to the head waters of Lake Winnipeg. I am sorry that the Government are not making an appropriation for the purpose of improving the Red River. It is a very important stream, and would open up and develop the resources which lay on the shore of Lake Winnipeg. I might also say in connection with this general vote that I would like to have seen the Government make some move with regard to improving the communication between Lake Winnipegosis and Lake Manitoba. That matter is also of great importance to the people of Manitoba, and to the people who own timber limits on Lake Winnipegosis. In that district there is large and valuable timber limits that the Government have disposed of, and at present I believe they are receiving no consideration for them on account of certain promises made to those parties when they received those timber limits, that the water communication between those lakes would be improved and made suitable for floating logs down, or running boats on the river. I hope the Minister of Public Works will see fit to have a sum placed in the Supplementary Estimates to go on with some of those works. This is a very small amount to place in the Estimates for general improvements in Manitoba.

Quarantine $68,664

Mr. ELLIS. Does the amount of $26,000 for quarantine St. John, N. B., refer to the building on Partridge Island?

Mr. CARLING. It is for salary and expenses at Partridge Island.

Mr. ELLIS. I do not know whether the Minister is aware that the buildings there are going entirely to decay, and if it were necessary to use them for any purpose they would prove to be entirely unfit. The matter came under my notice in this way: The school board of St. John has maintained a school on the Island, although there were only 8 or 10 pupils, and for the purpose of this school one of the rooms in the building was placed at the disposal of the board by the department. It became, however, so unfit for use that the board were compelled to entirely give up the school, and the report was that the rain came through the roof so that not a single room was fit for use. I suppose the Minister is aware of that fact, because the board was rather curtly treated by his department when they asked the department to place the building in a condition so that it could be used. It was an act of grace to maintain a school on the Island at all.

Mr. CARLING. My intention has been called to the state of the building, and the Minister of Public Works has been requested to make an examination and report with a view to have the building repaired at once.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). With respect to the item $3,400 for Halifax, I desire to enquire what amount has been put down for the chaplains of the station?

Mr. CARLING. $200 each.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Last year the vote was taken in the same way. I pointed out to the Minister that there was a Protestant and Catholic chaplain for the quarantine station at Halifax. The Protestant chaplain belonged to the parish in which the quarantine station was situated, but he moved away, and his successor has not been paid anything, while the Roman Catholic chaplain has been drawing his salary, and very properly so, ever since. The Minister then promised that this would be continued to the rector of the the parish in which the station is situated. Some of the parties have come to me about the matter on several occasions, and I addressed a communication to the department, reminding the Minister of the conversation in the House and privately, but I never received any reply. I should now like to understand from the Minister whether that sum is available for the rector of the Eastern Passage Church, the Protestant chaplain, as well as for the Roman Catholic chaplain, who has been drawing his salary for some time, because, although the matter was distinctly understood last year, I have been unable to obtain any information from the department since with regard to it. I want to know whether we can rely on the settlement of the matter in the future in this way.

Mr. CARLING. I regret very much that the correspondence with the department was not acknowledged; I am sure that I was not aware of it. I can say to the hon. gentleman that a clergyman has been appointed to act with the Catholic clergyman, but I cannot at the moment give his name. I will, however, give it to the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I should like to have it before this item is carried.

Mr. CARLING. If the vote is allowed to pass, I will give the information to-morrow.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What information does the hon. gentleman want? It appears by the Auditor General's report that the Rev. Father Wood drew a salary of $100, but the Protestant chaplain has not been drawing a salary

for two years. It lapsed under a change of rectors, and the people have applied to me on several occasions in regard to the matter, as the position properly belongs to the parish in which the station is situated. There is nothing more for the hon. gentleman to say than either to admit or deny whether the Protestant chaplain would be paid the same as the Roman Catholic chaplain or not. I do not think there is a great deal of duty for either chaplain to do, but they attend when required. I think the hon. Minister can tell me now whether he is prepared to place the Protestants in the same position as the Roman Catholics?

Mr. CARLING. The Rev. Dr. Partridge is acting with the Catholic clergyman now and has been appointed.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is sufficient; but it is a departure from the usual custom, which it would have been much better to have adhered to, because the Eastern Passage congregation is a poor one. It is among fishermen, and is directly opposite to the quarantine station, and the salary of the rector of the parish is small. Dr. Partridge is rector of St. George's, in the city, and is an excellent man in every respect; but his salary is much larger, and, being a city clergyman, he is five or six miles distant from the quarantine station, and can hardly be so available as the clergyman of the locality. The position belongs to the Eastern Passage parish, and I could not tell who is rector now. It has always belonged to the parish of the Eastern Passage, and I think it would be better to allow it to remain there instead of giving it to a city clergyman (a very proper and well qualified man, I must say) who has a larger salary. I cannot understand why the change should be made, particularly when the Minister promised last year that it should go in the way I have explained now.

Mr. CARLING. I do not recollect promising the hon. member that I would appoint a local clergyman. I think that I promised the hon. gentleman that a clergyman would be appointed in the place of the gentleman who acted before.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Of course you will understand that I do not take exception to Mr. Partridge. I only point out that it was an assistance to a poorer parish.

Mr. ELLIS. Why should there be any chaplain at all? I do not think there have been more than three persons in the quarantine hospital in Halifax for the last year. What is the good of paying $200 for clerical services when you have no one to attend the services.

Public Health $10,000

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I wish to ask what benefits and results are supposed to be obtainable from this grant?

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentleman will find in the Auditor General's Report, which I see he has beside him, particulars of how the money has been expended.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I certainly see how some of the money has been expended but, to me, it does not seem completely satisfactory. I think the Minister ought to be able to explain the item, and to show that the money is well spent. I see, in the first place, that Dr. Montizambert, who is in charge of the quarantine hospital, receives a very liberal allowance of $2,300 a year salary, and, if we take into account the various items connected with this service, we will find that this amount has been increased last year to somewhere near $4,000. It may be that he performs services to the public which amply compensate the public for the amount of money paid, but we certainly ought not to be asked to vote this large sum of money without some explanation from the Minister as to what duties Dr. Montizambert performs. I think that instead of referring me to the Auditor General's Report the Minister should give some detailed report of the expenditure. I find also in the report that Dr. Playter receives the sum of $1,200 a year, and I think the Minister should give us some explanation of what services he renders. I am aware that Dr. Playter edits the *Sanitary Journal*, but I am not aware that the *Sanitary Journal* has a very general circulation. I can well understand that $1,200 is beneficial to the individual receiving it, but I am not aware of the beneficial effects of the *Sanitary Journal*. I can understand that it is a great assistance to him keeping up the journal, but I would like to know what return the Government get for this $1,200? Are they receiving a certain number of copies of this journal or do they grant this amount as a bonus?

Mr. CARLING. Dr. Playter was very strongly recommended by the medical gentlemen of this House some few years ago to take charge of this journal. The Government receives 100 copies of that journal, and it is, I believe, very freely distributed all over the country to the medical profession and to the different cities and towns, and I know that it is very highly appreciated by those who receive it. I believe that the journal has done a great deal of good and I have had many communications urging me to increase the grant to Dr. Playter instead of reducing it.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I understand you receive 100 copies. How often is the journal issued and how many copies do you receive during the year?

Mr. CARLING. It is a monthly journal.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Perhaps the Minister is able to explain to whom these journals are sent; by what means they are distributed and what advantages do they expect to derive from their distribution.

Mr. CARLING. This amount of money has been given in aid to the *Sanitary Journal*, and a certain number of copies monthly are sent to the department and these are distributed. It has been also, I believe, distributed very freely all over the country. This grant has been given for a number of years.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How many years?

Mr. CARLING. Four or five years, I believe. The journal was thought to be very valuable by the profession, and the medical gentlemen in this House strongly urged this grant.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I desire to know who received these journals. Are they sent directly by Mr. Playter to any one whom he may wish to send them to, or are they distributed by the department?

Mr. CARLING. This amount of money is given in aid of the journal, and Doctor Playter sends them to whom he thinks proper. I believe it has been very freely circulated in all parts of Canada, in addition to the copies which have been given to the department, and which are forwarded to the different immigration and quarantine agencies and institutions throughout the country.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What is the object of this journal?

Mr. CARLING. It is to give the public the benefit of Dr. Playter's experience.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). This may be a satisfactory explanation, but certainly I cannot yet understand to what agencies these books are sent. They are, I suppose, sent direct by Mr. Playter to the various points, not through the department at all. He may send them to his various subscribers for aught I know. This item seems to be unreasonable. There is another item of $400 for the French sanitary journal. Is that distributed in the same manner as Mr. Playter's?

Mr. CARLING. I understand that it is.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin.) I think it is a useless expenditure. Hon. gentlemen on that side may laugh, but if it were their own money, they would hesitate very seriously before they would adopt a course of that kind. I believe this is nothing more nor less than a gift to this man Playter, and I believe there is no beneficial effect from the distribution of this sanitary journal at all. It is a question to me whether, if you searched the agencies in the different parts of the Dominion, you would find a hundred copies of it. If you would, it is not read, nor is it regarded by the medical profession as being of any particular value. My hon. friend said that a few years ago it was highly recommended by the medical men of this House. There may have been some who signed a recommendation to the Government to subsidise this sanitary journal in this way, but I have yet to find that it has been of any material benefit. It is useless, so far as any benefit to the profession arising from its perusal is concerned. Then, I would like to have some explanation of the large amount of $4,000 which is paid to the medical superintendent for salary and expenses.

Mr. SPROULE. As one of the medical men of the House who signed the recommendation to the Government, I wish to say that I think there were ten or twelve of us, including Dr. Brouse, the two Dr. Fergusons and Sir Charles Tupper, who came to the conclusion, after an examination of this pamphlet, that it was a useful and valuable one. We also recommended the department to grant some assistance for getting out a number of these monthly periodicals; and that they were distributed, I think there is no doubt, because they come both to the medical men and the boards of health in my part of the country, and they are considered valuable aids in looking after the sanitary condition of the country. It was also arranged at the time, I think, that assistance should be given to have a pamphlet for the same purpose distributed in the French language. I know that this work is a valuable one, Dr. Playter is most assiduous, and what he culls is from the best medical writers of the time.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Will the hon. gentleman explain the expenses of Mr. Montizambert, fares $165, Pullman and porters $45 ?

Mr. CARLING. Those were the expenses of Dr. Montizambert in attending the medical convention at Louisville in 1887-88. He was requested to visit that convention as a representative of Canada.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Will the hon. gentleman explain the item of Mr. Dyke, Liverpool, travelling expenses $489.69 ?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Dyke is Government agent at Liverpool, and was employed in connection with the cattle quarantine in Great Britain ?

Mr. KIRK. What has been done towards stamping out cattle disease in Pictou, N.S. ?

Mr. CARLING. I think it has been stamped out. The officer of the department visited that district last autumn. He reported that a number of cattle were slaughtered, and that the disease no longer exists there.

Resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 1st April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE OFFICIAL DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS (translation) moved:

That the second report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House, brought down on the 22nd March last, be adopted.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (Translation.) moved in amendment:

That the said report be not now concurred in, but that it be referred back to the said committee with instructions to enquire into the justice and expediency of granting an indemnity to Messrs. A. E. Poirier, Remi Tremblay and Ernest Tremblay, who were discharged from their positions.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before the motion of the Chairman of the Debates Committee (Mr. Desjardins) be granted, I wish to return to the charge in support of a motion which I made last year. As I stated last year, when I made a similar motion, my intention is not to renew the debate which took place in this House in the matter of the translators who were dismissed, inasmuch as your decision was sustained by the House, but I think, as I stated then, that an indemnity ought to be given to these men who have been, to say the least, treated in rather a cruel manner. In bringing up again this question before the House, I am only acting upon the suggestion made by the hon. the First Minister, who, on the 17th of May last, when I brought forward this motion, asked me to withdraw it and make it at the beginning of the present Session. The hon. the First Minister stated then that he would make no promise, but that he would take the matter into consideration during the recess. I am convinced that the hon. the First Minister, who always keeps his word, must have kept this promise as all his others, and that he must have taken the matter into consideration. He ought to be in a position to give a definite answer, which I trust will be favorable to the young persons who have been hardly used. I have no intention, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, to reopen the debate, but it will suffice to recall the following facts: that these men were engaged as translators, that no fault was found with them as such, and that their work was carried out in an intelligent manner. It will be remarked that they came here last year at the beginning of the Session, to continue their work, that they waited here for five or six weeks for a decision on their fate, because no signification had been given them in an official manner that their services would no longer be required. Consequently they made an outlay in coming here; they took a house, they incurred considerable expense, and after five or six weeks of waiting these gentlemen were obliged to go back and endeavor to earn their living in another way. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not right to treat officers of this House, against whom, I repeat, no complaint has been brought, and who have always performed their duties well, in a more unceremonious manner than is customary with ordinary workmen. It is well known that, according to the law in the Province of Quebec, it is not lawful to discharge mere domestic servants without giving them fifteen days notice or without paying them an equivalent. Now, in this case, not the slightest notice was given to these men. When you decided that their services were no longer required and the House ratified your decision, these men were obliged to go away without any other notice and without any compensation for their time and the considerable expense that they had

been put to. I think that it would be but fair that an indemnity should be granted them, and that this report be sent back to the Debates Committee in order that a recommendation be inserted therein to the effect that they should be paid, if not the whole sessional allowance at least a portion of their expenses. As for the two Messieurs Tremblay I know that they took a house here, that they purchased the movables requisite for their housekeeping, and that after their dismissal they were obliged to throw up their houses, sacrifice at a low figure their effects and pay damages to their landlords. It is not exemplary damages but the real losses which should be paid, and I think that under the circumstances the House will be unanimous in yielding to the desire expressed by the hon. the First Minister to take the matter into consideration. Although no formal promise was then made that an indemnity should be paid them, I would wish that the Committee should decide what amount be granted them. I may say that the men are not greedy; they will be satisfied with a reasonable indemnity and the House will be only committing an act of justice in giving them a certain sum.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report referred to, as I understand, appears at page 267 of the Votes and Proceedings, and is as follows:—

"The Committee beg leave to report the following Resolution as a recommendation: That Members desiring to procure copies of their speeches from the Queen's Printer may have them furnished in the numbers desired, either in quarto or octavo form, covered or not covered, as may be required, at the actual cost for paper and labor, not including composition, and that this rule may apply to all accounts for the present Session."

That being the resolution, the amendment has, consequently, not the slightest reference to it, and is out of order, as the report does not refer at all to the compensation of officers. Again, I see that the hon. gentleman has a notice of motion on the paper on the same subject, and on both these grounds I object to this amendment as being out of order.

Mr. LAURIER. Strictly speaking, it may be that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette) is not quite in order, but he is certainly carrying out the suggestion which was made to him last Session by the Prime Minister. When my hon. friend made a similar motion then in amendment to the report, he was advised by the Prime Minister not to press it, but to bring it up this Session. My hon. friend has taken advantage of the suggestion to bring up the question in this form. It may be that the amendment is not absolutely relevant to the motion, but last year the Prime Minister gave the advice which my hon friend is now following. The discrepancy then was just the same.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I find that the hon. gentleman gave notice as long ago as the 25th February, of a motion for a Committee of the Whole:

"To enquire as to the justice and expediency of granting an indemnity to Messrs. A. E. Poirier, Rémi Tremblay and Ernest Tremblay, who were discharged last year from their positions as *Hansard* translators;"

And when we arrived at that motion, going over the list, the hon. gentleman was not ready to go on with the motion.

Mr. LAURIER. Pardon me; he was ready to go on upon several occasions, but the motion was not reached in time. It was when unopposed motions were called that it was reached.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; that is so.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette) has taken the Premier's advice, but the Premier has taken the hon. gentleman's days.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In this connection, I desire to call attention to the fact that on Friday last the debate in this House finished at about eleven o'clock. On Saturday morning about eleven or half-past eleven o'clock, I sent a written order to Mr. Senecal, in charge of the printing of the Debates, for some copies of the previous day's proceedings, and in reply, he says:

"Your order for 50 copies of the Debates of the 29th inst. was too late, as the daily *Hansard* was printed off."

This is dated on the 30th, the following morning. Now, I was going to say, that if we are to understand that copies of the *Hansard* cannot be had when they are ordered at eleven o'clock the day following the debate, of course members will not be able to know whether they can get them at all. I desire to bring that to the notice of the Government, in order that some time should be fixed, otherwise the reports would be of no value to the members of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. A similar motion is on the Order paper, and as it is not in accordance with the Rules or Parliamentary usage to take a motion out of its proper place and move it as an amendment to another question, I must, therefore, rule that it can not now be put to The House.

Amendment ruled out of order, and main motion agreed to.

MARINE HOSPITALS.

Sir DONALD A. SMITH asked, 1. The number of sick seamen cared for, and the aggregate number of days of hospital care given to them, in each of the ports of Montreal, Halifax, St. John and Quebec, respectively, during the last fiscal year? 2. The amount charged to the Sick and Distressed Mariners' Fund, in each case, as for hospital care in each port? 3. The aggregate rate per patient per diem in each port, as shown by the foregoing? 4. The causes why the average cost per patient per diem was so much greater in Quebec than in Montreal. or Halifax? 5. Whether any arrangement has been made with the managers of the Marine Hospital, Quebec, as contemplated by the "Act respecting Sick Mariners," section 6; and if so, what arrangement; and if not, why not? 6. Whether the Ministry consider the amount so charged to the fund, as for the care of sick mariners in the Marine Hospital of Quebec, to be "a reasonable compensation for the care and treatment of the sick mariners sent to such hospital," as provided for by the above-named section 6 of the Act? 7. What steps the Ministry intend taking to insure that the charge to the Sick Mariners' Fund, for hospital care and treatment, in the city of Quebec, shall not hereafter exceed the amount paid in Montreal and Halifax for similar services?

Mr. TUPPER. The number of sick seamen cared for, and the aggregate number of days of hospital care given to them in each of the ports of Montreal, Halifax, St. John and Quebec, respectively, during the last fiscal year, is as follows, viz.: Montreal, 170 seamen, 2,927 days; Halifax, 164 seamen, 3,882 days; St. John, 157 seamen, 4,429 days; Quebec, 318 seamen, 4,179 days. 2. The amount charged to the Sick and Distressed Mariners' Fund in each case, as for hospital care in each port, is as follows: Montreal, $2,634.30; Halifax, $3,493.80; St. John, $3,465.69; Quebec, $18,777 82. In the amount given as an expenditure for Marine and Immigrants' Hospital at Quebec, is included the cost for providing for immigrants and sick residents of Quebec, and a fair proportion would be as follows, viz.: for seamen, $5,680.19; for immigrants, $1,068.34; and for residents, $12,029.10. A grant of $1,866.67 was received from the Government of Quebec for support of residents, and $182.25 for rent of beach lots, &c., thus reducing the cost of maintenance to the Government of the Dominion to $16,723.70. 3. The aggregate rate for patients per diem in each port, as shown by the foregoing, is as follows, viz.: Montreal, 90

cents per diem; Halifax, 90 cents per diem; St. John, 78¼ cents per diem; Quebec, $1.36 per diem. 4. The causes why the average cost per patient per diem was so much greater in Quebec than in the other ports, is that the hospital has a large and expensive staff, and a large number of residents at Quebec is cared for in the hospital, and the amount contributed for the sick residents in Quebec is not in proportion to the number of days during which they are cared for, and the commissioner or trustees, visiting physicians, resident physicians, and the chaplains, are all paid salaries. 5. No arrangement has been made with the managers of the Marine Hospital at Quebec, as the hospital has been managed by trustees in the past, under the supervision of the Marine Department, and is supported by Dominion funds, and is a Dominion institution. 6. The amount charged to the fund for the care of the sick mariners in the Marine Hospital at Quebec, is considered large, but this expenditure is largely owing to the practice which has prevailed of taking in sick residents, for whom only a small sum is paid by the Government at Quebec, as it is not like a public hospital where the Government pays a fixed rate per diem without any further responsibility, or the treatment of sick mariners who are put there by arrangement. 7. The question of reducing the expenditure for the Marine Hospital at Quebec, is at present under consideration.

GRAZING LEASES.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. EDGAR) asked, Have any grazing leases in Alberta been cancelled since the 1st January? If so, are they "old leases" or leases under the amended form? Does the Government intend to compel the holders of old form leases to fulfil the conditions of the leases, or, as an alternative, to permit settlers to settle on the ranches, as provided for in the new form leases? Is the Government aware that the principal owners of these ranches are Englishmen residing in Great Britain?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Two leases under the amended form have been cancelled since the 1st January, 1889; and it may be added that on the 14th of the previous month, 27, of which four were on the old form, were also cancelled. 2. The Government are cancelling all leases, irrrespective of the form, when the conditions are not being fulfilled. So far it has not been necessary to give the two years' notice in any case, for which provision is made in the old form of lease, inasmuch as in every instance where it has been shown that the land is required for settlement, the lessees have invariably agreed to relinquish the necessary land without notice. 3. The Government are aware that a large amount of British capital is invested in ranches in the North-West.

DEFENCE OF AN INDIAN PRISONER IN COUNTY OF BRUCE.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Has the Government employed legal counsel to defend the Indian who is charged with shooting a white man at Allenford, county of Bruce, this winter? If so, whom did they employ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. A. B. Klein, barrister, of Walkerton.

ILLICIT MANUFACTURE OF WHISKEY.

Mr. RINFRET asked, What is the amount of the costs incurred and paid in the suits instituted against Messrs. Lafleur and Vézina, of Ste. Philomène, county of Lotbinière, and for suits against Messrs. Coté and Hamelin, of Grondines, county of Portneuf, for the illicit manufacture of whiskey in the year 1888?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Messrs. Casgrain, Auger and Hamel were paid $37.40 in the case of Vezina; $53.95 in the case of Coté; $18.50 in the case of Hamelin. I cannot find that any costs were paid in the Lafleur case, nor can such a case be found in the books of the Inland Revenue Department.

TELEGRAPH LINE TO ESQUIMAUX POINT.

Mr. FISET (translation) asked, Since when has work on the telegraph line, which is to go to Esquimaux Point, been begun? How many miles have been constructed in all, particularising the number built in the summer of 1888? What has been the cost per mile?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member I can state that the work was begun in 1880. At the end of the year 1887 there were built 365¼ miles; the cost has been $166.38 per mile, one thing with another. In 1888 there were 418 miles built, at a cost of $139 per mile, taking an average.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LAND AND MONEY SUBSIDY.

Mr. MACDOWALL asked, 1. At what date were the first maps published showing the intended route of the Canadian Pacific Railway? 2. At what date were the first maps published showing the present route of that railway? 3. What was the land grant per mile granted to the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway? 4. What the amount per mile of money bonus? 5. What is the quantity of land surrendered by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and how much per acre were they paid?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The answer I have to give to the hon. gentleman's questions is as follows:—(1) At what dates were the first maps published showing the intended route of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Answer. In 1872. (2) At what dates were the first maps published showing the present route of that railway? Answer. In 1882. (3) What was the land grant per mile granted to the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Answer. Central section, 900 miles at 12,500 acres per mile, 450 miles at 16,66$\frac{6}{100}$ acres per mile: Eastern section, 550 miles at 9,615$\frac{35}{100}$ acres per mile. (4) What the amount per mile of money bonus? Answer. Central section, 900 miles at $10,000 per mile, 450 miles at $13,333 per mile; Eastern section, 550 miles at $15,384.61 per mile. (5) What is the quantity of land surrendered by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and how much per acre were they paid? Answer. 5,793,014 acres.

LUMBER SHIPMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) asked, Is any export duty exacted upon piling and small lumber shipped from the ports in New Brunswick to the United States? What is the rate of duty? And what amount collected during the past year?

Mr. BOWELL. There is no export duty collected or imposed upon small logs measuring not more than nine inches at the butt.

JOSEPH E. VINCENT.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency) moved for:

Copies of correspondence between Joseph E. Vincent, of the city of Quebec, and the Customs Department, respecting the French version of the present tariff and the amendments thereto.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no such correspondence. The only letter received from this gentleman is by my private secretary, who answered it, and the letter was then thrown into the waste paper basket.

Motion withdrawn.

ROCK LAKE DAM.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved for :

Copies of all reports and recommendations, by engineers and others, respecting the erection of a dam now under construction at the opening of Rock Lake, in the Township of Storrington, in the County of Frontenac; the height to which it is proposed to dam back the water; the number of acres of land which will be flooded, and the other damage which will be caused by said dam; also copies of reports by the Department of Justice as to the legal right to erect the dam and cause said damage; also copies of all petitions and protests against the erection of the said dam.

He said : In making this motion I desire to call the attention of the Government and the Department of Railways and Canals to the serious mistake which, I believe, has been made in the erection of this dam, and to the serious effects which will follow if the work is proceeded with. The dam mentioned in this motion is at the opening of Rock Lake, a lake which falls into the Opinicon Lake, which is one of those feeding the Rideau Canal. An improvement in that water communciation was suggested by a petition, which was presented to the Government in 1884, when, instead of asking that these waters in these lakes should be raised, the petitioners asked the waters be lowered. I hold a draft of the original petition, which was presented to the Department of Railways and Canals from the ratepayers, asking :

"1st. To lower the waters of the following lakes; Knowlton, Mid, and Desert, Township of Loughborough, Buck and Mud Lake (Bedford), by clearing out the pasages between them and making a lock (cheap) between Mud Creek and Devil Lake (Bedford), of such a height as to make the highest level of water in said lakes the present summer level, and not higher, of Mud Lake (Bedford); also clear cut said passages to the same width as the locks on the Rideau Canal, and to such a depth that when the supply necessary for the Rideau Canal is drawn off, there may still remain the depth of wster upon the bottom of said passages as there is upon the sills of the locks on said Rideau Canal. Also to construct a lock (cheap) at the junction of Devil Lake and the Rideau Canal, North Crosby. The above improvements will open up a way for barges to the head of Knowlton Lake, giving the traffic of 486 miles of coast to the Rideau Canal—a largely increased water supply, both to the canal and the Gananoque River, and also enable the land owners to cultivate their meadow land and to work their mines, besides enabling a large quantity of firewood, now locked up, to come to Kingston, and thereby reduce the price of that commodity in the city.

"2nd. To make a shute or passage for ore, &c., from Buck to Devil Lake, in case a direct passage to the Rideau should prove, upon examination, to be expensive. 3rd. To purchase Hunter's mill right between Rock and Opinicon Lakes, and by a cheap lock make a passage from Opinicon Lake to Rock Lake, lowering the water to the summer level of Hunter's dam, and making the passage the same width, and having the same depth of water as the canal locks, also to clear out the stream between Rock Lake and Stone House Lake and raise the road bridge—for the same reasons as stated under No. 1.

This is the petition which was presented in 1884, signed by a large number of residents in the counties of Frontenac, Addington and Leeds, and it is one of the means to be adopted for getting a better water supply for the Rideau Canal, and also for the Gananoque River, for the benefit of mill owners in Gananoque. The object then was not to raise the waters in these lakes, but to open passages between them, so that there might be communication to benefit a large number of the mines in that locality, which export a large quantity of phosphate, and suffer great detriment in consequence of the long haul that has to be made. A meeting of the ratepayers, large and enthusiastic, was held the other night at the township of Loughborough, in the county of Addington, calling for the expenditure of money to be given for the building of a railway. But if they had this canal built, it would open no less than 486 miles of coast, which it would make tributary to the traffic carried on over the Rideau Canal; and when you consider that large mileage, it is evident there is a large amount of material in that county which could be brought to market if this waterway were constructed. That question was taken up, after Sir Charles Tupper left the department, by the present Minister of Railways, whom, we all regret to know, is very ill and unable to attend his department. He was so impressed with the desirability of the work, that he asked the Government for a grant of $20,000 to investigate into and make some of these improvements. $8,000 was given by Order in Council to the Gananoque River Improvement Company, and was expended in improving the supply of water to that river, but the rest was intended to carry out the idea mentioned in this petition. But what do we find? All that has been undertaken was to purchase the mill site of a man named Hunter, at the opening of Rock Lake, and, instead of making a passage in order to lower the water at Rock Lake, the engineer, or somebody else, constructed this dam in order to dam back the water, under the impression that they had a legal right to do so. But, according to all the information and evidence obtainable, I claim there is no such right. Upwards of 20 years ago, Mr. Hunter had a dam there which was used for the purpose of damming back the water in the spring, in order to float logs down, but the water was always lowered, and the dam taken away by the 1st June, so that no water remained there during the summer. The present dam is erected for the purpose of making a reservoir, and keeping back the water until August or September. No right was given by Mr. Hunter's dam for that purpose. The right he had was only to keep back the water in the spring, so that the Government have no legal right to dam back the water. I am told that it will overflow hundreds of acres of land. A roadway has been built by the township of Storrington some 600 feet long, and this roadway will be from 4 to 6 feet under water, unless this dam be removed. The hon. the Minister of Railways will see that this dam will have serious consequences to the people in the township of Storrington. The township council have petitioned against it. The people are much excited, and I really fear the same thing will take place as took place when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was at the head of the Government. He then had a dam at Devil's Lake, and one night it disappeared in some mysterious manner, and the hon. gentleman very wisely never made any enquiries as to who took it away. The people were so indignant at its being put there; and the same thing may probably take place if the present Government proceed with the construction of this dam, and put in the stop logs, and keep back the water. I hope the Government will make investigations with a view to carry out the requests contained in this petition, and to find out the means of making connection between these lakes, so as to allow boats and barges to pass between them and so open up this country, to the benefit of the Rideau Canal. I may also say that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction in regard to the way in which that canal is managed at the far end, because the water has been kept up to a height which was not intended when the canal was originally built, and hundreds of acres of land have been drowned and damaged, and every year we have had many claims for damages to be settled. This is not right, because, by a little expenditure of money, the canal can be made fit for barges and boats drawing more water than those which pass through now. That can be done by a little dredging. If they were to move the head lock from Kingston Mills to Washburn, and were to dredge between Brewer's and Kingston Mills, they would have enough water to allow boats drawing 6 feet of water to pass, whereas now, according to the design of the Royal Engineers who built the canal, no boats of more than 4½ feet draft can pass. The estimate of the expenditure required for that is $60,000, and, by removing this lock from Kingston Mills to Washburn and dredging out the bed of the river, the Government could not only lower the water to a depth of 8 feet, but would reclaim 4,000 acres of land, the richest and most fertile in that country. That land would be readily saleable at $30 or $40 an acre, and would far more than pay the cost of the improvement. It has been said that a man who could make two blades of grass grow where one grew before would be a great man. By making this improvement, the Government would reclaim

4,000 acres of the richest land in Ontario, and I think it is their duty to take that course. Not only that, but they would stop the damage which is now done to the lands of the farmers living all round that level, some 20 miles in distance, who are suffering annually from the raising of the water. It has been raised to 7 feet 9 inches on the sill, and I hold in my hand the affidavit of the first lockmaster at Kingston Mills, who was there for 40 years, and he says that the practice was to keep 5 ft. 6 in. of water on the sills, and that no boat was allowed to pass through with a draft of more than 4½ feet. That is signed by Mr. John Brady, who was the first lockmaster at Kingston Mills, and was there for 40 years, and is still alive. If that rule were enforced, it would take away all the objection. The farmers complain because the water is kept 7 feet on the sills, and boats drawing 5 feet and 6 feet are allowed to pass through. The Government have no right to cause this damage, and if they require more water, they should spend money in dredging the canal and removing the lock at Kingston Mills to Washburn.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD Of course, there is no objection to bringing down these papers. It is an engineer's question, which the House cannot well understand until all the papers are laid before the House; and if there is no full report on the subject, I shall see that a report is prepared, giving the views of the Government engineer in charge of the canal, and shall see also whether his report is endorsed by the chief engineer, Mr. Page. I think, however, my hon. friend ought not to threaten the House and the Government with an act of violence in pulling down this dam unless it is removed. I draw a great distinction between this dam and the one my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Mackenzie), when he was Minister, allowed to be pulled down. I understand that was the Devil's Dam, and we are all anxious to get rid of that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) did not allow that dam to be pulled down. It was done without his knowledge or consent. He did not ask for a vote to repair it; that is all.

Motion agreed to.

ARREARS OF INDIAN ANNUITIES.

Mr. O'BRIEN moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, since the 1st January, 1888, between the Government of the Dominion and that of the Province of Ontario, relating to the arrears of annuities due to the Indians who surrendered their lands under the Robinson Treaty, and to the grant of a reserve to the Chippewa Band of Lake Temogamingue.

He said: I would ask the Minister of the Interior whether any arrangement has been come to, or is likely to be come to, in reference to the arrears of the annuities due under the Robinson Treaty and to the Temogamingue Reserve. An arrangement was arrived at to make the reservation, but, owing to a dispute between the Ontario Government and the Dominion Government, I understand that no reservation has been made. These people have been for years anxious to get a reserve there. They are in very poor circumstances, and have no resources except fishing and hunting. They are anxious to get this reserve, and I think it is very hard to keep them out of their right because these two Governments cannot come to an agreement. I understand that the reason why the reserve was not made, in the first instance, was that these people were overlooked, as they were in a distant part of the country, and now the reserve cannot be made because of the difference between the two Governments. Pressing representations have been made to me from every Chippewa band on the north shore of Lake Huron in reference to this reserve. They all make common cause with this band in regard to it. Of course, in regard to the other portion of the motion, as to the arrears under the Robinson Treaty, that is a different question, and that is a matter also causing great injustice to these people for the same reason. The two Governments cannot agree, and the matter remains unsettled, and so it goes on from year to year, but I would like the Minister to tell the House, so that I may inform the people, what likelihood there is of the arrears being settled, and also of this very small matter as to the Temogamingue band being arranged.

Mr. DAWSON. This matter of the arrears due to the Indians under the Robinson Treaty, is a very important one, and it has been up in the House year after year. No settlement, so far as we know, has been arrived at with the Government of Ontario whereby the Indians could get what has been so long due to them. There was a statement made in the House some years ago in reference to a motion of this kind, in which it was shown that the amounts due the Indians under the Robinson Treaty were as much as $800,000, or something approaching that, with interest added. This is a very large sum to be due these poor people on the north coasts of Lakes Huron and Superior, and it is very desirable that some arrangement should be made between the two Governments so that they might get a portion of what is due to them. I would never suggest that all that money should be paid at once to the Indians, but it might be funded for the purpose of education, for the purpose of helping them on in farming, and in many other ways, which would be of great advantage to them. Now, on the north coast of Lake Huron, at this very moment, a change is coming over the Indian population which should not be lost sight of. The opening of the Canadian Pacific Railway has let in immense numbers of white people, including white hunters, and the consequence is that the game is fast disappearing. Fish poachers are going in and setting pound nets in the little lakes and sweeping the fish out of them. The consequence is that the Indians, in the course of a few years, will be destitute, and the Government will have to provide for their subsistence, as they are now doing for the Indians in the North-West, unless something is done in the meantime to teach them agriculture and to establish industrial schools among them. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Ontario has been exceedingly friendly to the Indians for some time past. It has tried to keep fish poachers out of the territory, and it has shown every disposition to act in a friendly way towards them. Then, again, there is the case of the Indians of the Lake of the Woods. Now that the territory has been awarded to Ontario, of course Ontario will have to pay the annuities, and pay the arrears of the annuities, as I understand the matter, and pay all that has been paid to the Indians for the cession of that territory; so that the decision of the Privy Council has not been altogether in favor of Ontario. It appears to me that Ontario is now in for a capital of a million dollars in paying the annuities. It will have to provide for the payment of those Indians, and the arrears due to the Indians of the north coast of Lakes Huron and Superior, to whom the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has so properly drawn attention, and whose case deserves the serious consideration of the Government.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am sorry I was not in my seat when the mover of this resolution spoke. I think I informed him there was no correspondence with regard to the matters since 1883. The only correspondence relative to the reserve at Lake Temogamingue consists of a letter to the Under Secretary of State, requesting that the attention of His Honor the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario might be again invited to the matter. To that letter no reply has been received. The band interested in the reserve referred to, were not represented when the Treaty of 1850 was made with the Ojibbeways of Lake Huron, their chief leaving through fear—thinking it might be "bad medicine," I sup-

pose—failed to be present. Consequently, no reserve was then allotted to them. The department was not, until the year 1880, made aware of the facts which, on investigation, were found to be substantially correct as stated by the Indians, and they have from that time participated in the annuities payable to the Lake Huron Indians under that treaty. But the land having passed to the Province at Confederation, the Dominion could not allot the band a reserve without the consent of the Ontario Government, which it has been endeavoring to obtain ever since, but without success.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Is there any possibility of this claim being enforced on the Ontario Government? Is it a matter of law or a matter of equity?—because it is rather hard for these people that they are not to be allowed the reserve upon which they were living happily. They made the surrender the same as the other Indians did, and they are entitled to the same consideration.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a standing hardship that these Indians should be kept out of their money so long; but the cause is, as has been mentioned, the want of agreement between the Dominion Government and that of the Province. The difficulty was presented to my hon friend the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when he was Prime Minister. The Indians were then claiming their money, but no conclusion could be arrived at between the Dominion and the Province. I think my hon. friend put a sum in the Estimates to relieve the then necessities of the Indians, in part payment of their claims. Since that time I do not think any progress has been made in the settlement of this treaty; and, I understand, though I am not fully informed on the matter, that the reason why there is not arrangement between the Dominion and the Ontario Government is that the two Provincial Governments consider that this matter is involved in the settlement between Ontario and Quebec in some way or other. However, I hope we will shortly be able to come to some arrangement with the Province of Ontario. I may say that Mr. Mowat, the Premier, will be here this week to see me on business, and I will improve the opportunity to discuss this matter with him, along with other matters.

Mr. DAWSON. The arrangement was that they should be paid their annual annuities. None of the arrears were paid. The annuities had been paid regularly since that time, but there was no payment of what was past due, and it is what was due previous to that time, with interest, that they now claim. I think there were statements made some years ago of the amount due, and if the Minister of the Interior would include them in the return so as to give all the information possible, it would be very desirable.

Motion agreed to.

FISHING RIGHTS IN MATANE RIVER.

Mr. CASGRAIN moved for:

Copies of correspondence between the Government and the holders of fishing rights under permit in River Matane, and of correspondence on the same subject with the riparian proprietors, and reports on their opposition to permits, &c.

He said: I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Marine, and also the attention of the Minister of Justice, to the subject of this motion. It affects the private rights of certain riparian proprietors on the River Matane, and I believe the action taken by the Government in this matter is to a certain extent illegal, and that the riparian proprietors along that river have been deprived by the Government of fishing rights which they have enjoyed in that river since the earliest settlement of the country, under the French regime. These rights were granted by the French King to the Seigneur of Matane, and the specific right to fish in the waters of the River St. Lawrence were given to seigneur D'Amours in 1680. That right being vested in the seigneur, it was by him conceded to his tenants, and they enjoyed the right up to the time the Government took upon themselves to deprive them of that right and to bestow it on a private individual, Sir Alexander Galt. I have nothing to say against Sir Alexander Galt personally. He simply took advantage of the right to the fishing which the Government gave him, and it was given to him in acknowledgment of services which he had rendered to the Government as Fishery Commissioner. But that did not give him, in my opinion, any legal title whatever to the fishing in Matane River. That title, I hold, was vested in censitaires holding title from the seigneur; they possess such right to the fishing that it could not be vested in other individuals by any persons whatever. It can easily be understood that the laws that govern this particular case, the old laws of France, could not be altered by the Conquest. The right acquired from the Crown by private individuals, was not taken away from them by the right of conquest; on the contrary, the lands given by the Crown of France to the Seigneur of Matane, must be held to hold good, and the title does hold good, and so much is that the case, that the rights of the seigneur were acknowledged by the Crown of England, and especially his rights with regard to the fisheries as appears by the records of *foi et hommage*. I have taken some interest in the case of these censitaires, because I have felt they have been very harshly treated, and not only has the action of the Government, but the conduct of those who had the license to fish in the river, pressed heavily upon them. These riparian proprietors, being in the enjoyment of their rights, continued to fish in the river at the time when the first license was granted to Sir Alexander Galt. The consequence was, that they were soon summoned before the Justice of the Peace of the locality, and were fined for using a right which they, or their ancestors, had enjoyed from the time of the early settlement of the country. It was supposed that the Government might have assumed a different position in this matter; but, on the contrary, I find, by an answer given some time ago on the floor of the House by the Minister of Marine, that the Government have renewed the lease of the river fishing to Sir Alexander Galt for nine years, to the detriment of the riparian proprietors, and in spite of the remonstrances of the inhabitants. Whatever may be the legal opinion of the law officers of the Crown in this regard, one fact is clear, that those persons were in lawful possession and enjoyment of that right to the fishery, and that the Government should not have deprived them of that right by giving a license to a third party. I have taken the trouble to endeavor to induce the Government to change their position in this matter; but, I am sorry to say, that I could not succeed. In my opinion since the grant was made to the right of fishery in the River St. Lawrence opposite the seigniories, it is very clear that the Government now cannot take it away and give it to another man. The point upon which the Government relies, as far as I have been able to discern, in order to grant the license, is that it was a part of the River St. Lawrence and a part of the River Matane, which is called an estuary, and which forms a special locality upon which the Crown can assert its rights to granting licenses. It seems to me very strange that there could be any such particular spot intervening between fresh water and the tidal waters of the River St. Lawrence. If it is asserted on behalf of the Crown that they could grant a license for the river above the tidal waters, then I say, that long ago that position taken by the Government was settled in the case of the Queen against Robertson. I hold, therefore, that there is no possible right in the Crown to grant licenses in the River Matane above the tidal waters. Then if it is alleged that they could grant a license in the waters of the St.

Lawrence, as I have said before, the prior right of the seigneurs is a complete bar to the Crown granting any license. I am unable to understand, and those people who have enjoyed the right to fish are unable to understand, how it is that a favor of that description could be granted to Sir A. T. Galt, against what they consider their just rights. They think it a great hardship and a great wrong that they should be mulcted in fines and condemned to imprisonment for fishing in that river, after having enjoyed that right for a number of years as they did. That seems to me preposterous. Allow me to quote the opinion given in the case of the Queen *vs.* Robertson, which may be found in the Supreme Court Reports, page 68. It is as follows:—

"In fresh water rivers, that is above the ebb and flow of the tide, the owners of the soil on each side have the interest and the right of fishing, and it is an exclusive right extending to the centre of the stream opposite their respective lands, unless a special grant or prescription be shown."

I may add that this is not only the English law, but it is also the French law upon that point. Since the Local Governments and the Federal Government are, to a certain extent, at the present moment, extremely sensitive as to their respective rights in these fisheries, it seems to me that if there was any right belonging to the Federal Government to be exercised under the British North America Act, that ought to have been decided by the Supreme Court. That right of fishery in the inland waters seems to be vested in the Local Government of the Province of Quebec where the seigniory is situated; therefore, I say that the Federal Government ought to exercise extreme caution before granting any more licenses, or renewing the license to Sir A. T. Galt. I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, that I differ from the views entertained by the Minister of Justice in this matter, because I know that his opinions are extremely valuable, and that his judicial mind is such that I ought perhaps to submit to his legal opinion. However, in this matter the case appears to me to be so plain that I do not think there is any room for doubt. I do not at all see how this license should have been issued in favor of Sir A. T. Galt, because it is a grievance imposed upon a number of the persons of that locality. With the permission of the House I desire to amend this motion by adding to it the words: "And also all the leases that have been granted for this river."

Mr. FISET. (Translation.) It is with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I second this motion. It refers to a river in the county of Rimouski, which I have the honor of representing here; and, besides, it includes a question full of interest to private persons and of considerable public moment. The hon. mover of this motion, some years past, when I was not in Parliament, made a report to the hon. Minister of Justice on this subject. For this reason I thought it becoming to give way to him and to content myself with seconding the motion. Not wishing to be prolix, I will enter at once upon the subject. According to the Union Act, the Federal Government has only the right to improve the lakes and rivers, and not the absolute ownership in them. On this point, I may be permitted to read the following, which I find in the treatise of Mr. Joseph Doutre, "The Constitution of Canada," at page 164:

"I have, therefore, arrived at the following conclusion:—That it was not the intention of the British North America Act, 1867, to give to the Parliament of Canada any greater power than had been previously exercised by the separate Legislatures of the Provinces; that is, the general power for the regulation and protection of the fisheries.

"That the Act of Parliament of Canada, 31 Vict., c. 60, recognises that view, and, while it provides for the regulation and protection of the fisheries, it does not interfere with the private rights, only authorising the granting of leases in fresh water rivers, where such rights have not already accrued, and that any lease granted by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to fish in fresh water rivers which are not the property of the Dominion, or in which the soil is not in the Dominion, is illegal; that where the exclusive right to fish has been acquired by grant of the land through which the river flows, there is no authority given by the Canadian Act to grant a right to fish; and, also, that the ungranted land being in the Crown for the benefit of the people of New Brunswick, the exclusive right to fish follows as an incident, and in such case is in the Crown, as trustee for the people of the Province, and a license to fish in such stream is illegal."

I think that this citation is conclusive. But I have further arguments: The River Matane, in the county of Rimouski, is situate about 240 miles below Quebec. The seigniory in which it lies was granted in 1672 by the Intendant Talon to Mr. Mathieu D'Amours. And, if the House will kindly permit me, I shall read out the title to this seigniory in order to make it better understood, how those at this day ask the right to fish in the River Matane are only seeking the exercise of a right. In the "Cadastres abrégés des Seigneuries de Québec," vol. 2, No. 98, we read as follows:—

"This Seigniory was granted on the eighth of November, one thousand six hundred and seventy-two, by Mr. Talon, Intendant, to Mathieu D'Amours, and at that period consisted of one league in front by one league and a half in depth, at the place called Matane, viz.: half a league on either side of the River Matane.

"Subsequently, on the twenty-sixth of June, one thousand six hundred and seventy-seven, this grant was confirmed by Jacques Duchesneau, Intendant, &c., who gave D'Amours a title for the league in question with a further grant of one league by the same depth "à prendre du côté de la rivière Métis, avec le droit de pêche sur le dit fleuve St. Laurent, pour en jouir, etc, à titre de Fief et Seigneurie, etc., aux droit et redevances accoutumés, suivant la coutume de la prévoté et vicomté de Paris."

"This grant, it will be perceived, gives a frontage of two leagues on the River St. Lawrence.

"On the twelfth of January, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-one, Donald McKinnon rendered foi et homage for two leagues and a quarter of the Seigniory of Matane, which is described as containing two leagues and a half in front."

And now we come to the most important passage:

"On the sixteenth October, one thousand seven hundred and ninety-three, James Shepperd, the Sheriff of the District of Quebec, executed a deed of sale in favor of Simon Fraser, of the Fief and Seigniory of Matane, situate on the south shore of the River St. Lawrence, in the District of Quebec, 'containing in the whole two leagues and a half in front by a league and a half in depth, to wit: half a league on this side and two leagues beyond the River Matane, with *haute, moyenne et basse Justice*, and the right of fishing in the said River St. Lawrence.' The sale had taken place upon Laughlan Smith, curator to the estate of Donald McKinnon and had been effected on the eighth August, one thousand seven hundred and ninety-three, for the sum of one hundred and sixty pounds current money of Lower Canada."

I humbly ask the House's pardon for taking the liberty of reading at length this passage. I know that a report has been presented to the Government by a very distinguished man; but in this report of his this passage is not quoted at length. I proceed:

"It is to be observed that by the original deed of concession two leagues only in front were granted, namely: half a league below the River Matane, and a league and a half above it; nevertheless, by the Sheriff's sale above mentioned two leagues are sold below the River Matane, and half a league above it.

"On the eighth March, one thousand eight hundred and twenty-four, the Earl of Dalhousie, the Governor General, granted to Jane McCallum and to her children, issue of her marriage with the late Simon Fraser, another league in front by the same depth; the said last-mentioned league, as appears by the description, being situate next to the half league above the River Matane.

"The present proprietor is at this day in possession of the whole three leagues and a half in front upon the River St Lawrence.

"From the above statement it will appear that the only extent granted below the River Matane, is a half a league, with a league and a half above the same river, the league granted by Letters Patent covering the same ground as the league granted by Duchesneau, in one thousand six hundred and seventy-seven, to D'Amours, beyond the league granted by Talon, to the same individual, in one thousand six hundred and seventy-two.

"No droit de Quint has accrued upon the seigniory within the last fifty years, the seigniory having descended by inheritance from Simon Fraser, who purchased it in one thousand seven hundred and ninety-three, to the present proprietor, his son; Simon Fraser paid the droit de Quint upon his purchase in one thousand seven hundred and ninety-three, on the twentieth day of February one thousand seven hundred and ninety-eight, to the then Receiver-General.

"Daniel McKinnon had become proprietor of the two leagues and a quarter for which he rendered foi et homage as above stated, by purchase from the representatives of Mathieu D'Amours, the original grantee."

In this way Mr. Mathieu D'Amours was the rightful owner of this seigniory which was later on ceded to Simon Fraser, and finally to Daniel McKinnon. The parcels of land sold fronting on the river have been sold with the same privileges attached as belonged to the seigniors, that is to say, with the right of hunting and fishing over the St. Lawrence and a *fortiori* over the River Matane. I have examined the titles of the various seigniories granted by the Kings of France to the seigniors of the Province of Quebec. Not one of them, perhaps, is more explicit than that referring to the River Matane. Let us see, now, upon what grounds the Government base their refusal to the proprietors of waterside lands of the right of hunting and fishing. They rely upon these words: "navigable and floatable rivers." Allow me to cite the opinion of one of the most eminent of jurists, whose authority gives weight in France, Mr. Laurent, in his treatise: "Principes de droit civil," vol. 6, page 7. He puts the following question:—

"When is a river navigable? The Code says nothing; but the meaning of the word navigable and the spirit of the law is sufficient to decide the question. Navigable means where is possible to navigate, and to navigate signifies to proceed by water either way, upwards or downwards. So that it is not sufficient that because one can cross from one bank to the other on a ferry boat that the river becomes a navigable one. Furthermore, it has been decided that a river is not a navigable one for the reason alone that the occupiers of the bank move about on it a few small boats for the transport of manure and the crops. In short the navigability implies the possibility of transporting men and material; it is because navigable rivers form a means of communication that the legislator has placed them within the public domain; if they cannot be made use of for the purposes of communication, the reason for which they are held to be public property no longer exists, and there is no effect without its corresponding cause. Whenever a river is not navigable it does not fall within the public domain."

Further on still, at page 19, he says:

"A river may be navigable in part and non-navigable in part."

This is the case with the Matane River.

"Will it belong to the public domain throughout its whole course? D'Agueseau maintained that the entire river is a appanage of the State domain. It is established in the Repertoire of Merlin that D'Agueseau wrote less as an impartial judge than as a special pleader for the rights of the domain. His opinion has not found favor. The contrary has been decided by the old law under the Code Napoleon. Applying the principles we have just laid down the correct decision is evident enough. If navigable rivers are under the control of the public, it is on account of their being navigable; in the case when they are not navigable throughout their entire course they only become public property from the point where they become navigable."

A little further on, at page 20, he says:

"For similar reasons the owners of water frontages will have the right of fishing in those waters; the exercise of this right not affecting injuriously their navigability."

After reading these lines one would say that the author had himself visited the Matane River, so closely do his remarks apply to the case in point. In fact this river is navigable as far as Fraser's wharf from the mouth. But at the place where salmon is caught by the line, from Fraser's wharf to Price's dam, it is not navigable even at high tide. I cannot understand how a man of such standing could send in to the department a report in which he stated that this river is navigable. For those who have seen it when I have, it is easy to determine that it is not navigable. As I have just said, from Fraser's wharf to Price's dam it is one succession of rapids. It is true that the high tide makes itself felt, but even with the high tide, the river is not even then navigable for any bateau or any schooner. Now what do we understand by the word "floatable"? Allow me again to cite the same author, who in France is regarded as a leading jurisconsult. This is what he says:

"There are rivers which are not navigable but which are floatable, that is to say, which although not bearing boats over their bottoms, yet serve to transport wood either in pockets or rafts or loose logs. Public opinion is founded on custom. Those rivers are never considered as floatable whose floating powers are limited to the floating of loose logs. We see no other reason for this distinction beyond the respect for the rights which attach to the water front proprietors on non-navigable streams. The legislator has wished to reconcile the interests of these proprietors with the interests of those engaged in transport by water. Their rights may be exercised without interfering with the floating facilities of the stream, therefore there was no necessity for placing under the protection of the State those rivers which float loose logs of wood; without necessity there is no public control."

Such is the opinion of this learned jurisconsult respecting floatable rivers, and what is understood by floatable streams. As will be seen in cases where the floating power is only sufficient for loose logs, not even for rafts, the river belongs to the proprietors of the front and is not reckoned as the property of the State. The strongest proof which I can adduce in this connection, to show that the river is not floatable, is the very fact that the Messieurs Price instead of transporting their sawn timber and deals, &c, by rafts, transport them overland by waggons, for they know full well that by rafting they would be exposed to serious loss. One last remark and I have done. It is further stated in this report which was presented to the Government some years ago, that the King's highway passes along the river's edge and that in consequence there are no river front proprietors. It is just the contrary. There is a road on each side of the river, a highway, but on one side are found frontage owners while on the other side are to be found proprietors who do not own the front, so that it cannot be said that the King's highway runs along the River Matane on both sides, and that there are no river front owners. For those who know the locality as I know it, it is impossible to understand how a man of such great pretentions was able to present to the Government a report which is nothing else but false. I might cite several more authors, and bring forward many more reasons for the purpose of establishing that the Matane River beyond its mouth is not navigable, but I think that I have said enough to convince this honorable House, and that it is sufficient for me in conclusion to put this simple question: How does it happen that the River Métis and the River Rimouski, both in the county of Rimouski, as is the River Matane, and each of them only thirty miles from the latter river, how does it happen, I say, that the Government does not withhold the right of fishing and hunting on these rivers, which are in precisely the same position as the Matane River is? The River Rimouski is navigable as far as its mouth; it is even floatable as far as Price's dam which cannot be said of the River Matane. So the River Métis is navigable at its mouth, but it is not floatable in its other portions. Nevertheless the Government have surrendered their rights over these two rivers. But as for the Matane River, the river front owners who possess the right of hunting and fishing by virtue of the titles which have been granted to them by the seigniors, find that they are deprived of the rights which the proprietors on the Rivers Rimouski and Métis enjoy. The Government lease this Matane River to a private person, who pays them $100 per annum, and by that very act they deprive the owners of the land of their lawful rights of hunting and fishing. Is it not plain that there is injustice somewhere, but I venture to hope that the Government so soon as they will take the trouble to inform themselves of the facts, will hasten to give back to the water front proprietors the incontestable rights which have been disregarded to this day.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

FISHERIES IN LUNENBURG COUNTY, N.S.

Mr. EISENHAUER moved for:

Return of all correspondence between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and Mr. C. C. Goddard, Overseer of River Fisheries in the county of Lunenburg, during 1888; also, his report to the department for the same year; also, the report of Mr. Rogers, the Inspector of Fisheries for Nova Scotia, for the year 1888.

He said: My object in making this motion is to ascertain, if I can, the parties who have been fined in the county of Lunenburg for violation of the Fisheries Act, and the parties from whom fines were exacted; and, also,

to obtain, if I can, the reports of Fishery Overseer Rogers for 1887 and 1888. I am informed that Mr. Rogers made a special report on the sawdust question in 1887, but I do not see it in the Minister's report, so that it must have been suppressed, I imagine. I am also informed that his report was to the effect that, in his opinion, the sawdust was not at all injurious to the river fisheries. Now, it does seem very strange that the Government should have suppressed that report. If they have no confidence in their own official, I think he should be dismissed from the service and some other official appointed in his place, in whom they would have confidence. From the correspondence I have had with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I judge that some years ago Mr. Rogers reported differently from what he has done during the past two years. Perhaps the hon. Minister can explain the reason of this difference in his reports. With regard to River La Have filling up with sawdust, I do not think it is any different from what it was fifteen years ago. Vessels of large tonnage go up the river, and load and come down as they did fifteen to twenty years ago. I think that is proved conclusively. The navigable part of the river is not filling up, as the Government have been led to believe. Several of the largest lumbering mills there have closed down, as the hon. Minister well knows, and hundreds of men are thrown out of employment; and I am informed, by parties in the county, that quite a number of those men are now making their way to the States for want of employment. In correspondence which I received to-day from the Minister, he said that if it could be shown that the sawdust was not injurious they would not enforce the law. It devolves on the Government to satisfy themselves whether the sawdust is injurious or not; I do not think those in the lumber business should be called upon to do so. I think the Government should, themselves, appoint a commission to enquire thoroughly into that question, because the lumber industry is a very large one in Nova Scotia, especially in the county I represent, and those millers say that the expense of erecting furnaces for the burning of the sawdust would be greater than they could afford, and if they are obliged to keep their mills shut down, the consequences will be ruinous to a large portion of the lumber trade in the Province, and especially in that county. I do think the Government should take this matter into their serious consideration, and if they satisfy themselves that the sawdust is really injurious, then they should decide which would be the more injurious, to stop these large lumbering operations, or to allow the small injury that would be done to the fisheries by permitting the sawdust to be thrown into the river. I am informed that there are just as many fish, on the average, taken from the river now as there have been for years past. There were quite as many fish taken on the Port Medway River for several years past as were taken many years ago. There are quite a number of mills on this river and all the sawdust has been thrown into this river. Whether that is due to the stronger current in this river, I do not know. There may be some sawdust in the eddies and little nooks of the river, but I think there is as much fish there as there was twenty years ago. I think the Government have been discriminating in regard to the parties who have been fined, or from whom the fines have been exacted. I hold in my hand a letter written by my predecessor, the representative of the county in 1886, which I will read. It is addressed to one Benjamin Hubley:

"My Dear Sir,—I think I answered your letter some short time ago regarding sawdust, but, having a doubt, I will make sure of it by writing you now. I delayed, when first I received your letter, in order to make arrangements with the Government. I am sorry you paid the fine you speak of, as Mr. Goddard should have collected first from the Davisons, who were the real violators of the law, as the sawdust from their mills has really been doing the injury to navigation, and they are the best able to pay. I have written Mr. Goddard, giving him an idea of what I consider is right, and his unfairness in exacting fines from the small millers and poor men, and letting Davisons go. I will write Goddard to-day, and until you hear to the contrary, don't be an exception in saving the dust, but be careful not to throw mill rubbish or slabs in the river. I can realise how hard it is to save the dust, constructed as our old mills are."

I think we may gather from this letter that there was some discrimination in fining parties who threw sawdust into the river, and I think that is one reason why those fined complain so very much. I may say also that in the county I represent there is a large number of small mills with one saw, and it would be impossible for those people to consume their sawdust. It would not pay them to go to the expense of burning it, or getting rid of it in some other way. I think it is the duty of the Government to seriously consider this matter and satisfy themselves thoroughly whether the throwing of sawdust into the rivers is really injurious or not. The law has not been enforced with regard to all rivers. The Government take the right to exempt some from its operation, and I do not see how they can do that properly, unless a commission is appointed to see which rivers should be exempted.

Mr. TUPPER. With the consent of the hon. gentleman, I would suggest that the form of his motion be varied so as to make it read, so far as relates to sawdust, and I will have no objection to the motion with that change. The hon. gentleman is mistaken when he thinks there is any desire to suppress Mr. Rogers' report. It does not appear in the Fishery Report for the very good reason that the report has not yet been laid on the Table.

Mr. JONES (Halifax.) When will it be?

Mr TUPPER. Very shortly. It is printed, and is now being bound for distribution. When the report is brought down, it will not contain Mr. Rogers' views on the sawdust question, but I have no objection to bring down, at the request of the hon. gentleman, that portion of the report in full, and the House can decide whether it is worth printing or not. The report is very voluminous, and a large portion of it contains nothing new or of particular value to hon. gentlemen on either side. It is, perhaps, an epitome of arguments that have been used on the question for a long time, and that are familiar to nearly all of us. At any rate, the printing of that is a matter which I will leave to the Printing Committee, if desired. The report itself will be brought down. With reference to the hon. gentleman's remarks in connection with Lunenburg County, no doubt he is aware of the great indulgence exercised by the department, ever since the year 1876, towards the lumbering interests in that county. I am quite satisfied that a careful examination of the correspondence will show that there has been no desire to favor any one, but perhaps a desire to favor the lumbermen and to encourage their industry—often, however, at the expense of the valuable interests of the fishermen. The department has been embarrassed considerably by the arguments used on both sides. As a rule we have tried to carry out the law of the land, which has been on the statutes for a number of years. The hon. gentleman incidentally discussed a principle of this law, which we are bound to administer, and there may be much to be said on both sides of the question. I notice a Bill has been introduced by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), who has raised that very important question as to whether this legislation regarding the pollution of rivers with sawdust should not be repealed; but I take it, until the House has repealed that Act, it will be the duty of the department, except in the case of streams exempted for special reasons, to enforce the law as we have enforced it in the past. The letter which the hon. gentleman read does not bear out the charge he made that the Government, in 1886, showed favoritism in this connection. Mr. Kaulbach, it is true, expressed in that letter his own individual views as to whether the fishery officer should not have proceeded against the rich lumberman before ex-

acting the fine from the poor lumberman. That is simply his opinion. We are not in possession of all the facts; we do not know which party was proceeded against first, and which has the prior judgment. However, I do not think that affects the question which the hon. gentleman has raised, and it does not support the incidental statement he made that there was any favoritism shown in regard to this matter. I am certainly not aware of any case of that kind, and am prepared to show that since I have had anything to do with the department there has not been any attempt to favor a single millowner in this connection. On the contrary, in my official capacity, I have become very unpopular in a large number of counties very favorable to the Government, because I refused, as I did not see my way clear to meet the wishes of the people in those districts, to relax the law, and it is because I have endeavored to carry out this law that considerable dissatisfaction has been expressed in many quarters, both in counties friendly to the Government and others. In the Port Medway River, which is in the county represented by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Freeman), the same instructions were given as were given in reference to the La Have In fact, I may state that all this sudden excitement in one portion of Canada only is due to the circular which I thought, in fairness, should be issued to the people interested, in the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia last fall, when I discovered that, probably owing to the views of the inspector in Nova Scotia whose name has been mentioned, that the sawdust does not injure the fishery interest, a great many lumbermen deposited sawdust in very considerable quantities in the rivers there, thinking they had the right to do so with impunity. And, consequently, I thought it would be fair to give them timely notice that this could not be done under the law, and that they must adapt their mills so as to dispose of their sawdust otherwise than by putting it into these rivers which were not exempted. I showed them the provisions of the Act, and told them that the law provided for the consideration of special facts, shown by petition to the Governor in Council, or to the Minister of Marine as Minister of Marine, pointing out the special circumstances which existed in connection with any particular river where the enforcement of the law would not serve any useful purpose. Since that circular was sent out, several petitions have been considered, and some streams have been exempted, and in regard to other streams the exemption has not been granted, or, where the exemption was not granted, the instruction was given by authority to the officer not to enforce the law, if a reasonable effort was made to keep out such quantities as could be kept out, of this sawdust or mill rubbish. As to the hon. gentleman's suggestion for a commission, I prefer the method which the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) has adopted in this matter. I prefer that the subject should be discussed on a proposition of that kind for the repeal of existing legislation, when the experience of all the fishery officers in the country can be used, as shown by the reports, and the opinions of scientific men can be discussed. The expense of such a commission as has been proposed, in order to effect any real purpose, would be enormous. The hon. gentleman mentions, for instance, that they should go to rivers and examine them. If he thinks for a moment that the commission would not only have to go through the rivers of the Province of Nova Scotia and examine them, but would have to go through all the Provinces of Canada and take evidence and make due enquiry, the difficulty, he must see, would be very great; and I suppose the hon. gentleman suggested that because he was of the opinion that in some streams it would be necessary to enforce the law while it might not be enforced in others; but there are other gentlemen who believe that the law should not be enforced in any stream at all. There is at present, though my hon. friend may not be aware of the fact, an enquiry being made into this subject in connection with the Ottawa River, a portion of which has been exempted from the operation of the Act for some years, and that investigation is now being made by very competent men. The papers will be brought down, and perhaps they will give the hon. gentleman some important information on this subject.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps my hon. friend will have no objection to amend the motion in the direction suggested by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I hope the Minister will have no objection to amend it so as to include the list of the fines imposed under the Act.

Mr. TUPPER. For any particular year?

Mr. LAURIER. For 1887 and 1888.

Mr. TUPPER. Certainly, there is no objection to that.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend has brought to the attention of the House, the point which has been referred to by the Minister, whether sawdust in rivers is injurious or not? I understand that that question is debated. Some affirm that it is injurious, and others affirm that it is not, and the object of my hon. friend is to decide which opinion is correct. However, the law assumes that it is injurious, and it is upon that assumption that the law is based. I quite admit that the Minister has no option but to carry out the law as he finds it, whether good or bad, but my hon. friend complains that a discrimination is made between offenders, and that the political complexion of the offender has a good deal to do with whether the law is enforced or not. The Minister repudiates that part of the statement, and I have nothing to say in regard to it, but probably the list which he will bring down may settle the question.

Mr. GILLMOR. This is a very serious question in regard to certain mills.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask the hon. gentleman to move the adjournment of the debate. I know that several members desire to speak upon it.

Mr. GILLMOR. I have nothing to say excepting that, if the law is carried out, you will do away with many mills in my Province.

Mr. KENNY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all correspondence between the Federal Government, or any department thereof, and the Government of Prince Edward Island, or any of its officials, regarding the piers of Prince Edward Island or harbor improvements in the said Island.—(Mr. Robertson.)

Copies of all tenders for the supply of beef for the Blackfeet, Blood and Piegan Indian Agencies, and all papers and correspondence connected with the calling for such tenders, and the awarding of contracts for such supplies during the summer of 1888.—(Mr. Edgar.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Dominion Government and the Corporation of Pilots for and below the harbor of Quebec, respecting the change in the present tariff of pilotage dues on vessels for and below the harbor of Quebec.—(Mr. Langelier, Montmorency.)

Return of all reports upon the state and condition of each of the piers in Prince Edward Island taken over by the Dominion Government from the Prince Edward Island Government, together with a Return of all expenditure on each of the said piers since the 30th of June, 1888; and all correspondence relating to the state of repairs of said piers, and the repairs thereof during the year 1888.—(Mr. Welsh.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, or reports or correspondence relating to admission of mining machinery free of duty by the Government of British Columbia for the development of the mineral resources of that Province, or to the remission by the Dominion Government of duties paid thereon.—(Mr. Edwards.)

Copies of all petitions, correspondence and documents respecting the extension of McMahon street through the Ordnance land, in the city of Quebec, to D'Aiguillon street.—(Mr Langelier, Quebec.)

Correspondence between the Government and Mr. E. P. Wright, of Ottawa, relating to a claim of the latter for a refund of duties paid by said E. P. Wright upon mining machinery.—(Mr. Edwards.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence, agreements and settlements respecting the conveyance of the North Shore Railway to the Government by the Grand Trunk Railway Company and by the Government to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Langelier, Quebec.)

Return of all claims presented from 1st February, 1885, to 31st December, 1888, for drawback on goods manufactured for export, showing the names of all applicants, their places of business, the article on which drawback was claimed and the amount of each claim, distinguishing between the claims which have been allowed and those which have been disallowed, and those not yet decided, and giving the reason for each disallowance; also copies of all regulations made by the Customs or other department with reference to such claims, together with a copy of one allowed claim and of the sworn declaration of each exporter.—(Mr. Ellis.)

Copies of all tenders received for the construction of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, with accompanying documents, including the approximate quantities on which such tenders were computed, and the gross amounts; and all correspondence, reports and Orders in Council, in relation to the same.—(Mr. Trow.)

Copies of all tenders received by the Department of Railways and Canals, in September and October, 1888, for the enlargement of the Cornwall and Galops Canal, including the approximate quantities on which such tenders were computed, and the gross amounts; and all correspondence, reports and Orders in Council, relating to the same, since the receipt of such tenders.—(Mr. Trow.)

Copies of all petitions, reports, Orders in Council and papers generally, in connection with the dismissal of J. M. Grover from the position of Postmaster of Morden, Manitoba.—(Mr. Guay.)

Return showing the entire cost of the St. Charles Branch Railway, including right of way, land damages, survey and engineering expenses, and all other items of expenditure of any kind, in the following order: Cost of survey, and to whom paid; cost of engineers' services, and to whom paid; cost of land damages, and to whom paid; cost of legal expenses, including conveyancing, and all legal services, and to whom paid; cost of all services rendered by any other party, of any other kind, paid by the Government; the entire cost of the line, including every item of expenditure of any kind connected therewith, and the amount of claims put in and not yet settled.—(Mr. McMullen.)

All the original cheques given in payment of all fees or expenses connected with the suit, the "St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Company *vs.* The Queen."—(Mr. McMullen.)

Copies of all correspondence, reports, petitions and other documents, up to this date, between the Post Office Department and the Post Office Inspector for the district of Montreal, Mr. King, and any other persons, respecting a change in the location of the Post Office of Belle Vallée, in the County of St. John's.—(Mr. Bourassa.)

Return of Orders in Council relating to the division of the subsidy of $250,000 to the International Railway Company, between the different portions of the road, say, from the St. Lawrence to Lennoxville, from Lennoxville to Moose River and Mattawamkeag, from Mattawamkeag to Harvey's Station, and from Harvey to Salisbury, giving the number of miles in each division, and the amount apportioned thereto.—(Mr. Jones, Halifax.)

Return, 1st. Copies of the petition asking for the incorporation of the Témiscouata Railway Company. 2nd. Copies of all correspondence between the Government and this company respecting the granting of a subsidy or having reference to such subsidy.—(Mr. Dessaint.)

Return, 1. Giving the names and places of residence of the Commissioners appointed in 1883 for the purpose of examining and reporting upon the fitness and eligibility of persons appearing before them for examination and qualification as Inspectors of the hulls of freight and passenger steamers plying in Canadian waters; 2. Copies of the circular sent out inviting competitors to meet at Ottawa, and the date or dates so mentioned from time to time; 3. The names and places of residence of all persons who were so examined at each and every meeting of the said Commissioners up to date; 4. Copies of the recommendation or recommendations of any of the said Commissioners, or any one of them, respecting the said examination or the qualifications, or otherwise, of any or all who underwent such examination at the first or any subsequent meeting of the said Commissioners, or either of them; 5. The name and place of residence of each and every inspector of freight and passenger steamer hulls appointed by the Government from 1882 to date, indicating who were appointed after undergoing and passing the necessary examination, as well as giving the name and place of residence of each and every inspector of such hulls who was appointed without having successfully passed the said examination, together with the name and place of residence of any inspector so appointed since 1882 to date who had been dismissed or had resigned within the time specified, and the cause assigned for such dismissal or resignation; 6. The name and place of residence of any person appointed to fill any vacancy or addition as inspector of said hulls; and 7. Copies of all correspondence between the Minister of Marine and any person respecting any of the questions enumerated herein.—(Mr. Wilson, Elgin.)

Return of the survey made of the Annapolis and Liverpool Railway, with the report of the engineer, and all papers and correspondence connected therewith.—(Mr. Jones, Halifax.)

DEATH OF THE HON. J. H. POPE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have the distressing duty of announcing to the House the decease of the Hon. John Henry Pope, my friend and colleague. Although the event is not unexpected, yet the blow is so severe when it falls that I feel I cannot say more just now. I shall, therefore, Sir, move the adjournment of the House. I have no doubt that a fitting opportunity will be taken by myself and some hon. members of the House on both sides, to express the great regret which is felt at the loss which the House and the country have sustained by the death of Mr. Pope. In consequence of the great desire on both sides of the House, as I believe, to get through the business of the Session as speedily as possible, while I move now that the House adjourn until to-morrow, as there are some private Bills standing which ought to be moved, the Government will give them, with the consent of the House, the hour after 7:30 to-morrow, of which they are deprived to-day. I, therefore, move, seconded by the leader of the Opposition, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. LAURIER. I certainly deem it my duty to second the motion of the right hon. gentleman. As he has stated, the death of Mr. Pope was not unexpected. In fact, it has been expected for some time, and, under the circumstances, it does not present to his friends the harrowing grief which the sudden termination of a useful career would be sure to produce. Still, I know that the country will realise that it is no ordinary or common life which has just been ended. As an opportunity will be given to say more on the subject on a future occasion, I shall say no more to-day.

Mr. MITCHELL. I feel deeply the event which has just occurred in connection with an old personal friend, and a gentleman who has occupied a prominent part in every great event in Canada for the last twenty-five years. He was a person who was universally respected for his ability, and he has left, in passing from the Cabinet, scarcely a man behind him there superior to himself in the particular line which he followed. The statement is true that we have expected this for two or three days past, and now I am sure that the country will agree with us in deeply regretting the decease of one who, if he had lived, would have continued to perform the useful services to the country which he has performed for many years past.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the House adjourns, I would like to ask the First Minister if it is the intention to go into Supply to-morrow?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I would ask the hon. gentleman to give the Minister of Finance notice, as that gentleman is not here, that I would like to have an answer to the question put to-day before we go into Supply, and that, on going into Supply, although I do not propose to move a motion, I propose to take up the time of the House for a short period in pointing out certain facts in connection with the recent 3 per cent. loan, of which I hope some explanation will be given.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 2nd April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

EXPROPRIATION OF LANDS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 131) respecting the Expropriation of Lands.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is a very important Bill, and I would like the hon. Minister to give us some explanation about it.

Mr. SPEAKER. When a Bill comes down from the Senate it is customary to take the first reading *pro forma*; the discussion only takes place on the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LOAN OF 1888.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether Government considers that the language used in the prospectus of the 3 per cent. loan recently negotiated in London, whereby it is declared that "The Canadian Government intend to apply the sums annually required for the redemption of the national debt in purchases of the stock now offered," requires them to use the sinking funds therein referred to in the purchase of the said 3 per cent. loan, in case the said securities should be held at premium at the time of purchase? If not, on what ground can the said sinking funds be otherwise invested?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government considers that the language used in the prospectus of the 3 per cent. loan recently negotiated in London, whereby it is declared that "The Canadian Government intend to apply the sums annually required for the redemption of the national debt in purchases of the stock now offered," requires them to use the sinking funds therein referred to in the purchase of the said 3 per cent. loan, in case the said securities should be held at a premium at the time of purchase, unless such premium is considered unreasonable and produced by unfair competition.

PRINTING OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that the House of Commons Debates are not published at as early a period of the day as I think they should be published. They are delayed very much more now than they were at the time when the printing was done by contractors, and I do not understand why this should be the case. Last week, when we had the debate on the Jesuit question, the official report was delayed more than usual, and extended reports appeared in the Toronto morning papers, which were delivered here before the official report of the House of Commons was placed in the hands of members. That state of affairs is certainly not creditable to the printing bureau. If the Toronto daily papers can publish almost as extended reports as those of the official Debates up to one o'clock, a.m., and have those reports telegraphed to Toronto and published in the morning papers, and have them transmitted by mail here and placed in the hands of members before the official report of Debates is delivered to members, I think there must be something wrong. It was understood when the printing bureau was established that the change was made in the public interest, and that better facilities would be afforded for the publication of the Debates and all matters connected with the printing of Parliament. So far this Session this has not proved to be the case. We are met continually with delays in printing, not only with respect to the publication of the Debates, but with regard to other matters, and whatever member of the Government has charge of the printing bureau at this time, should give his attention to this matter, so that the interests of the House may be attended to in connection with the printing of Parliament.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish, in connection with this matter, to call the attention of the Government to the fact that there are 120 galleys of matter now standing in the Government printing office—I believe the entire debate on the Jesuits' Estate Bill. That amount of matter standing will certainly seriously impede the progress of the work and delay the publication of the *Hansard* still further. I do not know for what purpose this matter is kept standing; but if it is intended to publish an edition of the entire debate on the Jesuits' question, it should receive immediate attention. Undoubtedly that amount of matter standing in type will disarrange the operations of the printing bureau and throw the work still further behind, and this will furnish still further reason for complaint, in addition to those which the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) has assigned to-day.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will call the attention of the Minister of Customs, who has that branch of the Department of the Secretary of State under his care, to what has been stated by hon. members.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I wish to call the attention of the Debates Committee to a matter respecting which the attention of the House has been called already, namely, the delay in the publication of the French edition of the *Hansard*. There has now been published over 900 pages of the English edition of the Debates, while the French edition has only reached 232 pages. If this state of things be continued any longer the French edition will be rendered practically useless. The French edition of the Debates is issued so long after the debate has actually taken place that the reports lose almost their entire interest. If we have to continue the *Hansard*, this defect should be remedied and the French edition published more regularly. I am informed that the cause of the delay is not due to the translators. I understand the translators have reached the debate on the Jesuits' Estates Act, and they are not, therefore, very much behind. The printing bureau, it appears, is at fault, and I think some very serious steps should be taken to remedy this state of things, which is perfectly absurd.

Mr. LAURIER. This subject was brought to the attention of the House a few weeks ago, and hon. members were promised that steps would be taken to remedy the evil. Now, after two weeks have elapsed, it appears that we occupy just the same position, and that all the fault lies with the printing bureau. The proposal for the establishment of a printing bureau, when submitted to the House, was looked upon with serious misgivings as to the benefits which would accrue, and up to the present time the results appear very much to verify what was stated on this side of the House at that time.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I regret that the chairman of the Debates Committee is not in his place, as he might be able to give some explanation as to the cause of the delay in the printing of the French edition of the Debates. When the question was brought before the House some time ago, we endeavored to ascertain the cause of the delay. There is one thing evident, that the delay cannot be attributed to the French translators, but to some other cause. In days gone by it was proved that the delay was due to the printers and to the same cause must be attributed the delay to-day. I think the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier) has truly said that if the French edition should continue to be issued so late it is of little value to members of the House. I think money would be saved if the issue of the French edition, instead of being delayed until the fall every year, was entirely suppressed. It is supposed to help the members during the Session of Parliament, but we do not receive it in time during the Session to answer that purpose. I hope the chairman of the committee, who I now see in his place, will perhaps be able to give us some information on the matter.

Mr. DESJARDINS. When the first complaint was made in the House I wrote to the superintendent of the printing

bureau, to call his attention to the fact that such a complaint had been made, and he said that he had met with some difficulties in the beginning because of the delay of the members in correcting their proofs so as that they might be sent to the French translators. I found out that the French translators were much in advance of the printers, and I called his attention to that, and since that time I have received proofs which show that there is a little more progress made than at the beginning, but not to the extent that it would be desirable. I am glad that the matter is called again to the attention of the House, for I think that there is something to be remedied. I do not know that; but the number of men in the office may be insufficient, or that there is something deficient in the manner of distributing the work, but certainly I think there is some remedy to be found.

Mr. LAURIER. The whole system is wrong, I am afraid; the whole printing bureau is wrong.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I have nothing to say about that. I am not in charge of that. As regards the printing of the French *Hansard*, I know that some delay must inevitably arise, but that delay should not be to the extent that we find it now.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I was calling the attention of the House to the fact that the English translation of the Debates has now reached nearly 1,000 pages, whereas the French version has only reached 232 pages. I am told that the translation is not backwards, or that it is very little backwards, for the translators have translated up to the debate on the Jesuit question. If we are to have these French Debates at all, they should be translated and printed for distribution at such a time as to be useful. If they are distributed as they were last year, and as they are this year (for this year is worse than last year), then this is a pure waste of money, because the people do not read the Debates. There is no interest in reading the Debates when the publication does not take place for two or three months after the debate. If the printing bureau is not able to do the printing of this House better, then I think that the Debates Committee should see that the printing is done elsewhere, and done in such a way as to ensure that the Debates are published in time so as to have them of any use.

Mr. DESJARDINS. There ought be only eight days delay in any case, between the issue of the English revised copy and the French version; but for one reason or another the delay is much longer than that, and much longer than it ought to be.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that some hon. member has suggested that it would be wise to print an edition of the debate on the Jesuits' Estates Bill, and that question pending has been the occasion of the delay complained of. If that be so it appears to me that that question ought to be disposed of at once. I cannot, for myself, see what public interest is to be gained by keeping alive this vexed question. Ordinarily, I would be in favor of the most complete publication of everything that occurs in Parliament, but, as has been stated by my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Somerville) the debate on that particular question was published with great promptitude and fullness in the daily papers of the country as the debate proceeded, and now that the issue in this House has been disposed of and a verdict rendered here, it is a question whether it would be in the public interest to aid in keeping alive the flames that have been started, or whether we should not consider that we have effectually disposed of the question so far as this House is concerned. My own opinion would be that, in the interests of the public, it is better for us not to place a brief in the hands of various persons interested in this question, by further publishing the speeches delivered on the floor of this House. I am sure that any person who is inclined to make mischief would be able to extract words and expressions delivered in the heat of debate which members might now regret. I think it would be a mistake in the interests of harmony for us to place such weapons in the hands of persons who might forget the interests of the country in seeking to promote the particular views that might be entertained by them. For these reasons, I think it would be far better for this House not to take any further steps in the direction indicated by some hon. gentlemen.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The question which I raised has nothing to do with the statement made by my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock). I stated that the publication of the English debate was delayed beyond all reason; and I instanced the report on the Jesuits' estates Act to show that the Toronto papers got ahead of our official record in publishing that debate.

Mr. TAYLOR. What Toronto papers?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. All the papers were alike ahead. I might say that this delay did not occur last week any more than other weeks in which we have had lengthened debates. Last Session when the House sat to two, or three, or four, or five o'clock in the morning, the Debates were published at an earlier time in the day than they are now when the House sits only to half-past twelve or one in the morning. That shows that there must be some great fault somewhere.

Mr. SPROULE. I decidedly dissent from the views enunciated by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), that we would do any harm by placing this discussion on the Jesuits' Estates Bill before the people more extensively than it has been up to the present time. I believe that a good deal of the excitement of the last few months has been occasioned by incorrect information in connection with this question. If we may judge by the criticisms from various parts of this country, which we see in the press, I think that we can come to no other conclusion than that the reports of the speeches that were made here were so limited, that people reading them could not fairly understand the force of the arguments on either side. The speeches that were made in this House on that question were careful and well considered speeches. They were logical, they were reasoning, and they were legal arguments, and, therefore, I think that the country would receive a great deal of benefit, if the Government printed large numbers of the *Hansard* containing those speeches, and distributed them extensively throughout the Dominion. I do not think that we can ever do harm by extending knowledge, but I think we could do a great deal of harm by endeavoring to curtail knowledge, if people were guided more by argument and less by prejudice and accidental circumstances, then they would, after a careful and intelligent consideration of this question, come to a different conclusion, many of them, from what they did.

Mr. AMYOT. I think that the French portion of the population would receive with great pleasure the French edition of that debate. They would like to read and to see how the question was discussed in this honorable House, and to see how well the interests of the Province has been defended. The publication of this debate would do well for Confederation's sake, because it would show that the rights of the interested parties have been well understood and defended in this Parliament. The French version of this debate would, I am sure, be very well accepted in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps the Government will tell us whether they have any purposes to serve in this matter, or what their intention is; 120 galleys of this matter are stand-

ing in the printing office for some purpose, and if there is no purpose in view, the type had better be distributed, and the work of the department allowed to go on.

Mr. TROW. The matter under discussion is that the French portion of the speeches delivered in this House were not published by the *Hansard* in proportion to that of the English. The complaint made was that the French *Hansard* was not published with sufficient expedition, but the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), and for Grey (Mr. Sproule), have discussed the matter in an entirely different form and spoken about some other subject, referring to the debate on the Jesuits' estates, which might be considered hereafter. It is quite foreign to this discussion to mention anything about that. Anything that may be in contemplation of the Government is not under discussion, but the complaint is that the French portion of the *Hansard* has not been delivered in the manner in which it should be delivered.

SUPPLY—LOAN OF 1888.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with the notice that I gave to the First Minister yesterday, I wish, before you leave the Chair, to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Finance, and of the House, to a matter which appears to me to be of very considerable importance in relation to the late loan. After the answer which I have just received from the hon. the Finance Minister, I would, under ordinary circumstances, have thought it unnecessary to detain the House for the purposes of any explanation, but I am very anxious that that hon. gentleman should not be taken unawares, and, therefore, I think, under all the circumstances, it will be fairer to him and fairer to the House at large that I should state, as I propose to do briefly, my opinion in reference to certain statements contained in the prospectus of the late loan; what consequences are involved in this; and that I should give the hon. gentleman an opportunity, if he desires it, of offering any explanation that he may wish with reference to that matter. Before I proceed further, I dare say, Sir, the House will remember that in the course of the Budget speech, the hon. the Minister of Finance made a statement relative to the terms at which the late 3 per cent. loan was effected. Those terms were exceedingly favorable, as the hon. gentleman stated then. He was perfectly right in saying, on the terms made and stated by him, that that loan was one of the most favorable loans that had ever been made on the London Stock Exchange. The House will recollect, that I put several questions to the hon. gentleman on that occasion. I enquired in the first place, if any sinking fund attached, and the hon. gentleman informed me there was no sinking fund attached; which was technically quite correct. I asked the hon. gentleman further, as to the rumor which had reached me, that all our sinking funds were pledged in some fashion, for the redemption of this loan, and the hon. gentleman told me that he did not consider that this was implied in our prospectus. Now, Sir, the statement of the hon. gentleman, to which I will call the attention of the House, is this: That, in June last, our High Commissioner had effected a four million loan in London at 3 per cent., repayable in fifty years, without any sinking fund attached, and that he had succeeded in selling this loan for the sum, on an average, of £95 1s. sterling. That loan, I repeat, the Minister of Finance stated, was a very excellent loan, and upon that statement of the facts submitted by him, I fully concurred, and I fully concur now. However, on that occasion, as I say, I put a question to the hon. gentleman, which he answered, as can be seen by the report of the Budget speech. Subsequently I asked the hon. gentleman to put into my hands the prospectus of that loan, and I was shown that prospectus at the Public Accounts Committee. I subsequently received a copy of it, which copy I hold in my hands. I may say, however, that, on first reading that prospectus, I could not believe that it was possible that I had received a correct copy. I found in that prospectus a clause so remarkable, entailing, as I understand it, such consequences, and likely to result (if I am correct in my interpretation of it) in such grave loss to the people of this country, that I have thought it my duty, before proceeding further, to state to the Minister of Finance what my interpretation is with reference to the effect of this clause, in order that, if possible, the fears which I entertain may be removed, and that I may be spared the necessity of taking further action. As the hon. gentleman stated, there was no sinking fund *eo nomine* attached to this loan, but there is a short clause to which I wish to call his attention and the attention of the House. That clause is as follows:—

"With a view of rendering the sinking funds of the various loans more effective than heretofore, the Canadian Government intend to apply the sums annually required in the redemption of the National Debt in the purchase of the stock now offered. The amount at present annually applied to the redemption of the debt is about £350,000 sterling, and, as the sinking funds are accumulative, the amounts yearly increase."

Sir, that clause is an extremely remarkable one. It is remarkable not merely on account of what it contains, but also on account of what it does not contain Now, I have examined the various bonds, the various prospectuses, of all our other loans made since Confederation; I have given this matter, as its gravity required, the best consideration at my command. I have consulted with other gentlemen whose opinion is of weight, and I believe—I would be very glad to be corrected if I am wrong—that the effect of this extraordinary promise on the part of the Canadian Government to apply £350,000 a year, annually increasing, to the repurchase of our loan, has had practically this effect: Instead of having made a fifty-year loan, we have made a loan repayable in ten annual instalments averaging £400,000; and we are further bound to repurchase our own securities at the current market rates, even though they should be considerably above par. I will not at the moment comment on the remark made by the hon gentleman touching on undue combination; that would complicate the matter unnecessarily. But, Sir, what has been done, if I understand the meaning of these plain words, is that whereas we had thought we had made a 3 per cent. loan having fifty years to run, we have, to all intents and purposes, made a 3 per cent. loan, which, so far as the Dominion of Canada is concerned, has an average of a little more than five years to run, and must be paid back by us in ten annual instalments. I shall be very glad if the hon. gentleman is in a position to bring forward any explanation which can remove the impression on my mind; but, if I am correct in this, it is obvious that the hon. gentleman was grievously mistaken in declaring that this was a good loan; it is obvious that it was a most imprudent loan on the assumption I have stated, and that it exposes us to very great risk. Looking to the high character of Messrs. Barings, Glyn & Co., whose names are attached to this prospectus, I have thought it right, before going further, to make this brief statement of the facts of the case to the hon. Minister of Finance, and to invite him, if he has any explanations to make on the subject at present, to give them to the House, in the hope that they will prove sufficiently satisfactory to enable me to alter the opinion I now have as to this loan.

Mr. FOSTER. Unfortunately I was not present in the House last evening when my hon. friend made allusion to this matter, and, I suppose, outlined the nature of the remarks he intended to make. I had not, therefore, the ad-

vantage of understanding the line of his remarks, and since we have been in here to-day, I have had but a very short time to look over the papers which are under my hand. Therefore, I think, probably, it would be more satisfactory, if my hon. friend has no objection, that I should think this matter over, and make an early statement to the House with reference to it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very well. I would suggest, then, as I understand that this loan was negotiated by the High Commissioner, who is here present——

Mr. FOSTER. The High Commissioner is not in the city, but I will communicate with him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should prefer that that should be done. In that case, I think it would be expedient, if the hon. gentleman will undertake to do that with reasonable promptitude, to call on the High Commissioner to give him such a report as he would deem proper to lay on the Table of the House; and I would suggest that it be printed. My remarks, when reported in *Hansard*, will show clearly and distinctly what my opinion is. I may say to the hon. Finance Minister that I am in no way desirous, as the unusual course I have taken shows, of taking him at an advantage in this matter. On the contrary, I would prefer that he should have reasonable time to consider his answer, and that his answer, if he sees fit, should include the report of the High Commissioner, who, I believe, was the party to transact this loan. That, however, is for himself. He is not called on to do more than make an explanation; but I suppose the explanation will be forthcoming to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. I will make the explanation as soon as possible. I will not unnecessarily delay it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would be glad of that; because if the explanation be not satisfactory, it would be my duty to follow the matter up. If it be satisfactory, I will be only too happy to drop it.

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

(In the Committee.)

Immigration Agent, Montreal.. .... $1,360

Mr. BAIN. What arrangements have you made with reference to supervising the children and female immigration department this season? Is it left in charge of a general agent?

Mr. CARLING. A number of the ladies of the city of Quebec have taken charge of any female immigrants that may come to Quebec.

Mr. BAIN. Are they in connection with the Montreal association in any way?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. FISHER. Is there any grant to them the same as to the Montreal association?

Mr. CARLING. There has been no grant, but it is intended to recommend a small amount to assist in the carrying on of the work.

Mr. BAIN. Do you propose to continue the grant to the Montreal society, as formerly?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. BAIN. I think they formerly kept an agent there.

Mr. CARLING. A thousand dollars here is granted the ladies of Montreal. Of course, the Government have no control of the management. We give the grant, and they make a report each year.

Mr. BAIN. My view of the matter is that it should remain in the hands of the Government. The supervision of the class of immigrants suited for the western Provinces should remain under the control of the Minister and his agents. I think it is patent, on the face of it, that only a certain portion of that immigration would find its way westward, for the natural reason that Montreal and the east would naturally look to their own interests first, and the western section would only receive those who had absolutely made up their minds to go west. I am not finding fault with the work of the ladies, because I am not aware of the details, but it strikes me it is very undesirable that their agency should be beyond the control of the Minister. It should be directly under his control, and he should place an agent in charge who would be responsible to the Government.

Mr. McDONALD (Huron). I would like to know what are the duties devolving upon Miss Richardson, the lady employed in connection with the Quebec agency?

Mr. CARLING. The services of Miss Richardson has been dispensed with, on account of the very large reduction made in the immigration vote.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What was she doing before?

Mr. CARLING. She was engaged in corresponding with ladies in the old country, and with people in different parts of Canada, in reference to places for domestic servants, and was taking a general interest in their welfare.

Mr. McDONALD (Huron). I find that last year this lady received $107.44 for ocean passage from Liverpool to Quebec. I do not see how that could be if her duties were only those of correspondence. She also received for fares and cabs $365.71, and for Pullmans $11.25. She received for hotel expenses $70.30, or altogether during the year she received $954.70. Now, if her services were what the Minister states, I do not see how she could draw such a large sum for the duties which appear in this report. I think she must have had some other duties to perform than those to which the Minister has alluded.

Mr. CARLING. Miss Richardson did pay visits to the older Provinces, and also to Manitoba. She visited England once or twice in the last few years, and her expenses were allowed. She has been corresponding with parties in the different Provinces, and we thought it advisable that she should visit the localities where the servants who had been brought out had been placed, in order to see how they were getting on, and whether their homes were satisfactory, so that she could report to the ladies in England who sent them out.

Mr. McDONALD (Huron). Her services are now dispensed with?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Do I understand that the ladies in Quebec are now supposed to discharge the duties which Miss Richardson had charge of?

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is the duty of the House to give careful attention to the items under the vote for immigration. We have for years been spending a large amount of money under that head, and it is quite clear that the results shown by the returns of immigration offices are not equal in value to the amount of money spent. We desire to cut down, as far as possible, unnecessary expenditure. It is the duty of this House to closely criticise the expenditure under this head, because I believe there is more waste in connection with that than in connection with any other item in the Public Accounts. If you take up these incidental expenses in Quebec, not for bringing in immigrants, but for payment to those employed as interpreters, clerks or assistants, you will find that we paid out last year

$5,245, and that is without taking into consideration the salary of the agent or of his clerk. I do not believe that it is at all necessary that the enormous expenditure for immigration should be continued. We have agents all over this country at large expense, and anyone who will criticise the Public Accounts will come to the conclusion that a large proportion of that expenditure is unnecessary, that a number of men are employed under the head of immigration who should not be continued in their offices, and that the country should not be called upon to pay these enormous amounts. I observe that the sum of $6,583 was paid in the Montreal agency. Of course, Montreal and Quebec are important points, but there are other points where I think it is unnecessary to make these expenditures. I find that, at Brandon, we are paying an agent $1,400 a year salary, and $366 for an assistant. The agent's name is Bennett, and we have D. Bennett as messenger and another Bennett as assistant in the office. I do not know whether they are relations of the agent or not. I do not think it is the desire of the Minister of Agriculture that items which are unnecessary should be continued, but it should be the earnest desire of the House to put a stop to this sort of expenditure; and I believe that, under the head of immigration, there has been more rottenness than under any other item of the public expenditure. We have seen something of that to-day in the Public Accounts Committee, and I suppose there is more to come. We should have extended and minute explanations on the part of the Minister in regard to all these items, and I would ask him now how many officials are employed in the Quebec office and what are their duties? Let us have that in the first place.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I desire to say a few words, as I am at issue with the hon. gentleman on this question. I think there cannot be too much attention paid to immigration. If the North-West is to be built up at all, we must have a live immigration service. The immigration agents in the North-West have done a great deal of good to those immigrants who have come there new to the country. They have put them in a way to secure their farms, and have saved the expense which a stranger in the country would naturally fall into. I think a little more money might be spent, and that the example of the United States might be followed, by having immigration agents on all the trains during the season, in order to induce the people to remain on Canadian territory. I believe that no money is better spent than that which is expended on this item, in giving the knowledge which is necessary to new immigrants who come in. There are a great many of these immigrants who are new to the country, and who, from want of knowledge of the new surroundings, are apt to waste the small amount of capital which they have unless they have this advice and assistance.

Mr. McMULLEN. I hope we shall have an answer to my question in reference to the Quebec agency.

Mr. CARLING. The agent at Quebec is Mr. Stafford; the assistant agent, Mr. Doyle; the book-keeper, Mr. Stein; the Norwegian interpreter, Mr. Andersen, and Mr. O'Reiley is the messenger. These are the permanent officers.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice there is an extra clerk, Mr. Powers, at $965 a year. Why is he employed?

Mr. CARLING. It was considered necessary by my predecessor, and is considered necessary by the agent at Quebec, that Mr. Powers should be employed. He is a very efficient man, and assists in keeping the accounts and the statements in regard to immigration.

Mr. AMYOT. I happen to know every one of those officers at the Quebec immigration office, and I may state that they are all very good officers, and do their duty. I would mention especially Mr. Stafford, Mr. Doyle, and Mr Stein, who are very useful officers. I would take this occasion for urging upon the Government the necessity of helping the movement now going on in Belgium and France, to direct an emigration of farmers to this country, of whom many are now coming. I know the Government have done something, but I think they could do more. They could bring into this country farmers who are in comfortable circumstances. Many of those who came last year brought with them from $5,000 to $10,000. They are a great source of wealth to the country at large. I am sure the Government will receive the thanks of the country, if they do more than they have done in the past to promote this class of immigration.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I would like to know whether it is the intention of the Government to compel ocean steamers bringing immigrants to this country, to land them at Quebec. It must be within the recollection of the Minister that, last year, several steamers adopted the habit of landing their immigrants at Montreal, and an order was passed directing them to land the immigrants at Quebec, but for some reason they preferred to go to Montreal. Now, the Government have spent a large sum of money in erecting buildings at Quebec to provide accommodation for immigrants coming to this country; during the last two years the Government spent $50 000 to finish some buildings intended for that purpose, that had been erected on the new Louise Embankment. That building has been almost wholly unused during the last year, as the immigrants are carried up to Montreal and landed on a wharf where there is absolutely no accommodation for them, and no protection for them. Any thief may approach them, and the result has been that a good many of these immigrants have been robbed. I have been told by people connected with steamship offices that a good many immigrants last year were victimised in Montreal. We know that in New York city, as soon as immigrants land, they are taken care of by the Government and carefully guarded. Nobody is allowed to approach them for any purpose, not even to sell them tickets or exchange money; there is an exchange office in the immigration buildings at Castle Garden. It was intended to introduce the same system into this country, and that is the reason why the Government have gone to such a large expenditure of money in providing suitable accommodation for them at Quebec, which expenditure I consider was a very wise one. This system was inaugurated three years ago, but if the system which prevailed last year is to go on for another year, these buildings, which have cost so much money, will become perfectly useless. If the Minister of Agriculture has gone to Quebec since these buildings were erected, he must have seen that they afford just as good accommodation for immigrants as is to be found at Castle Garden, in some respects superior. I have seen and inspected the accommodation for immigrants at Castle Garden, and, as a rule, they are not so well provided for as they are at Quebec. These buildings have been erected on a large embankment, separated from the mainland by the new dock, so that these people are entirely protected from all those who might have designs upon them. They are in the hands of the immigration agents of the Government; and they have this great advantage which they have not in New York, that the Canadian Pacific Railway runs alongside of these buildings, so they can pass directly from the steamer through these buildings, and embark on the Canadian Pacific Railway, after passing through the formalities that are considered necessary. Of course, I only speak of immigrants, and not of ordinary passengers, and I desire to know if the Government intends to compel all steamers bringing immigrants, to land them at that place, provided at such a great expenditure of money, and, as I repeat, wisely provided; because I think it is very important that we should treat immigrants as well, if not better, than they are treated when they land in New York. If the system which has

been going on last year, is continued during the coming year, I am satisfied that the immigrants will not be taken care of as well as they are in New York. In Montreal they are landed as ordinary passengers who are supposed to be able to take care of themselves, landed on the wharf where they become a prey to designing persons. There is another danger to which I would call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture, and that is the lack of quarantine arrangements at Montreal. There is great danger in the fact of immigrants landing at once in a great city like Montreal, that they may propagate epidemic diseases. I have been told by physicians that it was quite possible for immigrants to pass inspection without any disease being detected, but they still may have the germs of disease about them. If they are landed in a large city like Montreal immediately from the ocean steamers, there is great danger to the public health of this country. I, therefore, trust that the Minister of Agriculture will take proper steps to compel all the steamers bringing immigrants, to land them at these buildings in Quebec, which have been provided at so great an expenditure.

Mr. CARLING. I am glad to know that the hon. gentleman approves of the accommodation afforded at Quebec. I am sure the buildings have been prepared with every care to meet the requirements of immigrants who arrive there. With regard to an order being issued that immigrants must be landed at Quebec, it has been usual for steamers to land them there, and full provision was made by the Government for the immigrants at that point. The Beaver Line carries passengers from Liverpool at the same rate to Montreal as they do to Quebec, and the Allan Line and the Dominion Line state that if the Beaver Line carry passengers or immigrants from Liverpool to Montreal at the same rate as they do from Liverpool to Quebec, they will be obliged to do the same. I understand, however, and I have been informed to-day, that the Allan and Dominion Lines are going to land immigrants at Quebec, notwithstanding the Beaver Line has landed them at Montreal, at least for the beginning of the season. Of course, I think it is most likely that the several steamboat lines will come to some arrangement with respect to the landing of immigrants at Quebec; but if it is found necessary that a change should be made, the subject will be brought before the Government for consideration. I am not, however, prepared to say, to-day, that the Government should issue an order that immigrants must be landed at Quebec, although they may have been ticketed to Montreal.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I do not see why we cannot do here what is done in the United States. In the States immigrants cannot arrive at any other places except those provided in advance by the Government. I do not speak now of ordinary passengers, who, of course, may land at any place where steamers may carry them, but I am speaking simply of immigrants. What I wish the Minister to do is, to adopt the practice pursued in the United States by the Government there. I am very much afraid, from the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture, that if the Government persevere in their line of action or, rather, inaction, we shall see the same results we saw last year. The Minister of Agriculture says he understands that the Allan Line and Dominion Line intend to bring their immigrants to Quebec, but the Beaver Line is going to land them in Montreal.

Mr. CARLING. I did not say that. I said that the Beaver Line did land their immigrants in Montreal last year, and the Dominion and Allan Lines felt that if the Beaver Line continued to do so, they would do so also. Whether the Beaver Line are going to land immigrants in Montreal or not this year, I am not aware; but I have been informed to-day that the Allan and Dominion Lines were going to land them at Quebec, for the beginning of the season, and I thought, under those circumstances, the Beaver Line was going to do so also.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I was informed some time ago by one of the chief officers of the Dominion Line that it was a losing business for the Dominion Line, as well as for the Allan Line, to carry immigrants to Montreal; but they have been compelled to do so, for if one line carried immigrants to Montreal they were compelled to do so. Last year, and two years previously, the Beaver Line advertised all over Europe, not only over Great Britain and Ireland, but over the continent, that they would take immigrants to Montreal, stating that it was 180 miles further up than Quebec, at the same price as their competitors would carry them to Quebec. Immigrants, not knowing the trouble that would arise from their being landed at Montreal, thought they would be in a better position than if they were landed at Quebec, and the final result was that some parties lost carrying business which was a very paying business, one of the very best paying businesses of the steamship companies in the summer. The result was that last year the other lines came to the conclusion to land their own immigrants at Montreal, at whatever inconvenience. Of course, it was a question either of carrying immigrants or not carrying them. If the other lines land their immigrants at Montreal, I am afraid we shall see the same results of which I am complaining, that all the immigrants, within a short time, will have to be landed in Montreal and not in Quebec, at which latter point there is good accommodation provided for them by the Government.

Mr. SPROULE. Our people complain that the immigrants are not landed in Montreal and in Toronto, and they would very much prefer that the immigrants be landed at Toronto, because, as they state, when they have to pass through the Province of Quebec and through Montreal before they reach Ontario, the best classes of immigrants are frequently kept in those localities. The demand for immigrants in the west has been very large lately. The agents in Toronto and Hamilton have been unable to supply one fourth the number of people for whom applications have been made, and if that should continue to be the case, I think it would be much more satisfactory if the immigrants were all brought to Montreal or Toronto.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). This illustrates the difficulty. I think the Minister should take into consideration whether it is not desirable to establish one point, either Quebec or Montreal, as the point where immigrants should be received, and from which they should be distributed. Immigrants come to this country unfamiliar with the English language, coming perhaps from Scandinavia, Germany, or some other European country, and they get away from the supervision of the Government officers in charge at the Grand Trunk wharf, and at the Louise Embankment at Quebec. The moment they get outside of the supervision of the officials who are responsible, they are liable to be pounced upon by sharpers at every turn, in the exchanging of their money and other matters, and they are led away to lodging houses, and low places, where the parties keeping them have no mercy or feeling towards immigrants. The result is that we are liable to get our whole immigration system by the St. Lawrence discredited, and are liable to make the steamship lines running to New York the channel of immigration to this country; and, while we have difficulty in retaining control of our immigrants after they come here, it would be infinitely more difficult if they came to Canada by way of New York. This is a matter of very serious importance, and the Minister should consider whether something similar to Castle Garden should not be established here. I do not mean to say that it should be placed in Quebec or Montreal, but the Government should feel itself responsible for seeing that the immigrants are protected as soon as they land in our country, and that fac-

ilities are given them to reach the various points in the country for which they may be destined. Unless some such steps are taken, the efforts that are being made, and perhaps legitimately made, to reduce what I feel hitherto has been a wasteful and unsatisfactory expenditure, will result in the wrecking of our whole immigration system. In the United States the authorities take charge of the immigrants at Castle Garden; they do not allow outsiders to interfere with them, and they see through Government officials that the new-comers get justice and fair play. There is a double advantage in that. We have had for some time a very undesirable class coming to our country; and I will venture to say that if the records of some of the friendly societies of Montreal were examined, they would reveal a condition of things that would shock the senses of the citizens of this country, who think we are receiving a respectable class of immigrants for the money expended. If any man or woman can raise money sufficient to bring themselves to this country, they are permitted to come. But, I remember, just before the immigration season last year, in looking over some of the Montreal journals, I found it stated—I think it was in the *Star*—that a meeting was held at the Protestant House of Industry, of various societies interested in benevolent objects in that city, for the purpose of considering what steps should be taken to put a stop to the undesirable classes of immigrants drifting into that city, and becoming a burden on their resources. The delegate of the Y.M.C.A., Mr. Budge, on that occasion said they were tired of endeavoring to aid people who came there, confirmed criminals, who hopelessly drifted into crime and settled down on the community. Now, if we had an organised system, similar to the Castle Garden system, we should have a certain guarantee, through our own officials, that what we call the undesirable classes who are sent out by steamship agents, should be sent back; and we should have this advantage, that immigrants coming to this country, unfamiliar with the English language, would have some assurance that they would not be cheated by impostors, and that they would find their way with the least possible expense to themselves, and under the best circumstances, to their destination. If we do not do something of that kind, our immigration system is going to break down and be an utter failure. I feel very strongly the importance of establishing some one point at which these parties would be landed and seen to. That class who are able to pay their own way, and who have had correspondence before they come here, can take care of themselves, and go to whatever point they please. I do feel that the Minister ought to take this matter into consideration, and not allow these immigrants to land at Montreal or Quebec, without having proper regulations, both for their sakes and ours. I think this is a matter that we may look at fairly on its merits, and I feel exceedingly anxious that the Government should consider it. So far as Toronto and other western cities are concerned, an examination of the records of the different societies there will show that they have felt so discouraged at the class of immigrants which are sent out by the aid of societies in the old country, that they have cut themselves altogether apart from those societies. You will find resolutions and protests entered by the benevolent people in those cities, time and again, against the system of sending out unsatisfactory immigrants, chiefly through the aid of various benevolent societies in the old country. Now, I realise, and I think every man in the House who considers the subject, will realise that there is a difficulty there. We know how it is. Parties drift down into the criminal classes, not because they are morally wrong, but because they are weak; then they fall into the hands of some of these societies, and express repentance and anxiety to change their course and do better. I should be very sorry to say a word against the good work these societies are endeavoring to do in reclaiming those classes; but the fact is that before these people have been weaned from the vicious habits into which they have drifted, the societies often think that, if removed to a new country and put in new surroundings, they will do better. Possibly in some cases they may; but our experience heretofore has not been satisfactory in this respect, and I venture to say that anyone who takes an interest in the work done by the Young Men's Christian Association, and various other societies in our large cities, with the view of aiding the lapsed classes, will find that they have generally a surplus of that class on their hands, and that they do not know what to do with them. Now, I feel that the only way we can effectually meet all these difficulties is by having a thorough and effective supervision of the classes of immigrants who come to this country, for the purpose of protecting both ourselves and the immigrants, and I hope the Government will take the matter into their consideration.

Mr. MITCHELL. I just want to say one word in confirmation of what the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) has brought before the House. I think it is the duty of the Government—I do not say this for the purpose of finding any fault with the Immigration Department—to adopt some such system as that hon. gentleman has pointed out. They have got to fix upon one port or the other on the St. Lawrence to which the classes of immigrants referred to should come; and but one of two places could be selected, either Quebec or Montreal. Now, the Government have gone to a considerable expense at the port of Quebec, in fitting up a very complete and perfect establishment for the reception of these immigrants. It is in an isolated position, and convenient to where the steamboats land, so that the immigrants would not have more than 300 yards to walk from the steamboat dock to the immigrant sheds. There is no doubt that what my hon. friend from Wentworth says is true, that the course pursued in the harbor of New York is the correct one—that these people should be kept apart from influences which would be likely to lead them astray, or from the danger of being gulled by the sharks who float around the immigrants. It is the duty of the Government to lay down a policy, and to decide to land those immigrants either at Quebec or at Montreal. I am not going to venture an opinion as to where they ought to be landed; but I will say this, that at the port of Quebec the Government have facilities at the present moment, which have been provided at considerable expense to the country, and which are in full blast; and until they decide to select some other place, they should first make preparations to receive the immigrants there. Therefore, I think the Government should be prepared, before the vote passes, to announce what policy they will pursue in regard to this matter. Some policy should certainly be adopted to prevent our immigration getting a reputation which will deter the very class of immigrants we desire from coming amongst us.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am very glad my hon. friend from North Wentworth has brought this matter before the House. My hon. friend's remarks, as are his remarks always, are such as deserve the very serious consideration of the Minister of Agriculture. I have had occasion to make enquiries at several points in my own Province, as to the class of immigrants we have been receiving of late, and, though, no doubt, a great many are desirable persons, I have been informed, on authority which I believe cannot be disputed, that of late years especially, a great many immigrants have been brought to this country who are subsequently objects of charity. This is the very last class we should receive here, to build up a country like ours. I will not enter upon a consideration of the policy of encouraging immigration, while we are not able to keep our own people in this country; that is a question apart, and, perhaps, better discussed at another time. But this I will say, that, to my

personal knowledge, a considerable number of immigrants are brought here on false pretences—I will not say by agents of the Government, but by parties who have an interest in bringing them here, such as steamship runners, and others of that class. They cluster in our great cities, and load down our charitable institutions. I was informed, by a gentleman of high standing, who takes an interest in these matters, that on a Christmas occasion, I think, in Toronto, no fewer than 8,000 persons were assisted in getting a Christmas dinner.

Mr. CARLING. Not all immigrants.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. By no means; I was just about to point that out. But it is a matter of great regret that such a fact should exist in any Canadian city, as that 8,000 persons should be willing or compelled to accept charity; but, according to this gentleman's statement, a large proportion of those people were immigrants; and I believe the records of the various benevolent societies, such as the St. Andrew's, St. Patrick's and St. George's societies, all go to prove the same thing, that, under our present system, a large number of people are brought on there who cannot support themselves, many of whom I strongly suspect have been shipped out here for the express purpose of getting rid of them, and preventing them becoming a burden at home. It is a very difficult thing for us to say that we will not allow other British subjects to land here; but we have a right to protect our own people; and Canada must not, and cannot be a dumping ground for a pauper population, no matter whether it hails from Ireland, Scotland, England or any other British country; and I think the time has come when the immigrants coming to Canada should be subject to examination, so that we would not be liable to imposition. I think that would be largely attained by the suggestion the hon. member for North Wentworth has made; and I believe the money so spent—and I do not suppose it would need to be a large amount—would be well and wisely spent in the interest of the country.

Mr. DENISON. I would like to ask the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), where his information came from; because I can hardly believe that 8,000 people were provided with dinner in Toronto on Christmas day?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was given to me by the president of one of the charitable associations in Toronto, and I saw it repeated in some of the Toronto newspapers. Those were not all objects of charity in the ordinary sense; but they were still objects of charity in this, that they were willing to accept eleemosynary doles from their fellow citizens, and that is not what I should like to see any Canadian citizen accept.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am glad to hear the expression of hostility against pauperism; but if ladies and gentlemen will meet together in their good feelings, and advertise that all persons who call at a certain house or shop on Christmas morning will be sure to get a roast of beef and other necessaries to make a happy Christmas, I do not think we are to suppose that all the people who accept this free lunch or free dinner are to be ranked as paupers. I think there must be a gross mistake as to the pauperism of Toronto. There is no city throughout the whole of this continent that is making such progress in every point of material wealth as the city of Toronto, and to tell me that 8,000 paupers are to be found in that city is, I can simply say, a piece of information which I must regard as grossly exaggerated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman ought to have noticed that I expressly stated they were not paupers in the ordinary sense of the term; but I repeated the statement as it was made to me. I am not responsible for it, except so far as calling attention to the fact that there is a great number of people in the Queen city who are not above receiving assistance from their fellow-citizens. Many of those people, no doubt, could not properly be called paupers. I do not pretend to say they were; but I state that I was informed that a number of persons were assisted—I cannot say whether last year or the year before—by generous citizens in Toronto.

Mr. McNEILL. The assertion was made last year to the effect that a very great number of emigrants were receiving assistance in Toronto, and that the charitable institutions in that city were overburdened by applications on behalf of these emigrants who were pouring into the country—these paupers who were being dumped on the fair soil of Canada. Well, the chairman of the Immigration Committee was requested by the Committee to ask the Mayor of Toronto for a return, so that we might have something definite to go upon and discover how much truth there was in this statement. That return was furnished and laid before the Committee this Session. We find that out of 88,000 emigrants who were landed here last year, some 432 were all that could be found to have received aid from the charitable institutions in Toronto, and in fact it appeared doubtful as to whether they even were receiving aid in the usual sense, as to whether that aid might mean that they were receiving work. It is well an assertion of this kind, when made on the floor of this House, should be sifted, and it is satisfactory to know that out of 88,000 emigrants who landed here last year, just 432 were found receiving assistance in one of the largest cities in the Dominion. If we consider that a like proportion are to be found in other cities in proportion to their population, I think that is a very fair showing for the work that has been done in the way of bringing emigrants to this country. It is clear proof that the class of emigrants brought here is a class well suited to the country. Many of these men who are receiving assistance in this way may be men well suited, but who may not have had as good a chance as others, to obtain employment. Hon. gentlemen ought to be very careful about making statements of this character on the floor of this House.

Mr. McDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has told us that out of 88,000 emigrants who came to this country, only 400 odd received charity in Toronto. But the hon. gentleman must remember that the 88,000 did not pass through Toronto. Only 16,196 souls passed through Toronto, and 400 and odd out of that is quite a large percentage. The hon. gentleman would lead the House to believe that 88,000 passed through Toronto. That was a misleading statement, and I take this opportunity of correcting it.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I am glad to have this opportunity of testifying to the liberality and generosity of the people of Toronto at Christmas time. I happened to be walking through Toronto market last year on Christmas eve, when I met a wealthy resident of Toronto, a gentleman whom you all know, Mr. John Holderness, who was distributing charity. I stood and watched the proceedings. He ordered one of the butchers to take down one or two of the largest and best quarters of beef, and to every person that came along he said: "Take a piece;" and I am happy to say that I received assistance myself the same day. He gave me a couple of steaks, which I took home and disposed of.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad to corroborate what has fallen from the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt). It may be that 8,000 people received something in the nature of a Christmas present from the good and generous souls of the city of Toronto, and it may be that a few more, or less, were able to appreciate this just as the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt) or others would. But I must

say that we have in Toronto—I do not say more than in other parts of the Dominion—a class of people of generous disposition, of which any city may well be proud, and we keep up the good custom of Christmas eve, if only for the sake of good cheer, amongst the many charitable institutions presided over by ladies and gentlemen who have but one object in view, the good of their fellow-citizens. We have a vast number of those institutions, and they make it their object in Christmas time to throw a little comfort into the houses of those who are not so well able as themselves, perhaps, to supply their own wants, so that no one may feel he has gone without a Christmas dinner. We give 8,000 Christmas dinners generally for nothing, and I have had myself my Christmas dinner for nothing. It is a rare thing for us to provide our own Christmas dinners in Toronto.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I rise for the purpose of correcting a misapprehension into which the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has fallen in regard to the alleged return from the city of Toronto. Last year, before the Immigration and Colonisation Committee, the statement was made, taken from one of the Toronto papers, that a large number of persons had been employed by the Mayor of Toronto at very low wages in order to give them some means of subsistence. It was not alleged that these men, or any considerable portion of them, were recent immigrants, although the inference was endeavored to be drawn that they were people who had come recently to Canada and had been unable to obtain employment. I received instructions from the committee to communicate with the Mayor in order to ascertain how many of those who had been so employed had come to Canada within the last year. I did so; and received an acknowledgment of my communication, and was told that the statement would be sent to me, but up to the present I have not received it. The information my hon. friend has, is taken from a special return which was made by the officials of the Immigration Department at Toronto, of the number that were aided by the department in the way of furnishing meals and assistance. No information has been obtained at all in answer to the request I sent the Mayor of Toronto, so that we are unable to say that any of those who had been employed for the purpose of saving them from starvation during the winter of 1888, were immigrants recently arrived.

Mr. McMULLEN. What has the hon. the Minister to say with regard to the suggestion thrown out on this side of the House? I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that we employ two staffs of officials at Quebec and Montreal, 16 at Quebec and 6 at Montreal, the salaries last year of which amounted to $9,055. If the system suggested by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) were carried out, we might save a very large sum. We should have but one place, and it should be understood on the other side of the Atlantic that immigrants would be expected to arrive at this place and there receive all necessary attention and instructions. We would thus be able to wipe out the expenses connected with those two points.

Mr. CARLING. I thought I had explained to my hon. friend from Quebec, that the Government had provided every accommodation at Quebec for the immigrants arriving there, and that, up to last year, all immigrants had landed from the steamers at Quebec. Last year, however, the Beaver Line brought the immigrants to Montreal at the same rate as to Quebec, and no great inconvenience resulted from this change. The Allan Line and the Dominion Line protested very strongly against the Beaver Line bringing their immigrants to Montreal; and they said, if the Beaver Line did so they would have to do the same. That difficulty only arose last year, and not to any very great extent; but it is now being considered by the department. I understand now, as I have said, that the Allan and the Dominion Lines are going to deliver their immigrants at Quebec, at least for the beginning of the season. The Government have this matter under consideration.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). So far as the two great railway systems are concerned, the one connected with the Louise Embankment in Quebec city, and the other at Point Lévis, opposite, which necessitates, to a certain extent, two points, these two points must be under the supervision of the Government. I would not like to say there is any truth in the report, but I have heard a few ugly rumors in reference to the way some of our immigrants have been treated on landing at the Louise Embankment. I would suggest that the Minister should exercise a little sharp inspection at both points, and give those men to understand that they are not there to do just as they please, but that if they should fail in their duty they will not only discredit themselves but the Government of this country. In addition, I would like to ask him to consider the effect of our placing the immigration of females and children under the charge of the society in Quebec—a local society. I think the western men will feel that influences of that kind might be exercised, perhaps fairly, and perhaps the immigrants of those classes coming there will be well placed; but, if the Minister allows that branch of the service to be placed in charge of the ladies in the locality, who are not responsible to the Government, and over whom you can exercise no supervision, I think he will find that it will lead to serious embarrassments and difficulties. What I am anxious for, first, is that the Government should be responsible for the whole transaction; and, next, that they should make such regulations and protections for that class of immigrants as to prevent their being preyed upon by outside sharks, or misled or led away by local influences and local circumstances. I have a strong opinion that, if the Government would ask that Montreal society who are to receive this $1,000 grant, to make a return for any one year of the number of immigrants who have been more or less under their observation, and have drifted before the police magistrate and into the cells, it would be a revelation as to the class which has been sent out to this country as likely to be useful immigrants. I am not finding fault with the Government, but, unless they take a firm stand, and take the responsibility upon themselves, and see that their agents are thorough in their work, I am afraid that our system is shortly going to break down. There is another point. The assisted passages were abolished by the Government last season, at the pressure of public opinion, and probably correctly. We are now open to the fair competition of the port of New York, and I am exceedingly anxious that there should be no fair cause of complaint, on the part of the immigrants who come here, and who may be exposed to be fleeced, in consequence of neglect on the part of the agents, by the action of the sharks outside who have no mercy on the people who come to our shores. If I can say anything to impress upon the Government the necessity of making a thorough investigation of this matter, I feel that I shall have done as much good in that as it is possible to do in any one Session of my attendance here.

Mr. CARLING. I can assure my hon. friend that the Government are quite alive to the necessity of a thorough supervision over the immigration service in Quebec. We have a man of great experience there, in the person of Mr. Stafford. No better agent than Mr. Stafford could be selected, and he has full charge of the buildings, and of the immigrants who arrive there, and we do not allow any society to take any power away from that agent. I am satisfied that, under his care, and under the supervision of his officers, nothing will transpire which will be injurious to the immigrants or to the public.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I am only speaking on this matter because of certain rumors which I am not respon-

sible for, and do not want to be responsible for; but there are some ugly reports abroad in reference to certain immigrants who have landed here. I am not finding fault with the Government, but I call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to that side of the question, so that, if anything of that kind has transpired, it may be remedied.

Mr. CARLING. I dare say rumors may have been sent abroad, but I can assure my hon. friend that, if anything of that kind is brought to the attention of the department, it will be thoroughly investigated. I am thoroughly alive to the importance of seeing that the immigrants who come here should be properly looked after.

Mr. McNEILL. I desire one word of explanation as to a statement I made a few moments ago. I stated that the figures I gave were on the authority of a return by the Mayor of Toronto, in reply to a request preferred to him to make such a return. I find I was technically incorrect, but I was virtually absolutely correct. The figures I gave were figures which, by the instructions of His Worship Mayor Clarke, the city relief officer, Taylor, recently prepared and furnished to the city press. That was the authority. When I heard Mr. Lowe speak of those figures, and mention that they were in a return furnished by the authority of the Mayor, I came to the conclusion that they were in reply to the communication referred to by my hon. friend. Practically it amounts to the same thing.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is there any very special necessity for an immigration agent at Hamilton? There may have been at one time, but I do not think there is now, because the stream of immigration, instead of coming into Ontario, is going out of it, and these agents in that Province should be called emigration agents instead of immigration agents.

Mr. CARLING. I think my hon. friend is mistaken in regard to Hamilton. A large number of people who come by way of Suspension Bridge stop at Hamilton. Some go by way of Toronto to the North-West, or to points in Ontario, and some remain there. We have a very efficient officer there, who gives every attention and assistance to those immigrants, and who sees that they are properly distributed to the points to which they should go. I think Hamilton is a very important point which should not be done away with. We have done away this last year with two or three agencies which we thought were not necessary.

Mr. McMULLEN. Where?

Mr. CARLING. They are shown in italic. The agencies at Qu'Appelle and at Emerson have been struck out, and the vote for immigration has been, as my hon. friend knows, very much reduced. Some two or three years ago, the amount asked was $350,000.

Mr. MITCHELL. That was when you gave assisted passages, which you never should have done.

Mr. CARLING. We have been reducing the vote since that, so that now the amount is less than $100,000.

Mr. McKAY. I may inform the hon. gentleman that Hamilton is a distributing point for those who enter from the American ports. They are distributed from that city all over the country—to the North-West and over certain parts of Ontario. If the hon. gentleman was at Hamilton station sometimes, and was to see the number of immigrants who are there, and who are sent off to various points, I think he would vary his opinion as to the importance of Hamilton as an immigration station.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the hon. gentleman say why he discontinued the agency at Qu'Appelle?

Mr. CARLING. I believe that the land in the neighborhood of Qu'Appelle has been taken up and settled upon, and immigrants now are more likely to go on to Regina, where a railway has been constructed and is likely to be extended to the Saskatchewan. We find that is a more important point than Qu'Appelle, which was at one time the most important point, because every one went in that direction to the North, but now Regina is the more important point.

Mr. MULOCK. When was the agency discontinued at Qu'Appelle?

Mr. CARLING. It was to be discontinued on the 1st of April this year.

Mr. MULOCK. Is the present agent to be appointed to some other position in the service?

Mr. CARLING. He is appointed to fill the vacancy in another agency.

Mr. DAVIN. I am sorry the Minister should have thought fit to take away the agent from Medicine Hat. I think he will find that the country around there is rapidly settling up, and that the agent would still be necessary there. I notice that very small amounts are spent on the agencies in the North-West, and from the tendency of the discussion here I should think that more might be spent in the west and less in the east.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the amount expended on immigration agencies in Canada. Last year the salaries altogether amounted to $46,237. I quite agree with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), that there are a good many places in Canada where these agencies could be dispensed with. I am not prepared to say that Hamilton is one of these places, but I believe that there are other places, for instance, Ottawa, where no agency is needed. Last year the agency in this city cost $1,950, including salaries for the agent, an assistant, and a messenger. Now, we have an agent in Montreal, one in Kingston, one in Toronto and one in Hamilton, and I would like to know where there is any reason for maintaining an agency at an inland town like Ottawa, at an expense of $1,950 a year. Then we have an agency in London. I notice that we have a man there drawing $1,000 a year, and we are paying $366 for a messenger. Now, I cannot understand why it is thought necessary to keep an immigration agent in an inland town like London. I can easily understand why at Toronto, which is a distributing centre, it is necessary to have an agency where the immigrants should receive such instructions as would enable them to reach their destination, as the hon. member for Wentworth suggested should be the case in Montreal. I cannot see, either, that there is much necessity for an agent at Kingston, although there may be a few immigrants coming across from the United States. Then we have agents at inland places like Dunnville, Richmond, Sherbrooke, Deloraine, and places like those, where, in my opinion, there is no necessity whatever that the country should be called to pay large salaries to maintain agents. We have an agent at Moose Jaw, and one at Calgary. We have an expensive agency at Winnipeg, the service of which last year, including the agent's salary, amounted to $6,554.85. Put all these items together, and you find that in the several places we are paying over $46,000 a year for salaries, much of which I think is useless, and many of these agencies, I think, might well be dispensed with. It would be better to close up many of these offices, and confine our operations to the frontier towns and large distributing centres, such as Quebec, Montreal and Toronto, and close up agencies at cities like Ottawa and London, places where very few immigrants arrive. I can easily understand why the agents at these small towns try to show, in their annual reports, that they have done a good deal of work for the money they receive. I notice in some places we have extended reports from agents, showing the amount of work they have done, the number of

immigrants they have received, and all that sort of thing, and this is done in order to show a pretext for keeping the office open in order that these men may continue to draw their salaries.

Mr. SCARTH. The hon. gentleman referred to Winnipeg as an out-of-the way place. We usually hear from hon. gentlemen opposite that we are getting no immigrants in Manitoba, that we are not progressing there at all. I would inform the hon. gentleman that Winnipeg is the centre of distribution for Manitoba and the North-West, as Toronto and Hamilton are for Ontario. The expenditure for Winnipeg, I think, is very small, considering the immense number of immigrants that come to that city with the view of settling in Manitoba and the North-West. The remark of the hon. gentleman affords me an opportunity of saying that I believe the expenditure for this purpose might be very profitably increased in Winnipeg. If these hon. gentlemen opposite wish to see Manitoba and the North-West filling up with inhabitants, they should help us to bring in immigrants, instead of carping at the small expenditure that we find in these estimates. We hear it said, from many points in Ontario, that they have got all the people they need, and do not want any more immigrants in that Province. But we want all the immigrants we can get, and all the expenditure we can get in the interest of immigration.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we can hardly admit the statement that the people of Ontario want no more immigrants. We do not grudge any good fortune to our friends in the North-West, or in any part of the Dominion, and we rejoice with them if their country is filling up; but it must not be inferred from that fact that we reject immigration of a proper kind in Ontario, and I think that the country cannot do better than to improve our system of agencies for dealing with immigrants. I have not followed this discussion very closely, but I do not think that the hon. gentleman will find any expression of opinion on this side of the House that would justify the conclusion being drawn that we are not in favor of the settlement of the North-West; on the contrary, I do not think any person who has the slightest regard for the welfare of the country is not most anxious that the North-West should be filled up at the earliest possible moment. While we are of that opinion, we are still desirous of seeing a wise economy prevail in the administration of the immigration service, and I presume that is the whole drift of the discussion—it is the intention, at all events.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr Davin) made a remark awhile ago that I think needs a little explanation. He says there seems to be a disposition to curtail the expense for immigration purposes in the North-West, and increase it in the eastern portions of this Dominion—I presume he means some of the Maritime Provinces. Now, I would like to ask my hon. friend to point out an instance in the eastern portion of this Dominion where the expense for immigration could be lessened, that is at a point where an agency has been established for any length of time. If the hon. gentleman did not mean to say that, let him retract his unjust statement in regard to the Maritime Provinces, or else let him explain to what he refers.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I believe, as much as does the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that the expenses of the country should be reduced, although I do not say quite so much about it. I differ from him, however, with regard to immigration agencies throughout the country. Whenever immigrants come to a point of distribution it is absolutely necessary that we should have a responsible agent to look after them. I have lived in the neighborhood of London almost since childhood, and this is one of the agencies to which the hon. gentleman took exception and thought useless, and urged that it should be abolished. I am perfectly acquainted with the immigration agent there and I know something of the work he has to do. It is one thing to bring a lot of men or women to a centre, and it is another thing to bring employers and them together. It is the duty of the immigration agent to do this, and I can bear witness to the industry of this agent in years gone by in this respect. The Minister of Agriculture knows as well as I do the labor which this man has gone through, and I can remember years and years ago, when immigration was larger that it is at the present time, the immense amount of work he performed in finding immigrants suitable employment; in fact there was a particular hotel, the Old Waterloo, where arrangements were made to furnish immigrants with board at the cheapest possible terms, and then those who wished to employ those parties went to the agent, who had a list of them made out, and engagements were made. We can all see the absolute necessity for this. These parties come here strangers, and if we have no agents to look after them and to see they are protected, they fall into the hands of those very sharpers to which the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) took exception in regard to Quebec. I have known the London agent for a great many years, and I repeat, he is indefatigable in finding employment for immigrants. I have met him again and again, dozens of times on the street, and he has written me letters again and again asking me if either I or my neighbors required help. Moreover, he has sent parties to my house, seven miles from the city, in the hope that I was requiring help, or perhaps that I could inform immigrants of any neighbors that wanted help. In the immigration season very seldom a day goes by but the agent or some of his clerks are asking information about parties who require help. A record is kept at the office, and I know people who go to the office day after day to enquire respecting immigrants; they register their names there, and ask that the help be sent out to them as soon as suitable parties are found. I understand this system is carried out throughout the country. I remember travelling on the railway in the county of Wellington, when a gentleman, with whom the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is, no doubt, well acquainted, Mr. Farrow, who farms 600 acres, was very much disappointed because, after a trip to the immigration office at Toronto, he had failed to obtain the help he required. Exception has been taken and fault found with the expenses in connection with the Winnipeg agency. I am not going to say that all the expense incurred is necessary, and that the management has been as efficient as possible, but, until proof to the contrary has been furnished, I am bound to assume that such is the case. When in Winnipeg two or three years ago I made particular examination with regard to the work there. I went to the immigration office, and Mr. Metcalfe pointed out the way in which the records were kept, and he showed that they had the record of every immigrant that came there, and they kept trace of them as to where they settled, and so on. I am not going to say that all this information can be furnished, for I understand the Deputy Minister could not furnish that information the other day; but if the work is done as laid out, no fault can be found with the system. It is absolutely necessary in a new country like ours, when we are inviting immigrants to come here from other countries, that we should have agents at distributing points who would look after the immigrants, see they are not imposed, upon, and endeavor to assist them in obtaining employment.

Mr. MULOCK. With respect to the item of $1,000 for the St. John agency: Do I understand that the Minister is quite satisfied that this is a wise expenditure?

Mr. CARLING. The agency at St. John, N B., has been established for a ong time, and it would be very wrong indeed to do away with it at such an important point. I am not prepared to say the number of immigrants that arrived there, but quite a number did arrive. As the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) has said, it is important that we should have an agent there to look after them when they arrive. It would be very wrong indeed to abolish the agency at St. John.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the hon. gentleman say by what means immigrants arrive at St. John, by vessel or how?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot say the exact number that arrived. Some arrived by vessel, others by rail from Halifax, and St. John being a large city and an important point in New Brunswick, and a number of immigrants coming there, it is most important that we should have some officer to look after them on their arrival.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think we require an emigration agent at Miramachi just now to regulate their transport, as so many people are going out of that section of the country.

Mr. CARLING. Are you in favor of sending them out?

Mr. MITCHELL. No, I am in favor of retaining them; but the policy of your Administration is such that it is send ing them out by thousands.

Mr. MULOCK. The report of the agent at St. John up to 31st December, 1888, is incorporated in the report of the Minister of Agriculture, and at page 117, it is stated that the number of immigrants to be dealt with at the St. John office was 231, while the total number arriving in New Brunswick was 1,432. Does the Minister say that 231 immigrants are sufficient to require us to maintain an office at St. John? The hon. Minister told us he cancelled the agency at Qu'Appelle. Surely more than 231 immigrants arrived there? And if the number of immigrants is to be the basis on which an agency is to be retained or cancelled, then I ask why should the Qu'Appelle agency be cancelled and that at St. John retained?

Mr. CARLING. I do not think it necessary to answer that question again. I have already stated the reason why the agency at Qu'Appelle was abolished, and why I think the agency at St. John should be retained. St. John is an important city, and while only 200 immigrants arrived there last year, there may be 2,000 this year, for all we know. No doubt the country is in a prosperous condition, notwithstanding the statement of the hon. member for North umberland (Mr. Mitchell). With the chances of increased steamboat accommodation across the ocean, I have no doubt that St. John will increase as rapidly, if not more so, than any other city in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope the Committee will understand that I am not altogether defending the maintenance of the immigration agency at St. John. If I received as many favors from the Government as the members for the city and county of St. John, I would feel bound to maintain the immigrant agency. I do not think it is of much importance, but I do not wish to say anything against it, because it is in New Brunswick.

Mr. MULOCK. I simply asked, at the beginning of this discussion, if the Minister of Agriculture thought the Government got value for this expenditure? I wish to emphasise this question by asking the hon. gentleman to bear it in mind for the future.

Mr. CARLING. The item would not be in the Estimates if we did not think we got value for it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to ask the Minister why he thinks it right that there should be this increase of one thousand dollars in the expenditure of the immigration office at Winnipeg. I have listened to the remarks of my friend from South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) regarding the Hamilton and London offices, but that gentleman is so much in the habit of trampling on the toes of gentlemen on this side of the House that we do not take much notice of what he says. I think, however, we should have some explanation from the Minister with regard to this increase in the Winnipeg immigration office.

Mr. CARLING. With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), if my hon. friend from South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) is trampling on the toes of hon. gentlemen opposite by telling the truth, I think that the oftener he does so the better. We have recommended that the agency at Emerson be done away with, and we thought it necessary to remove Mr. Têtu to Winnipeg. Mr. Têtu is a French agent, and we have found that a large number of the people from Lower Canada are going to the North-West, so that we have removed him to Winnipeg where his services will be very useful.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What is the salary of Mr. Têtu?

Mr. CARLING. $1,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Has he got the same position at Winnipeg as he had at Emerson?

Mr. CARLING. He is assistant to the Winnipeg agent.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the hon. the Minister if he has at last discovered that this agent was of very little service at Emerson. It has been frequently explained that this gentleman was there for the purpose of ascertaining the number of immigrants who went to Manitoba, and his returns proved very unsatisfactory when laid before the Agriculture Committee. I believe it is right that members on this side of the House should criticise those items, but I would say, that so far as the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories are concerned, that I will approve of the Government increasing the expenditure for immigration purposes there, if the increased expenditure is properly applied. I believe it is the duty of the Government to assist as much as possible people in settling up Manitoba and the North-West, but I must say that the results of their policy in the past have not been satisfactory. I would wish to point out for the information of the Minister that the expenditure for immigration has not had the result of bringing immigrants from a foreign country, but that a large portion of the immigration this year to Manitoba is from the older Provinces of Canada. The appropriation for immigration purposes in Manitoba and the North-West Territories is very small, and I do not think that the expenditure exceeds more than $10,000 this year. I would like that the Government should try to induce as many foreigners to come into that country as possible. It is hard for a member on this side of the House to advocate any increase in the expenditure of the Department of Agriculture after such exhibitions as we have had of agents being employed by the Government, and receiving their money for doing nothing. We had an instance of that kind this forenoon, in the Public Accounts Committee. Mr. Webster is another gentleman who makes a report to the Government of immigration matters, and, I believe, that he is employed in a similar position to that as Mr. Smyth. While I am always in favor of speaking well of our country, I do not think it is well that our immigration agents should be allowed to give statements to the general public which are not true. Mr. Webster, in his report, tells of the work he has been doing for the department in Dakota, and that is a terrible place, and, according to Mr. Webster's report, it is not fit for a person to live in. When we remember, that this miserable, wretched country, is only across the line

from Manitoba, some people may conclude that our country cannot be much better. I do not think that it is necessary to have such reports printed. We have a good, and a very good country, that its advantages over Dakota are worthy of being advertised to the people of the world. I wish to say, that I would like to see the Government spend a little more money in opening up more agencies in Manitoba and the North-West, instead of reducing the expenditure. There are some new sections of the country now opening up for settlement, such as the Lake Dauphin district, which is a splendid tract of country. I think that it would be a very good expenditure if agencies were established at the terminus of the Manitoba and South-Western Railway and of the Manitoba North-Western Railway. It is important that settlers coming there to prospect with the intention of settling on the lands, or of inducing others to settle there, should be in charge of some agent who would show them through the country and point out to them the parts which are valuable for settlement. I believe that it would materially assist in the settlement of Manitoba and the North-West if we had agents at the points I have mentioned, and others which are just of as much importance. I believe that the work done by Mr. Graham, in Winnipeg, is giving very general satisfaction, but the trouble is that Mr. Graham has not got enough outside agents and he has to be all the time in Winnipeg. From what we have seen of the result of an expenditure made by the Local Government, under the immigration system they have inaugurated, I believe that it can only be a matter of regret that the work of the Dominion Government in this direction in the past has not proved more satisfactory. There are more settlers going into Manitoba this year from different parts than there have been during the past five years. I need not say what I think are the reasons for this, but one of the reasons, I believe, is the immigration policy adopted by the Local Government. They have agents in different places, they send exhibits all over, and they have a very fine exhibit in the city of Toronto opposite the Walker House, showing the agricultural and mineral products of Manitoba. The agent there goes out to the different sections of the Province of Ontario and delivers lectures before farmers' institutes. I believe that those agents of the Provincial Government are doing a good work. If good men were employed by this Government to do the work in a proper manner I should certainly approve of the Government making a large appropriation for immigration purposes, whereby they would assist in the early settlement of Manitoba and the North-West.

Mr. CARLING. I would say in reply to the hon. gentleman that no reduction has been made in the appropriation for the Province of Manitoba, with the exception of reducing the expenses for the Emerson agency. The agency at Winnipeg is still being continued, and perhaps its facilities have been increased for doing the work there. We are also continuing the agency at Brandon. I think that the hon. gentleman will find that the Dominion Government have rendered very great assistance in inducing immigrants from Ontario to go to Manitoba and the North-West. He has referred to Mr. Webster, who was employed by the Government to visit Dakota and Manitoba, and he has disputed some of the statements that gentleman has made. I believe that gentleman to be a true and thoroughly patriotic Canadian, who has no interest to serve but the good of his country, and the statements he has made he believes to be true. That gentleman has been summoned to appear before the Committee on Public Accounts, when I hope the hon. gentleman will make the statements which he has made here to-day; and if I am not mistaken, Mr. Webster will be able to convince the hon. gentleman and the Committee that the statements he has made are strictly accurate.

Mr. WATSON,

Mr. McMULLEN. There is one part of the hon. gentleman's statement which I will agree with, that Mr. Webster is a true and patriotic Canadian, only I would put in the place of Canadian, the word Tory.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I agree with the Minister in the propriety of abolishing the office at Emerson, but I have a decided objection to moving Mr. Têtu to Winnipeg, on the grounds the Minister has represented to us. I think both Ontario and Quebec immigrants who go to Manitoba are, as a rule, able to take care of themselves. Our experience of Mr. Têtu and of the kind of returns he made in former years, when we sifted them in the Immigration Committee, are not such as to satisfy me of his fitness for any immigration office. That operation of counting the immigrants that went into Manitoba —I may as well tell the truth about it—I believe was a downright swindle. I believe he was only a salary drawer at Emerson, and his official returns were utter failures; and I do protest against continuing him at Winnipeg simply to continue a salary drawer. If we are going to do anything to improve our immigration system, let us apply the pruning knife where there is an opportunity of doing some good, and let us not transfer a man from a place where he has been of no use to Winnipeg where he will be of as little use. I may as well say that I think it is a fraud on the Immigration Department to perform such an operation. I think the time has arrived when the Dominion Government, and the Government of Manitoba, may fairly consider how far they can combine their resources in the administration of immigration affairs in that Province. I am satisfied that there is no man in this House who is at all unwilling to expend even a large amount of money for immigration purposes in Manitoba and the North-West, if we can only secure some return for it; but as for transferring an officer who does nothing to advance the interest of immigration, I think the sooner that is stopped the better. I think there is reasonable ground, as the hon. member for Marquette suggests, for having in various localties some men who would have a certain reputation for local information, and who would be reliable, to aid parties in obtaining possession of lands and locating; but if we are going to accomplish anything in that direction, it is not by increasing our staff at Winnipeg. It is not at that point that immigrants require to be taken care of. Everyone acquainted with our immigration system for the last few years knows how thoroughly that system broke down; and while we are very anxious to have that country settled up, there is no use closing our eyes to the fact that the best part of the immigration that went into Manitoba and the North-West has been composed of people from the older Provinces without any effort on the part of the Government With regard to the employment of such agents as Mr. Henry Smyth and Mr. Webster, I think the Government might find better ways of rewarding their friends than by employing them in immigration positions. Perhaps that subject will come up again; but I may say that my experience of Mr. Webster leads me to believe that while he may be a very honest immigration agent, his chief value to the Government has been in connection with the missionary labors he has performed throughout Ontario whenever an election has been imminent or on hand. If his work has been satisfactory to the Government in that direction, I suppose we have to submit to be bled a little occasionally; but I think we may as well tell the truth about the way that immigration agency has been employed.

Mr. LA RIVIÈRE. I did not intend to take part in this debate, but owing to the way in which the question is now drifting, I am bound to say something, because one of the agencies in my own constituency is referred to. But before referring to that matter, I must say that I am somewhat

astounded at the remarks made by the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain). The hon. gentleman is complaining, and he is bound to complain, I suppose, being on that side of the House, that appointees of the Government are always at fault. I may tell him that this Mr. Têtu is an appointee of his own friends. While I regret exceedingly that the Government has had to withdraw the agency at Emerson, I agree at the same time with the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) that we ought perhaps to have more agencies in Manitoba than we have had hitherto; but I understand why the hon. Minister has thought advisable to withdraw the Emerson agency under existing circumstances, because the passengers coming into the Province are not coming through Emerson to-day; they are coming chiefly through Gretna and very few through West Lynne. It is true, West Lynne is close to Emerson, but an agency which is kept for the express object of receiving the immigrants had better perhaps be at the meeting point, that is, at Winnipeg. I do not agree with the hon. member for Wentworth that no agent should be appointed, on account of his nationality, as appears to be the case in regard to Mr. Têtu, because, I may tell the hon. gentleman, that we are actually receiving a very large immigration, speaking the French language, not simply from Lower Canada, but from the old country, France and Belgium; there are 150 Belgians now on their way to Manitoba, and therefore the Government are in duty bound to have officers in the immigration department who can understand their language. I presume that the object of the Minister in removing Mr. Têtu to Winnipeg is to have that officer there to meet those people, whose language he understands, and to facilitate their settlement in our Province. Anyone who has followed the progress of immigration in Manitoba will find that this is a very exceptional and a very good year for that Province. No less than 5,000 immigrants have already arrived, during the last month or so, in the city of Winnipeg, and they are not all coming from the eastern Provinces, as we are led to suppose. They come from the States, to a very large extent; they come from the old country too, and, therefore, I believe that it is to our advantage to spend as much money as possible in the Province of Manitoba for the advancement of immigration. I am not very sanguine that any success will be achieved by the present Local Government, and what success we have I do not think we can attribute to their efforts. I am somewhat scandalised at the remarks made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), in referring to this report on Dakota. The hon. gentleman appears to be sorry that an official of our Government should find out that Dakota offers less advantages than the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. WATSON. No.

Mr. LA RIVIÈRE. The hon. member says that the two countries are situated exactly alike and that the only difference between them is the division line——

Mr. WATSON. No.

Mr. LA RIVIÈRE—one being on the north and the other on the south. At any rate there is a difference between the Province of Manitoba and the present State of Dakota, and the difference is to the advantage of Manitoba. If it is not altogether in the quality of the soil, it is in the laws of the country; it is in the land regulations in force; it is in the quantity of snow that they have and that we have not; and it is in the frost and the blizzards they enjoy and which we have not. Therefore, I am not at all astonished that an official of our Government should have found out those things which are generally known in the west. It would be well that the report of the official sent up there should be published, so that the public at large may find out that Manitoba offers greater advantages to immigrants than the State of Dakota.

Committee rose, and, it being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Assistant Agent, Vancouver..... $1,200

Mr. MARA. I would draw the attention of the hon. the Minister to the fact that the agent at Victoria only receives $1,000, while the agent at Vancouver receives $1,200. The officer in Victoria has held the position ten years, and yet receives less than the officer in Vancouver, who has only been newly appointed.

Mr. CARLING. We have not appointed a new agent at Vancouver, but we transferred the agent at Medicine Hat to that place at the same salary he had at Medicine Hat.

Mr. MARA. It appears like discrimination. Here are two towns side by side. In one the agent has held the position for ten years, and, consequently, must have been a good and efficient officer, and yet he only receives $1,000. While in the other, where the office is new, the agent receives $1,200. That does not appear to be right. Either the old officer should have his salary increased or the salary of the other should be cut down.

Mr. CARLING. The officer at Medicine Hat has been transferred from there to Vancouver. As a very large number of immigrants are going into Vancouver, it is important to have a man of experience there such as the agent at Medicine Hat.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Am I to understand that the duties at Vancouver are greater than those at Victoria?

Mr. CARLING. I think they are, and they will be much greater than they are at Victoria.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Had the hon. gentleman any reliable information given to him before making the appointment, as to the necessity of the appointment and the probable amount of work that would be required?

Mr. CARLING. I have had applications from the council of the town of Vancouver. Resolutions were passed by the municipality of Vancouver, and petitions were sent by the inhabitants there a year ago, asking the establishment of an agency there, on account of the large number of people coming in from the United States, to give such information as was required.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I hope, when we get these agents changed, we will be able to stop that leakage which I hear some hon. friends opposite state is taking place in that part of the country. It is a very discouraging feature of our immigration system, and it appears that British Columbia is no exception to the rule. There has been a very decided leakage, according to some statements made by these western men, and the returns show that the only immigration to British Columbia during the last year amounted to a little over 3,000, so that it should not take very many agents to manage that.

Mr. MARA. The appointment of an officer at Vancouver will do a great deal to stop the leakage referred to. He can stop intending settlers from taking the Sound steamers, which the agent at Victoria cannot do.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the Minister should act on the suggestion of the North-West Council, and arrange for special agents in the interest of the North-West in the outlying Provinces and in England. The Minister has got the memorial before him, and, as he is cutting down our agencies in the North-West, he might easily make that up by adopting the suggestion of the North-West Council,

Mr. TROW. I would like to ask the Minister where there are lands within a reasonable distance of Vancouver on which to locate the settlers when they arrive there?

Mr. CARLING. I am not prepared to say where the lands are. A good deal of the settlement has come from the United States by way of Vancouver, and we want it to be known to those who come, that the agricultural and mining interests of the country are suitable, though I cannot at present say exactly where the lands are which we propose to give them.

Mr. TROW. Will the Minister state what class of immigrants arrive there, what is their occupation or their employment, whether they are miners, or fishermen, or what?

Mr. MARA. The majority of the immigrants have been farmers, and a great many lumbermen have gone there also. There is a large quantity of excellent farming land in the delta of the Fraser as well as in the district of Chilliwack, and there are no better farming lands than in the Sumas country, Chilliwack, and on the lower portion of the Fraser. There are also many islands on the west coast and north of Vancouver Island, which are capable of receiving settlers. If there is no agent at Vancouver, these people take the steamer, as I have stated, for Puget Sound, and they are lost to the Province; but, when we have an agent there, information can be given by which these people will have their choice, either of remaining on the Fraser, or of going to the north, or to Vancouver Island. I may say further that settlers pay a lower rate for their passage to the coast than they do to the interior, and many can be induced to return by an agent who is able to give them reliable information there.

Mr. FISHER. I see that the Minister boasted this afternoon that he had lessened the expenditure at these points; but we find that the agent at Emerson has been removed to Winnipeg, and that there has been a corresponding increase in the expenditure at Winnipeg. Then the agent at Medicine Hat has been removed to Vancouver, and there is a new establishment there, so that the decrease which the hon. gentleman told us about this afternoon can only refer to the closing of the office at Qu'Appelle. I would like to ask if the Minister has not provided for Mr. Baker, who used to be the agent at Qu'Appelle, in the same generous manner as he has for the rest?

Mr. CARLING. I stated this afternoon that Mr. Baker had been transferred to another agency.

Mr. FISHER. Then they are all provided for?

Mr. CARLING. I stated that, as Mr. Têtu is a highly intelligent and efficient French Canadian, and a large number of French were going into Winnipeg, it was thought desirable to have someone there who thoroughly understood the French language. We have also information that there are many Belgians coming there this year; so we removed Mr. Têtu to Winnipeg, as an assistant to the present agent.

Mr. FISHER. Where has Mr. Baker gone?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Bennett, the agent at Brandon, will be removed to Winnipeg, and Mr. Baker will take his place at Brandon.

Mr. FISHER. Is that an addition to the Winnipeg office?

Mr. CARLING. No; the agent at Winnipeg has asked for leave of absence, with the view of resigning, and Mr. Bennett will take his place.

Mr. FISHER. Will the agent at Winnipeg get a superannuation or a retiring allowance?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Are these agents allowed to absent themselves from their posts without leave from the department?

Mr. CARLING. No, they are not.

Mr. MULOCK. When was that rule adopted?

Mr. CARLING. That has always been the case, though, if they apply for leave and it is reasonable that they should obtain it, they get it.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the hon. gentlemen will remember that, in 1888, reference was made to the case of this same Mr. Baker to whom the Minister has referred. On that occasion, it appeared that Mr. Baker had without leave, as the Minister said, absented himself from his office and had come to Russell county and had done a certain amount of immigration work there during the election, which was a Dominion by-election. On that occasion the Minister stated to the House that he did not know that this immigration agent had left his office, but that he had heard that he had appointed a substitute, which appeared to be quite right. The Minister, of course, did not know that this agent of his had left his place at a time when he ought to have been at Qu'Appelle, and came down here. But it seems to the Minister all right, and he gave the House to understand a year ago that it was quite permissable for an agent in his department to absent himself without leave. I am glad he has turned over a new leaf now, and that he is going to require them to attend to their business. But we have heard to-day, and before to-day, of many persons employed in the Department of the Minister of Agriculture, going round the country as agents during election time. We had his "good friend, Mr. Webster," who, he says, is so reliable a man, plying the business of immigration agent in ridings where there are elections going on. So with the case of Mr. Smyth, ex-M.P., so with Mr. Baker, ex M. P. They are stationed nominally at Qu'Appelle or Regina, but it does not seem to make any difference where they are stationed, because these are merely nominal offices, the same as you give a local habitation to a corporation, and that is everywhere. So these men travel the world over at their own sweet wills, wherever there is a by-election going on, and their travelling expenses are charged to the Immigration Department. Is that a proper way to use the funds of the Immigration Department? Is that honest? Is the hon. gentleman proud of that way of dealing with the public money? He knows that has happened, he knows it is happening. He knows that Mr. Baker absented himself without leave. Does the hon. gentleman not remember——

Mr. CARLING. If the hon. gentleman will allow me—I do not remember what took place that year, but I know that all officers of the Government are granted leave of absence during certain seasons of the year. At the seat of the Government, I think each officer is allowed three weeks leave of absence; that is customary in the departments, and the same custom prevails with respect to the agents. Mr. Baker might take his leave of absence then, applying for it, notifying the department of his intention to take his leave of absence, which he could obtain provided the work was properly carried on during his absence. Mr. Baker would not require to ask me for leave of absence, if he was taking holidays in the winter or in the summer time. Mr. Baker had a right to take his holidays, and I could not object.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there no regular period when they are to take their holidays?

Mr. CARLING. No regular period.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Baker, then, is allowed to take his holidays at a time when, of all times, he ought to be at the post of duty?

Mr. CARLING. I do not know that, because I do not think the time when he took his holidays was at a time when the business of his office was so very pressing.

Mr. MULOCK. It may not have been, but it was in the month of May, 1888. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Debates of last Session he will find that on the 2nd of May, 1888, it was admitted by the hon. gentleman himself that at that particular time Mr. Baker, the immigration agent at the town of Qu'Appelle, was in Russell County canvassing.

Mr. CARLING. Yes, he had a perfect right to be there.

Mr. MULOCK. He had a perfect right to absent himself at the time?

Mr. CARLING. I have already said that he had.

Mr. MULOCK. Was not that at a time when immigration was brisk?

Mr. CARLING. He had a right to ask his holidays at any season of the year, in winter or in summer. He did not get his holidays twice, I am safe in saying.

Mr. MULOCK. He had a perfect right to ask for holidays, and it was not a wise exercise of discretion to give them at a time when, of all times, he ought to have been at his duty. Of course the hon. gentleman can afford to disregard the public service in trying to promote the election of a political friend, but that is not in the public interest. The hon. gentleman thinks that the Immigration Department, and all the offices at his disposal, are to be used for campaign purposes to keep him there. I repeat that this is nothing more than a gross breach of trust. It is just what the Public Accounts Committee have shown, to-day, as the outcome of the hon gentleman's administration. Now, before the Session closes, we hear of one of the most fraudulent cases that could possibly take place, right under the hon. gentleman's own eyes, and the account is sent in for immigration work. The whole thing is a fraud, I believe every bit of it is a fraud. The Minister talks about his "friend, Mr. Webster." Where was Mr. Webster doing his immigration work? In Haldimand, in all the counties where by-elections were going on.

Mr. CARLING. Do you know he was in Haldimand during the time he was employed by the Government?

Mr. MULOCK. I am told he was.

Mr. McMULLEN. We know he was by the Public Accounts, by the accounts that he sent in himself, and we will prove it by the Public Accounts Committee to-morrow. By an order of this House he sent in the return of his services and the different places where he had been, and in that return there is a charge for expenses from Kingston to Haldimand, and Haldimand back again to Kingston, during the election campaign.

Mr. CARLING. What year was that in?

Mr. McMULLEN. During the last election that took place in Haldimand.

Mr. CARLING. I can only say to the hon. gentleman that he is quite mistaken. I say there is no account in the department for Mr. Webster for over a year. I state to this House that the hon. gentleman is making a statement that is totally untrue. Mr. Webster did not receive a dollar from the Govertment during the time of the last election in Haldimand.

Mr. McMULLEN. I challenge the hon. gentleman to appear before the next meeting of the Public Accounts Committee, and if I do not prove that in his own handwriting are receipts for moneys actually received from the department for expenses for going to the county of Haldimand to attend the election, that he was there during the election, that he left there two days before the election was over, and came back home, then I will take my statement back.

Mr. CARLING. Now, Mr. Speaker, I state here before the House that I challenge the hon. gentleman to make that statement before the Committee, because Mr. Webster was not employed by the Government during the last Haldimand election, and there has been no account rendered. The only account here is up to the 30th of April, 1888.

Mr. McMULLEN. He was in the service of the Government from the 30th of April.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. While on this question, I would like the Minister to explain what are the duties of travelling immigration agents like Mr. Webster and Mr. Smyth. Now, we had in the Public Accounts Committee, last week, Mr. Lowe, the Deputy Minister, giving evidence, and he declared that Mr. Smyth had a roving commission, that he was appointed as an agent for six months in a year. We had the accounts to show that he was paid $100 per month, and $2 per day and travelling expenses besides. Mr. Lowe declared before the Committee that Mr. Smyth had a roving commission to travel anywhere he pleased all over the North American continent. I think it would be well for the Minister to explain to this House just exactly what duties are required of these men who are given these roving commissions like Mr. Smyth and Mr. Webster. I do not know that this is a proper time to enter into a discussion in regard to Mr. Smyth's account, which has been investigated partly in the Public Accounts Committee to-day. But there may be another opportunity before the close of the Session, and, in the meantime, I would like the Minister to explain what are the duties required of men like Mr. Smith and Mr. Webster.

Mr. CARLING. I dare say the hon. gentleman has read the letter of instructions that was given to Mr. Smyth and Mr. Webster.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The letter was asked for to-day, but it has not been brought down.

Mr. CARLING. I will read the letter:

"OTTAWA, 30th April, 1887.

"SIR,—I have an instruction from the Minister of Agriculture to say to you, that in view of the actual circumstances in relation to settlement in Manitoba and the Canadian North-West, he desires to engage your services for a period of six months from this date, for the purpose of promoting immigration to Manitoba and the Canadian North-West.

"He desires you to meet, in as far as possible, the efforts which are being made by agents of the United States railway and land companies, who are actively distributing their pamphlets, maps and other publications in Canada, in order to neutralise them, in as far as possible, and also to divert such emigration as might be moved from the old Provinces of Canada by the influence of such publications, to the Canadian North-West, where it is believed the advantages are equal, if not superior.

"It is also the desire of the Minister that you should visit the adjoining North-Western States, and take the opportunity to visit some of the Canadian settlements which have been located in them, in order to ascertain the facts, in as far as possible, as to the state and prospects of such settlements, and what comparison they bear to similar conditions in Manitoba and the Canadian North-West, as regards the soil, climate and railway facilities, land laws and regulations, &c.

"The facts ascertained should be reported to the department for the information of the Minister, and you should utilise the facts you find, in order to give effect, in as far as you can, to the object of your mission.

"You will generally act under the verbal instructions conveyed to you by the Minister.

"The rate of pay for such services will be $100 per month, with an allowance of $2 per day for boarding expenses, and the cost of moving expenses, such as railway fares and other conveyances which you may find it necessary to use. All expenditures of this nature must be accompanied, as far as possible, with vouchers, and in all cases, the dates and names of railway stations between which tickets are purchased should be furnished in accordance with the requirements in such matters of the Audit Act.

"It is the desire of the Minister that you should make monthly reports of your operations, or more frequently, in the event of occurrences which you may consider it important for the Minister to know.

"I have, &c.,
(Signed) "J. LOWE,
"Acting Deputy Minister of Agriculture.

"HENRY SMYTH, Esq.,
"Chatham, Ontario."

That was the letter sent t Mr. Smyth to guide him in his travels in the North-West and in the Western States. I may say that we found in Canada a very large number of American railway agents and land agents doing everything possible to induce our people to go to the Western States, and I regret very much they have drawn such very fine pictures of Dakota and other Western States that a great many of our young men have been induced to go there. I felt it was the duty of the department to try to counteract that emigration, and to do so I selected a gentleman who had been a member of this House, who had had the confidence of a very important constituency for a number of years. The people who knew him best elected him as their representative twice, and he was defeated by a small majority, I believe, in 1887, and I thought a gentleman who had enjoyed the confidence of his neighbors and constituents, and who had been a faithful representative in this House, was qualified and competent to discharge the duties to which he was appointed. I believe he did his best to persuade the people of our own country, especially in the western part of it, and I know a very large quantity of immigration literature was distributed by him, especially in the western part of Canada. I have no doubt it had a very good effect, and we find now, that, through the speeches, and the canvassing, and the distribution of information to our people in Canada, the tide has turned to our country, instead to Dakota. I am not ashamed to stand here, and defend the appointment of Mr. Smyth. If Mr. Smyth has done anything wrong, it is for hon. gentlemen opposite to prove it. I do not think the salary of $100 a month, and $2 per day for travelling expenses, are a very extravagant charge. Hon. gentlemen opposite have brought this matter before a Committee of the House, and it is hardly fair for the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), and the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville), when they have the case before a Committee, and have witnesses to try and prove a case against him, to bring forward the subject now. If they can establish a case against Mr. Smyth, it is not a matter for me, because I acted fairly and squarely with Mr. Smyth, and I expected that he did the same with the Government. The same remark applies to Mr. Webster. He is a most active and efficient man, and I think he has rendered great service to his country. I believe no better man could have been selected than Mr. Webster, and I instructed him to visit Minnesota, Dakota and the North-West, and he visited them, not as an officer of the Government, but as a farmer, and without letting the people of the districts know that he was employed by the Government, believing that under such circumstances he would be more apt to get the information he wanted. That information has been published in pamphlet form and distributed among members. Mr. Webster will be before the Committee, to-morrow, and if hon. gentlemen opposite have any charges to make against him, and if they can prove that he acted unfairly and made false statements, it is for those hon. gentlemen to make their charges to-morrow, and I shall guarantee that Mr. Webster will be able to satisfy the Committee that he acted honestly and faithfully to his country and has induced thousands to go to the North-West who would have gone to Dakota.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to read a letter from a constituent of mine, whose opinion, I am sure when I mention his name, will be accepted by many members of this House who know the gentleman, as to what Mr. Webster is doing in regard to our North-West country. The letter is dated 14th March, 1889, and is dated from Limehurst and is signed by Henry Green. It says:

"GEO. TAYLOR, Esq., M.P.

"DEAR SIR,—Some days ago, Mr. W. A. Webster gave us a splendid lecture in R. W. Copeland's hall. The subject was: 'Our North-West.' His recommendation of this country, as a field for our young men in which to settle and to make money, was good. In my humble opinion, we should have in the field more such men as Mr. Webster, who would, I believe, tend to counteract those Grits who constantly, in the House and out of the House, are running down our country."

That is the opinion not only of the gentleman who is the writer of this letter, but, I believe, it is the opinion of a great many others.

Mr. MITCHELL. Give us the whole of the letter; do not spare your friends.

Mr. TAYLOR. It relates to the Budget, and not to Mr. Webster.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it is the hon. gentleman's duty to read the whole of it.

Mr. TAYLOR. It may be my duty, but I do not propose doing so. As we have this matter under investigation before the Public Accounts Committee, it is very unkind for the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) to say that the account is a bogus affair from beginning to end, when the hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Smyth swore that every dollar in the account had been expended in the interest of the Government. That was his statement. He acknowledged the fact that, as regards the details, the clerk who made out the account might have been mistaken, but so far as the amount was concerned every dollar had been expended. While the matter is being investigated by the Committee, it is very unfair, I say, for the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) to bring it here and say it is a bogus affair from beginning to end and an imposition on the Government and on the country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I was going to say, when I was interrupted by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor)——

Mr. TAYLOR. I had the floor first.

Mr. SOMERVILLE—that the Minister of Agriculture evidently entertained a very high opinion of some of the gentlemen who have occupied positions in his department. He entertains a very high opinion of Mr. Webster. For my part I cannot say that I know much about Mr. Webster, but I must say that I know a great deal about Mr. Smyth. We have learned a great deal about Mr. Smyth to-day, and I must say that the Minister of Agriculture, after being present in the Public Accounts Committee and hearing Mr. Smyth's evidence with regard to his account, amounting to some fifteen hundred dollars for services said to have been rendered to the Agriculture Department, that if the Minister continues to entertain a high opinion of Mr. Smyth, after hearing the evidence that Mr. Smyth himself gave with regard to the correctness of that account, he must not set up his agents on a very high standard when he chooses to admire them. Every gentleman who was present on that Committee must have formed a different opinion. I only refer to the matter now because it has been already alluded to. I did not introduce the subject with regard to Mr. Smyth at all, except to ask the Minister what were the instructions given to those outside agents of the department. Now that the matter has been brought up, I think it is nothing but right that I should continue the debate that has been started on this question. We had Mr. Smyth before the Public Accounts Committee to-day, and he was examined with regard to the correctness of the account which he had rendered to the department for services. We had this man who stands so high in the esteem of

the Minister of Agriculture, declaring that from the first charge in that account, which was made some time in the month of June, up to the last item charged at the end of November, that he could not certify to the correctness of one single charge that was made. He could say, as he did say, that the amount was right. He could state that he expended this money in the interest of the Government, but he could not say, as he declared in the presence of the Minister of Agriculture—he could not say that one single item in that account was correct as far as dates were concerned. The Minister of Agriculture read out to us to-night the instructions given to Mr. Smyth when he was appointed to this position, and these instructions declared that he must give day and date and vouchers to the Government for the expenditure of the money and for his expenses. Mr. Smyth did not do that. He gave dates, but how did he give those dates? He pretended to have a memorandum or a diary in which he kept an account of all his transactions.

Mr. CARLING. I wish to rise to a point of order. This case was before the Committee to-day and is to be before the Committee to-morrow. The evidence has not been concluded, nor reported to the House yet, and I think it is unfair for the hon. gentleman to state to this House that every member of that Committee condemned Mr. Smyth, when there was no vote taken or no decision of the Committee arrived at. We are yet waiting for further evidence and further deliberation on the part of the Committee.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I did not start this discussion at all.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. RYKERT). I was going to call the member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) to order for referring to proceedings now before the Public Accounts Committee. It is quite irregular and quite improper so to do. The rule laid down by Bourinot at page 448 is:

"Until a Committee report, it is irregular to refer to its proceedings in debate in the House. For instance, in the Session of 1873, Mr Huntington was proceeding to refer to certain papers and letters relative to an important matter under the consideration of a Select Committee: but the Speaker decided, in accordance with English precedents, that they could not be read in the House."

I am quite satisfied that the discussion is out of order and that the subject had no right to be referred to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not rise for the purpose of disputing your ruling, Mr. Chairman, for I believe it is quite in accordance with previous rulings on the subject, but I think under the circumstances that either this whole item, or, at any rate, one portion of it should be reserved so as to afford an opportunity, before this matter is disposed of, for discussion; it bears on the whole conduct of the immigration branch of the Department of Agriculture, and there is no doubt that a discussion must be had upon it in this House. If a single item could be reserved and the rest proceeded with, I think that it would suit the convenience of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that would be right at all. There can be a full discussion about these two gentlemen whose names have been mentioned either on Concurrence or on the report of the Committee of Public Accounts. It is quite absurd that some items must be stopped—allowed to lay over because some collateral point has arisen or some charge like this is brought against some Government employé. If that were done we would never get along in the world. This discussion is not relevant to the subject at all. We are discussing the comparative salaries of agents at Victoria and Vancouver, and this has no more reference to those subjects than the man in the moon has. It is a simple waste of time, and besides, it is breaking every parliamentary rule and every rule of common fairness to bring up charges against a party which are yet under consideration.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The charge has not been made against Mr. Smyth. The charge is made against the Government for wilfully squandering the public money and paying it out to a man who rendered no service for it.

The CHAIRMAN. It has nothing to do with the present matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have had a good deal of ground, and very just ground, for complaining of the mode in which the money voted to the Government for immigration services has been used. One of those grounds (and one of the worst grounds) is that over and over again men have been employed by the department who, as we allege, are mere political hacks, who do no service to the country, and who have been used at every by-election through this country, and while under pay from this department, for political services to the Administration. Mr. Smyth's case, I am informed, is a notable instance of that. I do not know, however, that it comes under this item, but the right hon. gentleman will see that, apart from what is decided by the Committee, we have a right to discuss the mode in which the Government have been using the vote for the employment of certain parties improperly. The First Minister knows that I am in the right when I say that that comes under the purview of this Committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, not this Committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh, certainly. We have a perfect right to discuss how you disposed of the money voted last year. Over and over again, while I was sitting on the Treasury benches, it was done for hours together, and notably, I think, by the late Mr. Plumb. We have always taken the position that that can be done while we are voting money for the future year. What is the use of the Auditor General's Report if we are not entitled to discuss the mode in which you applied the money you got for the past year, and of which alone we have a perfect account. As regards what passed in the Public Accounts Committee, I hardly think my hon. friend (Mr. Somerville), except by consent of the House, can go any further, but he can bring up the question *de novo* when any item is under discussion cognate to this, or having reference to any similar services to those in which Mr. Smyth was employed. I think that is correct.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To a certain extent the doctrine laid down by the hon. gentleman is true. There may be some general item which will bring up legitimately a discussion on the course of the Government, or the whole matter can be brought up on Concurrence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not well, on Concurrence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It can be brought up on the report of the Committee on Public Accounts. The hon. gentleman will see that, besides the unfairness of this proceeding, we would never get through if we were to have a lengthened discussion on every item, on the policy of the Government or on the alleged crimes of the present Administration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That brings very forcibly into notice the complaint that I have made repeatedly, that we have got into the pernicious habit of lumping together some twenty or thirty items under one head. That was not the case formerly, and I do not think it ought to be the case now. If those items were separate there would be no difficulty about allowing one of them to remain over for discussion. What is the necessity of mixing up "salaries," "expenses of Canadian agencies," and "aids to women's protection societies" under one vote. That was the reason that I made the suggestion that one

item might stand over, as I think it would be for the convenience of the House and for the convenience of the Government. It may be true that it is only on the last item that this discussion can arise.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to enquire, Mr. Chairman, if a discussion on the expenses connected with travelling agents is in order. We are taking special votes for the agents, and we are taking special votes for the assistant agents, and while we take those votes we would be justified in supposing that the travelling agents should also be discussed, when they are figuring in the Public Accounts as travelling agents. If it is not proper to discuss this under the head of agents or assistant agents, tell me under which of these items it can arise? We desire to have, and we intend to have, a discussion on travelling agent W. A. Webster, and when can that come up?

Mr. CARLING. That is paid out of the last item.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then, I think, it would have been better that Mr. Webster should have appeared as a travelling agent, as the Public Accounts describe him, and then we would not have been stopped in discussing these estimates. It is a curious thing to lump his pay in the last item of charges towards immigration and immigration expenses. But I have not the slightest doubt the Committee will wait until that item is reached, and then the discussion will be had.

Mr. LAURIER. We have fallen into another pernicious habit, of rushing into Concurrence of these resolutions when we are close on prorogation, and if we follow the same practice this Session, we must take more time to discuss these items in Committee.

Mr. MITCHELL. The leader of the Opposition has just taken the word I intended to utter out of my mouth. Whenever the right hon. gentlemen is hard pressed, he refers to rules and practices that have been in use, and he tells us that we can have this matter up on Concurrence. We know that Concurrence is rushed through at the end of the Session at a galloping rate, and there is no opportunity then of discussing these matters. I can tell the hon. gentleman that he will get on far better with these items if he pursues a reasonable course, and does not put too strict an application on our rules and practices. What I would suggest about the present case is this: There are two items yet unpassed by the Committee under which we would have a right to discuss Mr. Webster's or Mr. Smyth's case. As Mr. Smyth's case is yet before the Committee on Public Accounts, I think you have correctly ruled that we should not discuss it; but I hold that the two items—contingencies, and the last item, towards immigration and immigration expenses—should be held over in order to enable gentlemen to discuss this matter. We are all anxious to bring the Session to a close, and if the hon. gentleman is not too strict in his application of the rules, he will get on a great deal better.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. First Minister has objected to any discussion on an item not yet reached. I contend that as this vote is all under one head (No. 52) any member has a right to speak with regard to any item under that head, and that if you reserve one item you have to reserve the whole vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is right in one sense. This is one resolution, and the items may be discussed. I suppose if any hon. gentleman chose, he might commence at the foot and go on upwards to the first item; but it was agreed some years ago, apparently by both sides, that it was much more convenient to put in one resolution the supplies relating to a particular service; but to prevent any inconvenience, and in order to enable hon. members to discuss freely the different items, it was understood that they should be ready to discuss the votes one after the other as they went on. That is the only sensible way in which a reasonable discussion can be carried on. I would suggest that we go on, if it pleases the Committee, and pass all the items except the last one, and it will be understood that when we meet again the discussion shall be confined to that one item, and it is a general item under which this question can be discussed.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understand, then that this item is to be reserved until the investigation in the Public Accounts Committee with regard to Mr. Smyth's account is completed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; I have no objection to that.

Mr. MULOCK. The explanation offered by the First Minister, I think, is entirely satisfactory, and it really shows the House that the discussion has been in entire order. As this resolution is presented as a whole, though embracing a great many items, however unreasonable it might be that we should refer to an item that is not the subject matter of discussion, yet technically it is in order. The Minister of Agriculture himself referred to the doings of one of his agents, Mr. Baker.

Mr. CARLING. My attention was called to that.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman himself, in answer to a question from the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), began to discuss the case of Mr. Baker and his removal from Qu'Appelle to another place. The question was referred to again after dinner as an illustration of the grievances springing up in the department, and we have had a crop of Mr. Baker's employés engaging in this guerilla election warfare referred to here. If it is to be understood that one or two of these items shall stand over, this question may rest.

Mr. WATSON. Does the hon. gentleman intend giving up the work formerly done by Mr. Têtu, of keeping count of the immigrants?

Mr. CARLING. It is the intention to withdraw the agency.

Mr. WATSON. Is the work of keeping count of the immigrants coming in and going out of the country not to be continued?

Mr. CARLING. It will be discontinued.

Mr. WATSON. Does the hon. gentleman think that work a failure in the past, or unnecessary?

Mr. CARLING. The people who go to the North-West now go by way of the Canadian Pacific Railway and by Port Arthur. We do not think it any longer necessary to keep an agent there.

Mr. WATSON. He made a report of 7,000 going in last year and 2,000 going out. Will the hon. gentleman not consider that of any importance?

Contigencies--Canadian Agency. \$16,000

Mr. FISHER. How do you make that reduction?

Mr. CARLING. There is a reduction at Medicine Hat, in connection with which agency there were contingencies, and there is a reduction at Qu'Appelle and Emerson, where the agencies have been discontinued. There are also reductions in other agencies.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can easily see, in looking over the Auditor General's Report, how the hon. Minister could easily make a reduction of \$5,000. Will the hon. gentleman turn to page C—144 of the Auditor General's Report, and he will notice that in one item, the London agency, there are expenses, \$444, for which there are no vouchers,

Mr. CARLING. The vouchers have been produced. They had not arrived at the time the Auditor General made up his report, but they have been produced since.

Mr. FISHER. It is very easy in contingencies to put down, in a rough way, a lesser sum, and then boast of the great reduction, but we should have some clear explanation as to how this reduction was arrived at. The hon. gentleman has accounted for it by the removal of the agency from Medicine Hat, but he has forgotten that if the agency has been removed from there, there has been a corresponding increase by the establishment of an agency at Vancouver. The reduction in contingencies by the abolition of the agencies at Emerson and Qu'Appelle will not effect more than a saving of $2,000, so that $3,000 remain to be accounted for.

Mr. CARLING. I cannot give the items, but I went through all the different agencies from Halifax to Vancouver, and saw that in a number of them I could reduce the contingencies, making a total reduction of $5,000. I am satisfied I can make that reduction, but I have not the particulars here of each case.

Mr. FISHER. Our general experience has been that reductions made in this way amount to nothing, and that by the end of the year the expenditure is just as great as it was before.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. On this question of contingencies, I would ask the Minister to turn to page 145 C of the Auditor General's Report, where he will find that for the Montreal agency Mr. J. J. Daley incurred an expenditure for cab hire in Montreal, of $1,220. I find that he made 617 trips, so he must have nearly two trips every day, including Sunday, or at all events, two trips a day for every working day. If the Minister wishes to curtail the expenses, he should buy Mr. Daley a conveyance and a horse, which would be much cheaper than spending $1,220 for one agent in one place during the six months in which he has to perform his work.

Mr. CARLING. That matter was enquired into, and we found that one horse could not do the work. It would require more than one horse. The return shows that there were 136 trips to the Bonaventure Station, at $1.50 per trip, and 63 trips to St. Martin's Junction at night, at $2.75, the former being two miles and the latter more than seven miles distant. There are other trips, which the hon. gentleman will find at page C-168 of the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. McMULLEN. We are glad that the Minister has decided to make a reduction in the amount of contingencies allowed to agents, but, in my short experience of parliamentary life, I have never known a Minister to state that it was his intention to make a reduction of $5,000 without giving some reasonable explanation of how he was going to make the reduction. The Minister says he is going to make that reduction, but he does not say how he is going to do it, and, when he is asked, he answers simply in a general way, that he is going to make reductions here and there. I think the House is entitled to more detailed information than that. If we had the Minister committed to a reduction on certain items, we could hold him to the fact that he had not fulfilled his promise, but he declines to do that, and simply says he will make that reduction.

Mr. CARLING. I say I will make that reduction of $5,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is to be hoped he will, because the expenditure under the head of contingencies is very absurd in many of these cases. Here is one which has been mentioned by my hon. friend, that one man should expend $1,220 for cab hire for his own service.

Mr. CARLING. Not for his own service.

Mr. McMULLEN. He expends $1,220 for cab hire and makes 617 trips. I say that is a perfect outrage, and it is preposterous to ask this Committee to quietly pass over items for contingencies of this character, and we have other such charges of an equally scandalous nature with this. In other places, when they get to know that a certain sum is allowed for cab-hire, or horse-hire, or travelling expenses, they, of course, will include a similar charge in their accounts in the following year, and they are all getting so thoroughly educated in reference to this matter that every item which can possibly be put in as incidental expenses is inserted by officers who are drawing enormous sums by way of salary. I see that in one office the enormous sum of $90 in charged for telephone, and there are other matters of the same kind. It is time to put a stop to these items in the account for immigration, and on this occasion I think we have had a criticism which ought to lead the hon. gentleman to understand that matters of this kind are not going to be passed over in the easy and indifferent way they have been passed over in days gone by.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Did I understand the Minister to say that some other arrangement has been made as to this matter in Montreal, or is it to be continued?

Mr. CARLING. I did not say that any other arrangement had been made, but, if any other arrangement can be made, it will be made. It seemed to be a large amount for cab-hire, but, when it was enquired into, I did not see so much objection to it as I did at first. However, I am determined to reduce that expense as much as I possibly can.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. On the same page of the Auditor General's Report, the hon. gentleman will find, under the Toronto agency, the item, J. A. Donaldson, fares $907.55. What does that mean?

Mr. CARLING. I think that is in regard to fares paid for sending immigrants to different points. That was at the time when we were giving assisted passages. It was not for cab-hire or anything of that kind, but for immigrants sent to different localities, and it was probably paid by the agent, Mr. Donaldson, who might have gone with them and looked after them to their destination.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The fares would not have to be paid at Toronto if they were assisted passages?

Mr. CARLING. It was usual, during the time that assisted passages were given, that, if the immigrants were not able to pay their fares to their destination, they were paid for them, but that is now done away with.

Mr. BRIEN. There is one feature which has not been touched upon yet, and that is with regard to these children who are brought out.

Mr. CARLING. Would it not be better for the hon. gentleman to leave that over until we come to the discussion of the last item, because any money which is paid in regard to that comes out of that last item, and we have agreed that the general discussion shall take place upon that.

Mr. BRIEN. If the Minister will allow me, I would rather say the few words I have to say now. I think this is the most objectionable class of the whole immigration.

Mr. CARLING. I have no desire to interfere with the hon. gentleman's speech, but it has been agreed by members on both sides that the discussion should take place on the last item, and any payments to these children come out of that vote.

Mr. BRIEN. That item does not come up at all.

Mr. CARLING. Not to-night.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I suppose that under the head of contingencies the expenditure for printing pamphlets would come up.

Mr. CARLING. That comes under the last item.

Mr. BRIEN. I presume I could take up the next item, then. I see there is $1,000 for the Women's Protective Immigration Association. I have reason for discussing this immigration of children which is not necessary here to mention, and unless it is really objectionable to the Committee I would like to do so now.

Mr. FOSTER. We are agreed, I think, to leave those items to be discussed under the head under which they properly come. We made the agreement. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) knows that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; I was appealed to by the Minister. It is quite true there was an understanding that the discussion would be taken on the item to which that properly belonged. At the same time that does not bind the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BRIEN. There has been already more time wasted than I would have occupied. As I am a junior member of this House, I trust I may be pardoned if I infringe upon the custom. However, this system of assisting child immigration has been continued for 10 or 5 years. Some of these children are of the worst moral character, and very little can be made out of them. If this country is to be made a dumping ground for the outcast children of European countries, I think it is something that we ought not to submit to. I know this question has been discussed several times before the Immigration Committee and the Agricultural Committee. Contrary opinions have been expressed in regard to the matter. I have taken some pains to get at the facts, and from what I have learned I am very seriously opposed to this class of immigration. The evidence that I have been able to procure shows that these children are picked up on the streets, that they are taken from workhouses, and from the lowest dens that you can find on the European continent. In the report of the Minister of Agriculture for 1870 I find the following:—

"Miss Macpherson came to this country last summer, with a number of boys, whom she personally saw placed in situations. She brought out altogether 264. These boys had been picked off the streets, and from the 'dens' of London; they were without parents or relatives who cared for them; and were placed during the winter, in the 'Refuge and Home of Industry' in Commercial Street, Spitalfields, London, where their wants were provided for, and where they were educated and trained to habits of industry."

Now, Sir, the origin of these children is such that you never can make respectable citizens of them. In order to prove that, I will read from the report of Mr. Smith, the Government's own agent at Hamilton. I find that many of these children are taken from the notorious Whitechapel region. I will not mention any of the names of any of these children, but here is what the agent at Hamilton says of them:

"Out of 46, 22 are positively bad, and 26 are fairly good."

Of a girl aged 12, he says:

"Untruthful, and cannot be trusted. Inclined to pilfer. She is inclined to form immoral habits with the boys. Requires very close watching and cannot be trusted alone."

Of another one, a boy, he says:

"Thoroughly bad, deceitful and untruthful. Stubborn, filthy and dirty in bed. Remained till May, and cleared out to Toronto."

Of a girl aged 10, he says:

"Remained seven months. Source of great trouble through being in bad health. Troubled with urinal affections, weak bowels and skin diseases.

Of another boy, he says:

"Stupid, untruthful, dirty and filthy. Has an abscess in the leg. Naturally weak, never will be able to earn his living."

Mr. CARLING

Now, if that is the character of these children, I think the Government of this country ought no longer to allow these parties to bring any more of them over here, no matter how good their intentions may be. At present the standard of the people of this country for morality, intelligence and industry, is not exceeded by that of any other people in the world, and we ought to see to it that that standard is maintained. But it cannot be maintained while the Immigration Department allows the introduction of such very objectionable children, and, if it is continued, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) will have to belabor this House for several Sessions to obtain the passage of a Bill to protect the boys from the aggression of the girls, as he did in an opposite direction a few Sessions ago. The proportion of our foreign born population is only 22·29 per cent., but they furnish no less than 47·88 per cent. of the inmates of our insane asylums. The expense of supporting the asylums for insane and idiots last year in the Province of Ontario, was $557,359 or about two-thirds of the entire subsidy obtained from the Dominion Government. I am opposed to the general expenditure for immigration, and I think the Government will do well to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and do away with a large number of these inland agencies. But with respect to these children, my objection is still stronger, and I think their introduction should be prohibited, and that this lady should not be allowed to pursue her present course any longer, at least with the assistance of the Government. We had during last year about 2,000 children brought out, at an expense of $4,000. It is an entirely useless expenditure, and I think if the department will consider the interests of the country generally, they will put a stop to the introduction of children of so objectionable a character. I might proceed, and show by authorities who have given special attention to this matter that it is absolutely impossible for such children to become respectable citizens on account of their past associations. I will confine myself, however, to reading a short extract from a work written by the Chairman of the London School Board and the Chairman of the Howard Association. Speaking of the associations and surroundings in which these children are brought up, the writer says:

"From a sad and depressing life in a workhouse nursery the orphan is next removed to the workhouse school. Here, again, it is compelled to mingle with the depraved children of depraved parents, and, worst of all, to share when ill, the sick wards of the adult paupers, of whom a large proportion are the very refuse of the population and the worst of characters. As the ailments of the children are often comparatively slight, they have nothing to do during the weary days but to listen to the conversation of the adults, much of which is of such a character as no child ought ever be permitted to hear. It is asserted that this association exerts a sort of fascination upon the children, with a result which it is not difficult to imagine. One experienced workhouse visitor says in her report that the teachers often complain that they cannot prevent the children from endeavoring to catch cutaneous diseases from each other, in order to be sent to the sick wards, the attraction of which in this way is so great. Not only is the atmosphere of these workhouse schools pauperising, but the schools are actively educative in a bad way, for very many of the orphans' school-fellows are the children of thieves, tramps, and women of bad character, who enter the workhouse for brief periods, coming from haunts of vice and crime, to which, with their children they quickly return. Meanwhile, those who have been associated with them can hardly fail to have been affected not only with ophthalmia, and other loathsome bodily diseases, but also with loathsome ideas and evil thoughts. Our desolate, destitute orphans, having been thus legally trained to live without affection, to accept pauperism as their natural condition, and the poorhouse as their home, have been furnished with precociously wicked companions, well instructed in vice, and, at the most critical time of their life."

The difference in the habits and surroundings of children in the old country and this, and the question of the poor rates, tend to teach them idleness and prodigality instead of industry and frugality. I may add that in my opinion only one-half or one-quarter of the expenditures that are made by the Immigration Department are necessary.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). In this House during the last two or three Sessions I have heard it stated that these poor orphans are the most undesirable and improper class of immigrants. I have had some experience with them, not perhaps so extensive as the hon. gentleman has had with them, but I have had to do with them to some extent. In my immediate neighborhood I have been instrumental in placing 50 or 60 of these children during the last six or seven years, some dating back perhaps as far as ten years. All these were from the Marchmont Home, and they may be of a different class to those children referred to by the last speaker. With one single exception, no single boy or girl has manifested any immoral tendency beyond that of the average boy and girl residing in our own country, and I state from private and professional observation that they are as healthy boys and girls as any ever raised in our country. Whether they are better selected, or whether they have come from a better class in the old country, I am not prepared to say; but the facts are as I state them, and I know from the people with whom those children have been placed that ten times the number could be placed in that district if the home provided them. That is the best evidence I can give as to whether the children are worthy, deserving and useful. Some of the girls have married fairly well, and I am satisfied they will make industrious and worthy wives and mothers. Some boys have considerable sums in the savings bank in the city, to my personal knowledge. With respect to the question of boys running away and girls becoming bad, I think it does not say much for the moral tone of the people about Hamilton who took the children. The only two cases I know of were cases in which the children were badly treated, and too much hard work exacted from little boys. They wanted to get from them the work of grown men for little or nothing. They ran away, and by my special interference they went back to the home, and now they are living with other people who have taken them, and are doing very well. It is only fair that some one who has had these children under observation should say something in their defence. Whether it is desirable or not to bring these children into the country I am not going to argue, but that they are immoral in their tendencies, or have diseased constitutions I deny, and the anxiety of the people to obtain them is evidence not only that they are desirable but that they are a desired class of immigrants.

Mr. HESSON. As one knowing the facts in connection with the Stratford Home I feel it my duty to say a good word in behalf of the home and the children there. I observe from our local papers that some 74 children were recently brought in, and nearly all were told off before they came. The home has been in operation 6 or 7 years and has given entire satisfaction. The children have turned out remarkably well, indeed in a greater proportion than the ordinary class of children in the community, this being due no doubt to the attention they have received from Miss Macpherson and others and to the care exercised in their selection. Those brought in ranged from 9 to 16 years and the home has larger demand than it is able to supply. They have proved so satisfactory with us that I regret hon. members should have been obliged to find fault with the class of children brought into the country. I speak from what I know, and my colleague (Mr. Trow) made a similar statement in the House some time ago, and if he were present now no doubt he would support my statement. I know the children have the very best of care, that they are selected with great prudence and caution as regards their past life and history, and that an effort is made to get the most desirable class into the country.

Sir DONALD SMITH. With respect to the item of $1,000, to the Women's Protective Immigration Society, Montreal, I wish to say to the Minister that there is at least one institution in Montreal in connection with his department which, in my opinion, is worthy of the best consideration and the best support of the Government and of this House, and that is the society here spoken of, the Women's Protective Immigration Society of Montreal. I have given some attention to this society, and I believe the ladies who interest themselves in it are really doing good work. They are caring for, and looking after, respectable young women who come here and have not relatives who can care for them. They are placing them in domestic service and in other useful employments, and altogether I believe they are doing so much that if the Minister could see his way to add in the Supplementary Estimates another $1,000 to what is here given I am sure that money would be as well bestowed as any other equal sum given for the purposes of immigration.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). We should have some information with respect to the operations of this society. I have no doubt what the hon. gentleman says is correct; but the very first principle in connection with public expenditure is that the public are entitled to an explanation as to how the expenditure is made. The report itself is of the most meagre character. In saying this I am not impugning in any way the statements of the hon. gentleman with respect to the high social position of the ladies who supervise this society. There are certain other things in connection with this immigrant question in Montreal, which I think would make this society an extremely desirable source from which to obtain information in connection with that matter. I would like to know from the Minister if any more information has been conveyed to him, or if any other reports have been presented to him further than what has been published in the supplement of his report.

Mr. CARLING. The only report I have is that on page 146 of the report of the Minister. I may say that there are quite a number of domestics who have passed through that home, and who were provided for and looked after by those ladies. I am glad to hear the remarks from my worthy friend the member for Montreal West (Sir Donald A. Smith). I have heard different gentlemen from the city of Montreal speak of this home in the equally high terms which the hon. member for Montreal West has done. Representing, as he does, the city of Montreal and having his residence there, I think that his information ought to be very satisfactory to the House. The report presented here shows the number of persons who have passed through the home, and every one of those has been well taken care of.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Could the hon. gentleman tell me where this money is expended? Is it in the city of Montreal or have they an agent at Quebec.

Mr. CARLING. They have no agent at Quebec. Of course they are in correspondence with Mr. Stafford, our agent at Quebec, and the ladies who have charge of the home at Quebec correspond with the ladies at Montreal. They have also, I believe, correspondence with parties all over the Dominion who apply for domestic servants, and the home is furnishing those domestics as they are required.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I do not understand why some more of the cities should not also be given grants in a similar way. Why ought not the people of Toronto and Hamilton have their efforts on behalf of those immigrants supplemented in this way. I do not want to be understood as being antagonistic to Montreal, but I want to understand on what system an exception is made in favor of Montreal, or how it is that this system is not extended to Toronto or Hamilton?

Mr. CARLING. Montreal and Quebec are at the head of the ocean navigation and it is considered of great importance

that there should be committees of ladies at those points. They have organised themselves into committees, and they have communicated with the Government and we find that they have done much good to the immigrants. I am not aware whether similar applications have been made from Toronto, Hamilton or other cities, but I hardly think there is the same necessity there as there was in Montreal or Quebec. When the immigrants arrive from the steamers the ladies take charge of them and see that they are properly cared for.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I am only speaking from recollection, but I think I remember seeing a report in a Montreal paper as to a Mrs. Corneil who represented herself as an agent of this association, and if my recollection serves me right that report seemed to me as though it was written from Quebec and addressed to the parent association in Montreal. It occurred to me from some other correspondence that I saw that this home had an agent at Quebec, because there was a question between the Government agents and this lady as to what their relative duties and rights were. I do think that a more extensive report from this association would be valuable to us for another purpose. I understand from their report that they have a home in Mansfield street, Montreal, where they furnish a refuge for those girls who are unfortunately out of work, or who under other circumstances come to them. I think we might avail ourselves of this home in order to get information as to the class of immigration which filters into this country, and which we were discussing in the early part of the evening. I think they could furnish us with some interesting information as to the class of girls who come under their notice, since we see that the Young Men's Christian Association and the House of Industry complain bitterly about the character of some of the immigrants. It would be interesting for us to know how many of those immigrants found their way into the police court or into places of public punishment for any one year. I would suggest to the Minister that he would ask the ladies who interest themselves in this home to extend their report next Session so as to show what proportion of this undesirable class of immigrants bear to the number that go through their hands, giving us actual figures. I do believe that the first principle that ought to be recognised in connection with the granting of public funds is that Parliament should have information with reference to the details of the work which it accomplishes. In saying this I disclaim any wish to speak against this association, because I do not know anything against its internal economy. I do think that while in other places we have to provide for those local wants by grants from the Local Government, or by charity from philanthropic individuals (and I know that the people of Montreal are not behind hand in giving their share for such purposes)—I do think that if those grants are made here the principle ought to be extended to other large cities as well, and a full report of their work furnished to the Minister.

Mr. FISHER. In reply to the remarks of my hon. friend, and without having studied the matter, I may say that I had in my hand a report of this society which was much more extensive than the report which is published in the departmental paper. The society did issue a report to those interested in it, giving a large amount of information which is not contained in the report of the Minister. I do not know whether that report was submitted to the department or not, or whether this very condensed report here published was all that was supplied by the society, but I am well aware that I have seen a report which was submitted by the executive of this society to the members giving a great deal more information than is contained in this report published. I am speaking from memory, and of course not in a position to state what information it contained.

Harbors and Rivers, British Columbia $24,300

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The vote of $1,000 for Cowichan River will be applied to the work of clearing the channel of snags. It is to make it navigable and at the same time to prevent the flooding of the adjacent lands. The vote of $10,000 for Fraser River is to continue the work which was begun three years ago, and which has proved to be very satisfactory. There were different channels. Two of them have been closed, so that by collecting all the water in the main channel, the river has been scoured, and there is a greater depth of water. This vote is for that portion of the river above New Westminster. There are large mills there now, and vessels can go up to them, and we expect that by completing these works we shall enable the largest vessels that go to the inner harbors of British Columbia to reach those places. The vote of $300 for the River Somass is to be applied in removing snags with the object of improving the navigation of the river and preventing the flooding of the adjacent country; this river is in Vancouver Island.

Mr. PRIOR. I see there is nothing in the Estimates this year for the improvement of Victoria harbor. I am very sorry to see this omission, and I cannot understand how it is that the hon. Minister of Public Works has not seen fit to place a sum there. I can only come to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman, by some means or other, has arrived at the idea that the Government need not pay any more attention to the needs of Victoria. It may be that the hon. gentleman has been reading some of the many paragraphs that have been going the rounds of the newspapers lately, inserted, no doubt, by men who are interested in property in other parts of British Columbia, to the effect that Victoria's days of usefulness as a port, her days as the commercial and financial centre of British Columbia, are over, that she is now on the downward track, failing quickly into a state of decay, that her trade and commerce are leaving her, and that her business men are quietly sleeping their days away in the delightful climate they have the privilege to enjoy. I say the hon. gentleman may have read these statements and may have believed them, as, no doubt, others have done; but I am glad to be able to stand here and tell the hon. gentleman and this House that so far from that being the truth, Victoria to-day is progressing more rapidly and is enjoying a larger measure of prosperity than almost any other city in the Dominion of her size. At the present time substantial buildings of all kinds are going up in every direction, her mechanics and artisans are busy, her workshops and factories are running on full time, and I do not think there is a single merchant in Victoria who cannot point to his books with pride and show that, during 1888, his business has increased from 15 to 25 per cent. over that of any other year. I cannot blame the owners of property who are trying to boom up their lots. I cannot blame them for trying by any fair means to induce immigrants and capital to go to their district instead of to Victoria, but I must object to the action of any Government who directly, or indirectly, by the influence of money under their control, or by any of the many means the Government has power to use, whether it is their intention or not, give an undue advantage to one city over another. I do not for one moment believe that the hon. gentleman or the Government intend to do that, but that will be the result unless they give Victoria a fair share of the money they intend to expend in British Columbia. It has been said to me many a time: "Oh, you Victorians are jealous of Vancouver." I beg to deny that; there is not a word of truth in it. British Columbia is large enough for 20 big cities, and the more cities that grow up the better it will be for those there at

present. I would like to ask this House, or any man who knows the facts, who owned most of the property in 1886, before Vancouver was started. Who are the men who own the most property in Vancouver to-day outside of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? Why, Victorians. Who have been the men who have put in the most capital for starting the water works and other enterprises of that kind there? Victorians. Who have always been ready to invest their capital in any scheme connected with Vancouver when there was the slightest chance of there being any reasonable return? I say it was Victorians. Why should they be jealous of Vancouver? They are not so, and if any hon. gentleman believes they are, or that Victoria is on the downward track, as some newspapers try to make out, I will try to show them how far astray they are. Victoria has been up to the present time the principal commercial and financial city in British Columbia, and I believe most thoroughly that she will continue to hold that position. There is hardly an industry of any magnitude, there is hardly an enterprise of any size carried on in British Columbia to-day—whether mining, lumbering, or fishing, or cattle raising—in which you will not find a large amount of Victoria capital invested, and most of these industries have their head offices in Victoria. I do not believe there is to-day a city in the Dominion whose business men are, as a whole, more financially solid, or who do business on a better basis than the merchants of Victoria. Business failures have been almost unknown, not because the volume of trade is small, for I can point to houses in Victoria to-day who do business to the extent of over a million dollars a year, several of them ranging from $300,000 to $700,000 a year—not a bad showing for a new and rising town—but because business there is conducted on proper commercial principles. I have here some statistics showing the exports and imports of British Columbia and the duties paid in that Province, and with the permission of the House I will read a few of them in order that I may show hon. members how fast, how very fast, the city I have the honor to represent is being distanced in the race for wealth and importance. In the year 1888 just passed, the following were the figures: The exports from British Columbia were valued at $3,928,077. Of this amount Victoria is credited with $2,122,939, or 54 per cent. of the total; Nanaimo is credited with $1,240,393, or 31 per cent. of the total; Vancouver, $553,539, or 14 per cent. of the whole. The total imports into British Columbia were valued at $3,509,951. Of this amount Victoria is credited with $2,922,399, or 84 per cent. of the total. Vancouver is a new city, and cannot be expected to have made much progress as yet, so her imports are valued at only $280,900 or 7½ per cent. of the whole. The amounts paid into the Customs houses of British Columbia—and I think they will rather astonish hon. gentlemen who think Victoria is on the downward track—are as follows:—The total amount in 1888 was $861,465. Of this the sum paid into Victoria Customs house amounted to $761,137, or 88 per cent. of the total; and Vancouver received in Customs dues $50,518, or about 6 per cent. of the total. This does not look very much as if Victoria was going to the dogs, and it does not look as if it was a wise policy for the hon. gentleman who is at the head of public works to altogether ignore her harbor. Let us look into the savings bank accounts. The total deposits in the savings banks of British Columbia amount to $1,566,123. Of that the Victoria savings bank has on deposit $1,328,414, or 81 per cent. of the total. This is not a very bad showing for a population of 15,000 inhabitants. The tonnage entered and cleared in British Columbia ports amounted altogether to 2,065,320, of which Victoria is credited with 1,011,043 tons and Vancouver 592,691 tons. Now, I think I have given sufficient information to show this House that Victorians are far from being the easy going, happy-go-lucky sort of people some of the press would try to make them out to be, and I also hope I have shown enough to convince the hon. gentleman that it is his plain and manifest duty, and I hope it will be likewise his pleasure, to give Victoria, at least, a fair share of Dominion expenditure. If you will examine these figures which I have just quoted, you will find that in commercial importance Victoria stands the fifth city of the Dominion. She pays more duty to the department so ably presided over by the Minister of Customs than Quebec, Hamilton, London, Winnipeg, Ottawa or Windsor, and she does more business in proportion to her population than any city in the Dominion. The only cities that pay more duty than Victoria, are Toronto, Montreal, Halifax, and St. John. Now, I wish to be distinctly understood by hon. gentlemen representing other constituencies in British Columbia, that I do not now ask that the Minister of Public Works should take off any sums which are likely to be voted for other constituencies, because I think they get little enough as it is, but I do think Victoria should get a fair proportion. I only ask that she should receive her fair share, taking into consideration her commercial importance and the revenue she pays into the Dominion exchequer. It is of the greatest importance that the improvements in Victoria harbor should be carried on, but unless a good round sum is placed in the Estimates for that purpose, the money that has already been expended will have been simply thrown away. If the hon. gentleman will look into the matter he will find that nothing has been expended heretofore which was not absolutely necessary, and the only trouble is, that the work so ably begun is not half finished. In conclusion, I need only say that I sincerely hope the Minister of Public Works will place a sufficient sum in the Estimates to carry on the improvements in Victoria harbor. If he does not, the only conclusion the people of Victoria can come to, will be that the Government are determined, through some cause or other, to deliberately lend their aid to assist in building up other cities against a city which has paid more revenue than all the other parts of the Province put together. I do not believe that is the intention, but, as deeds speak louder than words, I hope to be gratified, when the Supplementary Estimates come down, by seeing that the hon. gentleman has placed a sum of at least $10,000 in the Estimates for the improvement of Victoria harbor.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I may say this to my hon. friend, that if we were disposed to forget Victoria, her representative in this House will remind us of all the good prospects of that city and of the importance of these works. The reason why we have not asked in these Estimates a new vote for the removal of the rocks, &c., in the harbor of Victoria is because we could not expend last year the amount of $12,500, and the balance of the previous year, on account of the accident which occurred at the beginning of November. Blasting operations were thus suspended until after the 1st of January of this year. Now, we have to continue the works as long as the season will allow, and to do as much as possible with the amount that has been voted. Besides that, the chief engineer says that a further grant of $6,000 is required to complete the removal of the shoal, boulders, &c., of Shoal Point, to 14 feet in depth at low water. The hon. gentleman speaks of something in the Supplementary Estimates. No doubt it is very pleasant to find a vote provided there. I cannot say to my hon. friend yet what he will find in the Supplementary Estimates, but I am sure, after what we have voted previously, that he will not suppose that we will give up the work just at the moment when we are to complete it. Having said so much I hope the hon. gentleman will wait until the Supplementary Estimates come down.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is not because I think British Columbia cannot urge its own claims, or that

the hon. member has not done his duty that I rise, but, having been in that Province, it struck me that, comparing what had been done on the Pacific coast with what had been done on the Atlantic coast, our brethren on the Pacific coast had not got their fair share. Of course it is true that the traffic is very much greater on the Atlantic coast, and that there must be a much greater general expenditure there than on the Pacific coast; but, in regard to the matter of lights and other things of that kind, I think more should be done on the Pacific. I also agree with the hon. gentleman as to the city to which he refers. The statistics which he has given show that it is a very important city, and I think the House would agree with the Minister in supplementing the grant so as to provide for these improvements. Of course, that Province is a long way off, and we know that sometimes its representatives press their claims very strongly, but I think that, in regard to any matters concerning navigation and the saving of life and the safety of vessels, the Government have not granted them more than their share; in fact, I think they have granted them hardly their fair share.

Dredging—New Dredging Plant. $16,950

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What does the Minister propose to do with this amount?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is to provide for new dredging plant on the Government dredges.

Dredging, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick..... $40,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Can the hon. gentleman give any idea what harbors in Nova Scotia he proposes to dredge this year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This vote is for the operation of the dredges in these three Provinces, for which we have a general vote of $40,000. I am not in a position to say where the dredges will be sent. They will be sent according to the wants of the different places. Last year we used these dredges at Cheticamp, Middle River, Pictou Railway Wharf, Port Hope, Wallace and Yarmouth Harbor.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Upon what principle does the Minister proceed with reference to the employment of these dredges? When a dredge is used by private individuals, do they pay for it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Because, at page 79 of the report, I find in regard to the *Cape Breton*, the following:—

"This dredge did not commence work until the 3rd October, 1887, after its arrival at Wallace, Cumberland County, N.S., where it remained until the 5th November and improved the channel of the ferry at that place, and removed obstructions off the wharves of the Union Freestone and Wallace Greystone Companies."

In such cases, do the people owning these quarries pay for the use of the dredge?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. If the dredge is used for a public wharf, we do the work at the expense of the Dominion, but, if it is for private wharves, if we can allow the dredge to work there while it is in the neighborhood, we make the parties pay the cost.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I notice that Pictou County has had a fair share of the dredging since Confederation. About one-fourth of the whole amount expended for dredging has been expended in that county. I see that $96,000 has been expended in Pictou County since Confederation out of a total of $440,000. I have no doubt that most of that expenditure is proper enough, but I hope the hon. gentleman will remember that there are other counties in Nova Scotia which require dredging as much as Pictou County, and, as that county has had one-fourth expended in it up to the present time, I hope the appropriation will be more generally distributed now than it has been in years past.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I made a motion a few days ago asking for copies of the report of the engineers. A discussion arose, and, at the request of the Minister of Public Works, the debate was adjourned. I see it has been placed at the foot of the Public Bills and Orders, and I am afraid it is not likely to be reached again this Session. I will, therefore, ask the Minister if there is any chance of our obtaining these reports?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to remind me of that in writing, I will attend to it at once. I confess that I had lost sight of it.

Mr. EISENHAUER. It appears to me that the Government do not intend to appropriate one dollar for the County of Lunenburg, because we were told by the Minister of Public Works that the Government act on the first information they get. They must have had information as to the public buildings there, because they voted money for the site. I would like to ask the Minister why nothing further has been done in that work to-day. Had he any definite information before they voted the money for the site?

Mr. KIRK. Is the Minister able to tell where he intends to spend this money in dredging in Nova Scotia next summer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is exactly what I cannot say now. Applications are made from all quarters, they are submitted to the chief engineer, and he has to make a report on the different works, stating what are more pressing, those that may be done at the public expense, and those that might be done by private effort. Another consideration is the place where the dredges are, because sometimes we have to move the dredge from one place to another, and the cost of the tug to carry the dredge over amounts to a large sum: then we are obliged to leave that aside until the dredge comes into the neighborhood. In answer to the hon. member for Lunenburg, the hon. gentleman is mixing up public buildings and dredges, which is not fair. If the hon. gentleman would only do what I ask him to do, and put what he wants in writing, I will give him the information.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I made a motion a few days ago asking for the report of the engineer sent to Lunenburg to examine the harbor there, and there was some discussion on the bringing down of the report. The hon. gentleman will remember that it was at his request the other day that the debate was adjourned, with the understanding that he would examine into the matter and give us further information. I did not suppose he would want any further writings from me to remind him of bringing down the report. While I am on my feet, I would say that it seems to be a very easy thing for the Government, if they do not feel disposed to make a grant of public money in a county, to get a report that will suit them. I really cannot understand why these reports differ so much as I have reason to believe. I think if the Minister would go down there, or send some competent person who would make a correct report, he would come to the conclusion that we need a dredge there very badly. I would ask the hon. member to look at the article in the *Free Press* of last Saturday, and he will see the importance of the town of Lunenburg.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have not time to do that

Mr. ELLIS. The whole amount that the hon. Minister asks for dredging in the three Provinces, $40,000, is scarcely sufficient to dredge one harbor. Then again there is not a dredge fit for dredging in a tidal river. Dredges such as he

now has, cannot be worked to advantage in tidal rivers, and I would suggest to him, as he has considerable knowledge of the matter and a great capacity to carry out his views, that he spend money to procure a dredge suitable to do work in a harbor like that of St. John. None of these dredges at present is good enough to do work on the coast or in the tidal rivers.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Certainly, I would like to have another dredge; but we do not think that we can ask Parliament this year to give us a vote for that purpose. The hon. gentleman remembers that a dredge was lost, and although we cannot get a new one this year, I do not know what we may do next year.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The present dredges are totally unfit for service on the Bay of Fundy, or in the tidal rivers. Considering the importance of both coasts of the Bay of Fundy, it seems to me that a suitable dredge should be procured to do work there.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I would ask the Minister where he intends to use the dredge in Prince Edward Island?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will have reports on the different applications that are made, and the chief engineer will say which work can be undertaken now, having in view the position of the dredges, and the necessary expense.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I would like to inform the Minister that there has been no dredge in King's County, P.E.I., for the past eleven years. During the fifteen years since we entered Confederation, the dredge has only spent one summer and part of another in the county of King's, although it is a large county, and has as many harbors as any other. She has spent nearly all the time in the counties of Prince and Queen's. I would like to bring to the notice of the Minister the fact that Murray Harbor, Montague River and Grand River are very much in need of dredging. Murray Harbor lies well up into the County of King's, and a large amount of shipping is done in it. The river is somewhat crooked, and it is difficult for small vessels to enter it. Montague River has also a large amount of shipping, and so has Grand River. Those rivers are at the east end of the Island where King's County is, and are the last of the rivers or harbors that freeze up in the fall, and consequently vessels are very liable to get frozen in.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend beside me a moment ago asked the Minister of Public Works, in connection with this vote for dredging in Nova Scotia, whether he intended this year to dredge the harbor of Lunenburg?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I did not hear the hon. gentleman ask that question. I may say that that harbor is on the list of those to be examined, to see whether we can do any dredging there this year out of this vote. I cannot say more than that we complete a list of the claims made, we examine what is wanted and ascertain what can be done. For example, if the work on a harbor would cost $20,000 or $25,000, we could not undertake to carry it out when $10,000 only was voted for the whole Province, and therefore we must regulate ourselves according to the amount voted. The desire of the Government is to employ the sum in the best way possible to promote the interests of the country.

Mr. LAURIER. This is hardly satisfactory to my hon. friend, who represents that this is not the first time this matter has been brought to the attention of the Government, on the contrary it has been brought up year after year. Under these circumstances, the hon. gentleman asked the Government whether they cannot, before the Session closes, give a definite answer to his request.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have taken note of it, and I will endeavor to give an answer definitely.

Mr. KIRK. I desire to ascertain whether I cannot get a promise from the Minister to send a dredge to St. Mary's River, Guysborough County, during the present summer. A dredge is very much needed there; it was applied for many years ago, and was recommended by the engineer of the department. The Government sent one there, but it was not suitable, and on removing it, they promised they would send a more suitable dredge. This was in 1872, and the Government have done nothing since. The trade is very much hampered in consequence. A steamer which plies between Halifax and Charlottetown, and is subsidised by the Local Government, is intended to call at that town, Sherbrooke; but it cannot call there at low water, and for that reason there is great necessity for dredging being done. I know the hon. gentleman will say that he will send the dredge where there is the greatest necessity. Now, I do not know whether he means necessity of trade or necessity of party, One of the leading Tories in Sherbrooke, interested in the deepening of the harbor, a few days ago wrote a letter to a Tory newspaper in Pictou County complaining that the Government had expended $40,000 in dredging the East River of Pictou while St. Mary's River had been utterly neglected, and he charged that the Government had done this in order to make it easy for the representative of Guysborough. I was not aware that the Government ever took into consideration the case of the member for Guysborough. It must have been done for their own convenience as it was not done for mine, and this Tory writer must be mistaken as to the Government's reason for omitting Sherbrooke and spending all the money at Pictou, and, therefore, in order to gratify this friend of theirs and to benefit the trade of the County of Guysborough, perhaps a dredge will be sent during the coming summer. Will the Minister promise?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have taken a note of it.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I desire to call the attention of the Minister to two harbors on Lake Erie which have bee n neglected for a very long time, and to such a great extent as to render them useless. I have frequently called the Minister's attention to the fact that something should be done to deepen Port Stanley, a useful harbor, so as to allow vessels when sailing on the lake to be able to make that harbor without running the great risk of rounding the point in order to get into the harbor. It may, perhaps, be said that the harbor is under the management of a railway company—the Great Western, now the Grand Trunk—and that therefore the company is responsible for its condition. Whether they are responsible or not, it is the duty of the Government to see that the harbor is placed in a reasonably efficient condition, which they have neglected to do. The Government allowed the London and Port Stanley Railway to take possession of the harbor. The position of vessels sailing up and down the lake is a dangerous one at the point in question, and neglect on the part of the Government in keeping the harbor in proper condition is an injury to the shipping. Another important harbor is that of Port Burwell. In 1874 the Government of that day expended in dredging, and other harbor works, $10,000 at that point. It was then capable of allowing vessels of considerable draught to enter. From that day to this not one cent has been expended by this Government since 1878, and the harbor has now, to a great extent, filled with sand, and a bar has stretched across the channel. Why the Government should have neglected these harbors I am unable to say. They may have an object, and they may feel they are justified in neglecting the interests of the people in that section of the country, but the shipping interests should be maintained, and vessels should not be compelled to risk life and property. Vessels coming down the lake in a storm find it impossible to enter these two harbors on account of their dangerous

state. Wrecks and loss of life have occurred, and there is no shelter until they have rounded Long Point. Port Rowan Harbor is in as bad a condition. The Government have not spent any money on the harbors along the lake. I have been asked by the Minister of Public Works to wait and see the Supplementary Estimates. I have waited, and I have to call the attention of the House to this matter. If the Government have any interest or any desire to preserve property and protect life they will send a dredge to the point I have indicated, and make an effort to place the harbor in an efficient state, which so far they have neglected to do. I do not expect they will do so, as long as they remain in power. I do not expect anything at their hands, and I regret it, for the interest of the country requires it; but the Government are very slow to perform their duty unless they see there is some political support to be gained by doing it. I suppose we may expect that when they have a little advantage to gain they will pay attention to the wants of the people.

Dredging—Lake Manitoba..... $15,000

Mr. WATSON. I like to know what part of this appropriation is intended to be expended on the White Mud River?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The appropriation last year was for the Red River, White Mud River, and German Lake. We have not decided this year where this sum is to be employed. That is purely and simply for the work of the dredges inclusive of tugs, but where they will be put I am not in a position to say now.

Mr. WATSON. I would direct the attention of the Minister to the importance of continuing the work on the bar of the White Mud River at Lake Manitoba. It is the dredge *Priestman* I believe was there. The work is about half done, and it is very important that this channel should be widened, as the water is low in the lake, and there is only a small channel for a boat to come into the lake out of the river. Last year the dredge was employed between the mouth of the river and McCarthy's Landing. It is very important that the work should be continued at the mouth of the river, and that the channel now dredged to some three or four feet should be widened to ensure the safety of a boat passing out from the lake.

Slides and Booms..... $15,000

Mr. LAURIER. In reference to this, Mr. Chairman, there is a matter to which I would call the attention of the hon. Minister. I am informed—and I received information also by special request to bring to the attention of the Government—that in the Saguenay region, about Lake St. John, the slides of the works erected by the Government for floating timber are very advantageous indeed to the lumbermen but disastrous to farmers whose lands are inundated by these works. I find that this complaint is verified by the report laid upon the Table by the hon. gentleman himself. In the French version which I have in my hand there is a report of Mr. Guérin which substantiates those very complaints. At page 226 he says as follows:—

"Outre les cinq barrages sus-nommés il y en a un autre à la tête de la glissoire de Saint-Joseph d'Alma, sur la Petite-Décharge. Ce barrage est situé à plusieurs milles en aval du lac et se trouve à environ 20 pieds au-dessous de son niveau. Il n'affecte pas le niveau du lac, mais un fermier du nom d'Alexis Tremblay, de l'île d'Alma, se plaint que ce barrage refoule les eaux de la Petite-Décharge qui inondent sa terre. Lorsque je suis allé faire l'examen de cette localité, la crête du barrage était couverte d'une couche d'eau de 30 pouces.

"Il n'y a pas de doute que ce barrage refoule l'eau de la Petite-Décharge, et élève son niveau, mais jusqu'à quelles limites M. Tremblay peut-il réclamer des dommages, il est difficile de le dire, sans connaître le niveau de l'eau haute de la localité avant la construction du barrage ou avant que M. Tremblay possédât sa ferme. Nous n'avons pas de renseignements certains pour nous guider maintenant à ce sujet; mais il est manifeste que le montant des dommages doit être peu élevé, puisque la terre descend en pente vers la rivière à raison d'un pied dans seize, de sorte qu'une élévation de 10 pieds dans le chenal de la Petite-Décharge couvrirait seulement une lisière de 160 pieds sur les confins de l'extrémité de sa terre."

I understand that since that time complaint has been laid before the hon. gentleman not only by Mr. Tremblay but by several others and as far as I can see the complaint seems to be well founded. While we have voted money this year, and last year as well to, erect a pier in certain localities to protect against inundations, surely if by works erected by the Government damage is caused (be it ever so small) and farmers suffer from the inundation it seems to me to be the duty of the Government that those who suffer should be compensated for those damages in some way.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My attention was called to this within the last four or five months, and I have given instructions that as soon as we can reach the place at the proper season we will have the complaints examined into. If the works are necessary for the object for which they were built, then the question will be what compensation may be given to those men, or to any others, who may suffer by them.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Is there any revenue from these slides and booms?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). How much?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Some give larger revenues than others. The slides on the Ottawa, on the St. Maurice, the Saguenay and the tributaries of the Ottawa all give a revenue, but the revenue from the Ottawa is by far the largest.

Roads and Bridges..... $45,000

Mr. COLTER. I wish to say a few words before these items are passed. There was an item in the Estimates last year as follows:—

"To pay one-half cost construction of a bridge across the Grand River at the village of York; the county council of Haldimand paying the other half."

That vote was made last year in consequence of the damage that had been done by the damming of the river at Dunnville. It was contended and conceded that the raising of the river so much at Dunnville caused the bridging at York to be much more expensive, and, therefore, this item of $10,000 was put in for the purpose of recouping the county council for the extra expense they had been put to, on account of this Government work. After this item had been put in there were some negotiations between the county and the Government, and some inducements were held out as I believe by the Government to the effect that instead of paying a lump sum for the damages done to the county by reason of their having built the bridge on the river at Cayuga, that the Government would build the bridge at York, in consideration of the county giving up any claims they might have by reason of the extra cost in erecting the two bridges. I would like to ask, if this item is to lapse, or if the Government has made or proposes to ask a grant in the Supplementary Estimates sufficient to complete the bridge. I have moved for the papers, but they have not yet been brought down. I believe the hon. Minister did promise some members of the county council, I do not know but he promised a public meeting as well, that this would receive careful consideration, and the people were led to believe that the claims of the county would be satisfied this Session. We claim that it is nothing more than a debt of long standing which is due to the county. The county council built this bridge at Cayuga, and raised it about 3 feet, and the river has been made much more difficult to bridge in consequence of the dam at Dunnville. This evil has existed for a long time,

and I do not consider it proper that it should continue to exist any longer.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman has put the case as it is, no doubt. This sum of $10,000 was put in the Estimates for the purpose stated, to pay one-half the cost of the construction of a bridge across the Grand River in the village of York, the County Council of Haldimand paying the other half. After that was done, the request was made by the people and the council through the predecessor of the hon. gentleman; and, later on, they spoke of another project, stating that they had the same rights in regard to that as in regard to the other. Negotiations were made and correspondence passed on the basis that the Government should build one bridge, on the condition that all the claims of the council were to be given up. There was nothing put in the Estimates for this good reason: that the question was under the consideration of the Government, whether we would build one bridge and give up this item. I am not sure whether it will appear in the Supplementary Estimates, but, at all events, I have not lost sight of the matter, because I think there is a claim there that the Government will have to meet.

Mr. COLTER. I was present at a meeting of the county council within the last ten days, and at that time they were anxious that this matter should be settled. The project has been delayed in consequence of these negotiations, and the people are suffering by the delay, and I would ask the hon. Minister to facilitate the matter as much as possible.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the importance of assisting two bridges across the Assiniboine River. There is no vote in these Estimates for them, but I hope the hon. Minister will place one in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Representations have been made, petitions have been sent, and letters have been received from the parties interested in these bridges, and the matters are now engaging my attention.

Mr. McMULLEN. I find by a return which I hold in my hand that the sum of $3,751 has been spent in front of the new building on Wellington street, in the city of Ottawa, since the 30th of June last, and that the sum of $7,633 were spent on roads immediately in the vicinity of the Parliament Buildings last year. This appears to me to be a very large expenditure, and I would like to hear what explanation the Minister has to give.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The road from one end to the other had to be put in proper order. We had to put new metal on it, and raise it. Then we had a special vote for paving that portion of the street between the east side of Elgin street and the west side of Metcalfe street. That has been paved with cedar blocks, and we think it will be a permanent improvement. As yet we have had only a few months experience of it, but we hope that by next spring our experience of the four seasons will show us whether or not the experiment is a proper one. The officers entrusted with the care of making that improvement studied the different qualities of pavements, and they were of opinion that this would be the best under the circumstances.

Mr. McMULLEN. If that was in the interest of the entire Province, to experiment as to the best material to use in a road, it would be no harm. But I can well remember that prior to the erection of the building the road was in just about as good condition as it is to-day. I would like to know what has been done with the material which was taken away from the road.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That was used in other portions of the road. The block pavement was also considered the best for deadening the noise of vehicles passing over the road in front of the new public building.

Mr. McMULLEN. I also notice by this return that there were two clerks in charge of this work, one at $2.50 a day, and another at $90 a month. I would like to know why it was necessary to keep two clerks in charge of that work.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. One man was required to look after the portion of the work that we made just opposite the new building. We required a special man to be there, and the other man was sent from one end of the road to the other to look after the work.

Telegraph Lines $8,300

Mr. LAURIER. Is this line towards Point aux Esquimaux completed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not. We have had it under construction for several years and will continue the work for a few years more, but the intention is to submit to my colleagues a scheme to complete the line to a certain point on the coast, and then cross over by cable to Anticosti, where we have land lines. These land lines will bring us to the east end of Anticosti where, if the cable which is spoken of to be completed from Great Britain to the coast of Labrador is built, we might join that cable by one of our own to that point, when these lines on the north coast and from one end to the other will become competing lines. That matter is now under consideration, and I am not in a position to say how far we may ask this in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. LAURIER. How many miles were built last year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Forty-one miles, and to the end of 1887, 365¼ miles.

Experimental Farm—Buildings, Fencing, &c.... $30,000

Mr. McMULLEN. How much has been expended altogether on that farm—lands, buildings and all?

Mr. CARLING. I have a return here showing the cost of construction of the buildings to 20th February, 1889. Total cost of buildings $72,874. I did not expect this question to come up, and have consequently not the other items.

Mr. McMULLEN. The expenditure in connection with this farm has been somewhat extravagant, and we have a right to know what amount has been so far expended on the whole. We have no desire to offer any opposition to any necessary expenditure, but I have looked over the item, and it appears to me there must be something over $200,000 spent in connection with that farm.

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. The total cost, when completed, of the several works, the expenses of the land, buildings, implements, &c., will not exceed $250,000. In Ontario, on the farm at Guelph, up to the present, the expenditure has been over $400,000. I am quite sure we will keep within the estimate.

Mr. McMULLEN. But the number of acres is larger in Ontario than here?

Mr. CARLING. No; we have here about 500 acres. In Guelph they have 550 acres.

Mr. McMULLEN. But the experimental farm in Ontario is much longer in existence than ours. If the hon. gentleman will look he will find that when it was in existence two or three years nothing like $250,000 was spent on it.

Mr. CARLING. The total expenditure up to the present is $750,000, including capital expenditure.

Mr. McMULLEN. That model farm at Guelph has been in existence for twelve or fifteen years, and they have had some buildings twice burned down. I have looked over the

items in connection with this model farm, and I think there are some very extravagant items there.

Mr. CARLING. Will the hon. gentleman name the items?

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, there are some items in connection with the purchase of horses that seem to me to be very extravagant. I would remind the hon. gentleman that if increases of this kind are to be made from year to year, as they have been made in connection with immigration, the result would be just as bad.

Mr. CARLING. There is not a horse on the farm that cannot be sold to-morrow for the amount which we paid for it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the hon. gentleman must be the best jockey in Canada. I have owned a good many horses, but I never got one that I could sell for the price I gave for it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does this vote cover all the farms?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. Upon what farms and buildings is this $30,000 to be expended?

Mr. CARLING. It will be divided between the Central Farm and the other four farm stations.

Mr. FISHER. What buildings will be put up on the Central Farm?

Mr. CARLING. I think there is to be an implement house and perhaps another small house for a laboring man. I think that is about all.

Mr. FISHER. How much of this money will be spent on the Central Farm?

Mr. CARLING. I find I have not got that information here.

Mr. GILLMOR. Can the hon. gentleman state about how many horses are employed on this farm during the summer?

Mr. CARLING. I think fourteen horses.

Mr. GILLMOR. What is done with them in the winter?

Mr. CARLING. They have been employed all the winter hauling manure for the Corporation of Ottawa.

Mr. FISHER. How much is to be expended on the Indian Head Farm in Manitoba?

Mr. CARLING. An estimate has been made, but the contract is not yet let.

Mr. FISHER. How much is to be expended on the farm in Nova Scotia?

Mr. CARLING. Some portion of the amount is to complete the building in Nova Scotia.

Mr. FISHER. Are the buildings on the other farms to be erected for the same purposes as those in the Central Farm here? Is the Minister going to keep cattle and stock at the other farms as well?

Mr. CARLING. Not to the same extent. Here we have a laboratory, a green-house, a propagating house, and other buildings, but on the other farms we will not have a necessity for those buildings. There will probably be three or four houses required at the different farm stations.

Mr. FISHER. Is it intended to keep stock at the different stations?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Last year, Prof. Saunders promised that he would issue bulletins, and he offered that, if we gave the names of some of the best farmers in different counties, the bulletins would be sent to them. I sent in a number of names of farmers in my county, and two or three times the bulletins were sent out to them, but then they were discontinued. I think it is a wise provision of the Government to send these bulletins out, and I must say that I think the farmers found there was a great deal of useful information given in those bulletins.

Mr. CARLING. There were not more than two or three bulletins issued last year. There is one very important bulletin now issued which will be placed in the hands of members to-morrow, and all these bulletins will be sent to the gentlemen my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) refers to.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I understood that they were to be issued once a month.

Mr. CARLING. No; no special time was arranged, but they are issued as occasion requires.

Mr. McMULLEN. On reference to the Auditor General's Report, I find that there was paid for a pair of heavy draft horses $550, for a dark chestnut horse $250, for a light chestnut horse $235, and for another span of heavy draft horses $500, making in all about $1,500 for six horses. That appears to me to be a very heavy expenditure for horses on that farm.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman may think that is a high price to pay for horses, but it is considered advisable to have heavy draft horses for that farm. It is more advantageous to have horses weighing not less than 1,400 or 1,500 lbs. than lighter, and to get sound young horses of that character you have to pay that price. In fact, it is very difficult to get them even at that price. If the hon. gentleman goes to the farm and sees the horses which have been purchased at that price, I am sure he will agree with me that they can be sold to-morrow for the prices we have given for them.

Mr. FISHER. I think there is one fact which is not conducive to economy on this farm, and that is that, while it was stated that we were to expend $17,000 last year for a barn to accommodate cattle and stock, there are no cattle or stock on the farm yet, and that barn has not been of any use. Of course, there is no use crying over spilt milk, but I think the Minister would have done well to accept my advice to hasten slowly and not to be in such a hurry to expend so much money on buildings which have not yet been used. The result of this haste in the expenditure has been that the buildings have cost more than was necessary or advisable, and I hope the Minister will take warning, and, in regard to the other farms where he is now proceeding to erect barns, that he will look closely into the matter and not erect expensive buildings until he has proved the usefulness of these. I understand that he is proposing to establish stock at the different farms throughout the country. If it is not considered advisable to establish stock here, I think the Minister had better wait and try the experiment, first, at the Central Farm, and see what utility the country may obtain from that before he establishes stock on the other farms. My own impression is that for some time to come the Minister has on hand quite enough without making experiments with stock, until he has shown he is able to carry on experiments in other things; he had better not go into any further expenditure until he has proved the utility of the work he has already done. I have always thought from the commencement that there was a great deal of unnecessary expenditure in regard to the buildings, and that the idea of stock keeping on these farms was not a practical idea, and that the experiments which would result from the keeping of a large stock on two different farms, would not warrant the expenditure. I believe if it is necessary at

all to try experiments in stock, only a few head should be kept, and they should be kept in small buildings, because the experiments would then be just as important and just as useful as if they were tried upon a larger scale. If the Minister undertakes to erect buildings on these other farms, and especially to build them through the architects of the Public Works Department, if we are to judge by their buildings on the Central Farm, he will find himself landed in an unnecessary expenditure which will not redound to the credit of his department, or to the advantage of the farming community.

Mr. CARLING. I do not think there has been any extravagance in the erection of the barn and the stable on the Central Experimental Farm here. I think the barn is one of the best in the country, substantial and well built. We require a great deal of barn room for the crops of the farm, and this last year it was completely filled from the barn floor to the attic, indeed there was not room enough. With regard to the purchasing of stock, we are not yet prepared to do so. We have only had the farm two years; it has been cleared, drained and cultivated, and we have been putting it into good order. I think the hon. gentleman, as a practical farmer, would not want me to keep stock without some pasturing on the farm. We have none yet, but we expect to have. We are building a silo this year for the purpose of saving the corn grown on the farm. At the same time we want a pasture, and we shall have one in a short time. I think the small amount of interest that is lost on the expenditure on the barn, will not be felt by the country. When we constructed that barn we had to make a good foundation, and the basement is ready for the stock whenever the farm is ready for it. In regard to the other farms, we are not putting up anything like as expensive barns upon them as we have done here, and it is not intended to go into any great expense in stock-raising on these farms—only to purchase a small number at the start. I dare say we may not purchase any stock for the outside farms this year, but we shall make the experiment at the Central Farm and then extend it to the other farms.

Mr. GILLMOR. I had the pleasure of seeing that barn, and it is one of the most beautiful barns that I ever saw. I was struck with one thing, and that was the very nice floor which was beautifully planed, but I could not see the propriety of planing a barn floor to be used for carts and to be trodden on by horses with iron corks.

Mr. FISHER. I must differ with the Minister with regard to the expensive character of the barn. I think it is a very expensive building. It has a wonderfully substantial foundation, and the Minister might put ten times as much crop into the barn as he did last year, without its having any effect upon the foundation. He says he does not see how he could keep stock until he has a pasture, and he also says that he filled his barns to overflowing last year. He might feed out his crop in the barn, and then he would not have to spend so much money in drawing manure from the city.

Mr. CARLING. We exchange the straw for manure, or we sell the straw, and we pay a very small price for the manure from the city. We have had six pairs of horses hauling manure all winter.

Mr. FISHER. It may be the Minister got a very high price for his straw, and paid a very small price for his manure. But I fancy he had to pay for drawing his straw into the city, and he had to pay for drawing his manure out of the city, and if he had kept an account of that I think he would have found himself at the wrong end of the horn at the end of the transaction. Here is an enormous expenditure put on that barn which has not been utilised by the keeping of stock upon the farm. I pointed out to the Minister, when he was building that barn, that he ought to have gone to work upon it slowly, and taken sufficient time to be able to modify his plans, if it was found desirable. A few minutes ago he gave me the extent of his modification. He says he is going to build a silo this year. If he had built his barn more deliberately he might have built the silo in the barn, and much more economical than by erecting another building for the silo.

Mr. CARLING. We would not have had so much room in the barn.

Mr. FISHER. Then you could have built the silo in the barn all at once much better than you could put it into another barn. Now, I would like to know what the Minister is going to do with the ensilage that he takes out of this silo. I do not think he will be able to sell that ensilage—at any rate I never knew of ensilage as an article of commerce in this country.

Mr. CARLING. It depends upon how many cattle we winter here, and it depends upon the size of the silo. We intend to keep stock the coming season.

Mr. FISHER. Do you provide any sum for the purchase of that stock?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. FISHER. Then how are you going to get your stock?

Mr. CARLING. I say no, because it will be taken out of the general vote, and not out of this vote.

Mr. FISHER. Then the Minister is to have a general vote out of which he can draw for any object he pleases?

Mr. CARLING. I may purchase a few cattle out of the vote that has already been granted.

Mr. FISHER. You propose to feed the ensilage to half a dozen head of cattle, or a dozen head?

Mr. CARLING. It depends upon the number of cattle. If we construct this silo it will be made sufficiently large for the number of cattle we intend to winter.

Mr. FISHER. Then I hope the Minister will take good care to consult some farmer who understands the ensilage question, and the building of silos, and not trust to the architects of his department in such matters; because if he does he will find himself at the end of the season in a position either that he will not have ensilage for his cattle, or he will not have cattle for his ensilage. The Minister said the barn had been economically built, but there were dozens of others of equal accommodation that had cost less than half.

Mr. CARLING. Not so substantially built.

Mr. FISHER. Perhaps so, but I hold that an immense amount of money has been absolutely thrown away on the foundation.

Mr. CARLING. A good deal has been said about the cost of the barn. Is the hon. gentleman aware that the estimate taken for a new barn at the Guelph Farm, to replace one burnt, is $20,000?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know the capacity of the barn. There were about 100 head of cattle kept there, and the Minister is talking about keeping from 6 to 10 next winter.

Mr. CARLING. We have accommodation for about 70 head.

Mr. FISHER. But you have not 70 head there.

Mr. CARLING. We will get them by degrees.

Mr. FISHER. In the meantime the barn is useless. It must, moreover, be remembered that there is an agricultural college at Guelph in connection with the Model Farm. The Guelph Farm has been in existence 15 years, and

during that time large expenses have been going on which are included in the amount to which the hon. gentleman has alluded as the price the barn is to cost. There is no foundation on which to make a comparison, and we cannot judge from the statements given by the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. McMULLEN. In the Auditor General's Report there is an item of $5,100, water supply from Ottawa. I find on the next page $20,000 paid for farm laborers, ditching, &c., and for teams and men $5,000, altogether $25,000. Is it necessary to expend this money to obtain water, and is it not possible to obtain water on the farm?

Mr. CARLING. We made an arrangement in the same way as the Guelph Farm did with the city of Guelph. The Guelph Farm made an arrangement to have the city water main taken to the farm, three miles distant, and they paid about the same money as we have been obliged to pay. We found it difficult to get water at the farm without great expense of digging, and it was cheaper to get it from the city We made an arrangement to carry out the main pipes for $4,000, and to supply the water to different buildings and have hydrants for fire protection. Altogether the cost will be $5,000.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). What do you pay the city annually?

Mr. CARLING. The arrangement is 8 cents per 1,000 Imperial gallons.

Mr. FISHER. The Minister has stated that they bought manure very cheaply at $1 a load.

Mr. CARLING. We paid that before we had our own horses, waggons and sleds; now we get it at about 40 cents a load.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). With respect to the item of $1,000, National Art Gallery, I would ask whether the amount has been spent on the building or in adding to the collection?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is to keep up the rooms, pay the officer who looks after the pictures and the messenger or guardian of the premises. Any balance is employed in purchasing a picture, if one is found satisfactory. We had a couple of pictures at the recent exhibition, and they are being examined to see if we should purchase them.

Maintenance and Repairs of Government Steamers...$137,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would state why he requires the additional $7,000 or $8,000.

Mr. TUPPER. The additional amount is for the steamer *Druid*. Certain portions of the machinery have broken down, being worn out, and it is necessary to make repairs. The reduction of $8,000 from $145,000 to $137,000, is in consequence of the changed intention respecting the use of the *Stanley*. The additional $7,000 is in connection with the repairs of the steamer *Druid*.

Mr. WELSH. I heard from a deputy minister in the hon. gentleman's department that they intended to convert the *Druid* into a screw ice boat. I would ask if that is a fact?

Mr. TUPPER. The cylinder, piston and cross head of this steamer have been quite worn out, and she being at present consuming a large amount of coal, the nautical adviser and the inspector have suggested that instead of replacing that portion of the machinery it would be a large saving to convert the *Druid* into a screw steamer, so that she would not only do the service more quickly and efficiently but also consume a good deal less coal. As the hon. gentleman knows we could not do without a steamer in her place and a large saving will be effected from this conversion, instead of abandoning the *Druid* and substituting a new boat at the cost of $100,000.

Mr. WELSH. The hon. gentlemen opposite laughed when I asked this question, but I think they will all acknowledge now that it is a very relevant question. I heard this stated, and the hon. Minister has now acknowledged it, and that was the reason I asked the question. I can tell the Minister that $70,000 will not make those changes he speaks of, and that they could build a better boat than ever the *Druid* will be when completed for half the money. At all events that is my opinion. I asked the question and I presume I had a right to do so.

Mr. AMYOT. In reference to this item of $6,060 for the examination of masters and mates, I wish to ask if there is any of the vote for the Quebec School of Navigation.

Mr. TUPPER. There is no increase or charge contemplated in connection with this vote. It is the ordinary vote.

Mr. AMYOT. Is it not the intention of the Government to grant something to the Quebec School of Navigation this year?

Mr. TUPPER. At present I am not aware of any intention of that kind.

Mr. AMYOT. It would be a very important matter to assist this school, because we could turn out some good captains there.

Mr. TUPPER. The subject has not come before me at all since I have been connected with the department.

Mr. AMYOT. I bring the matter to the attention of the hon. gentleman now, and I hope he will inaugurate a new era in this respect.

Wrecks, collection of information relating to disasters to shipping..... $1,500

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Last year I brought to the attention of the House the desirability of the Government taking charge of all investigations connected with disasters to shipping. I pointed out that when often these accidents occur, as they very frequently do, not only by carelessness but also from design, that the underwriters have great difficulty in dealing with the masters, and on many occasions they have been convinced in their own mind that there was an actual intention to cast the vessel away, that in some instances they have gone to the length of resting a case against the officer on their information of suspicion. In one or two instances, through some technical law points, they have failed in getting a conviction and the masters have threatened the underwriters with an action for defamation of character. These investigations can only be properly undertaken by the Government, and in my opinion they should be undertaken by the Government. Every loss that occurs should be investigated by the Government and the masters and parties connected with it should be properly dealt with. Until that is done, we shall never have that carefulness which is necessary among our coasting and seagoing vessels generally. I think it would be highly proper for the Government to take that matter in hand and to provide themselves with authority to investigate every loss, and deal with it according to the evidence that may be laid before the court of enquiry: punishing a master, if there is thought to be wilful negligence, by the suspension of his certificate (if he has one), or otherwise rendering him incapable of taking command of a vessel. Or, in case of proved design to wreck his vessel and lose the property, to deal with him in a criminal manner. It is one of those points which the mercantile community feel very strongly

about, and I hope the Government will consider it and deal with it this year as the public interest demands.

Mr. TUPPER. I shall certainly take that matter into consideration and bring it before the attention of the Government. At first blush it strikes me that if we go through this, further than enquiring into the conduct of the master and mate which leads to the cancellation of his certificate, it might involve a much wider question. I merely express without mature deliberation the idea that when it comes to the enforcement of the criminal law it would widen into a question as to the responsibility of the Federal and Local Governments in the administration of the criminal law. It may be there can be found a distinction in connection with those maritime matters.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister will remember that the Government have undertaken this in certain cases, and I only wish that the extension of this same principle would apply to this.

Mr. TUPPER. I certainly will consider that.

Montreal and Quebec River and Water Police..... $10,000

Mr. ELLIS. I called attention to this vote last year. It does not seem fair that one or two ports in the Dominion should have the police supported at the expense of the other portions of the country, which have also charges entailed upon the local authorities by reason of the fact of their having a marine force. I think there is a small tax levied on the ports of Montreal and Quebec, but the amount of revenue received is not equal to one-half of that expended. It certainly is a very unjust thing to ports like St. John and Halifax that the local authorities there have to provide this service, and that Montreal and Quebec should have an advantage over them in that respect.

Mr. TUPPER. I may state that this matter has been carefully considered by the Government since the Estimates were brought down. Recognising that the expenditure under this head had exceeded the receipts from the tax on shipping which is levied at the ports of Montreal and Quebec, the arguments to which the hon. gentleman has alluded have been considered sufficiently strong to induce the Government to reduce the expenditure to the amount realised from the tax, and if the House insists, I will reduce that vote now; but we are dealing somewhat suddenly with this vote, which has been granted year after year; and as the tax still exists, and the necessity of employing the force still remains, it might embarrass the Government to reduce the vote at once. As the matter has gone on since 1867 in this way, I think the House might accept the proposition I make, with a full sense of its responsibility, that an effort will be made to bring the expenditure within the vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the amount of the tax?

Mr. TUPPER. The receipts at Montreal amounted in the last fiscal year to $9,624, and at Quebec to $11,447. Of course there is a very large over-expenditure, as the hon. gentleman will see, but a great many arrangements will have to be made in the coming season to bring the expenditure down.

Mr. JONES (Halifax.) I would be disposed to accept the suggestion of the hon. Minister if he could give us a more positive assurance. He said every effort would be made. That is hardly an assurance that they intend to reduce the expenditure under all circumstances.

Mr. TUPPER. I would consent to a reduction of $15,000 at once, if that would suit the hon. gentleman, which would leave me a certain margin, with the understanding that an effort is to be made to bring the expenditure within the receipts.

Mr. LOVITT. I hope the hon. gentleman does not propose to raise the dues on shipping.

Mr. TUPPER. No, not at all.

Maintenance and Repairs to lights, fog-whistles, buoys and beacons, and humane establishments..... $287,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that there is a nominal reduction of $42,000, but I also see that last year the expenditure for this service was only $263,000, so that $24,000 more appear to be wanted for 1889, than were spent in 1888.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will recollect that all along there has been a very wide margin allowed in connection with this service. I, in my humble judgment, believed the margin to be entirely too large, judging from the agent's estimates and the expenditure of the past few years; and, in view of that fact, instead of asking Parliament for the ordinary vote, I have brought it somewhat down, although I have still left a good margin in case of emergencies occurring, because in services having so wide a range we cannot fix the exact amount we might require.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to a petition which I think was presented to the department three years ago asking for an automatic buoy to be placed at the eastern entrance of Lunenberg. Vessels engaged in fishing passing in and out of the harbor go by the eastern way, and there is no light on the mainland to guide them; there have been several vessels wrecked there in the last few years. The said buoy would not cost very much, and I hope the hon. gentleman will not forget to have one placed there during the coming season.

Mr. TUPPER. Since the hon. gentleman spoke to me of this the other day, I have looked into the matter, and find that Mr. Kaulbach pressed the Government very urgently with reference to this. From a hasty examination of the papers submitted by the hon. gentleman I certainly think there was a necessity in that very important harbor for the automatic buoy. I have not had time to go through all the papers which are very voluminous, including the hon. gentleman's correspondence and the correspondence of Mr. Kaulbach.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there any reduction likely to be made in the cost of the service?

Mr. TUPPER. I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is as a matter of fact no reduction in the cost of the service for lighthouse and coast service. The total for 1888 is given at $489,000, which allows a margin of some $30,000 for this year. I do not object to a reasonable margin but what I want to understand is that there is no difference practically, and that the expenditure of the hon. gentleman is the same as that of his predecessor. Yet the hon. gentleman gave us to understand that there would be a saving of $50,000 in the department.

Mr. TUPPER. I hope so. I will explain how this will come about. I claim no particular credit of my own part for any saving. I have been too short a time in the department to make great reforms, but my predecessors had gradually reached this point in connection with the expenditure of these enormous sums. I will just allude to considerable changes in the style of our estimates as the hon. gentleman will see a little later on. There is a large decrease and some increases under some heads, and the endeavor of the department has been, with considerable success, to

not take as large a vote and restrict the power and authority of many agents, who were allowed considerable latitude in times gone by and who were not very careful in watching the expenditure. Though the total vote may not show in round numbers an actual decrease, I think I could explain in going over many of the details that there has been a saving in the ordinary charges. We are increasing every year the number of buoys and beacons, and lights, and so on; and by watching this expenditure more closely and centralising the supervision, there is every indication that we will save considerable money. I stated on the authority of the officers of my department that the result already was such as to show a saving of $50,000 a year, not $50,000 less than the vote taken the year before, but $50,000 less than we would have voted had we proceeded at the rate we did formerly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will not discuss that point just now, but wait until we see next year. I notice that the Cape Race light, $7,000, was struck out. Have we ceased to use that?

Mr. TUPPER. That is included in the bulk vote, and I might have claimed that as one of the reasons for still increasing the charge in the general sum. We have taken over that light, and instead of asking the House to vote a sum separately, we insert it in the general vote of maintenance. The accounts next year will show we received $100,000 from the British Government in connection with our assumption of management of that light.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When did you receive the $100,000?

Mr. TUPPER. Some time in January, or perhaps later.

Mr. EISENHAUER. The lighthouse in the County of Lunenburg at Mahone Bay was burnt down in 1887, and there is nothing now to replace it but a lantern hung on a pole. The number of vessels going in and out of that port is increasing very considerably.

Mr. TUPPER. I will take a note of that.

Mr. ROBERTSON. What were the reasons for closing the light at Little Sand Bay?

Mr. TUPPER. It was in consequence of the report from the agent, and I think from the commander of one of the cruisers, that this place was so filled up with sand that it was impossible for vessels of ordinary draft to have access to it.

Mr. EISENHAUER. It is a bold shore and consequently could not fill up with sand.

Mr. TUPPER. The depth of the water was represented to me by the officer at Prince Edward Island, and, I think, by the commander of the cruiser as somewhat below four feet.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There was a breakwater built there for the accommodation of the shore fisheries, and there was a light placed there by the Local Government before we entered Confederation. It has been very inconvenient since that light has been removed.

Mr. TUPPER. I understand that, but we have refused constantly to keep up lights of that kind, though they might be of benefit to the fishermen and small boats; but, in view of the reports as to the boats which have access to this place, it seemed to me that it would be unfair to maintain this light and pay the salary of a man there from year to year. I can give the hon. gentleman the reports to look over if he desires.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should not think the expense would be very great, and this being a bold shore, I think it is of as much service as the harbor lights.

Mr. TUPPER.

Meteorological Service..... $56,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How far north has this service been carried up to the present time?

Mr. TUPPER. I think Edmonton is the farthest point north.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And how many points are there on that line of latitude?

Mr. TUPPER. I must confess that this is a branch of the department in regard to which I cannot give the details, but I think there is only one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I presume that any of these points would be of little practical value unless they were connected by telegraph, but I have been informed by some of the authorities at Washington that, if it was in any way possible to connect our system with some of the stations they have recently established in Alaska, the value of our service would be enormously increased. I should like to know if it would be possible for the Government to take any steps in that direction?

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Carpmael, the superintendent of that service, has, for some time, been considering the question of the extension of the system in regard to British Columbia and Manitoba and the North-West Territories, particularly as to the issue of the probabilities, as there is a strong local demand for that. The only question that has embarrassed us is making the necessary telegraphic arrangements with the companies, and the sums that have been named up to the present time have been so enormous that I have not felt warranted in asking Parliament to vote the amount required.

Mr. FOSTER. We have many correspondent stations north of Edmonton, at the Hudson's Bay posts, but they are not telegraphic stations, and the information has to be sent by mail. That has been the course for years past.

Mr. ELLIS. If a system of exchange could be adopted with the United States, it would be of great advantage to the Eastern Provinces. I believe the American system ends at the St. Croix River. The Toronto probabilities are of very little value in reference to eastern storms. If the whole of the eastern coast could be warned from Washington by some arrangement for an exchange, we would get great value from such an arrangement.

Mr. TUPPER. I will bring that to the attention of the director of the service, Mr. Carpmael, and see if it is possible to make such an arrangement.

Mr. PRIOR. Was I right in understanding the Minister of Marine to say that he understood the necessity of extending the meteorological service to British Columbia? It is of the utmost importance, in view of the vast amount of shipping we have there, that it should be extended, and it would save a great many valuable lives and a great deal of property.

Mr. TUPPER. Of course, if the service is to be maintained at all, it must ultimately cover the whole of the Dominion of Canada as far as possible, and the only thing which blocks our way at present is the very important question of cost. We have been dealing with that for some time past, but we have reached no result up to the present which would justify us in asking Parliament to vote the money required.

Marine and Immigrant Hospital, Quebec..... $15,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Why does the Government require seven medical men at the Marine Hospital at Quebec?

Mr. TUPPER. A good many of these are only nominal, and are paid very small amounts. There is one resident

physician there, Dr. Catellier, and we are making a reduction in a vote which has been in the Estimates, as I understand, right along. The expenditure has been and is out of proportion to the number of men who are properly chargeable to this fund, and we are now endeavoring to grapple with that matter and to expend only so much as we are bound to expend. The number of officers is due to the fact that this property was handed over before Confederation as a trust for this purpose, and these trustees and commissioners have received a nominal salary from the time of Confederation to the present day. It is now the idea of the Government not to replace these officers as the offices become vacant, and to reduce the expenditure as fast as possible.

Mr. MITCHELL. I may say, as having had some experience with the Marine Hospital at Quebec, that my hon. friend will do good service to the country by giving the matter his most diligent attention, and he will find that he will be able to reduce very largely this sum of $15,000.

Mr. TUPPER. I think we can, even this year.

Mr. MITCHELL. Under the old régime, when we came into Confederation, we left things as they were, because there were five or six hundred vessels coming into the harbor at Quebec in the course of two months. Now, the number is very much reduced, and the necessity of maintaining that staff at the hospital no longer exists. I think my hon. friend will be able to reduce that sum by one half. I am speaking now in the presence of the hon. gentleman who always looks after the interests of Quebec, the Minister of Public Works. It is very rarely that I say anything against Quebec, but I must say in relation to this Marine Hospital that when the tonnage has been reduced so enormously, when business is almost extinct, and when the large fleet of three or four hundred vessels that we have seen there at one time has been reduced to 20, or 30, or 40, I think the Minister of Marine will see the propriety of impressing upon the Minister of Public Works the necessity of letting him put the pruning knife into the Marine Hospital. I know the Minister of Marine is anxious to do what is right, and I know the difficulty he has to contend with when he attempts to cut anything down in Quebec, and I say this in order to strengthen his hands.

Marine Hospitals in Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia $30,000

Mr. ELLIS. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Marine to the condition of the Marine Hospital in St. John, the management of which is disgraceful to the country. In regard to finances I dare say for the last two years the expenditure is less than the receipts. But it has been shown during the year that the patients are practically starved in that institution. The diet table is one wholly unfit for men who are sick or even convalescent. At one time during the year two seamen from the hospital came to my office with the dinner provided for them, and I can say to the Minister as a matter of absolute fact that the potatoes were not fit to be eaten by well men, much less by men who are supposed to be sick. The meat they brought to me, while it was sweet enough, while they might cut it very well at sea when men were working, with their teeth, it certainly could not be eaten in any place where men were being treated for sickness. There is no attendance. The men are not attended to by any person except the keeper. They are farmed out at $3 a head to this keeper, whose business it is to expend as little as possible for the money he receives. The attendance is almost entirely of the sick people themselves upon themselves. The allowance which is given to the keeper for engineering, or for fire, practically goes into his own pocket. He hires no effective help. The food that is sent by charitable people around the city, as a matter of kindness to these sick men, is very often taken possession of by the keeper himself, under the plea that the doctor must know what sort of food is given to the people. I have the diet table here to which I will call the attention of the House. For breakfast, one pint of tea, eight ounces of bread, one ounce of butter. There is an alternate of porridge and milk. If a man takes porridge and milk he is not allowed tea and bread and butter. There is no coffee, no chocolate, none of those nourishing things, and no fruit at all. Dinner consists of beef, potatoes and soup, except on Friday, when there is codfish and potatoes. No tea, no liquid of any kind at the dinner. Supper is precisely the same as breakfast. There is an allowance of roast lamb or veal on Sunday, but no desert of any kind at any time.

Mr. DAVIN. That is the best régime

Mr. ELLIS. Provided that it was eatable. My hon. friend while in his usual health, no doubt, could eat the very toughest beef in the North-West, but if he was a sick man in the St. John hospital he could not eat the beef provided in that institution. The great trouble is that there is no supervision over the hospital. The hospital came into the charge of this Government at Confederation; it had been established by the Provincial Government, and there were commissioners who acted from month to month as an act of grace in visiting the institution and looking after it. Now that has been done away with entirely, no new commissioners were appointed, the old ones have no power, and consequently the institution has practically gone to the bad. The old physician, Dr. Botsford, a man who stood very high in his profession, went there largely as a matter of love, and I think that while he was alive the institution was in better condition than it is now. Since his death the physician appointed has other duties to perform, and he cannot visit the hospital when he is suddenly called upon, and although he has an assistant getting additional pay, it sometimes happens that the owners of vessels or the agents of vessels take a man to the hospital requiring early treatment, and he has to lie there three or four hours before he can get medical attendance, and then perhaps another medical man has to be called in. I am satisfied that the Minister of Marine himself, who appears to be a very humane man, if he knew the facts of the case, would not allow anything of that kind to continue. The facts are so glaring that they were stated openly in the public prints, and the Government organ at St. John dispatched its reporter to view the place. I can furnish the Minister with his report if he desires to see it, and I can furnish to him the names of responsible persons in St. John who are quite willing to corroborate the statements made. The reporter found the place was very dirty. He found in the kitchen dead rats lying about the floor, and he makes the sharp remark that they evidently had not been fed upon the hospital regulation diet table. I trust the Minister will go to work and institute a rigid examination into the management of the institution. I do think, as an absolute matter of fact, that it would be better to abolish the institution altogether than allow it to go on as it is. An arrangement could be made with the general public hospital at St. John to board the patients at so much a week. There have been in the institution perhaps 150 patients at a time, but the whole year round they only average 12. I really think for the same money they would get far better treatment if they were constantly under the eye of all the physicians of St. John.

Mr. TUPPER. Certainly what the hon. gentleman has said will engage my attention, especially as he has brought out some new matters. I saw the article in the press to which the hon. gentleman alludes, and I sent the article at once to the agent of the Department in St. John, Mr.

Harding, and the doctor, whom I understand to be a reputable physician in the city, although I do not know him personally. Their reports, which are in the department, can be brought down, but certainly to my mind they fully meet the charges that have been brought against the treatment of inmates of that hospital. Some additional points seem to have fallen from the hon. gentleman's lips that did not occur in the article, nor had they been dealt with particularly by the agent or the doctor in the reports to which I refer, but if my recollection serves me rightly—and it is some time since I read the report and the article—there was a reason for those charges. These two sailors to whom the hon. gentleman alludes had a quarrel with the keeper and with the doctor, and in the spirit of revenge they made these charges. They, at all events, drew the attention of the good citizens of St. John to the institution, and convinced a certain number of people that their charges were true. But if the statements of the doctor and the agent of the department, in addition to that of the keeper, after careful enquiry, are honest, and I have no reason to doubt them, the hon. gentleman will find, unless he has some personal knowledge of the matter, that the statement has been highly exaggerated.

Mr. ELLIS. No.

Mr. TUPPER. I hope such is the case; but the first opportunity I have of making a personal investigation as to the condition of the institution I will certainly take advantage of. In regard to the larger question which the hon. gentleman has brought up, I think the system is a very good one indeed. It has worked well in Halifax and Montreal, where the hospital is paid a per diem allowance for every man sent there, and there have been no complaints whatever with respect to the treatment of the men at those institutions. But if the hon. gentleman wishes to push the matter further it would be more satisfactory to him and to me to have the reports before us, and if he desires I will show them to him, but so far as they are concerned, they meet the statements in the press as to bad food and the bad condition in which the hospital is kept.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. gentleman must himself see that such a diet table is not suitable for an institution of this kind. Further, if a certain amount is paid per head, the contractor will naturally endeavor to make as much money as possible out of it, and he will endeavor to keep the diet down to the very lowest limit. The very worst person indeed to whom the enquiry could have been referred was the Government agent at St. John, for, while he might be a very good agent, he would naturally be biased in regard to a question which reflected on himself.

Mr. TUPPER. He is not responsible for the management of the hospital.

Mr. ELLIS. I think he is.

Mr. TUPPER. No; he has only general superintendence over Government affairs at the port. The keeper is in charge of the hospital.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). That is the point of which we complain. Before Confederation the institution was under a board of commissioners composed of gentlemen interested in the shipping and commerce of the port, but only one now remains. Some person should be responsible, and the charge should not be left in the hands of the keeper. Of course he endeavors to make as much as he can out of the weekly allowance. Some few years ago the hospital was rebuilt, and it is a very good building with every convenient arrangement, and if it were brought under the control of the general public hospital it would be an advantage. I am satisfied from what I have seen and what took place at the time, that if an investigation had taken place by a disinterested person, the statements made in the press of the time and those made by my hon. colleague would be found to be well founded. I will read a letter from a Spanish captain, who was at the hospital. It is addressed to a lady who took an interest in the institution. It is as follows:—

"The man is not capable of writing out a statement of his case himself, but I have obtained from him an account of his treatment in that institution. He was a seaman on board the Spanish steamship *Euskaro*, and having received certain injuries in the discharge of his duty, was admitted to the hospital four months and a half ago. I arrived here on the 6th instant, and on the 8th I went to the hospital to see the man, he being a townsman of mine. I found he was looking in a bad and neglected way, his hair and whiskers not having been trimmed since his admittance; and I may say if the man had been incarcerated in a common gaol in my country he would not have been left in such a neglected condition. He complained of the food, saying that it was the same things day after day, without any change. For breakfast he had bread, butter and tea; and for dinner a little beef and potatoes; for tea they were given tea, butter and bread, and for a change they had fish on Fridays. At last his stomach refused to take the stuff, and he said he would have given anything for a change. He gave them $5 to procure a little variety, and for the next three days he was given at dinner a piece of chicken. After the day I was there (the 8th) he had nothing to complain about the food. On the 15th, it being fine weather, I took him on board my ship, and I will take him to Liverpool and send him to his family. They gave him back the $5 when he left the hospital. Trusting the foregoing may be of use to you in your kind efforts for benefiting the condition of the unfortunate patients in that hospital, and thanking you for the interest you have taken in the case, I am &c."

I will hand the letter with certain comments made on it to the Minister of Marine, and it goes to show that those sailors were not the only ones to complain. In our port, where a number of vessels are arriving all the time, this hospital is a most useful institution for the sailors who visit the port, and if it were under the general public hospital, which is an admirably conducted institution, and if it were placed in charge of Dr. William Bayard, who has charge of the General Hospital, and of the hospital staff, it would be well conducted.

Mr. MULOCK. What does it cost per head per day?

Mr. TUPPER Seventy-five cents.

Mr. MULOCK. Does this man pay all the expenses of maintaining the hospital?

Mr. TUPPER. No; this is a board allowance.

Mr. MULOCK. What does the property cost to maintain?

Mr. TUPPER. In St. John, $3,465.

Mr. MULOCK. It appears to me that no matter what supervision the Government endeavor to exercise, it will be wholly impossible to have justice done to the inmates as long as the present farming-out system obtains, because the keeper is interested in preparing such bills of fare as have been referred to, and no instructions from the head office can make an improvement.

Mr. TUPPER. The dietary scale is prepared by the doctor.

Mr. MULOCK. Is he a resident?

Mr. TUPPER. He is a resident of St. John.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, but he is not a resident surgeon, and, therefore, cannot exercise proper supervision. How would the doctor be able to say whether there was bad food served out in months gone by. The only way to make improvement is by a radical change in the system and not by any superficial examination. In the meantime men will suffer so long as this system is kept in force. Seventy-five cents a day for each patient is a very good allowance, but I suppose they are few in numbers, and that it does not pay as well as if there were a large number. Any person in Ontario can send a patient to the general wards of the Toronto Hospital and have the patient boarded for forty cents per day.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have been waiting for the last half hour to say something on this matter, and I propose to say what I have got to say now with all due respect to other hon. gentlemen who seem anxious to speak. The seamen pay the tax for attendance at the Marine Hospital, and they have a right to proper maintenance and support. If the statements made by the hon. member for the County of St. John (Mr. Weldon), and the hon. gentleman from the City of St. John (Mr. Ellis), are true, they are not to the credit of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I am sure the Minister would not allow this state of things to exist one minute, if he knew it, and now that he has had his attention called to it, I hope that he will take such steps as are necessary to have a reformation made in the matter. Those seamen pay the taxes for their maintenance, and they have a right to suitable accommodation and suitable food while they are in the hospital.

Mr. GILLMOR. The sailors pay ?

Mr. MITCHELL. I said the seamen pay.

Mr. GILLMOR. I merely wanted to understand that.

Mr. MITCHELL. If there are any of those eleemosynary institutions in this country which receive the money of the people and do not properly conduct the establishment in the way of giving the inmates proper support and proper food, the matter should be looked into at once. The statement of the members for the County and City of St. John lead us to believe that there are gross grievances in relation to the management of the hospital at St. John. If that is so, now that the attention of the Minister is called to it, he should have a proper report on the matter. If there has been mismanagement, the guilty people should be properly punished. I am sure that your zealous young Minister of Marine, wishing to make a reputation for himself, will not allow a blot of this kind to remain on the escutcheon of the department for any length of time, but that he will see and have it removed.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I think the hon. gentleman is incorrect in saying that the sailors pay the tax. The shipowners pay it.

Mr. MITCHELL. The sailors pay it, they are charged 20 cents per month for it.

Resolutions reported.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman propose to take up to-morrow first ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will take up some Bills, probably the Franchise Bill, then some minor Bills and then the Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may inform the Minister of Public Works that probably on going into the Estimates my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Flynn) will desire to make some observations in reference to the Cape Breton Railway, although I do not know that he intends to make a motion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 3rd April, 1889.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 132) to amend the Revised Statutes respecting Interest (from the Senate).—(Sir John Thompson.)

W. A. WEBSTER.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, 1. Has W. A. Webster been continuously in the employ of the Government since the 1st July last? If so, at what salary, and how much per day for travelling expenses? 2. What amount has been paid him on account of services up to the 1st April instant?

Mr. CARLING. 1. No; Mr. Webster was temporarily employed from May 1st, 1887, to July 31st, 1888. He was re-employed from September 1st, 1888, until January 15th, 1889. He was re-employed on March 1st, 1889, until further notice. He was paid, while on service, $2 per day for salary, and an allowance of $2 per day for living expenses, together with actual moving expenses. 2. The total amount paid to Mr. Webster, to the present date, is $1,887.84, covering the period from May 1st, 1887, to April 30th, 1888: $730 for salary, also $730 for living expenses, and $427.84 for moving expenses. The latest date to which Mr. Webster has been paid for any services, or expenses, is April 30th, 1888.

BUOYING LAKE ST. PETER.

Mr. RINFRET asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to substitute a floating light for the buoy located opposite Yamachiche, in Lake St. Peter, on the River St. Lawrence?

Mr. TUPPER. This matter was only called to my attention by the hon. gentleman who asks the question, and I have asked for a report to be made upon the subject, and at present there is no particular reference to it in the department.

LAKE ST. JOHN RAILWAY.

Mr. COUTURE (for Mr. DE ST. GEORGES) (translation) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant, during this Session, a subsidy to the Lake St. John Railway Company, to enable the company to reach the City of Quebec by way of the Parishes of St. Ambroise and Charlebourg, instead of by using the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway as at present.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to give an answer to the hon. member. He must wait till the policy of the Government upon that matter is laid before the House before the end of the Session.

Mr. COUTURE (for Mr. DE ST. GEORGES) (translation) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant, during this Session, to the Lake St. John Railway Company, a subsidy to aid in the construction of a branch about ten miles in length, from St. Gabriel Station to St. Gabriel West, in the valley of River-aux-Pins.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) My answer to the hon. member is the same as that I have just given to the previous enquiry.

N. W. T.—MORMON SETTLEMENT.

Mr. DOYON (translation) asked, Whether the Government have had cognisance of the following despatch published in the newspaper, *La Minerve*, of the 28th March: "Some hundreds of Mormons have crossed the frontier and are grouped near Fort McLeod. The despatches say that they are now importing a large number of cattle for stock-raising, and that they are preparing for a large colony. This is very bad seed grain, and we do not want to see any comer of the North-West poisoned with it. Polygamy is forbidden by our laws, and whosoever practices it infringes them," &c. If so, what steps do they intend to take in the matter?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member, I may state the Government have no such information before them.

B. C.—MINING IN RAILWAY BELT.

Mr. MARA. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice whether the Privy Council have given a decision in the case submitted by the Government of British Columbia regarding the precious metals within the Railway Belt?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have received an intimation to-day that the decision is in favor of the Province.

Mr. MARA. I wish to make a suggestion to the Government with reference to this matter. I would say that whilst the decision of the Government is, I believe, satisfactory to the Province of British Columbia, it will also be in the interests of the whole Dominion, as it is far better that our mining laws should be administered by one, rather than by the two Governments. If the Federal and Local Governments had a dual control, it would necessitate having two staffs of officers, and two separate sets of mining laws and regulations. I would, however, impress upon the Government the advisability of entering into negotiations with the Provincial Government for the transfer or exchange of the land within the twenty-mile belt, for lands within the Peace River District.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is hardly in order in referring to this matter now.

Mr. MARA. My excuse for bringing the matter up now is that if I put a motion on the paper it would be impossible for it to be reached this Session.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman can bring this matter up on going into Supply as effectively, if not more effectively, than it can be brought before the House now.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 4) to further amend the Revised Statutes, chapter 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope the hon. gentleman will give further explanations as regards the scope of this Bill, to those which he gave on the first reading.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not think it was necessary to repeat to the House the explanations which I gave in introducing the Bill, and which, I think, were sufficient to explain its provisions. The House will remember that the Bill which is now presented was introduced last Session with very slight differences. Instead of its being pressed upon the attention of the House, it was agreed that a temporary statute should be passed suspending the Revision Act for last year, and maintaining, of course, the existing lists. It was stated to the House at that time that provision would be made for printing the electoral lists, during the recess, in the printing bureau at Ottawa. That has been done, and the principal feature of this Bill is to make the lists, as printed and now ready in the Bureau of Printing, available for the revision of the present year. The Bill, therefore, provides, that as soon after the 1st of June as practicable; and availing himself of all the sources of information which the present law provides shall be made available, the revising officer shall proceed to make two supplementary lists. First, a supplementary list of those who are to be added to the list as now printed, and awaiting distribution in the bureau, and then a supplementary list of those who are to be struck off; that those supplementary lists so prepared by him, are to be transmitted to the proper officer in Ottawa, to be printed here as additions to, and corrections of the lists as now set up. These supplementary lists being struck off are to be forwarded to the revising officer in sufficient numbers to enable him to post them in the proper places and to distribute them throughout the polling districts to the proper persons. He thereupon appoints a day for making his revision, and he then takes up the supplementary lists, so prepared, of additions to and diminutions from the electoral lists, and proceeds with the revision in the way now prescribed. I may explain to the House that the appearance in the last page of the Bill of section 13 is an error of the draughtsman. He was desired to incorporate in the Bill, for submission to this House, the main features, with but a few exceptions, of the Bill of last year, and his attention was not called to the last section of the Bill of last year which had been adopted and went into force and is not required to be repeated this year. It is, therefore, proposed, if the Bill should meet the favorable consideration of Parliament, that the revision should take place this year upon the lists as now set up, and accordingly the electoral lists which I have described will be prepared immediately after the 1st of June. That is the main feature of the Bill. There are two or three other minor ones which it will be unnecessary, I presume, that I should explain on the second reading. We propose to adopt a new schedule of voters, in order to lessen the expense of printing, and that provision will be found on page 6 adopting some further provisions, as the House will know, as it was explained at a previous Session, which will result in very considerable diminution of the expenses of preparing the lists. There is also a provision in the Bill that persons who are disqualified by law from voting, for anything like corrupt practices, shall be likewise disqualified from being placed on the list. The object of that, as indeed is the policy of the present law, is to make the list itself final as far as possible and to avoid the confusion which might take place at the polling place in disqualifying a voter who may be correctly on the list but may not have the right to vote. If it were not for that, a person, although disqualified under the Election Act from voting, would not be disqualified from being placed on the list if he had the proper qualification, and he might present himself at the poll when there would be no opportunity of investigating the facts connected with his disqualification. We propose that the loss of qualification by reason of any act of the kind I have referred to shall result also in the deprivation of the right to be put on the list. The object of that is to make the list as far as possible final, and just as it is intended to be used at the polls. I think that the explanations I have made involve the disclosure of the important provisions of the Bill. Of course, I shall be glad to explain any further detail that may be found necessary.

Mr. EDGAR. I think that the most acceptable Bill that the Government could have brought in on this subject would have been one to repeal this Act altogether. I am inclined to think that the expenses of the machinery of that Act must have convinced the country how unwise a measure it was, and that the trouble which it gives to mem-

bers and to the electors themselves must have convinced the members of this House on both sides that we would be very much better without this Franchise Act. More than that, when the Bill was passed it disfranchised a large number of electors in Ontario, in Manitoba, in Prince Edward Island and in British Columbia. It not only continues to do so in some of these Provinces, but in the Province of Ontario, on account of the recent legislation there which has so widely extended the privilege of the franchise as to make it practically manhood suffrage, there are an enormous number of the electors of that Province disqualified from voting at Dominion elections. I am surprised that I did not hear some suggestion from the Minister of Justice that he would extend the scope of the franchise to meet these difficulties. I admit, if the Bill is going on at all, that the amendments which he proposes in regard to the supplementary lists are necessary to carry out the new system of printing the lists which he has adopted. But there are some suggestions which I am going to take the liberty of making, and I hope the hon. Minister, with the frankness which usually characterises him, will consider whether he cannot adopt them or something like them. Now, I do not think anybody can justify the provision, which I see is to be re-enacted in section 15, that the preliminary list shall be made by the revising officer from the assessment rolls and all the information that he can obtain from that or any other source. Surely that never was right, and it is not right to re-enact it. I will leave it to the Minister of Justice whether a judicial proceeding of that kind should properly be covered by such language—that this judicial officer is to be at liberty to put names on the list, from any information he can obtain from any source whatever, hearsay or otherwise, and to put the public to the expense of contesting these names in the formal way provided in the final revision. Surely, it would be fairer all round, more business like, cheaper and more just, if we imposed some restrictions on the powers of the revising officer in connection with the preliminary list. I would suggest to the Minister that he should provide that the revising officer, in preparing the preliminary and supplemental lists, shall have regard to these two sources of information—first, the last revised voters' list, which is at present the basis of all his proceedings; and next, the last assessment rolls as finally revised for municipal purposes; and after that, for the purpose of ascertaining who has died since the last revision, that he shall procure a copy of the official list of deaths according to the latest mortuary statistics to be had, and shall strike out the names of those who have died. Beyond that he should have no other power to make any alterations, corrections or additions in the list, unless he does it on the basis of a statutory declaration made by persons who show a personal knowledge of the facts sufficient to justify the returning officer in adding or removing names or making corrections. I would suggest, also, that a time be fixed in this Act when the revising officer shall be bound to receive such statutory declarations, some time after the 1st of June when he is to go to work; and then some later date should be fixed up to which he can receive them, and beyond which he cannot receive them; so that everybody will have fair play. I would suggest that these statutory declarations should be open to the inspection of anyone interested at the office of the revising officer, just as the existing law provides in the case of the final revision. Now, I cannot see any reason against this. It is not an expensive proceeding; it takes a great deal of unpleasant responsibility from the shoulders of the revising officer; it prevents him being charged even with any sort of collusion or unfairness, as he might easily be if he chose names by hearsay or made corrections on hearsay evidence; and it will altogether give the public a certain amount of confidence in this law which they do not possess now. I hope the Minister of Justice will see the fairness of these propositions. I have drafted some amendments which might suit his views, but we can easily arrange those when the House is in committee. There is not a great deal to criticise in the details of the measure, because the Minister has explained them pretty fully. I see he has extended the time from the 1st of September to the 1st of October for finishing the preliminary list. That will throw it somewhat later, but I suppose there is no objection to that as long as it gives more time to get the preliminary list thoroughly prepared. Then I see he proposes in section 17 to charge 25 cents for copies of the list in each polling district, while the charge in the present Act is only 10 cents. I think it is a pity to increase the price, because under the present system of Government printing, surely the work is more economically done than it was before. In sub-section 2 of section 17, I think there is a clear error made by the draftsman of the Bill. It is proposed to restrict the number of lists which shall be sent by registered letter to officials. The present Act provides that those lists shall be sent to each member of a council. In this Bill these words are proposed to be struck out, and the lists are only to be sent to the mayor as a member of the council. I think it is a great pity to restrict them to the mayor in places where there is a mayor, and it is still more unfortunate not to let the members of the council have them where there is no mayor. They should certainly be sent to the reeves of villages and townships, because in Ontario there are no mayors except in cities and towns. I suppose that will be changed when we get into committee, for it is evidently an error. I do not think that the subject, in itself, calls for much more comment than I have made. There are some matters of detail which will be discussed in committee, but I hope the Minister will consider these suggestions.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it is greatly to be regretted that the hon. the Minister cannot see his way clear to anticipate the inevitable result of this matter by two or three years and repeal the whole thing. I certainly believe a great majority of his own friends would approve of that course. The result, so far, of this measure has been to convince the vast majority of the Conservative party that this Bill is cumbersome, expensive and unnecessary. I know this to be the case in my own section of country. I have noticed editorials in party journals supporting the hon. gentleman which have unhesitatingly and in unqualified terms condemned the measure, and I do not believe there is a more absurd measure on the Statute-book of any country than this same Franchise Act. We have now in process of formation in various Provinces of the Dominion a better voters' list than would be formed under this Act—a voters' list in the course of formation by the officers of the people themselves, and in the formation of these lists the people of this Dominion are exercising the right specially delegated to them by the British North America Act. The mode in which the franchise should be exercised, and the question as to how it should be exercised in the various Provinces is, in my opinion, a matter that comes within the scope of the local authorities as pertaining to civil rights. The last Frachise Bill cost this country, in round numbers, $500,000; the present list will cost as much, or more. I assert that it is entirely unnecessary, and, in addition to this cost, it puts the people to a vast amount of trouble and expense in attending the Courts of Revision and seeing that their names are properly put upon the list. The whole thing is a matter of vexation, trouble and expense to all parties in the Dominion. I know this from personal observation, having had the experience attendant on the formation of one voters' list. There is no country in the world where such a policy exists as exists here; there is no reason for such a policy. In the formation of lists for municipal purposes, or for local or provincial

purposes, there is no reason why the list that answers for the purpose of electing a member of a Local Legislature should not answer very well for the election of a member of the Dominion Legislature.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). You cannot elect to a township council on the same list.

Mr. CHARLTON. The same list answers both purposes. On the same list is a list of the voters eligible to vote for members of the Local Legislature, and for municipal councillors.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). No, not by any means.

Mr. CHARLTON. The policy of the Government is not a uniform policy. We have universal suffrage in some Provinces and qualifications in other Provinces, and the very principle upon which was based the enacting of this law was violated in its enactment. It was asserted that the law was necessary in order that we might have a uniform Dominion franchise, but when the Government proceeded to frame the law they gave us as great, if not greater, variety of qualifications in the various Provinces than exists in the provincial lists. I shall take the opportunity before this Act becomes law, to offer an amendment to the effect that in all Provinces where universal suffrage is established, the voters' lists of such Provinces shall be accepted for Dominion purposes; and I believe, if the hon. gentleman will consent to so amend his Bill as to provide for universal suffrage, that would at least minimise the objections against the measure and the vexations attendant upon the formation of the lists and the working out of the law. The best thing would be to sweep it away altogether, but the next best thing to that would be to adopt manhood suffrage. If the hon. gentleman cannot see his way to adopt universal suffrage in all the Provinces, let him adopt it in Provinces in which it now exists for provincial purposes. In that way he would simplify the operation of carrying the Act into force, he will reduce the expense, he will popularise the law, remove discontent, and make the Act much more acceptable to the people and much more in consonance with principles of good government.

Mr. COLTER. I would like to call the attention of this House to section 7 of the first Franchise Act, chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes. That section provides:

"In the case of farmer's sons or of the son of an owner of real property, other than a farmer, each such son, to entitle him to vote as such, under the foregoing provisions of this Act, must have been, from the time of his name having been placed on the list of voters to the time of the election for the electoral district in which he tenders his vote, and must then be, a resident in such electoral district as hereinbefore provided with his father, (or with his mother after the death of his father), being such owner as aforesaid."

Now, this section is absolutely inconsistent with section 42 of the Election Act, which provides that all persons on the list of voters shall be entitled to vote at the election. This legislative enactment in the Franchise law and this provision in the Election Act, are contradictory, and have given rise to quite expensive litigation. Under the circumstances, it must be very difficult for our courts to determine whether section 7 truly constitutes the law and the lists are not final, or whether the Election Act, which makes the lists final, is to be taken as the law. This is a point which should certainly, in the interests of the public generally, be cleared up. Then there are several other points that require to be made clear. There is the point with reference to aliens and persons who have gone to another country and taken the oath of allegiance. There is nothing in the oath provided to prevent those persons continuing on the franchise list as good voters. Some judges have decided in some way and some in the other. At any rate, in the Election Act, any person who swears he is a British subject by birth—and that is not inconsistent with his having been since naturalised in a foreign country—can take the oath and vote. It would be well to have some amendment made in that respect. There is another point. We have very often voters who at one particular stage possess a certain qualification and at another stage change that qualification. For instance, a man may be the owner of property within an electoral district. During the year he may sell that property, he may live on the interest of the money, or he may rent a farm and become a tenant. Now, according to the law, that man and all his sons as well are disfranchised, because he has become a tenant, and yet has not been a tenant one year. The law provides that he must be a tenant for a year before he can be placed on the list of voters, and his sons cannot qualify in any case as farmer's sons, because they cannot qualify as the sons of tenant unless the lease is a five years lease. There is another point to which I wish to call attention. It is said that the assessment roll is proof or evidence of value, but it is evidence of nothing else. The revising officer, or his clerk, is not obliged to adopt the assessment roll and incorporate the names placed thereon with the names on the revised Dominion voters' list, and in some cases he is unable to do so. Take the case of a tenant who appears as a tenant on the assessment roll. *Prima facie* he would appear to be qualified to vote, but that does not make him comply with the requirements of the Franchise Act. The mere fact that he is placed as a tenant on the assessment roll does not show that he is placed as a tenant for one year previous, and, therefore, the revising officer is not obliged to enter his name on the Dominion list. Again, there is no provision for using that assessment roll with reference to income voters, and the number of income voters, in all constituencies, is very large. Therefore, if we have to revise these voters' lists from the voters' lists of the Dominion, revised in 1886, the number of changes that will have to be made will be enormous. I know that in my own constituency there will be not less than 1,000 names to be added. I have some grounds on which to base this calculation. In 1887, it was expected that a revision would take place, and, between the revision of 1886 and the revision which we expected to occur in 1887, there were 350 names to be added, for one party only, in a constituency of an ordinary size. Supposing the other party to have had, at all events, 250 names, there would be a change of about 600 names in a purely farming community in one year. Therefore, I think I am within the mark when I say that there are quite 1,000 names to be added. If these people have to be qualified by statutory declarations, the labor will be enormous, and, therefore, I would suggest, for the consideration of the Minister of Justice, that the revising officer should take the Ontario list for 1888, or should take the assessment roll as it is with reference to tenants. He cannot take the assessment roll very well in regard to income voters, which refers to those who have an income of $300, because the only income voters who are assessed for income are those who have a considerable income, much more than sufficient to enable them to qualify. If the Ontario list of 1888 was taken by the revising officer with the Dominion list revised in 1886, the labor to the candidates, and to those working for the candidates, would be very much lessened. Then another suggestion which I would ask to be incorporated in some way in the Bill, is that after the revising officer shall have completed his work, the list, before being sent down to Ottawa as finally revised, should be for a certain number of days subject to inspection, in order that, if any clerical errors creep in inadvertently, those who are interested and those who have notes of these clerical errors can call the attention of the revising officer to them. By way of illustration, I may mention that in my own constituency I discovered that certain clerical errors had been made by the clerk of the revising officer quite innocently.

I called his attention to it, and he sent down here and procured the list to be returned to him to be corrected; but this did not dispose of all the errors that were made There were other errors made. For instance, the clerk may not take his notes very carefully when the court is being held, and he may enter an appeal as being allowed instead of disallowed, quite inadvertently; but, according to the present arrangement, the roll would come down to Ottawa with that error in it and without our being able to rectify or correct that mistake in any way. There is another point to which I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice. It is one which has come up in practical experience. Farmers' sons are allowed to qualify on the property of their mother only after the death of their father. If it should happen, as it does in many cases, that the farmer's sons are living on the property of the mother during the lifetime of the father, they are not able to qualify at all. I remember an instance where a man had deserted his wife, and she had brought up the family. They were living with her on the property which she had acquired by her own industry. Those sons were helping her to manage that property, and yet by the law as it exists—and there is no correction in that regard in the Bill now before the House—those sons were not entitled to vote because they were living on the property of the mother, the property which they had helped the mother to work, during the lifetime of the father. There are many objections which might be urged against the Bill. It is a very complicated Bill, and it is difficult to attend to all these provisions in regard to fancy franchises. However, I think it my duty to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to these matters that I have mentioned.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this measure is a very important one, and one which should receive from the House and the Government greater consideration than has been for some time bestowed upon it. The House, a few years ago, undertook to change the policy which had prevailed for seventeen years, providing that the qualification of voters for election to this House should be the qualification adopted by the Legislatures of the different Provinces. No abuse or difficulty had ever grown out of that course. In adopting the policy which previously prevailed, we voluntarily adopted a provision which is also a provision of the American Constitution. It is well known that, in the United States, Congress has no power to declare what the qualification of electors for voting in regard to the House of Representatives shall be. The Constitution provides that whatever is the qualification for electors to the more popular branch in the State shall be the qualification for voting for members to be elected to the House of Representatives. The framers of the American Constitution proceeded upon an obvious principle—a principle which we have often discussed here, that our system of government, like theirs, or their system of government like ours, proceeds upon the assumption that the people are qualified for self-government, that the Local Legislatures will not abuse the powers conferred upon them, and that those who are qualified as voters for representatives in the Legislatures of the Province or the State are equally competent to elect members for the House of Representatives in the United States or for the House of Commons here. When I look back to the articles of Confederation which were agreed upon by the representatives of the different Provinces prior to Confederation taking place, which were altered afterwards by some authority, I do not know what, though perhaps the hon. gentleman opposite might explain, before the British North America Act was adopted, though certainly they were altered without the authority of anyone on this side of the Atlantic, I find that the very provision for which I am contending would, by those articles, have been made always a part of our constitution if faith had been kept, and if that plan of the constitution had been adopted by the Imperial Parliament which was agreed upon by the Quebec Convention. That convention goes even further, for I find that it was there expressly reserved to the Provinces to determine the boundaries of the different constituencies which were to elect members to the House of Commons. The framers of that plan of the constitution, of whom the present leader of the Government was one, went upon the assumption that this House represents the people of the different Provinces, and that, in the creation of the Federal Legislature, it was for the people through their representatives in these different Provinces, acting separately and distinctly from each other, to say what the qualification of the electors should be within their respective limits. If the articles of Confederation framed by the Quebec Convention had been incorporated into an Imperial Act just as they are, without any modification, it would not have been in the power of this House to have dealt with this question at all. It would have been for the Legislative Assembly of each Province to say what shall be the qualification of the electors within the limits of that Province; and that is the only rule consistent with the principle of representation by population. You will observe, that representation by population is not adopted with respect to the constituency. The constituencies may be unequal; they are unequal in the Province of Quebec to this hour; but there was no intention to break the inequality of the constituencies. There was a provision, not that each electoral district shall be equal and contain the same population—that is not the provision of the constitution; but it is, that each Province shall be represented in the House of Commons in proportion to its population. Quebec is to have 65 members, not that each electoral district in Quebec shall be equal, but that the Province of Quebec shall be represented here by 65 members, and all the other Provinces shall be represented in the same proportion, on the basis of population. Now, I think here is the mischief that is likely to arise from the course that was at that time determined upon, and, that until a very few years ago was voluntarily adhered to by the representatives of the people in this House. Sir, when we look at the whole political organisation of our community, from the school section up to this House, we find that all the machinery by which a proper voters' list can be prepared without serious expense to any portion of the community, rests wholly with the Local Legislature. Why, Sir, who prepared these lists? They were prepared according to the provisions of the law, by the representatives of the people in their municipal councils. The members of the council were assisted by the assessor and by the clerk of the municipality. The voters' list was prepared without difficulty. In the first place, the assessment was the basis of the voters' list; in the next place, the members who met together to prepare that list from the assessment roll, were men who were personally acquainted with the members of the community whose names they were called upon to put upon that list. It was scarcely possible, it is scarcely possible now, in the Province of Ontario at least, to omit from the voters' lists the names of parties, because those who put these names upon the lists are persons who are personally acquainted with the entire community for whom they prepare the lists. Then there is this further consideration—it is scarcely possible to find a council in which both political parties are not represented. I venture to say that 95 per cent. of all the municipal councils in the Province of Ontario to-day contain members of both parties; I believe it is the same in all the other Provinces, where municipal organisations are in existence. The result is that the voters' list is prepared by the community, by those who represent the different political sentiments of the community. There is no such thing as packing a voters' list. There is no necessity of incurring any serious expense in securing upon that list

the names of all the electors. Why, Sir, during the whole of the 17 years that that law was in operation, I doubt whether there is a single representative in this Parliament, or in any of the preceding Parliaments, who was put to any expense whatever in the preparation of that list. Occasionally they might be called upon to lose a day to appear before the Court of Revision to add half a dozen names in that particular municipal district in which they reside. Beyond that they exercised no control, took no interest incurred to expense, and lost no time. But is that the condition of things at the present day? Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman put upon the Statute-book a measure, one reason assigned for which being the anxiety for uniformity. Was that principle of uniformity adhered to? Why, it was departed from in the majority of the Provinces of this Dominion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Pedantic uniformity.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman talks about a pedantic uniformity. Why, the adoption of that plan was a pedantic uniformity. The complaint the hon. gentleman made, if it were an honest complaint, was a pedantic complaint against the laws of the Provinces. The hon. gentleman knows, if he professes to follow the English practice, that in the mother country no reform is attempted unless there is an abuse to reform. What abuse did the hon. gentleman seek to reform? What mischief had grown up under the old system which necessitated legislation upon this subject? Why, there was no necessity for it whatever, there was no cause made out, there was no instance assigned of wrong being done. Yet the hon. gentleman, under pretext of securing uniformity, introduced his Bill, and when he introduced it he departed from the principle which had rendered such a measure necessary. Then we pointed out to him that the result would be that men who would be appointed to prepare these voters' lists over the whole country, would not be the men who were most familiar. If he had taken men who were familiar with the electors, who best knew them, who had been most frequently brought into contact with them in their homes, scattered over the entire electoral districts, there would be but a small fraction of these people with whom he was not acquainted. It would be necessary to take some other means than those which the hon. gentleman provided in his Bill to secure anything like a full and correct voters' list. But what has been the experience? There is not a member of this House who was a member before the last voters' list was prepared, who has not been put to expense, or whose friends on his behalf have not been put to expense, with the view of getting the qualified parties upon the list, to make it anything like a complete list. I know members who have been put to the expense of several hundred dollars, some of them over a thousand dollars, in the preparation of the last list. I leave out of the account the time—if you are to put a value upon the time—of men who go through a constituency for the purpose of seeing who are residing there whose names are not upon the assessment roll, whose names have not been transferred to the voters' list, but who are entitled to go upon it. I say if all these expenditures were taken into consideration a million dollars would not represent the cost of the voters' lists for a single year to the people of this Dominion. Then, Sir, we pointed out to the hon gentleman that these voters' lists would cost from $250,000 to $300,000 to the public in their collective capacity. The hon. gentleman pooh-poohed our representation. He said we exaggerated, grossly exaggerated, what would be the cost of the preparation of the voters' lists. Did we greatly exaggerate the cost? We could not get a complete statement of the actual cost from the hon. gentleman or from his colleague who had special charge of this whole matter. We were told it was so much up to such a date, that it had cost something more than that, and that the accounts had not come in; and so over a period of two years we were unable to obtain from the colleague of the hon. gentleman, a full statement of the actual cost. Now we find the cost had been something like half a million dollars, in fact the cost was too much for the hon. gentleman's courage; the Government did not fancy coming to the House and informing the country that our representations had been more than surpassed by the expenditure incurred. And yet, when we look at what the hon. gentleman has done since, we see what evils have grown up in connection with the whole system. I pointed out, looking at what had been done, and taking a township in my own constituency, there was a variation of from 5 to 10 per cent. a year in the voters' list, sometimes 5 and sometimes as many as 10 per cent. of change in the personnel of the voters in the municipality. The hon. gentleman said that was an overstatement of the change that had taken place in the country, that no serious evil could arise to our voters to have a voters' list prepared annually. The hon. gentleman did not, however, prepare a list annually, and I apprehend the chief reason was the enormous cost involved in preparation. What do we find from the statement made by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Colter)? That in his constituency, if a proper voters' list were framed in accordance with the provisions of the law, placing everybody entitled to vote on the list and omitting everybody who was not entitled to vote, there would be an addition of 1,000 names on the voters' list in that county. Under these circumstances, is it fair to say that a member returned represents the sentiment of those entitled to vote? Why, you have practically disfranchised a large number of persons by refusing to prepare a voters' list for constituencies which had been called upon to return members to this House. There is but one rational course for the House to adopt: it is to have the courage of its convictions, for I am satisfied that hon. gentlemen opposite are no more in love with this measure than we are, and to return to the condition of things that existed before. Let them provide that those who are entitled to vote at elections for members of the Local Legislature in the Province in which they reside, shall have the right to vote for the election of members to the House of Commons. That is a simple rule. The voters' list prepared by the officers of the municipalities should be accepted, which would be a perfectly fair course for members on both sides of the House, and members of both parties in the country. That is not the case now. Hon. gentlemen opposite have a Printing Bureau; the lists are being prepared in that bureau. How do we know how many members may have lists placed in their hands to send to their constituencies, a favor which is denied to members on this side of the House? How do we know but that an hon. gentleman may write to his constituents, and find out the political sentiments of electors, and communicate with them, sending them copies of the voters' list, under the name of blue-books, or in some other way, and in this way have an undue advantage, as compared with the members on this side of the House? I say that is possible. The centralisation of everything here renders abuse possible. The hon. gentleman knows we cannot have very much confidence in the Administration, remembering what was done in the case of the Gerrymander Bill, and in regard to Indian voters, how hon. gentlemen opposite placed on the voters' list men who are not entrusted with the management of their own affairs, men who were the wards of the Government, men who were receiving charity from the Government, and yet those men were held to be qualified to pass judgment upon the most important and abstruse political questions ever submitted to an intelligent electorate. What we desire is fair play, that the judgment of the country shall not be determined here by the action of the Govern-

ment and by legislation instead of by the independent electors, and that is what in a great measure the hon. gentlemen has undertaken to do by this Bill. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman legislating to make himself popular, to his taking such measures in the public interest as shall secure the confidence of the people. If he can present to the country a more acceptable policy than we can present, then he is entitled to succeed, but let us have a fair electoral division, a fair election and a fair voters' list, and let the majority of the electors determine, when an appeal is made to them, what shall be the policy of the country. That cannot be done under the existing system. If the electoral sentiment is with the hon. gentleman it is by the merest accident, because if we consider all those measures adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite, we see that the leader of the Government has undertaken to secure a majority of the seats, no matter whether he has the majority of the electors to support him or not. That is the condition of things, and by this voters' list we have no opportunity of knowing who are legally qualified electors. Here are the electors in the abstract set out in the law, but when you look at the voters' list, the electors in the concrete, we find, as the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Colter) has said, there is 1,000 difference between the voters' list in one county and what the law says the list ought to contain. And so it is in every other constituency, and so it will continue so long as this measure remains on the Statute-book. The law, as it now stands, is a nuisance against which public sentiment has pronounced, and, as the representative body, we should take the first opportunity of abating that nuisance and compelling the adoption of what is in accordance with reason, justice and common sense.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman said that the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Colter) declared there were 1,000 electors in the single county of Haldimand deprived of their votes. It only shows, if that be so, that since 1886 there are 1,000 more voters, and the depletion of which the hon. gentleman and his friends have been complaining has not taken place in that county at all events. If there are 1,000 more voters there in 1889 than in 1886 there has been no exodus from the county of Haldimand. The speech of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) made me look back and think we were sitting in the Parliament that passed the Franchise Bill, because the speech just delivered was a repetition of the speech delivered by the hon. gentleman in that debate. I say in all seriousness that I think it would be very unfortunate if the progress of this Bill to amend the practical working of the law as it is, should be impeded by bringing up the general question as to what the franchise should be. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) and the hon. member for Haldimand, (Mr. Colter), took that line, and they both, I have no doubt, would agree with my hon. friend, Mr. Mills, to have either universal suffrage, or manhood suffrage, or the various suffrages as they exist in the different Provinces, adopted, as giving our electorate for the Dominion Parliament; that is their opinion, and it has been their opinion. But I do not think that question comes up this Session, and at this period of the Session, in connection with this measure of practical politics. I do not think there is any chance of our immediately going back to seek a renewal of confidence from our constituents. I think, especially after the strong vote of confidence given by the hon. gentlemen opposite to the present Government, that we can well consider that we are going to last for a year or two.

Mr. MITCHELL. You get some of that vote under protest, you know.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; but we got the vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, yes; you got the vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We got the vote anyhow, and the protest will stand for what it is worth. In the meantime I hope that we will not be drawn into a discussion of that great and important question, which, I think, when it is brought up on its own merits, for the purpose of altering our constitution and our parliamentary representation, shall receive full consideration. I know the strong feeling that the hon. gentlemen opposite entertain on that point, and I know that they will take care that before there is an appeal to the people that that question will be brought up. Meanwhile, this is a simple proposition to amend the law as it is, and I will invite the consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite to this Bill as it stands, and as a Bill simply amending the law as it is. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that he will, this Session, and before this measure gets through the House, bring up the entire question. If he thinks it right to do so, or if any other hon. member thinks it right, we will have to discuss the general principle. I am not quite sure that the hon. gentleman will take my advice that it would just be as well to postpone that for another Session, and to discuss then, on its merits, the question: What ought be the representation of the people of Canada in the Dominion Parliament of Canada? In the meanwhile I would ask that we should not be induced to enter upon that large subject, which can produce no practical result this Session, but that we will discuss this Bill on its merits, as a Bill merely amending, and amending in no important principle, the Franchise Act as it now stands.

Mr. LAURIER. The right hon. gentleman has not at all rightly apprehended the position which has been taken on this side of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. No. The position which we take on this side of the House, and which has been taken by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Edgar), was that if the Act is to remain on the Statute-book we have no objection whatever that it should be amended in the direction that has been suggested; and indeed my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Edgar) said that he would assist the Minister of Justice in that task. But above, and superior to that question, we have never abandoned the ground that we have taken from the first, that the Act is bad *ab initio*, and being bad *ab initio* we must persist in the protest we have always made against it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And keep it as bad as possible.

Mr. LAURIER. It is as bad as possible, and I am afraid that the right hon. gentleman will not admit that. Neither the hon. gentleman, nor anyone on his side of the House has ever met the objection which has been once more made to this Act by my friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and which was to the effect that the only manner in which to view this question of the franchise is to look at it as a civil right which has to be determined according to the lights, education, and antecedents of the population in each Province. The tendency in this age—on this continent at all events, and in parts of the older continents also—is certainly in favor of manhood suffrage. Since this law has been on the Statute-book, that is within the last three years, the suffrage has been extended in the Province of Ontario to this extent of manhood suffrage, and it is now being extended in New Brunswick to the same extent. Manhood suffrage was already in existence in two other Provinces of the Dominion, and in the Province of Quebec, the franchise has been extended, not to the extent of manhood suffrage I admit, but to an extent largely in excess of the franchise provided by this Act. It is so also in Nova Scotia. We see that in all the Provinces now the

franchise provided by this House is not up to the standard of the franchise in any one portion of the Dominion. What is the reason that we find such a diversity of franchises among the different Provinces and in the Dominion? The reason can only be what I have just stated, that it is a question which can be determined only according to the different complexions of each Province. Take my own Province of Quebec, for example. The hon. gentleman or his friends would not vote in favor of universal suffrage, and I myself, although I claim to be a Liberal of the Liberals, would not vote for manhood suffrage, at least in my own Province.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes; I make that statement frankly, and what is the reason? I have no objection at all that the Province of Ontario should have manhood suffrage if the Province of Ontario is satisfied with it, but I would not want the Province of Ontario to impose it upon the Province to which I belong, because the Province to which I belong does not want it. Neither would I have the Province to which I belong impose their views on the people of the Province of Ontario. I claim that in a matter of this kind you must take the Provinces with their views, and even with their prejudices such as they are. I have stated, a moment ago, that I would not vote myself for manhood suffrage. It may be a matter of prejudice with me, but, at all events, such are the convictions of the great majority of the people of the Province to which I belong. For all that I do not claim to be in my profession any more a Liberal than anybody else, but when I look at contemporary history it seems to me that the position which I take is borne out by these facts. Take for example, the land of my ancestors, France. It seems to me that the best Government that France ever had since the Revolution was the monarchical Government of Louis Philippe. This representative Government was carried out under a limited franchise—too limited in fact—yet the great fault of the French people was to change from that very limited franchise directly to manhood suffrage. That was a great fault and the result has shown it, because you gave the right of franchise to a population not prepared for it. The course followed in England was quite the reverse. They commenced to reform the franchise in 1832, and they gradually extended it from time to time and from period to period. They did not commit the fault that was committed by the French people, of changing from a limited franchise and giving to every person in the land manhood suffrage, but the people of England extended the franchise gradually as the education and the condition of the people warranted it. They are near manhood suffrage in England now, and my belief is that they will attain that end before long. At all events, they do not think in England, although they are just as liberal in England as we are on this continent, that it would be wise to adopt universal suffrage now, although I have no doubt it must come before long. Those are the views upon which my convictions rest. If we are to have a federative system of government such as we have for the last twenty years, with all its cumbrous machinery, it is simply because the feelings of the people are not the same in all the Provinces. For this reason it seems to me that the position we have taken on this side of the House with regard to the Federal Franchise Act is one which has never been successfully met. Our position is that the true principle which underlies this question is that you cannot impose the same franchise on the people of Ontario, or the people of Quebec, or the people of British Columbia, or the people of Prince Edward Island, or the people of the other Provinces, but that every one of these communities has itself to decide or to choose within the limits of each Province, and that each ought to be entrusted with the great responsibility of the franchise. Under such circumstances, I deem it my duty again to bring the question before the House and to test it once more. Therefore, I beg to move:

That the Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House, the Electoral Franchise Act ought to, be repealed and it is preferable to revert to the plan of utilising for the elections of this House the provincial franchises and voters' lists.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that motion is carried, I desire to make a remark or two. Whatever doubts we may sometimes have, in a parliamentary sense, of the perfect accuracy of the hon. First Minister's utterances, few of us who have followed recent events can doubt that he is perfectly sincere and accurate in stating that he is not just at present desirous of testing the popular feeling of the electors, particularly in his own Province. There might be considerable inconvenience on the part of brethren like himself and the Minister of Customs, and a good many other hon. gentlemen, in organising the Orange lodges which used to be the backbone of their party, and still are to a great extent; therefore, I am disposed to believe that the First Minister is perfectly sincere in saying that just now he does not want to test the feelings of a good many of his supporters throughout the Province of Ontario. However, I do not desire to prolong the discussion on this motion, which I believe entirely expresses, not only the views of the Liberal party, but a good many of the Conservatives throughout the Dominion, and notably in the Province of Ontario. I believe they are sick and tired of this Franchise Act. I believe everyone in this House who has had experience of it knows that it means a great deal of trouble and expense, and in the end results in very little good to the parties whom it was supposed it would benefit, except in those constituencies where there are men who are absolutely under the control of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, as it notably did effect the result of elections in certain special counties. But I want to call the attention of the First Minister to a point of constitutional practice, which I think he will hardly controvert. One thing is clear, that we ought always to have a voters' list which would fairly represent the electorate of this country, and it ought to be kept in force year by year. Under the pretext of avoiding the enormous expense which this system has incurred, this country has not been possessed of an electoral list to which an appeal could fairly be made, not for one year only but for two or three years. Not one of the bye-elections which have taken place within the last three years, have appealed to the real electorate of the constituencies; in not one single case has that electorate been represented by 15 or 20 per cent. Like other gentlemen, I have made some enquiries as to the voters who have been disfranchised each year that the list has not been revised, and I believe my hon. friend from Bothwell was correct in stating that every year that the voters' list is not revised, by the natural operation of death, and by the natural operation of growth, by which a number of young men every year become entitled to exercise the franchise, a large percentage, often amounting to 10 per cent., always, I think, equalling 5 per cent., are practically disfranchised; so that when we appeal to the country in these bye-elections under the present system, we do not appeal to the true electorate of the present time, but to an electorate of three or four years ago; and, I dare say, the House will remember that when we pressed, that when bye-elections take place, the voters' list should be revised, we were voted down. Now, if the hon. gentleman proposes to continue this system, it is his bounden duty to see, expense or no expense, that the voters' list is revised from year to year, or at any rate in all cases where there is reason to suppose there may be a bye-election. Otherwise, should a dissolution occur—and a dissolution may not be so utterly improbable as the hon. gentleman supposes—we would have to fight out the contest, not by an appeal to the electorate as it is, but as it existed three or four years ago; in other

words, an appeal to the country when 20 or 25 per cent. of the electors are disfranchised. That is entirely an unconstitutional practice. I do not think there is any country enjoying representative institutions where such a thing would be permitted or has been practised, save in Canada. I know it is not in England, where the voters' list is revised every year. The hon. gentleman may, of course, plead, as he did before, that the expense of this system is so enormous that the country cannot afford it. There is a good deal of truth in that, and it goes to prove that his system is a mistake; and the only way to save the expense to the country and to correct the mistake, is to adopt the motion of my hon. friend.

Mr. MITCHELL. When this Franchise Act was under consideration, as, I dare say, many members of this House will recollect, I supported the general principle of the measure. What I supported was the principle that the regulation of the people who should control the election of members of this House should emanate from this Parliament. In other words, the contention of the Government side of the House was that this Parliament should pass a Franchise Act to provide who should have the right to vote for members of this House; the contention on the Opposition side was that the franchise of each of the several Provinces should be taken, and that the voters under those franchises should have the right to say who should sit in the Parliament of Canada. At that time my opinion was given very frankly and freely, that theoretically, and I thought it ought to be practically too, the members of this House should not be subject, as to who should elect them, to the legislation of any other body. I supported the right hon. gentleman in that principle, and I stood by him through the whole of that contest which occupied weeks and weeks. But Sir, almost every detail of his Bill, almost every section, I felt bound to oppose, because of the enormous expense they were likely to involve. It was predicted at that time that it would cost this country about half a million dollars a year for the creation and annual revision of the lists. My right hon. friend has found it necessary to abandon the annual revision in consequence of that enormous expense. He cannot deny that the creation of those lists has cost between $400,000 and $500,000; and the predictions of its cost made at that time have been fully realised. Now, Sir, after the experience we have had of this measure, I am bound to say that I have changed my opinion about the course that ought to be pursued, not from conviction, not from a theoretical policy, but from the absolute fact that the only way in which economy can be obtained in the formation of these lists is to take the municipal lists of the different parishes and adopt the policy of the different Provinces. I regret that we should have to do this, but I place at the door of the right hon. gentleman the necessity for this change of policy on my part. I charge him with sacrificing the correct principle for the necessities of the case. I charge him with having placed me in this position, that I have to come forward now and explain to the country why I have changed my policy on this question. I have not changed my conviction. I believe this House should be independent of any local influence or any local legislation which would change the Dominion Electoral Franchise, but the necessities of the case demand the economy of the country demands, that a different course should be pursued from what has been pursued by the right hon. gentleman. Therefore, I am bound to speak against my own convictions of what ought to be the proper theoretical policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear." Do they approve of what I say, when I lay at the door of the right hon. gentleman the consequences of compelling men, against their own convictions, and for the purpose of economy, justice, equity and fair play, to adopt a policy which they do not exactly believe in, in order that they may accomplish the objects of right, and truth, and justice? I regret that I have to say this in relation to the Franchise Bill. I regret that every prediction of enormous expenditure, every prediction of the injustice which would arise out of the working of the measure, that was made at the time, at all events by myself, has been realised. These fancy franchises of the right hon. gentleman, have been a total failure. These Indian franchises, a portion of which he had to abandon, have been condemned by the country. The accumulated provisions of that Bill, which very few men, to-day, can understand, have led to innumerable difficulties, and to-day, after three years have elapsed, we are without any annual revision of the franchises having been made. A large portion of the people to-day, where an election takes place, have been disfranchised, and we could not get a fair representation of the votes of the people if a general election took place to-morrow. It is not improbable a general election may take place before very long. I do not think it is liable to occur from any volition on the other side, although we occasionally hear the defenders of the Government talk of general elections this summer. There is no fear of a general election this summer, or the next—not the slightest. My right hon. friend knows too well he dare not go to the country now, and I tell you, Sir, there is a great deal more danger that we may have six sittings of this Parliament, if the hon. gentleman is not ousted before that time, than that we will have any premature dissolution of the House. There have been times, and my hon. friend has availed himself of them, when he has prematurely dissolved Parliament, for his own purposes, when he thought he was in a position to go to the country. That is not his position to-day. He knows he dare not go to the country; and if he did, he knows he would have to fight many of those behind him. He knows the men behind him have ceased to have their confidence in him, which their votes would seem to imply.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hon. gentlemen say "no," but they know in their hearts they disapprove of the policy of the hon. gentleman, and do not sustain the views he entertains. At all events, there is one man in this House who does not approve of the hon. gentleman's course, and who is not afraid to tell him so. He does not appreciate the advice I give him. Well, it does not cost him much, but perhaps it is worth just as little as it costs; but whatever it may be worth I would advise the right hon. gentleman to take into consideration the advice I give him and to consider the discussion that took place on the passage of this Franchise law originally, and wipe out all these fancy franchises which he has created. Let him abolish this enormous expenditure in which he has involved the country, of $400,000 or $500,000 a year, which it costs to correct and remodel the lists. Let him adopt manhood suffrage, which is the simplest thing, or let him adopt the franchises of the different Provinces, which will cost not over $50,000, and thus save $400,000 or $500,000 a year. That is what I would advise my right hon. friend to do, and he might do worse than take my advice. The hon. gentleman does not care much about it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I do think a great deal of it.

Mr. MITCHELL. But you show very little appreciation of it. I do not wish to take up the time of the House further. I have given expression to my opinion and to the reasons why I support the amendment. I do not support it on party grounds, but from necessity. I do not support it because I believe in it, but because I think it is necessary in the economy and interests of the country, and because it is the only means of enabling us to meet the enormous expenditure which the hon. gentleman's policy has brought upon the country.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There can be no doubt that if the opinion of hon. members who support the Administration were consulted, and if they were not under party allegiance bound to support the policy of the Government, there would be a very general unanimity of opinion, on that side as well as this, that the time has arrived when this law should be repealed. The supporters of the Government have felt the inconvenience of it in many respects, as well as hon. members on this side. They have found it has entailed a large amount of work; they have found it has entailed inconvenience and expense, and they know very well that the whole thing has to be gone over again every year. It was that alone which prevented the lists from being completed for the last two years. Does any one suppose it was from any feeling of economy that the Government hesitated having the lists completed last year, and the year before? Not at all. It was simply owing to the fact that there was such a strong feeling and pressure from their own side of the House, as to the inconvenience, and trouble, and expense that would be involved generally, and the Government were forced, in deference to that feeling amongst their own supporters, to defer changing the lists until the present. When this Franchise Bill was introduced it was introduced with two objects. First, to obtain uniformity. That was the avowed policy of the administration. Secondly, to give a broader franchise to the people of the Dominion than they enjoyed at the time. Now, how do we stand in regard to those two points? As regards uniformity, the Government sacrificed that principle at the very inception of their measure, because, as we are aware, they gave to the Province of Prince Edward Island universal suffrage while they prescribed a different franchise for all the other Provinces. Then with regard to the broader measure of franchise which they were going to confer upon the electors, that is entirely changed. I admit at that time there was possibly something so far as that was concerned in that policy, although it would hardly justify the ground which the Government took. Still, so far as regards a comparison of the franchise which they introduced and the franchise then in force in the various Provinces, the Dominion franchise was in some measure more liberal. Since that time, however, all that has also changed. We have been told to-day of the changes which have taken place in the various Provinces. We have been told that, in the Province of Ontario, they have taken that great step in favor of universal suffrage; that in New Brunswick they have also made a most important concession; and, in my own Province of Nova Scotia, they have made a most important change and have carried the franchise far lower than the Dominion franchise. The Dominion Franchise Act provides that the income basis shall be $300 a year to entitle an elector to be placed on the list. In Nova Scotia, they have placed the income franchise at $250, and in order to meet the case of the fishermen and miners in Nova Scotia, they have reduced the property qualification to $150; and, in the mining districts, where these people are not the real legal occupants, or, as it were, leaseholders of the properties on which they lived, they have given them a right to vote if the property on which they live amounts to the value of $150 per annum. So, in this respect, as well as in regard to income, they have gone far beyond the franchise given by the Act which is now before the House for amendment. They have also admitted farmers' sons and schoolmasters and professors, and a class of people of that kind who should be on the list. Under these circumstances, I cannot see what object is to be gained by keeping this statute in force. We know what it cost us before. Does anyone expect that it will cost us less in the future? It cost us in the neighborhood of half a million of dollars to compile this list before, and from that experience we know that, when it is placed in the hands of the various revising barristers, and that there is so much trouble connected with it, it is not likely to cost us much less in the future. I ask hon members on both sides of the House if it is worth while, or is worth the cost, to expend half a million of dollars every year for this purpose, when we have our own local machinery which is more perfect and provides for a more extended franchise, without one cent of cost to the taxpayers of this country. Our municipal corporations, having charge of these lists, generally make them up on a system of great fairness to both sides. We have never, in Nova Scotia, had any cause to complain on that ground, because these councillors are generally elected from both sides, and it is very seldom that any advantage is gained in that way. In these municipal councils, the spirit of party does not enter as largely as it would when the result would be that they would have to go through the formality of making an application to a revising barrister, and to be represented by counsel for one party or the other. I think the members from Nova Scotia who are in the Cabinet, the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine, will bear me out in saying that the system in that Province under our municipal arrangements, has been eminently satisfactory and inexpensive. For these reasons, in addition to the question of cost, and the infinite trouble which will be involved in the revision of the list every year, I think the amendment should be adopted. Take a county like my own, which runs 100 miles down the eastern shore and 50 miles on the western shore, and 30 or 40 miles into the country, all having to be travelled by waggons, without railways to reach any portion of that county. Those people are so scattered along the coast that it is almost impossible to get the electors from those points to meet the revising barrister when he announces that he is going to hold his court at a certain place; and men who live at great distances along our fishing coasts, and have no means of transportation except by water, will not go to those places unless they are provided with means of transportation. It is said that this difficulty may be obviated under certain circumstances by a declaration being made, but, in these small districts, unless you have a legal gentleman accompanying the revising barrister to see that no improper exceptions are taken to applications made from the opposite side—because he is sure to need no looking after in regard to his own side—you will lose a large number of the electors under such circumstances. It is, therefore, important to consider the trouble as well as the cost, and I do think that the Government now should accept the opinion of the House on the subject. I am sure that, if no Government pressure was brought to bear upon the hon. members of this House, and they were asked to vote as they thought best in the interests of the country and not in the interests of a party, the vote would be almost unanimous in favor of going back to the provincial lists. This is a matter of so much importance that I think we should debate it thoroughly, and should let the country understand the fact that they have before them two propositions. The one is—because I suppose the Government will not propose continually to withhold the revision of the lists as they have done during the last three years—to revise these lists every year at the enormous expense to which I have referred, and the other is to go back to the provincial lists, made under our municipal institutions, which have always given satisfaction and which can be obtained without any expense. I think, when the people realise that, during a Parliament extending over five years, this will cost at least $400,000 a year, amounting to $2,000,000 in the course of the five years, they will feel sufficiently interested in the matter to indicate their views and their impressions to their representatives on both sides of the House. Under these circumstances I trust that the Minister of Justice will consider this matter again, and that the Government will consult the feelings of their own

friends, as well as the opinions on this side of the House and in the country generally; for I believe if they were to go to their own supporters, as I have conversed with them time and again, they would find that they are in favor of going back to our provincial franchise.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). During the four years that this Bill has been in operation, we have been able to wit ness its effects and to view it in the light of experience. When the Bill was first introduced it was purely a matter of theory, but now we have had an opportunity of testing it, of seeing its practical effects. I think any person who has observed the mode in which this Bill has been carried out, and the cost it has been to the country, must feel that experience has shown that it is inadequate for the purpose for which it was destined, that it not only imposes an enormous expense upon the country, but that it has produced great difficulty, great labor, and much inconvenience to all the parties engaged in it. But this point was very clearly put by my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Jones), so that I need not enlarge upon it. But, referring to the motion made by my hon. friend in front of me (Mr. Laurier), I wish to say that when this Bill was before the House for the first time, I strongly supported the proposition that provincial lists should be made the basis of the Dominion lists. I believe that, so far as the exercise of the franchise is concerned, that subject is more properly in the hands of the Local Legislature. I believe that the Local Legislature of our Province of New Brunswick is better qualified to decide who are entitled to vote in that Province, than hon. gentlemen who sit here for British Columbia or Manitoba; and we in the Maritime Provinces are not as well qualified to decide who are entitled to exercise the franchise in British Columbia and Manitoba, as are the Local Legislatures of those Provinces. Moreover, we found that in the neighboring States, under a constitution somewhat similar to our own, the principle prevails that the State Legislature should control the franchise, both of those who are entitled to vote for representatives to the State Legislatures, and of those who are entitled to vote for representatives in Congress. For these and other reasons I advocated strongly, at that time, the adoption of the Provincial Francise. In addition, I believed that the Local Legislatures were desirous to extend the franchise from time to time, as the requirements of each Province seemed to dictate, and that the Local Legislature would limit the suffrage or extend it in such a manner as would be to the public weal. But this Bill was passed, and, as we pointed out, its operation has been attended with an enormous expense, and during the four years since that time a large portion of the people have been practically disfranchised. We have pointed out upon other occasions, cases where men who were entitled to be put upon the voters' list, by accident or otherwise have been omitted from the list, and although they were properly qualified, possessing more than one qualification, under the provisions of that Bill the Government have prevented them being put upon the list, and they have been deprived of the franchise; young men who have since obtained their majority and have obtained property, have been deprived of the exercise of the suffrage. Then there was the fact of the enormous expense, which no doubt, was the reason which induced the Government to allow the Act to remain a dead letter upon the Statutes during the last three years. I must say that had the resolution of my hon. friend been proposed last year, I should have been compelled to vote against it, for the reason that in the Province from which I come, the suffrage at that time was higher than that determined upon in the Franchise Bill, and numbers obtained the franchise who would not have obtained it under the provincial lists. The principle having been adopted and carried into effect I should have felt that I was not justified in depriving any person of the right of the franchise. But the circumstances have changed now, a change has taken place in our Province. As has been stated, in the Province of New Brunswick a most liberal Bill has been passed, extending the suffrage in some cases far beyond that of the present Electoral Franchise Act. That being so, I feel now that I am in such a position that I can heartily support the amendment offered by the leader of the Opposition. As I pointed out before, and as the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has pointed out, the mode in which the voters' lists is made up under the provincial law entails but little expense to the country, and it seems to me that if no other motive could actuate hon. gentlemen in this House, they should have adopted a mode by which a large amount of money could be saved to this country; at the same time they would have avoided in the past a great deal of trouble and annoyance in getting up the voters' lists. I believe that these difficulties and these troubles will be greatly enhanced by the mode now proposed by which these lists are to be made at Ottawa. Mistakes have already occurred under the present system, but I believe that the proposition now before the House to have these lists made at Ottawa, will lead to a great many more mistakes. For all these reasons I believe that the proper way is to go back to the simple mode in which the provincial franchises were regulated in the different Provinces, and to leave the Local Legislature, which I believe is the proper authority, to regulate the franchise from time to time, as the necessities of the Province may require.

Mr. McMULLEN. When the Franchise Bill was first introduced, we saw in it a great many objectionable features, and we endeavored to remove them without success. On this occasion we want, in the first place, to enter our solemn and united protest against the continuation of a measure that has had a trial in the country, and that has virtually been condemned by every unbiassed mind in this Dominion. I fearlessly assert that if the question of the continuation of this Franchise Act was left to a vote to the people of this country, a very large majority would say that they prefer the municipal voters' list. Our municipal voters' lists are very carefully prepared. We do not have, as a rule, a municipality all Tories or all Reformers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would just say, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. gentlemen opposite think that by making a noise they are going to shorten this discussion, they are very much mistaken. Some years ago that effort was tried, and it only resulted in lengthening the Session to six months instead of three. If hon. gentlemen opposite think they are going to accomplish their object by interrupting those who address the House, they will find that the result will be the lengthening of this Session just as it was before, but perhaps without the extra $500. I was going on to say we have not all Tories or all Grits in the municipal councils. In one of the straight Reform townships in my riding there is a Conservative assessor, and to the credit of the Conservatives in another township, where there is a very strong Conservative majority, there is a Reform assessor. This shows that the political prejudices of the people are not so strong as those of hon. gentlemen opposite. Those hon. gentlemen think that, unless they have under their absolute control the preparation of the voters' list, their friends will not be dealt with justly. If they will take the experience of the last four years under the Franchise Act and compare the voters' list under that Act with the municipal voters' list, they will find that every man in any township, or town, or village who is entitled to be on the list and is not on the list is omitted because he has kept the fact that he is entitled to vote secret. I fully agree with the remarks of the leader of the Opposition, that under the system by which the municipal voters' lists are prepared they are more likely to be fair than are the

lists under the present Act. When we consider the fact that the court revising the lists in the municipality is composed of five men chosen by the people themselves, regardless of their political views, simply elected as men who will act uprightly in the preparation and revision of the lists, it is clear that the interests of the electors are likely to be much better served. The best evidence of this is, that there are some Conservative townships which elect Reform officials and *vice versa*, so there is not that political antipathy which prevails amongst politicians, and it is well there is not. Again, the revision of the voters' lists takes place before the same judge before whom our present list comes if there is an appeal. The judge of the county is the last court of appeal when there is any person in a township, town or village, who wants to be placed on the list. The same appeal is had under the present municipal list that they would have under the present franchise list, if we continue it in existence. Its abolishment would undoubtedly save a large sum to the country. When the list was first introduced, it was stated that it would cost $1,000,000. The First Minister said it would not cost over $200,000, but we know it has cost over $400,000. In addition, the judges in many cases have been very poorly paid. They have gone through much hardship in going from place to place to hold revisions, and I know, in the western section of the Province, a great many judges have complained of being poorly paid. If that is the fact, we cannot expect to obtain much reduction on the expense for revision. The officials serving with the judges also claim that the pay they received was but a miserable pittance for the work they performed. I therefore contend that there is no hope of reducing the cost of the revision to a very much less sum than has been paid. Another matter of expense in connection with the list is this: At the time of the inception of the first voters' list a number of deputy judges were appointed in the several counties solely for the purpose of performing certain duties in connection with the revision of the list. From fifteen to twenty were so appointed, in some cases where they were not required; and I know counties which have a senior and a junior judge, and either could do the work, except the revision of the voters' list. In order to provide revising officers a number of junior judges were appointed solely in connection with the revision of the lists, and the country in this way is to-day called upon to pay $30,000 more than otherwise would be necessary in consequence of the Franchise Act. If the Dominion thought the municipal lists should be reprinted, as not being sufficiently explicit in their terms or in their descriptions, this might be done, and by taking the assessment roll and voters' list of each municipality, we would obtain a much more fair, better and more correct list than any ever produced by this Act or that could be obtained by amending the Act. In my own county, to-morrow, there will be a vote taken upon the Canada Temperance Act, and from six to eight counties altogether will be called upon to vote to-morrow upon that important question. It is highly desirable, in the interests of the people, and with such an important question to decide, that every man entitled to vote should be placed upon the voters' list. In Wellington the people will go to the polls, record their votes in favor of a continuation of the Act or the reverse, and there will be from 3,000 to 4,000 electors in that county alone who will not have the privilege of recording their votes upon the question. This is a very unfortunate state of things, and if we had a municipal voters' list in place of the present voters' list, every one of those men would be entitled to vote. We imagined, judging from the fact that the Government has left the question over for three years without a revision taking place, they would probably introduce an Act to sweep away the Franchise Act; they do not, apparently, feel disposed to do so, but are going to press upon the House, at this late period of the Session, the consideration of this most vital and important question. I contend it is a vital and important question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MULOCK. We had better adjourn while the hon. gentlemen perform.

Mr. SPEAKER. I beg hon. gentlemen to cease making a noise, or I shall deem it my duty to name them.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is a very important question, as it involves the representation of the people and the manner in which they shall perform their duties at the polls. The past history of the Act has shown a great deal of confusion in the public mind. Sometimes people have gone to different polling places. There are different polling places for the Dominion and the local elections, and it is highly desirable we should have a voters' list for all purposes as clearly framed as possible, and the people should vote at the same places for the Dominion elections as they do for local elections. If matters were simplified in that direction, the people would discharge their duties far more intelligently than at present. There is also objection to the form in which the voters' lists were issued last time. They were issued in sheet form, and in a great many cases these sheets became cut and torn in handling, and the names were rendered almost unintelligible before the votes were taken. On the other hand, the municipal lists are prepared in pamphlet form, and they will last from year to year without getting into such a condition as the Dominion lists did, so that you could hardly decipher the names on them. I contend that for this, and many other reasons, we should get rid altogether of this Franchise Bill. I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite will sustain any loss by it, for I do not believe there is a man in this House who can say that in his constituency, owing to the system adopted in the municipal voters' lists, any of his friends would be deprived of the franchise. If that is the fact, I ask why it is considered necessary that, in the present embarrassed, financial condition of the country, this House should be asked to consent to an annual expenditure of three or four hundred thousand dollars for revising voters' lists, where there is no necessity for it? If every man is now on the voters' lists, I ask, why not accept that list? If the Dominion Government want to have the power of revision under control of their own officers, I may point out that the same officers revise the two lists. I understand that before the introduction of this list there was some reason for it, because in some of the Provinces there was no list at all. I believe, however, that has been remedied, and that in every Province they have municipal lists now. That being the case I cannot see the wisdom of keeping up this voters' list at such trouble and such great expense to the country. We must know that every member of this House when he goes home—if this Franchise Act is enforced—instead of being able to attend to his business, will have to travel through his constituency from township to township to try and have this list put in order. That is trouble, annoyance and expense to the members who support the Government, as well as to those in opposition, because if the Conservative members do not pay attention, they may find that some of their friends may be struck off the roll. This is a trouble and expense which we can easily be relieved of by taking the municipal lists as we find them, in place of using those lists which are obnoxious to the members as well as to the people of the country. I believe that there is not a single place in the Dominion that would send in a petition for the maintenance of this Act. At every political demonstration which I have attended, whether of Conservatives or Reformers, they were all opposed to this Act. I hope the Government will decide, after mature deliberation, and, in consideration of the late stage of the Session at which we

are asked to consider this question, will withdraw the Act. Before next Session they can prepare a list on the plan of the municipal voters' lists, and adopting that as the basis of representation. If you want to print that list here, I am satisfied that this side of the House would offer no opposition. I hope the Government will consider this suggestion.

Mr. CURRAN. I desire merely to say a few words on this question, as it has been stated that if we were to return to the system that was formerly in vogue no members of the community would be deprived of the right to vote. I think that those who know the history of recent legislation in the Province of Quebec admit that under the influence of the present Franchise Act of the Dominion Government a certain educational process has been going on, and at the last session of the Local Legislature a new Franchise law was passed which, whilst it has very many bad features, at the same time must be held to be in some respects an advance upon what existed there before. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (Mr. McMullen) has stated that not one man in the Dominion of Canada would lose his vote if we were to return to the old system. That is entirely a mistake, because whilst in the Election law passed at the last session of the Legislature in Quebec a vote was given to farmers' sons, and to teachers, and to the sons of owners of real estate in cities, yet we have a large class of wage-earners who under that law are entirely excluded from the right to vote. In the large cities of our Province, Montreal, Quebec and, other places where manufacturing is carried on or where there is any large congregation of people, there is a vast number of the working class, young men, book-keepers, clerks, mechanics, laborers and others, who are earning $300 a year and upwards, but who do not keep house, and who board either with their parents or in some other place, and, under the present law in the Province of Quebec, that large class of wage-earners would be deprived of the right, which they hold to-day, of having their names inscribed upon the voters' lists, and of exercising the franchise at elections for the Dominion Parliament. Under those circumstances, I think it would be a step backwards if we were to deprive that large section of the working classes of their right to vote. They are as intelligent a body of men as can be found in any country; they are young men who, most of them, have been brought up in this country and educated here, and nearly all of whom read and write and follow the public discussions of the affairs of the country which take place in Parliament and in the press of every shade, politically. That class, which has a representative now on the floor of this House, would be deprived of the franchise if we adopted the Quebec provincial lists. I am sure that the names of no less than some thousands of young men in the city of Montreal alone would be wiped off the electoral lists if we went back to the old system. I think that whilst in the Province of Quebec, as has been truly said by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, the vast majority of the people are opposed to manhood suffrage, still I am convinced that there is no class of people in the whole Province of Quebec who are desirous that those men who give the very best evidence of their value to the community by earning $300 a year and upwards should be deprived of the franchise, and who would not be sorry to see those people wiped off the electoral lists. I, for one, cannot consent to that. I would be recreant to my duty here if I did not raise my voice and protest against that large class of persons in the Province of Quebec being deprived of the right to vote which was granted to them by this Parliament a few years ago. I pointed out that under this new law in the Province of Quebec, while a step has been made forward, and the classes which I have mentioned, including teachers, have had the right to vote granted to them, although they are not housekeepers, yet another step has been taken there which I think was not a wise one. They have wiped off the voters' lists the name of every man who holds a public office, whether under the Local Legislature or under the Dominion. That large class of persons are perfectly free to cast an honest and independent vote, now that we have the ballot, and they are an intelligent class who know the workings of the machinery of government; and unless we wish to brand them as persons who are not fit to vote honestly and uprightly, they should not be deprived of that right. If we adopt the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, all that class will be disfranchised, and I think it will be admitted on all hands that they are as independent a class as can be found in the community. Now, I think we should continue the present law, and give it a chance. It has not yet had a chance of showing its results. It is altogether too soon to talk of repealing it. Let us see what will be the effect of these amendments which are proposed in this Bill, and which, according to hon. gentlemen who have opposed the Bill, are in the right direction. The majority of the members of this House I believe will come to the conclusion that, so far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition would be a step backward instead of forward.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I certainly am not in sympathy with the views of the hon. member for Montreal Centre. I cannot agree with him, that the people of Quebec are not the best judges of how extended their franchise ought to be. He may not be in sympathy with the Local Legislature of that Province; he may feel that it is not legislating in the interest of the people; but I say that the representatives of the people in that Province are the proper ones to say who ought, and who ought not to vote. They are among the people, they have an opportunity to ascertain the views and opinions of the people, and the Act they passed ought to be satisfactory, not only to the hon. gentleman, but to the Province generally. He admits that they have made a step in advance; and, so far as I am able to understand it, I believe the franchise at present prevailing in Quebec is almost, if not quite, as liberal as the franchise of the Dominion. That being the case, what injury or wrong would be done to the people of Quebec, by our adopting the local franchise for Dominion elections? None at all. The hon. gentleman says, some wage-earners would be deprived of the opportunity of voting. I do not know how many are affected in that way, but I think it would be a limited number. Then, with respect to public officers being deprived of votes, I have no sympathy with his views. From our experience in Dominion affairs, I think it would be much better if they were not permitted to vote. I must say, to the credit of the public officers in the riding I have the honor to represent, that they abstained from voting, as they regarded it unseemly that individuals drawing pay from the Government of the day should go to the polls to record their votes either in favor of or against the Government. Therefore, I think the feeling in regard to them will amount to nothing. I think the amendment moved by my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, is in the right direction, and if these be all the objections the hon. member from Montreal Centre can offer against it, he should be found among those supporting it. We were told years ago, that this Act was a necessity in order that we might have a uniform franchise; we were told time and again, that it was unseemly that this Parliament should allow its members to be elected on a voters' list prepared by some other Parliament. I appeal to the members of this House to point to a single instance of any injustice or wrong having been done to any individual in any municipality, in the whole of the Dominion of Canada, in any election that took place under that system. If they cannot point to a single instance, then I ask, what was the necessity of changing from

that system, which had been in existence for years, and adopting a Dominion franchise? If hon. gentlemen opposite could show that any wrong was done or that any agitation existed in the country for a Dominion franchise, then I could understand the necessity of passing an act, and allowing a reasonable amount of expenditure in connection with it; but up to the present time I have never heard a single expression from anyone to show that any such wrong existed prior to the passage of this Franchise Act. Is it not more reasonable to suppose, if we are going to have a voters' list efficiently and impartially prepared, which would be satisfactory to all parties concerned, that it would be better prepared by the various municipal officers, whose duties bring them every day more or less into contact with the electors? They would have better opportunities of knowing every individual who was entitled to be placed on the list, and every one who ought to be struck off. Is it reasonable to suppose that the revising barrister can sit in his office and be able to say what individuals in the different parts of the constituency ought to be struck off the list, and what individuals should be placed on it? If it be the wish of the Government, as I presume it is, that a fair list should be made, why not take the various municipal machinery in operation in every part of the Dominion, by means of which the lists can be prepared with hardly any expense. And these would be more efficient lists than any that can be prepared under the present system. No individual would then be deprived of his vote. Such is not the case under this law. Anyone who has had to go through the trouble of preparing lists will remember that after all the trouble to which he had been put, and after all the expense necessarily incurred, and after the lists had been finally prepared and revised, a very large number indeed of those who ought to have been upon the list were left out, and thus a great amount of dissatisfaction was created Every prospective candidate or representative must expect to be taxed very heavily in seeking out the necessary individuals to be placed upon the lists, and after every exertion had been made and an enormous expense incurred, it is found that the lists are generally incomplete. I hold it is the duty of the Government to adopt means to make the work as easy as possible of having every individual entitled to a vote placed upon the lists. No individual in a free country like this who is entitled to vote should, by any omissions on the part of the Government, be deprived of that right. Now, the present lists were prepared three or four years ago, and in every election that has taken place since we find that a very large number of the people who are entitled to exercise their franchise have been deprived of it through defects in the lists, and not through any fault of theirs. Many had moved into new municipalities, where they had purchased properties and lived one or two years, and yet when an election took place they were not permitted to record their votes, and through no fault of theirs. We all know that the reason these lists are not revised every year is that the Government dare not impose upon the country the annual expenditure of $500,000 which it costs to prepare and revise these lists. I would ask hon. gentlemen on the opposite side, who have gone through an election campaign, if they would dare go back to their constituents and say they were prepared to retain the Dominion lists in their present shape, and inflict upon the Dominion the enormous expenditure incurred in the preparation of these lists, when they cannot bring forward one single tittle of evidence to show any necessity for this expenditure. I would like to see any one of them rise and say he can go back to his constituents and defend this law. I have met those hon. gentlemen, time and again, on the platform, and have always found them as strong in their denunciation of the Act as I could possibly be myself. They were even stronger. They declared there was no necessity for it, and that no wrong had been inflicted by using the provincial lists, and that it was unnecessary to impose this expenditure upon the people. During the previous discussion on this law, hon. gentlemen opposite argued that the lists prepared by the municipalities were not free from partisanship, that the councils appointed men on political grounds, and that the assessors selected their assistants on political grounds, and that hence the Government wished to introduce an impartial system. Is that a reasonable assertion? The council select their assessors, the assessors select their clerks to prepare the lists, and the lists are presented to the county judge for revision. Is there any machinery that could possibly be devised by which we could obtain more impartial lists? Could any list be more reliable than those prepared by the various municipalities throughout the Dominion? Is it not better that we should have only one list in an election campaign, than have voters upon one list that are not on another, so that one half the time they do not know at which poll they must record their votes, or on which list their names are entered? This has been a great source of inconvenience and vexation.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE.—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 114) to incorporate the Title and Mortgage Guarantee Company of Canada.—(Sir Donald Smith.)

DIVORCE.—W. G. LOWRY.

Mr. SMALL moved second reading of Bill (No. 119) for the relief of William Gordon Lowry.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We are now coming to that kind of legislation which is more anomalous, as I think the House will agree, than any other kind of legislation which we are called to pass upon. If I might say so without disrespect, which I do not mean to the House, I would venture to say that Bills in relation to divorce are too frequently passed by the House without a full acquaintance on the part of members, generally, with the circumstances under which they are asked to vote. It is quite true that, in the other House, the evidence is very carefully taken, and I have no doubt, from the discussions which take place in that Chamber, that the cases are very carefully sifted; but I conceive that that does not relieve this House, and every member of it, of the responsibility which the House, and every member, has in allowing such Bills to pass. If we are to allow such legislation at all, as to which I have my own opinion, I submit that, in dealing with questions which are involved in these cases, it is just as imperatively the duty of every member of this House to know the evidence upon which he votes and to form an opinion upon it as it would be if he were performing the functions of a juror in a court of justice, because very important results arise from the conclusions to which we come in these matters. I do not know how I can better impress upon the House that plain duty which should be discharged than by asking the House to divide upon these Bills, and I shall certainly do so in relation to the first of them, which is now proposed for a second reading. No doubt some members have taken an interest in these Bills and will differ from me in the conclusion which I have arrived at I therefore make the remarks I do with all deference to their view and without presuming to say that they should be influenced by the view I take as a lawyer in reference to this first Bill. I will only express my opinion as to the matters of fact which are involved in it. I think this Bill asks for a divorce without any proof whatever of the fact on which the Bill is based, other than the mere admissions of the parties. The Bill is evidently promoted on the ground that the respondent has been guilty

of adultery, but there is not the slightest evidence that she was so guilty except the admissions which were made by herself. There is no proof that there was ever an opportunity given for her to commit the offence excepting one, and that was the occasion on which she met the party with whom it is alleged that she committed the offence, and when there was nothing that would create a strong presumption that the offence was then committed. The only occasion, as far as it appears by the evidence, was at an interview brought about by a friend of the family or a friend of herself—I do not know which—who invited her to come to his house and invited the person with whom she is alleged to have committed the offence to meet her there, apparently for the purpose of explanation or in order to prevent further trouble or dispute between the families. On that occasion, she met this person in the kitchen, and remained there for some hours in conversation with him; but I submit to hon. gentlemen who have read the evidence that there is nothing in the time, or place, or circumstances of their meeting to lead to the presumption—as such presumption is often found in cases of that kind—that the offence was then committed. I, therefore, say that the case remains on the admission of the wife that she had committed the offence. It is true, no doubt, that the admissions of a party accused of an offence are proper evidence, but the weight of that evidence depends entirely upon the interest which the party may have had, and in this instance it is apparent that the real interest of the woman was in favor of making an admission. She desires a separation, of course, and her husband desires it as well. She did not live happily with him, and she left him. By the evidence, it is true, that that was without any provocation, and under circumstances which devolved the whole blame on her in the separation. She left him within three weeks or so after the marriage, and never lived with him afterwards. He remonstrated against that, and she expressed plainly to him her determination not to live with him again, and admitted then that she had been unchaste prior to her marriage. There was at that time no admission that the offence had been committed during marriage, and I need not remind the House that, as regards the antecedent events, they formed no ground for the passage of this Bill. But this important fact appears, by her statement to her husband then, that she was anxious for a divorce, indeed she avowed that she would marry this man named Wilson, with whom, it is alleged, she had previously cohabited; that she would marry him if she had an opportunity. It appears, then, that there was present to her mind the motive of a desire for divorce, and she seemed afterwards willing to help her husband in getting one. Subsequently she makes the admission that at that interview in the kitchen, she committed the offence, and she makes that admission in the presence of a witness. The witness was brought for the purpose of being a witness, but the wife refused to make the admission in the presence of her husband and the witness. The husband retired, and the witness pursued the enquiry and pressed upon the wife the necessity of making an admission if she were guilty of the offence, and she finally made the admission to him. These are the circumstances under which this case is presented, without, as I have said, any proof whatever of the act having been committed, but depending entirely upon the admissions of the wife, and those admissions made under a state of mind which, however discredible it may be to her, gave her an incentive for making the admission. Under the circumstances I think the House will be inclined to believe—I know the conclusion has been forced upon me—that the case is not free from suspicion of collusion between the husband and wife. It is true there is the bald statement which is always made in such cases, on the part of the husband, that no collusion does exist. I know nothing of the parties, I have not seen the witnesses, I can only vote on the case as it is before me, and from the case as it appears before me, I feel so impressed with the idea that there may have been collusion, and that the case is a weak one, resting on the admissions which the wife made, that I shall feel compelled on that ground, if no other existed, to vote against the Bill, and I feel bound to call the attention of the House particularly to this Bill. I may add that, notwithstanding the careful enquiry which takes place in the other Chamber in regard to such matters, a full debate took place on the Bill before it was passed, and 28 members of the Senate voted for the Bill and 23 against it. On that division, which was a close one, two Senators who were present asked to be relieved from voting, and abstained from voting on the ground that they had not seen copies of the evidence. As I said before, I do not wish the conclusion to which I have come to influence the judgment of other members; but I do feel that this is a case in which there is a peculiar responsibility upon us to examine carefully the principle upon which we shall proceed. I do not hesitate to say that the Bill is one for which I cannot vote.

Mr. JAMIESON. I desire to say a few words in reference to the Bill before the House, because I happen to know the most of the facts connected with the case. The applicant for this divorce resides in my constituency, and I should be expected to take some interest in the matter if the party is properly entitled to the relief which he seeks. On the evidence, I do not agree with the Minister of Justice in the conclusion he has come to. I think that a Bill of this character having been passed before a properly constituted committee of the Senate, and the evidence having been adduced before that committee and carefully investigated, and the committee having unanimously reported in favor of the Bill—these are strong circumstances which should induce us to vote for the second reading of this Bill in order that it may go before the Private Bills Committee of this House. I am quite aware that there was a discussion in the Senate on the second reading, or the third reading—I believe it was the third reading. I will just ask the hon. gentlemen who have given any attention to the evidence, to compare the statements made by the senators who took part in the discussion in opposition to this Bill, with the evidence which has come down in this House, and they will come to the conclusion that those who opposed the Bill in the Senate were either ignorant of the nature of the evidence, or they wilfully misrepresented that evidence. I have come to that conclusion after having carefully looked into the evidence which was taken before the Committee, and after having perused the speeches made by the hon. gentlemen. I take this to be one of the most painful cases which could come before any body having authority to grant relief of this character. It is not necessary for me to go into the evidence at length; I trust that hon. gentlemen have perused the evidence, although I confess that in this and in other cases, it seems a very difficult matter to get the evidence in a case of this kind, into our hands. It is sent down to this House ostensibly for the purpose of giving information to the members, but unfortunately, from some cause or other, the evidence very often disappears. I trust that in the future more care will be exercised in cases of this kind, so that members for whose use and benefit the evidence is printed and sent to this House, should be enabled to peruse it. I would say in reference to the evidence in this case, that, in my judgment, a very strong case for relief has been made out. I look upon it as one of the most unfortunate things that could have happened to this young man. I feel satisfied that if hon. members would carefully examine the evidence and weigh the facts, they will not for a single moment hesitate to vote for the second reading of the Bill. I do not desire to go into the evidence, but if hon. gentlemen will look at it they will find that this young man was basely deceived. What occurred afterwards, in my judg-

ment, was ample evidence to support the charge which was made against the respondent in this case. I do not desire to enter more fully into the evidence, but I trust the House will see it is proper to allow this Bill to go to the Private Bills Committee, where the evidence can be carefully scrutinised and examined, and no doubt hon. gentlemen will agree with me that this is a case in which the rule ought to be followed.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman state if Judge Gowan was on that Committee, if he took part in the enquiry, and if he concurred in the finding.

Mr. JAMIESON. Yes, he was chairman. The Committee unanimously reported the Bill.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand the Minister of Justice has drawn his conclusion from the evidence that there is not sufficient proof of the alleged offence, and also that there may have been collusion. Then I understand the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Jamieson) to state that the Committee who heard the evidence were not of that opinion—

Mr. JAMIESON. Certainly not.

Mr. MULOCK—and that Judge Gowan, who has taken great interest in these matters, concurred in the finding. Under these circumstances, would it not be desirable to postpone adjudicating on the case until an investigation has been held by a Committee of this House? While it has been the custom in all uncontested cases to accept enquiries before the Senate Committee and not repeat the work, yet I do not understand there is anything binding upon the Private Bills Committee of this House, where there is any conflict of opinion and any doubt, not to take evidence under our own direction and with special direction to the points stated to be in doubt by the Minister of Justice. I think it fair and in the interest of all parties that, before giving final judgment, this House should investigate the case by its own Committee.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I agree with my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, that if there is any doubt we must be guided by fixed rules, and we must assume the responsibility of deciding these cases. I must say, after reading the evidence that, putting aside the confession alleged to have been made by the wife, the evidence is not such as would satisfy a court of divorce. If the evidence were at all clear, then the confession might perhaps be brought in; but this evidence is so weak I do not think any court would adjudicate upon it and grant a divorce. I admit, when we come to the question of confessions we have to be guided by rules laid down with respect to them. The practice adopted here is somewhat analogous to the practice established in the House of Lords before the court was established for the purpose of dealing with divorce cases. The rules were very clear that a confession was not sufficient evidence on which to obtain a divorce, and the ecclesiastical courts follow the same rule, and it wss quite evident that the reason on which the rule was founded was that it afforded opportunity of collusion; and in the Divorce Court in the Province from which I come, the court has rejected confessions in cases of this kind. It is true the law in England has been altered of late years, since the formation of the new Court of Probate; it is based on the principles of common law, rather than civil law, as regards the rules of evidence, and the common law provides that confessions are admitted, the same as any other evidence, and are sent to the jury. The reason for the rule which has prevailed in the House of Lords, and in ecclesiastical courts, does not exist in the Court of Probate, because there the judge presides, and if he comes to the conclusion on the evidence that there is collusion, he refuses the divorce. There is also a process by which the matter can be further enquired into, by the intervention of the Queen's Proctor. I do not, therefore, consider that in trying this question as a tribunal we should adopt the present practice of the Court of Probate, but we should rather follow the rule that has hitherto prevailed in the House of Lords and in the ordinary courts in ecclesiastical cases. Viewing the case in this light, and after reading the evidence carefully, I come to the conclusion that we should reject the Bill. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) stated that the Committee of the Senate was unanimous, while the Minister of Justice has pointed to the close division in the Senate on the question. With either matter we have nothing to do. We are here to form an opinion on the evidence before us. Applying the rules which govern these cases to that evidence, we must endeavor to come to a correct conclusion in regard to it. Notwithstanding the serious position in which this young man will be placed, I do not think we can ignore the principle which should guide us in determining this case, and I concur with the Minister of Justice and feel myself most reluctantly compelled to vote against this Bill.

Mr. LISTER. As I understand the matter, the motion before the House is simply that this matter should be referred to a committee. I appreciate fully the powerful argument of the Minister of Justice, and if there is any good reason for believing that the parties are acting in collusion, the application made for divorce should be refused by this House. But the House owes something to the Senate, which is the court for the trial and decision of these cases. There is, to be sure, a very considerable responsibility resting upon members of this House, but heretofore we have always accepted the decision of the Senate as to these matters, and without paying very much attention to the evidence, we have concluded their consideration and recommendation to be sufficient to lead us to grant a divorce. So far as this case is concerned I think that, under all the circumstances, it should go to a committee of this House to investigate the evidence. It is a very hard thing indeed that this young man applying for a divorce should be ruled out in the way proposed. If there has been adultery committed, he should receive a divorce; and it is not courteous to the Senate, or doing justice to ourselves, to throw out the Bill without further consideration. It should be referred to a committee to hear the evidence, and consider the evidence laid before the other House. So far as that House is concerned, they have devoted themselves very thoroughly to the estimation of this class of cases. If there is one class of business more than another to which the Senate has given great care and attention, it is to these divorce cases, and when we are informed that a gentleman of the legal experience of Judge Gowan, chairman of the committee, has concurred in the finding of the committee, that opinion should be received with very great weight by members of this House. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) has said that the present practice in England is that the evidence of the wife shall be sufficient to obtain a divorce unless the judge is satisfied there is collusion. In this evidence there is nothing to show that the parties have been acting in collusion, and, such being the case, I feel bound to vote for the reference of this matter to a committee of this House.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has largely expressed what I would have said about this question and I will only supplement his remarks by two or three observations. There is one circumstance to which I would call the attention of the House, and it is a very important consideration, I think, in a matter of this kind. When you appeal from an arbitrator to a judge the judge very frequently relies, and relies almost entirely in doubtful points, on the impression that the arbitrator forms when hearing a witness. I think that is a fair illustration

of our duties here as contrasted with those of the Senate. The Senate heard those witnesses and we did not, and in a doubtful case it would make all the difference in the world to me in forming an opinion as to whether I heard the witnesses or not. Therefore, what the hon. member for Lambton says is, I think, very pertinent to that view. The Senate is the tribunal which this class of legislation is delegated to, and, as the hon. gentleman says, they make very careful enquiry and hear the witnesses. I cannot agree with the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) that there is no other evidence but the confession of the wife. Surely, if he has read about the meeting that took place in the blacksmith's house, there is a strong inference there; and, to my mind, the manner in which the witness gave his evidence on that point would have much to do with the case. If the Senate send a Bill of this sort to this House there ought be no objection to referring it to the Private Bills Committee. I would regret very much, and I do not care what the majority in the Senate was, if after the Senate sent the Bill here we should not send it to the Private Bills Committee where it would be thoroughly considered.

Mr. KIRK. I would like to ask the Speaker whether the result of this Bill being carried on the second reading will be that it will go to Committee on Private Bills.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I believe the statement made by some hon. members that those who hear the evidence are in many cases more competent to judge of the weight that should be given to that evidence than those who only read it. Still it does not follow in all cases that we are not able to form a correct judgment from printed evidence. I think this case is one in which we can form a very fair judgment from reading the evidence and without hearing the witnesses at all. I do not see the particular object of referring this Bill to the Private Bills Committee, because I do not understand that the Committee takes any fresh evidence.

Mr. MULOCK. Certainly they can.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). If fresh evidence is taken before the Private Bills Committee it will have to go to the Senate to be reheard, or we will have the anomaly of this House agreeing to the Bill on evidence the Senate has never heard of. I am strongly inclined to agree with the position taken by the Minister of Justice and my friend from St. John on this question. The evidence appears to me to be of the slightest character possible. After reading the case over it seems to me that those who promoted the Bill do so largely on the grounds that there had been unchastity previous to the marriage, but we all know that is not a ground for divorce. The only ground on which we could grant this Bill is that there was adultery committed in the blacksmith's shop. On this we have only the evidence of one witness who states that he went there for the purpose of obtaining a confession from the wife of her guilt on that occasion. I must say that on reading the evidence carefully which he gave to the Committee, I have come to the conclusion that the evidence was not given as fully and as truly as I would like to enable me to form a judgment which would be absolutely correct. You must remember that in this case there was no opposition to the Bill and that there was no cross examination of the witness except the casual cross examination which the members of the Committee themselves conducted. The witness upon whose evidence, and upon whose evidence alone, this Bill can be granted, states that he went to the woman, and he said to her: "This scrape you have got into is a terrible thing. I asked her if she knew I was there as a witness, and I said I am brought here as a witness, and anything you tell me will come against you." It seems to me that this is a very curious way for a witness to give his examination. Afterwards the witness tells her this crime was committed by her, and asks her, "is it not so," and he says, "she admitted it was so." That is the sum and substance of the evidence on which the Bill is asked to be granted. It seems to me that we ought to look upon evidence of this kind with the greatest suspicion. I would not, myself, be inclined to vote against the Bill on the simple grounds that there was no other evidence than that confession, if that evidence were clear and full, and the circumstances pointed clearly to guilt, but in this case I submit it is not so. It occurs to me, from the evidence, that the probabilities are against the party having committed the guilt on the occasion of the meeting at the blacksmith's. In England, as we know the Queen's Proctor can intervene and very often does intervene in a doubtful case, but we have no Queen's Proctor here. The wife appears anxious that a divorce should be granted and I have come to the conclusion that beyond all reasonable doubt there was collusion between the parties although that was in a sense contradicted by the husband. In reading the evidence no reasonable man can come to any other conclusion than that both desired a divorce and the case rests entirely on the confession of the wife made to this witness who says he went to her as a witness and put the words in her mouth. I have come to the conclusion that there are no grounds for granting the divorce in question or for sending it to the Private Bills Committee, where the Bill would not be one bit more advanced than it is here.

House divided:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Barnard,	Hickey,	Prior,
Barron,	Hudspeth,	Putnam,
Bell,	Innes,	Roome,
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Ross,
Bowman,	Kirkpatrick,	Scarth,
Boyle,	Lang,	Scriver,
Brien,	Lister,	Shanly,
Brown,	Macdonald (Huron),	Skinner,
Bryson,	Macdowall,	Small,
Burdett,	McCarthy,	Smith (Sir Donald),
Cargill,	McCulla,	Smith (Ontario),
Carpenter,	McDonald (Victoria),	Sproule,
Charlton,	McDougald (Pictou),	Stevenson,
Cochrane,	McKay,	Sutherland,
Cockburn,	McKeen,	Taylor,
Colter,	McMullen,	Temple,
Daly,	Madill,	Tisdale,
Davis,	Mara,	Trow,
Denison,	Meigs,	Tyrwhitt,
Dewdney,	Mills (Annapolis),	Waldie,
Dickey,	Mitchell,	Wallace,
Dickinson,	Moncrieff,	Watson,
Eisenhauer,	Mulock,	Weldon (Albert),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	O'Brien,	White (Cardwell),
Guillet,	Perley,	Wilson (Lennox), and
Haggart,	Platt,	Wood (Brockville).—79.
Hesson,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Doyon,	McGreevy,
Armstrong,	Dupont,	McIntyre,
Audet,	Ellis,	McMillan (Huron),
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Renfrew),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Bain (Wentworth),	Ferguson (Welland),	Marshall,
Béchard,	Fiset,	Montplaisir,
Bergeron,	Freeman,	Neveu,
Bergin,	Gauthier,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gigault,	Perry,
Boisvert,	Godbout,	Porter,
Bourassa,	Grandbois,	Préfontaine,
Campbell,	Guay,	Rinfret,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Hale,	Riopel,
Choquette,	Holton,	Ste. Marie,
Chouinard,	Joncas,	Semple,
Cimon,	Jones (Halifax),	Somerville,
Coulombe,	Kirk,	Thérien,
Couture,	Landry,	Thompson (Sir John),
Curran,	Langelier (Quebec),	Tupper,
Daoust,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Turcot,
Davies,	LaRivière,	Vanasse,

Davin,	Laurier,	Weldon (St. John),
Dawson,	Lavergne,	Wilmot,
De St. Georges,	Lépine,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Desaulniers,	Livingston,	Wilson (Elgin), and
Desjardins,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Yeo—80
Dessaint,	McDougall (C. Breton),	

Motion for second reading negatived.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

House resumed consideration of Bill (No. 4) further to amend the Revised Statutes, chap. 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Sir John Thompson.)

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I was endeavoring at six o'clock to point out to the Government the impropriety at the present time of going on with this Bill. I was endeavoring to show that the Act, in the experience we have had of it so far, has proven to be extremely expensive, and that the country is not favorable to its continuance any longer on the Statute-book; and I think the majority of the members of this House, as well as the majority of the people, will agree with me that it is of no benefit to the country. I have had frequent opportunities of meeting gentlemen on the Conservative side of politics in the country, and I have yet to find a single individual who would undertake to defend the Act on a platform during the campaign. That being the case, it is unreasonable that the First Minister should persevere in retaining it on the Statute book. It has been pointed out in the House to-day that if an election should be held in any constituency at the present time, a very large number of the voters who formerly lived there are not to be found there now. That shows the objectionableness of this Act. In various sections of the country where the Scott Act is in existence, the electors are at the present time being called upon to record their votes for or against the repeal of that Act, and in doing so they are compelled to use a voters' list three or four years old. The result is that perhaps 500 or 1,000 who were entitled to vote at the inauguration of the Scott Act are now out of the country, so that the expression of opinion will not be in any way satisfactory. Besides that, since the revision of the list, a large number of other people who have come there, and ought to be entitled to vote, are not permitted to vote. To-morrow there will be a vote taken in St. Thomas on the repeal of the Scott Act. I was credibly informed when I was last there, that in St. Thomas alone between 400 and 500 of the electors who voted when that Act came into force are now absent, and that, on account of the neglect to revise the lists, some 300 or 400 people who ought to be placed on the voters' lists and be entitled to vote, are not permitted to do so. It is utterly impossible for those who are doing the canvassing to ascertain the names of those who possess votes, so that the vote will not be a fair expression of the views of the people as to whether they are in favor of or opposed to the Scott Act. Sir, I challenge and defy any of the hon. gentlemen opposite to stand up and defend the Franchise Act and say that they are prepared to go and defend it before their constituents. When they are before the electors, they condemn the Act because of its being very cumbersome, and because of the enormous expense connected with it; and if the First Minister finds that his followers one and all condemn the Act when before the people, and that they dare not get up in the House and defend it in the interest of the country and of the purity of the franchise and of elections, it is very unreasonable in him to expect us to support it. Will he or any of his followers tell me that it is essential that this Act should continue on the Statute-book? Will he or any of his followers say that the elections have been better conducted, or that the voters' lists have been better prepared since it has been on the Statute-book than before? Such is not the case, and, therefore, I say it is the bounden duty of the Government to accept the amendment offered by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and allow each

Province to arrange the franchise in the way most suitable and agreeable to itself. For these reasons I am bound to vote for the amendment.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is known to those who were members of the last Parliament that when the Act which is now under consideration was placed on the Statute-book, I was slightly opposed to it. It was, Sir, as you know, at that very time fully discussed. It was very strongly opposed as first introduced, and I think it was worthy of the character it received at the hands of many members of the House as one of the most iniquitous measures ever proposed in Parliament. As it finally passed through Committee to take its place among the statutes of the land, it was somewhat improved; some of its most objectionable features were removed. As the Bill was originally introduced, power was taken by the Government to appoint a person, not one of the judges of the land, but a barrister of five years' standing, and to place in his hands absolute power over the electorate of the country. He could virtually have put on the list whom he chose; he could, if unprincipled, have left off whom he chose; and there was no appeal from him. That provision was modified somewhat, the First Minister, whether willingly or unwillingly, conceding that when the revising barrister was other than a judge, there should be an appeal to the judge; but in the case of a judge, there is still no appeal. Many other objectionable features were wiped out, and the Act was made a great deal better than it was as first introduced, because as first introduced it was simply an assumption by the Government of the rights and liberties of the people, nothing more, nothing less. It is no wonder that it has become a part of the history of this country that the Liberal members of Parliament, who believe in the power being centred in the people, should have stayed away from their homes, and at the risk of their health, if not of their lives, in order to combat that measure until they succeeded in getting some of the most objectionable features in it eradicated. But even as it did pass into the Statute-book, we claim it was still a most vexatious measure. Not one request had been made to the Government, either directly or through any newspaper from one end of the Dominion to the other, asking for any change in our franchise at all; yet this Act was passed, and to put it into operation costs us about $500,000 annually. It was stated by the First Minister and others that it would cost nothing like that amount, that the cost would be comparatively trifling, and probably upon this assurance some members voted for the measure, who would not otherwise have done so. But now we have seen the Act put in force. We know the expense involved, and we know that it cost, the year we had it in operation, between $400,000 and $500,000; and since then it has been suspended and not in operation at all. The right hon. the First Minister said this afternoon that this was an inopportune time to discuss the measure at all, because the Government were simply introducing some simple amendments to the Act. Why, the Government placed upon the Statute-book an Act which is unworkable, and they have to come down now and try to make it workable. The very fact that it has been allowed from year to year to lie in abeyance, the very fact that an Act has been passed here suspending its operation from year to year, shows that it is an unworkable Act; and after all the expenses incurred, after all the time lost, the Minister of Justice comes down and is now trying to put the Act in workable shape. Well, the Minister of Justice claims as one of the main features in the amendments he proposes that it will lighten the cost of the working of this Act. A very laudable motive, indeed, but I can show him a more efficacious way—the way proposed by the leader of the Opposition. Let him wipe out the Act altogether, and there will be no expense at all. That would not only lighten the expense, but

completely remove it. Would that produce a state of confusion and disorder? No; we would accomplish a saving of over $500,000 yearly, and return to the system that the people of this country have always approved of and never asked to have changed, and to which they wish to return now. These are some of the reasons why I think we can very strongly urge the House to support the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) said he could not accept the amendment, because the Dominion franchise was lower than the franchise of the Province of Quebec. He said he could not think of disfranchising the mechanics and the workingmen of Montreal as we would do if we returned to the local franchise. I do not think the hon. gentleman is correct, judging by what I have heard from other members from the Province of Quebec, but assuming he is correct, I was not aware that there was any very strong feeling in the Province of Quebec to have an Act passed by this Legislature extending the franchise when that could be equally done by their Local Legislature if they desired it. However, if the hon. gentleman thinks he is right, that is his concern; but I wish to point out to the representative of Ontario constituencies that by retaining this Act upon the Statute-book, they will disfranchise hundreds of young men, wage earners and others of the Province of Ontario, and if the Ontario representatives are as careful to maintain the franchise of those who are entitled to it in their Province as the hon member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) professes to be with regard to his, there is but one course open to them and that is to eliminate this Franchise Act from our Dominion statutes and thus prevent the disfranchising of a large number of young men, wage-earners, who had the right of franchise conferred on them by the Province of Ontario last Session. I take the ground that the provincial lists should be used. I take the ground that this is a federal union, and that each Province shall decide how its proportion of members to this House shall be elected and who shall elect them. I believe in that principle, setting aside the question of expense altogether. Why, Sir, not an hon. gentleman on the opposite side, although this law has been attacked, has arisen to defend it except the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran), and we heard the grounds on which he defended it. Why, the feelings of the hon. gentlemen opposite are known with reference to this matter. These gentlemen have on the public platform disclaimed responsibility for this law—those of them who were not members of the House when it was passed. They stated they had nothing to do with the passing of it, and did not believe in it. This amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition will test the sincerity of these hon. gentlemen. I consider it right and necessary that we should have this discussion. When this law was placed upon the Statute-book, another Parliament was sitting; a great many members who are now in this House were not members then and not in a position to judge the merits of the Act. That Act has been allowed to lie unused from that date until now. It is now proposed to put it into operation. I may remark that the fact of leading the country without revised voters' lists for four years is little short of an outrage. What has been the result? Men who had removed out of the country, men whose whole interests were in the United States, have votes in Canadian constituencies, although they have ceased to hold any interest whatever in this country; and on the other hand there are hundreds of young men who have come of age and others entitled to vote, who are disfranchised because the Government have allowed this Act to remain inoperative while still retaining it on the Statute-book. Now that they are moving in the direction of making it operative again, we take the first opportunity of moving against it, and calling on this House to pronounce whether it should not be abolished; and it will not do for hon. members in the future, to say they are not responsible for the passing of this Act. They will now have to assume responsibility for this law, which they know costs nearly half a million of dollars of public money annually, and will continue to cost that, and which has caused endless inconvenience, expenditure, and trouble, besides restricting the franchise in many Provinces, disfranching men who have votes under Provincial laws, and who ought to have them in Dominion affairs. I make these remarks, because it is desirable this House should, on this, its first opportunity, express its opinion as to whether we ought to continue an Act which was never asked for, which curtails the liberties of the people, and costs annually something like $500,000. We are not so flush in our public funds that we can afford to throw away this amount for something which is not only unnecessary but which is absolutely injurious, and which hon. gentlemen opposite know in their hearts is injurious to this country. I have the greatest pleasure in voting for the amendment which proposes to repeal this Act which I never approved of, and which I have no higher opinion of now that I had when it was placed on the Statute-book.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I do not want to keep the House very long by going into the merits of this celebrated Franchise Act. It would be useless to do so, because they have been dealt with by other hon. gentleman on this side, and the Act has not been defended on the other side of the House. The only hon. gentleman who has risen on the other side of the House, the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), has confined his remarks principally to an attack upon the Province of Quebec. His charge is that the Province of Quebec, as far as her electoral law is concerned, is far behind the other Provinces, and the only argument which he has made in favor of keeping this law on the Statute book of the Dominion is that, if it is now repealed, though it might enlarge the franchise in other Provinces, it would reduce the franchise in the Province of Quebec. I am surprised to find that charge made by a representative of the Tory party of the Province of Quebec. Who is responsible for the electoral law in the Province of Quebec being behind that of the other Provinces? It is the Tory party. In the year 1875, we had the most pronounced Conservative Government ever seen in that Province. The de Boucherville Government was then in power. An Act was introduced by the leader of that Government in the Assembly, the Hon. Mr. Angers, now Lieut-Governor of the Province, to consolidate and amend the Electoral Law, and I then moved an amendment embodying several new franchises. It was a very modest amendment, considering what we have now adopted in other Provinces and considering what the Province of Quebec is reproached by the hon. gentlemen for not having adopted. It was an amendment proposing to give votes to all householders, all professional men, all teachers, all persons earning $400 a year, and all young men holding diplomas. That amendment was opposed most strenuously by every Tory in the House without any exception. I was denounced as a man who wanted to introduce revolution in the Province of Quebec, and I am not sure that the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) was not amongst those who attacked me on that occasion. All the Tory press attacked me for that proposal. The *Minerve*, the regular organ of the Tory party, attacked me for introducing an amendment which would give a vote to people who had scarcely a roof to live under. Now, we see the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), who boasts that he is a dyed-in-the-wool Tory, reproaching the Government of the Province of Quebec for being backwards in regard to the Electoral Law. The hon. member is the last man who should make that reproach. On the occasion to which I refer, these amendments were opposed by every Tory member in the Local Legislature, and the only votes I got were those of the handful of Liberals we had

at that time, numbering, I think, 10 or 12 in the Legislative Assembly. They all voted for my amendments to extend the franchise to a great many people who were deprived of it. I repeat it, if that reproach was a well founded one, the hon. gentleman should be the last to make it to our Province, because he and his party are responsible for the state of things in existence in that Province until we had a change of Government. The hon. gentleman says that, if the present law is repealed, the Province of Quebec will be in a very bad position. I do not like to hear such a reproach and such an argument from a gentleman coming from my own Province. I think every man should have enough pride in his own Province to induce him not to try to get his Province condemned by members from the other Provinces, and especially when such a condemnation is not deserved. The hon. gentleman is trying to enlist the sympathies of the laborers and the wage-earners of the Province of Quebec, because he says that, if the amendment were passed, many of them would be deprived of the right to vote. That statement is not well founded. Take the law as it is now. Before the amendments were made in the last Session of the Quebec Legislature, it was provided by our law that any man could vote who was the proprietor of real estate amounting to $300 in cities of more than 20,000 people, or $200 in the country districts, or who was a tenant or occupant of real estate worth $30 a year in those cities, or $20 in the country. I make bold to say that it would be impossible to find a married workman or wage-earner who would not have a vote either as proprietor or occupant or tenant under this law. Besides that, there are new franchises introduced during the late Session of the Quebec Legislature, giving votes to the sons of farmers and of owners of real estate, and to teachers without any property qualification. If you take the franchise as it is now in Quebec, after these amendments were made during the last Session of the Legislature in that Province, I am sure, speaking for the country parts of the Province, that the franchise possessed under the Dominion law will not be taken from one out of a thousand of those who are now in possession of it. In the cities, who is going to be deprived of the franchise who now has it under the Dominion law? The hon. member can scarcely find any. He may find a few dozen unmarried young men—very respectable young men—who are not keeping house; but anyone who is keeping house is sure to have the franchise under that law as he has under the present Dominion law. The reproach of the hon. gentleman is therefore completely unfounded. The hon. gentleman has also objected that the law of the Province of Quebec has deprived Government employés both federal and local, of the right to vote. The hon. gentleman ought to know at whose demand that law was passed. It was at the demand of the employés themselves and that was due to the system which has been followed in the past. I could give many instances in reference to the course which has been taken in regard to those employés. Only last week, I saw an employé of the Treasury Department who was first employed when I was there. He had the misfortune to be a Liberal, and he told me how glad he was that the law was passed. He said that during the last election he was known to be a Liberal, and as it was well known that he would register his vote in favor of the Opposition candidate, some Tory wire puller went to him and said: "I warn you that if you give your vote you will be summarily dismissed." This gentleman told him that he had a right to give his vote, that he was not meddling with the elections in any way to make himself obnoxious to the Government of the day (the Ross Government). The Tory wire puller repeated the threat that if he voted he would be immediately dismissed, and he did not vote. He said to me: "I never felt more humiliated, and if I had not had a family, I would have run the risk of being dismissed at once." Sir, these are the people who have been asking the Government of Quebec to pass the law which was passed during the last Session. We saw on a late occasion in the election which took place in the County of Laval, that all the employés of the penitentiary went in a body to vote for a man who would not have been elected but for this interference of federal employés. These are the reasons why that law was passed by the Quebec Legislature. The hon. member is not following one of the most important leaders of his party. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) knows what position Mr. de Boucherville occupies in the Conservative party in the Province of Quebec. Well, that law was approved by Mr. de Boucherville in the Legislative Council, although it was denounced by some other Conservative members; but that great and highly respected Conservative leader in the Province of Quebec approved with both hands the law which was intended to deprive the employés of the two Governments from the right of voting. As for my opinion of the Franchise Act, it is very well known, and I shall vote with much pleasure for the amendment.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).

Mr. LA RIVIÈRE. From the remarks made by the last two members, I notice that they are praising the franchise system in their respective Provinces. I am very sorry that I cannot say as much concerning the system in my own Province. At the same time we see that a different franchise system exists in each Province, and if we were to adopt the amendment before the House, we would have a House composed of members who would be elected under diverse franchises. The main object in view in passing the Act we have now in force was to have a uniform system of franchise, but if the present law was repealed, that object would be lost. I say that the question of expense, though it may be large, should not be considered when the question is that of having, as far as practicable, a uniform system of representation for the whole Dominion. In the Province of Manitoba we have a system that is called the one man one vote. Only residents are qualified to vote in their respective localities. That may be considered well enough for a Local Legislature, but in a Legislature like this, having so many powers, not only over the liberties of individuals but over their properties, I believe the franchise should be much more extended than it is for Local Legislatures. If we adopted the local franchise for the House of Commons, a large number of electors would be deprived of their right to vote, and they would thus have no voice in the representation of their respective constituencies. In my own constituency there are over 1,000 electors owning large properties, but who, unfortunately, not being residents in the constituency, would be deprived of their vote if the law was made different from what it is to-day. I believe it would be a hardship to these electors to deprive them of their franchise by adopting the local franchise that now exists in that Province. This is not so much felt in the Local House, because during the local election these electors cannot very well vote in all the places where they are qualified; but as respects the House of Commons, I believe it would be a hardship. Therefore, I say that not only because the system at present in operation has been found effectual, but with the object of having a uniform franchise, we had better maintain the present law. Let us amend it if it is found defective, let us extend it if it is not found to be wide enough, but let us not throw away a good law which was put on the Statute-book for a good purpose.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition is one that should carry in this House. It should carry for many reasons. It should carry, in the first place, because the Franchise Act is unnecessary; it should carry again because the Franchise Act is very expensive; it should carry because the Franchise Act may become very mischievous in the way it is at present

constituted. It is well known to every member of this House that the Franchise Act is not uniform in its character. The member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) indicated that he would support it because it was uniform. The hon. member should know that the Act is not uniform in its character, that the franchise under that Act is not the same in all the Provinces, but differs in two or three of them, I believe. So, if the hon. member wishes uniformity, he cannot oppose the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition. Now, the expenditure for printing the Act is something enormous, and the people of this country get nothing in return for it. I do not know a single redeeming feature in the expenditure of that money. I see by the report of the Auditor General that in 1887-88 we expended under the Franchise Act $69,970.35. Now, what in the world we expended that money for, is something I cannot understand. There has been no revision of the lists since 1886, and that revision cost us, if I mistake not, something in the neighborhood of $400,000, to be accurate $407,625.69, so that we have nearly half a million expended, probably more than that, by this Dominion for the Franchise Act. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, the opposition that was made to the Bill when it was introduced; you remember the long days and night sittings that we held over this Bill, and if there is anything that I look back upon in my career in Parliament with a feeling of pride, it is the contention we made on that occasion; it is the effort we made on that occasion to defend the people's rights, and save the people's money. I have sometimes regretted that we did not hold out longer. I have sometimes thought it would have been one of the best things we could have done in the interests of the country if we had continued the agitation. In travelling through the country I have met many candid thinking men who have come to the same conclusion. At the last election many gentlemen brought out to support the Government declared in their addresses that, if elected, they would vote for the repeal of the Franchise Act. I know of some instances in which that was the case. I do not know how many of those elected to support the Government made such pledges, but I am aware of some who did.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They will be named, no doubt; the people will name them.

An hon. MEMBER. Are you frightened?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I stood before the country in opposition to the Franchise Act before, and was not frightened. I do not think I am frightened now. I am never frightened when I know I am right, and I know I am right in opposing the continuation of this Act. It would be in the interest of this House and country if the Act were repealed, and I do not know but that I am prepared to make another bold stand and continue the agitation against this Act. Some hon. gentlemen desire to have the Session brought speedily to a close. I am anxious for that, but I am not anxious to sacrifice the rights of the people in order to do so. I am not anxious to get away and leave an Act on the Statute-book that I consider bad and vicious and against the interests of the people. I am not going to consult my own convenience and close the Session before I have expressed my views on this Act, which I consider to be a bad one. I prefer the system we have followed since Confederation with respect to the voters' lists, a system which has cost nothing to the people who voted for members of the House of Commons. On the other hand half a million dollars have been thrown away on this Franchise Act. That sum given as a bonus would have double-tracked the Grand Trunk from Montreal to Toronto. Would that not have been of more advantage than a Franchise Act by which the Government have been able to get persons on the voters' lists who have no right there? In one township in my riding 31 bogus voters were allowed to remain on the list, simply because the solicitor was half an hour too late in posting letters objecting to those names. Those 31 bogus voters there were men who had no stake in the county; they had been put on the list by fraudulent means, by wrong representations, and every one of those 31 bogus voters voted on that occasion.

An hon. MEMBER. How many did you get?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I did not get a single one. I was elected by the freemen of this country. Moreover, I was elected by men opposed to this Franchise Act, and I will fight against the continuance of this Act so long as I am in this House, because it is unnecessary, because it is subversive of the rights of the people, because it may be mischievous in its effects, and may lead the Government to do acts which, under other circumstances, they would not do, or have their officers commit acts against the interests of free elections in this country. I presume we shall have the Minister of Public Works voting for the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. He is an honest looking Minister, and I think his honesty will compel him to vote for the amendment. I shall be very much surprised if, after consideration, that Minister is not found voting for it. I notice that very frequently during this Session he has told hon. members that he was unable to erect buildings that were very much required in different constituencies or do other works necessary to develop the wealth of the country. I do not know that he denies these requests so often when elections are near at hand as he has done this Session; but if he had half a million to spend on public works, it would be a benefit to the country. No one knows better than the Minister that half a million would do more good to the country than getting bogus voters on the list to sustain a corrupt administration of public affairs. I am in earnest in this matter, and if this Bill goes into committee I may continue my agitation as long as I did before. I do not think I will do so, but I will take the matter into serious consideration; and I will oppose the Bill at every stage, because I believe it is an unjust, an improper and an unfair measure, one unnecessary, uncalled for and one vicious in character, and one not uniform in character, as the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. La Rivière) pointed out. I hope the amendment will be adopted. From one end of the country to the other there is a desire to have this measure repealed. I believe a great many supporters of the Government would be glad if they did repeal it, viewing it from a party standpoint. It is an Act that gives great trouble to everyone in political life. It is very expensive to those in political life, and it compels hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to put their hands in their own pockets in order to obtain justice. It may be different, perhaps, with hon. gentlemen supporting the Administration; perhaps they may have other means of raising money and may compel the public to contribute to defeat the people by the use of their own money. These are some of the reasons why I oppose, and shall continuously oppose this Act. I do not know but we may be here far into the summer before the measure is passed from the way I feel on the question now.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. La Rivière), has referred to the franchise as now existing in Manitoba. As one favoring the most liberal interpretation being placed upon the qualification of voters for elections to the House of Commons, I am in favor of the franchise in Manitoba as compared with the present Franchise Bill in this House. The franchise in that part of the Dominion is more liberal than the franchise for the House of Commons. That is one reason why I desire to see the House adopt the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition. Another reason is the tremendous expense

this Act has been to the country, and not only is there that enormous expense to the country directly chargeable to the Government but the cost indirectly is as much more. Under the Dominion Franchise Act we have three voters' lists before the people, namely, the municipal list, the Local Legislature list and the Dominion list, and this House should take into serious consideration whether it is well to burden the people with the expense of maintaining the machinery in operation for the purpose of enabling people to vote. I prefer the Manitoba franchise to the Dominion franchise, particularly on account of the fact that it is a one man one vote franchise. There might be objections to that in Local Legislature elections, but I do say that, so far as Dominion elections are concerned, the principle of "one man one vote" ought to be carried out. I say that I am entirely in favor of manhood suffrage, for while we raise our revenues on the system of taxation that we do at present, I hold that every man 21 years of age living in the Dominion of Canada should be entitled to vote for a representative in this House. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) has just stated that by the Act of the Local Legislature one thousand individuals in his county would be deprived of having a vote. I believe that if the election at which that hon. gentleman was elected had taken place in Provencher on a list prepared during the year previous to his election, that the chances are that that hon. gentleman would not be here to-day to speak in this House. I say that it is a disgrace to this country that any gentleman should be elected to a seat in this House in the year 1889 on a voters' list prepared four years before, in 1885. I say that this is more particularly the case in a new country where the settlement changes very rapidly, and I further hold that under the system of adopting the local franchise there would be less expense to the country and less trouble and annoyance to the people, and that they would have a better chance of sending the proper representative to Parliament.

Mr. COLTER. I had the pleasure of addressing the House for a few moments this afternoon.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Spoken.

Mr. COLTER. I am speaking on the amendment. I spoke on the main motion then and I suggested for the consideration of the Minister of Justice certain amendments which commend themselves very strongly to my mind. I would be anxious, however, and very anxious, to see the amendment moved by the hon. the leader of the Opposition carried, because it commends itself much more strongly to my mind than any improvement that could be made in the present Franchise Act of the Dominion. I think that a very great many members of this House have not taken into consideration the enormous difficulty which is going to attend the revision of this next year's list. We must remember that we have to use as a basis the list which was compiled in 1886. We have carried on from year to year, on this voters' list, people who have been disqualified, by death or otherwise, to a very large number indeed. In the estimate that I made this afternoon of one thousand who are disqualified by the operation of this Act at the present time, I know that I was within the mark The list which I mentioned to the extent of 350 voters prepared by one party in one year were all verified upon statutory declarations. This was the extent of the additions to be made by one party in one year, and if you come to consider the additions which would necessarily have to be made during the two succeeding years you will see that I am well within the mark in my estimate of 1,000. We have then to prepare ourselves in an ordinary agricultural constituency for the addition of at least 1,000 voters to the voters' lists, and we have to prepare ourselves as well for the striking off from this list of an equal number of voters who have become disqualified through removal or other causes. Let us take into consideration what expense this involves. Suppose we consider the simple drawing up of these declarations and say that the charge is only 50 cents for drawing each, then for a thousand the cost will be $500. In order to strike the names off the list we have to subpœna probably about 1,000 witnesses. If we allow 25 cents for subpœnaing each one we have the extra expense of $250 under that head alone. Then if we take into consideration the expenses of say 600 witnesses, which would not be more than enough, at $1.25 a day each we would have to pay for witnesses expenses $750. There are other smaller items of expense that have to be taken into consideration in connection with this revision, but these three items of expense which will devolve upon members of both political parties in addition to what is paid out of the public treasury will amount to about $1,500. I am sure that this calculation is within the mark and it shows that this is a very severe burthen imposed on those whose duty it is to see to the revision of the voters' list. We have to consider further that the time spent in revising the voters' lists next year will be double what it was at the revision in 1886. There will be more than double as many names to be taken into account and more than double as many appeals to be heard, and this will involve the sitting of the court for a large number of days. Business will be to a certain extent disorganised and there will be great indirect loss upon the people of this country. There are a great many other objections to this Bill, but I will merely enumerate one of them, which I found out from practical experience. We may have some revising barristers who differ in opinion from others as to the form of the statutory declaration, and that has been found to be the case in a great many instances. Some revising barristers will admit a very simple statutory declaration in order to qualify an income voter, while others require very minute details as to the sources from which the income is derived. We will suppose that there are a large number of those statutory declarations made up. They are submitted to one revising barrister and they are admitted as good and they may be submitted to another revising barrister and he pronounces them bad and rejects them all. We have in this way an implement for doing a wrong to the people of this country, and I say that this wrong ought not to be continued. I have had considerable experience in this matter and I must say that I am somewhat wedded to this old voters' list. I have run four elections in one division, so that I have the list pretty nearly off by heart and I would be reluctant to part with it, because on every one of those occasions I had the majority of legal voters. But I have this to say, that we have to prepare ourselves, no doubt, for a great deal of labor, a great deal of worry, and a great deal of expense in this revision, and I think that the House ought to pause before it imposes this unnecessary burthen upon those who are in political life. If we come to consider that the revision is properly carried out under the present Franchise Bill, and that it is properly carried out under the law as it would be in the Province of Ontario, we will find that if the amendment of the hon. the leader of the Opposition was sanctioned we would have practically the same result. I know that in the village in which I live we had under the revision in 1886 on the voters' list every man who was 21 years of age and who had lived there the required time. If he could not get on in one way he could get on in another, and it was practically manhood suffrage in my locality as well as throughout the county. We could obtain the same results without incurring such expense as has been incurred in the past, and we could accomplish the same results in future without having the expense imposed on the country or upon those whose duty it is to take an interest in the revising of those lists. I believe that if we were to take an ordinary agricultural constituency in Ontario and compare the list as it would be

if thoroughly and completely revised under the present Act after all this expense had been incurred, with the list such as it would be if the amendment of my hon. friend were carried out, we would not find a difference of two per cent.; I doubt if we would find a difference of one per cent.; and both parties would be very glad indeed to be relieved of this great burden. But it may be thought by hon. gentlemen opposite that it is very much to their interest to have this Act, because in several cases they get the start of us in the revision of the lists, and probably they calculate that they may get the start of us again in the next revision. Well, we think we have learned something from experience and we think we can get along with the Franchise Act about as well as they can; but it will entail a very large amount of expense and care and labor in order to do this, and I believe those who sit on this side of the House will see that that work is done properly. There are a few other considerations which I would like to bring before this House. Look at the time that will be involved in this revision. We have practically begun the work now, and it will be continued with very little intermission until the lists are finally revised in October or November. We have to prepare the declarations, see that the names are put on the original list as prepared by the revising officer. This list has to be published and posted up throughout the county, then it is examined by various people, and a great deal of time is lost in doing so, and we come at last down to the final revision, and what do we find then? We find hundreds of neighbors going into the witness box and swearing against one another on various matters, causing a great deal of hard feeling and bitterness which is totally unnecessary. Under the present system of the Province, the law is very easily administered. I remember a remark made this afternoon by an hon. member, which set me thinking. It was that in most of the municipalities throughout the Province both political parties were represented in the council. I thought of my own constituency, in which of the eight municipalities there seven have divided councils, some of the members being Reformers and some Conservatives, and the only council which is not divided is wholly Conservative; yet in working the system we succeed very easily, and there is not much red tape in getting the lists revised. The assessor has to go around, and if he finds that a man has died or gone to the other side during the year, he drops his name from the assessment roll; it is his duty to do so. When that roll is returned, there are fourteen days in which it can be examined and appeals can be entered; and if any correction is to be made, it is made in an hour or two, without any expense, on the matter being represented to the council. The whole work is completed without either party being beholden to the other. If the Court of Revision has made a mistake or behaved in a partisan manner, an appeal can be made to the county judge. The Local Government have no interference whatever in the preparation of these lists, and they are very accurately, fairly and cheaply prepared. We also have in the Ontario law the very important provision of one man one vote, and I believe fully in that doctrine. Let us just consider this. I know one man in my county who polls no less than five votes, and he is not worth five dollars; and I know another man who is worth $200,000, and he is entitled to only one vote. The wealthy man lives in the centre of the county, where he owns a large quantity of real estate in one block. Suppose he lived at the corner of the county, his land might extend across the boundaries of three or four counties, and he might thus be enabled to have as many votes, whereas if his land were placed a mile north or a mile south, he might be entitled to only one. There is another difficulty in connection with this Franchise Act. We sometimes find a man whose income from various sources will amount to nearly $300, and if he wants a vote he is bound to work it up to that amount in some way. I know one man who was examined who made out his income to be $290. It was hard work to get it higher, although he took into consideration his various earnings; but a happy thought struck him. He happened to remember that he kept twenty hens which laid eggs, and that he sold the eggs, and he figured up that probably the sale of the eggs would make up the other ten dollars, and he swore to that, and the revising officer put his name on the list. The question arose, who was entitled to the credit? Were not the hens entitled to a good deal of the credit of getting him a vote? As this Act stands, it must cause a great deal of waste of the earnings of the people. If we had a franchise such as that in vogue in Ontario, we would do away with such unseemly scenes as this, and we would have something secured to the people which would give them their political rights, which would be unattended with expense to the country, and which would do away with a great deal of hard feeling among neighbors in connection with the preparation of the lists.

Mr. DALY. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) called the attention of this House to the working of the Local Voters' List Act in the Province of Manitoba. I think it would have been well if the hon. gentleman had left that matter alone. It is no doubt within the knowledge of the members of this House that we had a change in the Government of Manitoba during the year 1888. In 1887 the Government then in power promulgated an Act by which they appointed enumerators throughout the Province. Exception was taken to the appointment of those enumerators by the then Opposition. They said that the Government should have appointed the local assessors, the clerks of municipalities, and that it was unfair and unjust to the people that they should appoint partisan enumerators. But one short year afterwards the Greenway Government came into power—the Grit Government, the Liberal Government, those men in whom there is no guile; and what did we find? We found that instead of carrying out the objection they had made when in opposition, they repealed the old law and introduced a new one. They did not even appoint the local clerks of municipalities as enumerators but chose partisans throughout the length and breadth of Manitoba. As there are fourteen local constituencies in the district I represent I had something to do with those lists, and I found that every single appointment that was made consisted of a strict partisan. If the hon. gentleman who has just sat down expects to have trouble in revising the lists shortly, I can assure him he will not have one-half the trouble that we had in Manitoba doing the same work. Hon. gentlemen opposite object to the appointment of judges as revising officers. Well, our Liberal friends in Manitoba do not say whom they will appoint, but appoint the straightest partisans they can find, and we find it necessary to follow the local voters' lists very closely. We have to attend the courts of revision; we have to go to these enumerators, and we often find they leave off deliberately dozens of men who have been in the Province for years, but who, strange to say, were Conservatives and opponents of the Government, and they put names on the list which we had subsequently struck off, and equally strange to say these were all names of Reformers. One of the greatest inequalities in connection with our Manitoba Act is that certain men in the Province are disfranchised by it, for instance the officials of the Local and Dominion Governments. No man who holds a position under the Government, according to that Act, has the right to vote. But do they carry out that principle?

Mr. WATSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman says, "hear, hear." He knows that all officials and employees of the Dominion or Local Governments who are in receipt of a salary to the amount of $350 shall not be entitled to vote. Thus a man who is amenable to influence, a man who is in receipt of

$350 per annum shall not vote, while a man in receipt of $351 shall vote. The consequence was a number of our people were disfranchised who were entitled to vote.

Mr. WATSON. It is the other way. Any person receiving $350 or over cannot vote.

Mr. DALY. All officials and employés of the Dominion and Local Governments in receipt of a salary to the amount of $350 and upwards shall not vote, and other people in the pay of the Dominion Government are equally disfranchised. For instance, the men attending the Winnipeg Military School—men who are British subjects and of age, and who would be entitled to the manhood suffrage which the hon. gentleman is in favor of—just because they happen to wear the Queen's uniform—are disfranchised. I hope and trust this amendment will be voted down. I hope, so far as the Dominion franchise is concerned, that we will have a uniform franchise over the whole Dominion, because I can assure you, Sir, from the experience which we had in Manitoba, if we take what is given to us by the Grit Government there, we can never have fair play. We cannot expect any fair play from any Grit Government as soon as they get into power, and if those hon. gentlemen opposite, who are kicking so hard to-day and who were kicking in 1885, once got into power they would not have a word to say against this Act and it would remain the law of the Dominion as it is to-day. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down told us he had the experience of four elections in connection with the lists and would prefer that they should remain as they are. I would not like to be personal, but I think it would be betting on a certainty in declaring that the hon. gentleman will not raise his voice in this House again after the next election, and I think probably if this list was not revised he would have an opportunity in a few short months to run another election in Haldimand on the same list. In order to assist that hon. gentleman to run another election on the Dominion list, the Minister of Justice introduced these amendments, and I have not the slightest doubt that when the list is revised in the County of Haldimand, the hon. gentleman who formerly represented that constituency and whom we all honor will again represent it.

Mr. COLTER. In spite of the voters.

Mr. DALY. I want to ask the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) if he will stand up here and defend the course of the Government of the Province of Manitoba in respect to these lists? Why, Sir, their policy was condemned by the party organ in Winnipeg. The *Free Press* condemned them, and the Grit press throughout Manitoba condemned them, and the Government of the Dominion could do no greater act of kindness towards our Province than to allow the Dominion Act to remain on the Statutes. If members from other Provinces had the same experience as we have in Manitoba in connection with what our Reform friends would do when they get into power, I would say to them: Let our Act be changed and the position of affairs would be much worse than it is.

Mr. McDONALD (Huron). As we all have had our experience in connection with the Franchise Act, I wish to express mine before this debate is drawn to a close. The speech we have just heard was characteristic of the hon. gentleman who uttered it. He never rose yet in this House to my knowledge—and I have heard him on most occasions—except as an apologist for the Government. One would almost suppose he was a prospective Minister, and ambitious to speak in favor of the Government, and leave the subject under discussion wholly alone. During his speech of ten minutes or so, he said nothing about the subject under discussion, but appeared to have a crow to pick with my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Watson) concerning the franchise of Manitoba. We are, however, speaking of the franchise law of this Dominion, and in my opinion a more iniquitous Act was never placed on the Statute-book of any civilised country. An hon. gentleman has said that he fought the Act for four months in this House. I am almost sorry the Reform party spent so much time combatting it. If it had been allowed to pass on the Statute-book, as it was brought down, I am satisfied that before this the indignation of the people would have been such that the Government would have repealed the Act. To tell you, Sir, that it is expensive is only to tell what is known to every individual that has had anything at all to do with it. I have not heard in this House, or in any part of the country, a single Conservative call the Act a good one. I have discussed this question on different platforms with different Conservatives, and I have not heard one say it was an Act that could be recommended. I challenge any hon. member opposite to get up and say it is a good Act. Not one dare do so. My constituency was badly gerrymandered in 1882 by hon. gentlemen opposite—for a purpose. It was a concocted scheme of the Conservative party, which was carried out in the Dominion Parliament. The County of Huron was first divided into three ridings, South Huron, Centre Huron and North Huron. The Conservatives in my town had a meeting, and put their heads together to see if it was in the interests of the Conservative party that such a division should be made. They found that it was not, and they sent a deputation down here when the Bill was in Committee of the Whole. I knew exactly what their proposed arrangements were. They left on Thursday, and on the following Tuesday the divisions were made exactly as I had them when the deputation left the town. In 1886 the Franchise Bill was brought into operation in my county, and about 300 votes were placed upon the list which had no right to be there at all, but that was done by the system adopted of sending a certain individual around to gather up as many names as possible and make the declarations himself, and he was to receive so much for each name. To counteract this, my party had to seek to get these bad votes taken off, and it cost us about $2 for each vote that was put off, so that it would cost $750 for getting those votes put off in that riding. But one of the revising barristers, who was a supporter of the hon. gentleman, took a technical objection to the name of the party who objected to those whom we wanted to put off, on the ground that, instead of this name being written, it was printed, and he, therefore, ruled that all those notices were illegal. The consequence was that 150 names which had no right to be there were left on that list, and we had to fight against that great majority. Still, to the honor of a number of Conservatives in that riding be it said, they were so disgusted with that arrangement that I believe a number of their votes were given to me which I would not have received but for that technical objection of the revising barrister, which was looked upon with disgust by the intelligent and honest Conservatives of the riding. That revision cost the Government in my riding $2,762, and it must have cost the two parties there as much, in consequence of which I think it is the duty of Parliament to wipe this measure off the Statute-book and replace it with something which is more in the interest of the country. I shall, therefore, support the amendment of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think that the time spent in the consideration of this question has been altogether lost. This Bill was passed in 1885, after very mature consideration, and after very strong protests from this side of the House. It has been on the Statute-book now for four years, and I do not think we require any stronger evidence in support of the contention that it is an unwise measure than is supplied by the Act itself and by the action of the

Government. This Act originally declared that the franchise should be settled every year: that there was to be an annual revision of the franchise. That revision took place in 1886, and cost this country directly, perhaps, more than $400,000. How much it cost the candidates and the public indirectly no one can tell; but I think it is within the mark to say that, indirectly, it cost the country not less than as much more; so that the revision of the Act the first time, in my opinion, cost the country not less than a million dollars. When the Bill was before the House, we pointed out to the Government what would happen, but they declared that no such result would follow; but the result did follow, and, though the Government declared the Bill would not cost what it did, yet, so unanimous were their friends in regard to its working, so ashamed were the Government of the cost, and so indefensible was the expense, that, after one year's experience, the Government suspended the Act, and it has remained suspended ever since. There is not an hon. gentleman from Ontario who dare stand up in this House and say this is a good measure; at all events there is not an hon. member who has done it.

An hon. MEMBER. Wait till the vote is taken.

Mr. MULOCK. I know how you vote. You do not vote as you think; but as you are told to vote. You do not vote under conviction, but under pressure. There is not an hon. member in this House who would not say, according to his conviction, that this Act is a nuisance, and an expense, and an injury, in fact that it defeats what it professed to accomplish: true, honest representation, and that the sooner it is done away with the better. The Act having been suspended for three years, the Government cannot do better now than to consent to repeal it. They may think that would be a back down, that it would be unworthy for them to recede from their position taken at that time, even in regard to such an unworkable Act as this. But, if I can show by precedent that it would not be contrary to their own record to back down, they should have no such hesitation. I ask them to admit that what we said in 1885 was true.

Mr. TAYLOR. Never.

Mr. MULOCK. Let us see what the precedents are; and, if I can prove to the hon. member for Leeds that the policy of his party is to back down in the face of public opinion, surely he will agree that they should follow their usual policy of backing down in this case as well. They have a distinct duty to perform, and that is to back down from the position they took in 1885, and I will give them good reason for doing that by referring to precedents. For about five years before the rebellion in the North-West, they were asked to compensate the half-breeds, to issue scrip to the half-breeds, but the Government said: No; never, never, would they do so. A rebellion broke out, and they backed down and issued scrip to the half-breeds. Then they captured Louis Riel, and they declared to their followers in Quebec, that they would put Louis Riel through the form of a trial, but that he should never suffer the extreme penalty of the law.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We never did.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) to testify in regard to that. I will cite the gallant colonel from Bellechasse, in support of the fact, that the Minister of Militia and other members of the Cabinet assured him that Louis Riel would not be hanged; but a little afterwards they did hang him.

Mr. BOWELL. There was nothing of the kind.

Mr. MULOCK. That was a good precedent. You also said that it was a grand thing to support the monopoly in the North-West. You said the worst thing that could happen to Canada would be to allow free trade in railways in the North-West. It was of vital importance to the east that had been pouring its millions into works for the development of the west, that it should have this trade with the west, and that we were not going to allow the traffic with the North-West to pass to the United States. Oh, never! It was not to be tolerated for a moment; it would endanger British connection to allow the people in the North-West even to see the Yankees. As a matter of justice, what could be more unjust to the people of the east than to rob them of the fruit they had seen ripening before their eyes? Having declared all that, they backed down, in the face of public opinion, and they paid several millions of dollars for permission to do so. They promised the country that they would build a line to the Pacific Ocean for a certain sum of money, which was to be the outside sum, and as soon as they said that they began to dip into the Treasury for millions more. When they came to Parliament they said this was the last time of asking for money—just like the actors going around the country and advertising that this was their last appearance. Whenever the Government declared that it was their last request for money, then you might be sure that they were going to turn round the next day and ask for more, that they were even then getting their bills ready. Only the last year the Government said that the strict clauses of the Treaty of 1818 must not be departed from, that a treaty was a treaty, a law was a law, and binding upon the Yankees as well as upon the Canadians, and they were going to have the whole treaty, and nothing but the treaty. Mr. Chamberlain went to Washington and sent us up a treaty entirely modifying the Treaty of 1818. The Government backed down; they stated that this was the best thing in the world, and they recommended it to Parliament, and Parliament very properly adopted the new treaty. These are precedents that I am giving to encourage you to take the course that we invite you to take on the Franchise Bill. These precedents show that you have no fixed policy. Your wonderful National Policy is a policy of surrender. I want you to live up to your record, and be consistent throughout; and when your record fails you, give place to men who have a different record.

Mr. BOWELL. Is that all?

Mr. MULOCK. No; I have a few more precedents, if my case is not established. Perhaps the Minister of Customs would like to hear something of his own record. He declared that he was a protectionist, first, last and always; no reciprocity for him.

Mr. BOWELL. I never said such a thing in my life.

Mr. MULOCK. Never said so! Yet he always put up the tariff as high as he could. Did he ever get a chance to increase the tariff when he did not do it? Did he ever get a chance, even on the slightest pretext, of wringing money out of the unfortunate importer, that he did not do it? Only a little while ago in this House he admitted that last year he had strained the law, and had done an injustice to importers.

Mr. BOWELL. What was the duty?

Mr. MULOCK. Did not the hon. gentleman admit the other day when we were discussing the question of placing corn on the free list, that he had strained the construction of the law, and perhaps had himself misinterpreted the law, when he took the millet seed——

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say that.

Mr. MULOCK. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. BOWELL. That is about as near as you can get to the truth.

Mr. MULOCK. I will tell the hon. gentleman what he did say, if it is permissible to refer to a past debate. He

placed millet seed upon the dutiable list last June, did he not?

Mr. BOWELL. I did not.

Mr. MULOCK. You caused your officers to collect duty upon it, did you not?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. So we have got one point established. He caused his officers to collect duty upon millet seed last June, causing it to be held, through some construction of his regulation, as cereal instead of a grass; and the other day in the House, when we were discussing a certain motion, he admitted that he thought that he was wrong on that occasion. Is that not a correct representation of what was said?

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Will some hon. gentleman be good enough to give me his words? I say that is what the *Hansard* shows, as I could prove if I had it by me. With regard to green fruits and other grains, although he declared that the United States had placed a statutory invitation upon the Statute-book, and had asked us to shake hands with them in that line, the Minister of Customs year after year maintained a Customs duty upon the class of goods that I refer to. He may say that I cannot prove by any language he used, that he was against this reciprocity. But do we want any more convincing language than his action in collecting the duties and continuing these things on the dutiable list? After declaring by these acts of his that he would never allow these things to go on the free list, he backed down last spring. That is another precedent for the Government to follow in backing down again. Last year we spent three weeks discussing the question of reciprocity, and after every one of these hon. gentlemen, who are now trying to suppress the voice of public opinion speaking through me—every one of these hon. gentlemen declared on that occasion that they were the most loyal of the loyal, that come weal or woe to Canada, it was England and Canada, and nothing else, and nothing, no nothing, would justify them by voice or vote in supporting a Government that would discriminate in the slightest degree against the glorious old land, Great Britain. But at the very time they were uttering these words they were laying their plans to discriminate against Great Britain and, of all countries in the world, in favor of the United States. The discussion came to an end on Friday night, and on Saturday morning the thing was in type. While you were protesting your loyalty, the next morning, to our horror we, sitting on this side of the House, the party of true loyalty to Great Britain, the party that takes an intelligent view of this question, were horrified to find a proclamation issued by the Governor General—I suppose under the advice of the loyal members of the Government—recommending His Excellency to do what? To discriminate in favor of the United States and against Great Britain; and that proclamation became law under the protest of the party on this side of the House. We who could not permit that discrimination under those circumstances compelled you to withdraw that proclamation and to back down once more. Perhaps the Minister of Customs will now be convinced that he, at all events, ought to take the advice that I suggested in regard to the Franchise Act.

Mr. BOWELL. I should be, if I took your words to be true.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, I will give a later record of the Minister of Customs. It would be a pity for him not to keep up his record. On the 26th of February the Minister of Customs, along with the rest of the Government, and their followers, voted against continuing the *modus vivendi* this year. Within a couple of weeks they adopted the *modus vivendi* contrary to their voice and vote on the floor of Parliament. This was another back down. There was a by-election at Halton a short time ago, and the supporters of the Administration declared they would place green fruit upon the dutiable list. As soon as the election was over the Government backed down. A couple of years ago it was well understood the Government would make the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) Deputy Speaker. They did not do so; I presume they backed down. I remember a short time ago, when the Local Legislature of Ontario was agitated on the Orange question, the Conservatives declared that if they once got down to Ottawa their friends here would see them through and give them Orange incorporation. They came here flying banners, beating drums and playing fifes to get the Order incorporated by the Government of the day. Did they get it? No; the Government backed down on that occasion. The Minister of Customs was Grand Master at that time, and had held the position for several years; he is not Grand Master now. I think the Government promised the millers good times. They have been asking for protection and the fulfilment of promises. But the Government have gone back on them; they cannot do anything for the millers; they have either gone back on the millers or the policy has gone back on the millers. Where are the millers now? They have been knocking at the door but to no purpose. We know that the Government promised to help the woollen goods manufacturers and give them substantial protection. What have they done for them? They have backed down on their promises. They have been coming every day almost begging the Minister of Finance to protect their interests, and I suppose he has wished he was back in the old quiet place which he occupied years ago. Hon. gentlemen opposite struck on a great scheme a couple of years ago by which they were going to develop a new industry under the National Policy, the manufacture of bogus butter and the protection of it. The National Policy was to work this all right, and a duty of 10 cents a pound on foreign bogus butter would enable bogus butter in this country to be better manufactured. The Government backed down on that question, because the member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) told them that the people did not want bogus butter even if it were protected 10 cents per pound. So he backed down, as the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) remarked. Why, that hon. gentlemen was going to have his chicken Bill restored, and he backed down. Last year the Minister of Customs declared that never would he go in favor of reciprocity in wrecking; he declared it would ruin our wrecking plant and destroy a vast amount of capital invested in this great industry, and not for a moment would he consent to have such industry destroyed by any such legislation. The Government all stood by him. This year the Minister of Customs, who is not now at the head of the battalions that gather under King William, who is not so military as when he had a regiment to himself, backed down. And the Government broke up on the question, the Government were wrecked. The Senate, however, defeated the wrecking Bill. Probably they will be able to back down next year, and so the Government majority in both Houses will have a consistent character. The Minister of Militia declined to do anything for the battalions in North York and Simcoe. They went to the North-West to do the work while he stayed here to collect the glory. Some came back; they found the Minister of Militia all right here. He had fought for his country here all summer and he had got honors to himself from his country; these men came back from the toils of war, and having served their country honestly, they asked to be recognised according to the law of the land. The Government did not back down at once. Subterfuges were used, it was a sneaky back down, not an open one, but in the end the Government deliberately backed down. For the Minister of War had

declared that these volunteers should not be recognised, that he had done the real fighting down here at Ottawa and those men had been merely instruments in the hand of the great master. True, he had never served in the war, he had never enlisted and he had never served even as a volunteer, and had no sympathy with the volunteers as a whole; yet the Minister of War drew as much pay as a thousand of these men, and he knew what was best for them, and the best thing was to send them back with their pockets empty. And he would have sent them back with their pockets empty except for public opinion. We had the Premier of Canada stating on the floor of Parliament that he would compel his Minister of Militia to back down, and all the Government side had to back down on that question. So these few precedents I have given will make it easy for the Government on this occasion to back down. I am sure the conciliatory manner in which I have presented the case will show the ease with which this can be done, and that it can be done without loss of grace and without loss of dignity, and that it will be in harmony with precedent, and moreover it will be for the interest of the country. If the Government do not back down they propose to spend $400,000 or $500,000. They never back down on expenditures, they keep increasing them. They are consistent whatever else they are, especially in spending money; and one feature on which the Conservatives may congratulate themselves is, that when they leave the public Treasury it will be a pretty empty one. They can say, I suppose, to themselves: For what are we in this House, if it is not for office and for our pockets? I am sure I know not. If they are going to spend half a million to put this Act in force, I ask if that is the best use to which they can apply the public money. Is there no other branch of the public service where this money is needed rather than in keeping this Act in force which is not to the advantage but entirely to the disadvantage of the people? Perhaps the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison), may be reckless in regard to the expenditure of money. It may serve his purpose to sit on the floor of this House and vote as he is told to vote, to neglect his duties and to interrupt and do as he is told, thinking that when I have succeeded, or when public opinion has succeeded, in creating a vacancy in the Cabinet he may be able to get the position of the Minister of Militia. Perhaps I may be carrying out his purpose and serving his purpose in the remarks I am making. I have not noticed him backing down on the Administration much. He has stood by them even when they came to deal with the service, which he, of all others, should assist to preserve, and we find him in the back ground, although he professes to be a militiaman. He has been receiving a salary as a militiaman, and a pretty good salary too, and he is one of the men who enjoys rewards, both from the service outside of the House and inside of the House, and having got a taste for it he wants more. Therefore, perhaps it may be serving his purposes when I am presenting this case before the Minister of Militia. I ask him, as he is figuring on getting into the Government, to give serious consideration to the proposition I would make. Does he think that the $500,000 could be better spent in keeping up that branch of the public service than in spending it on these voters' lists?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; certainly.

Mr. MULOCK. If he thinks that it can be better spent in maintaining the militia force efficiently he will vote against spending it in this way.

Mr. DENISON. We want both.

Mr. MULOCK. You said it would be better spent on the militia, and if there is not enough money for both let us have it for where it will be best applied. If the militia service is complete, if they have got all the clothing they require and of the best quality, and if they have got all the necessary facilities for drilling, perhaps we might find if we look into some of the other departments that the money is badly wanted there. I think we would find that the money could be much better spent in some other branches of the service than in carrying out the provisions of this Franchise Act. I am sorry that the House will lose the benefit of my reviewing the different departments, because I have got a cold and my voice is not good, but if I did so I am sure the hon. members would profit by what I would say and would have taken my advice into serious consideration. I maintain that if the money involved in the putting of this Act into force can be more wisely spent in other branches of the public service than in carrying out this Bill, where it is worse than wasted, that it is the duty of the House to so expend it. Some hon. gentlemen seem to care little for the expenditure of public money. This money that we are entrusted with is gathered out of the pockets of the people of Canada and they feel every dollar that they have to pay whether it be by indirect or direct taxation. I do not think that this House has heretofore shown that solicitous care in the expenditure of public money which it is bound to do. The expenditure of this vast sum of money for the purpose of this Franchise Act is wholly indefensible and is entirely unnecessary. I think that the argument of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) that it was desirable to have a uniform franchise could be easily dealt with by any member who was in this House when this Bill was first under discussion. Every one who was here then knows that it was not uniform, because it is a kind of manhood suffrage in Prince Edward Island and British Columbia and some other kind of franchise in the other Provinces. The pretense of uniformity which the Prime Minister urged as a reason for adopting the Act when he first introduced it, he abandoned at a very early stage.

An hon. MEMBER. Another backdown.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes; it was a case of backdown. Any hon. gentleman who was here in 1885 knows that the Dominion Franchise Act possessed no feature of uniformity except the uniform confusion which results from putting it into force throughout the Dominion. As one of the representatives in this House I desire to record my protest against such a waste of public money as is caused by keeping this Act in force. Quite irrespective altogether of the other objection, that it prevents the people from having a proper, equitable and fair representation in this House.

Mr. DENISON. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not know why the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) singled me out for his remarks to-night. He made some reference to the pay which I draw. I think that pay is somewhat in the neighborhood of $4 a day for twelve days in the year, and if the hon. gentleman can be the means of getting it increased I will be very much pleased. I do not know that the hon. gentleman has any experience of volunteer life, but I think that before he criticises us he had better put on the uniform and do a little work himself.

Mr. WALDIE. I desire to express my views on this matter, and I think that I can plead that I have some experience of it when the House remembers that on this Franchise Bill four or five elections have taken place in the county which I represent. No doubt the Ministry of the day when they introduced that Bill intended the list to be revised annually, and in a country like this where changes are very frequent, where population changes from place to place and where there are great developments in certain sections of the country an electoral list necessarily changes to a greater extent than it would in older countries. The importance of revising the lists frequently is pressed upon the attention of the Legislature, and I think it should also

be impressed upon the attention of the Ministers. No doubt the cost of the revision of that list astonished the gentlemen responsible for the expenditure of the public funds of this country. No doubt the statements when made by the Opposition that a large sum of money would be wasted upon this Franchise Act and that the result would not warrant the expenditure were not believed by the Ministry at the time, but those predictions have been realised and so great was the expenditure that the Government allowed three years to elapse without a revision taking place. It is proposed now that the revision shall take place on the same lines as the present list; that is by revising barristers and by using the old lists as a basis, and as I understand it is thought that the revision could be made cheaper by using the old lists as a basis than by adopting the assessment roll for beginning a new list. I think that before they get through with this revision taking the old list as a basis, they will discover that serious mistakes are made. I know to my own knowledge that a revising barrister refused to accept the evidence of a registered letter having been sent to a party whose name it was proposed to remove from the list unless proof was given that the address was the proper one. I know that in the last four years such changes have taken place in the residences of the voters on that list, ten per cent. of the names the residences are not known. I know from my experience of the recent election in my county that many letters which were sent out to where the voters were supposed to reside came back from the dead letter office months afterwards, never having reached the parties to whom they were addressed. Now, if these names are made the basis of the revised list, how is the revising officer to ascertain that they have been notified? If he cannot ascertain their residences, how is he to know that a registered letter has reached them? Will he insist on the expense of having each man hunted up and the notice served on him before his name is put on the list? If that is the case, I am sure the $500,000 will be trebled and quadrupled to the people of the country who have to look after these lists. The difficulty and expense of revising them has restrained the Government from revising from year to year, as was their intention and their duty. That expense will be increased, for they cannot repeat the policy which has been carried out during the past three years. The list may be revised in 1889 or 1890; then there will be a census taken in 1891; and they must revise the list again probably before another election takes place; so that instead of its costing this country $500,000, it will cost double that amount. I have a suggestion to make, with the object of saving a large expenditure and giving what a great many in this House and in the country think a better system; that is, for the interim elections which may occur before the next general election, that the Government should just amend the Act by wiping it out, and let the local lists govern those elections; and when a new census is taken and the constituencies are rearranged, they can then revise the voters' lists and save at least half a million dollars, if they think it necessary to have such lists as this Franchise Act gives. But I think if they adopt for the interim elections the local lists they will never return to the lists provided by this Franchise Act. I am entirely in favor of a residential qualification for voters, and the principle of one man one vote and only one, and I shall support an amendment in that direction if it is moved. I do think it is not in the interest of this country that this Franchise Bill should be adopted.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I did not intend to say anything on this question, but seeing that very few members from the Province of Quebec have been heard upon it, I think our silence might be taken as signifying that we have no objection to this Franchise Bill, whereas if there is a piece of legislation which I consider outrageous, it is this. As I do not expect to change a vote on this question, I will not go over all the arguments which have been presented; but I may say that our great objection to the Franchise Bill is the immense expense which it causes to the country and also to the people. As we all know, the expense falls on the shoulders of very few in every county; in many instances it falls on the shoulders of the candidate himself. I think the law might be amended, so that it would be just to every constituency. For instance, in the constituency I represent there are two counties in which there are 8,200 voters, and two revising officers to look after. One of these officers in the last election was of such a stamp that it was very hard to follow him. To show his way of operating, I may tell you that one day he would decide in one way against me, and the next day when I would make the same objection that was made against me, he would decide the other way. He would also make it a point in the local revisions, when he saw that we were following him, to stop on his way and send his clerk, and his clerk would adjourn the court to the next day so as to discourage the people who were sent there, to make costs and prevent witnesses from coming. We have been so disgusted with his conduct that even his own friends were bound to give up following him, and the consequence was that we succeeded in having perhaps a fair list. I would not make the Government responsible for the choice of this man, but in choosing him they were badly advised. They took for reviser a man who had been sent away from another county as an embezzler. He could not make a living in another county, and he came to our place, and a couple of years afterwards he was made our revising officer. I would not make the same complaint of the present reviser, but if we have a good man now, I think he must have been chosen by mistake. I have nothing more to say. My object in rising was to place myself on record, and not give a silent vote on this question. If this amendment is carried, I think it will give us about the same list of voters as we have now, because the franchise of Quebec is about the same as that of the Dominion, but it results in a great saving of money, trouble and time.

Mr. PLATT. The issue involved in the amendment does not require any lengthened discussion of the merits of the Franchise Bill of 1885 in order to enable members to decide how to vote on this occasion. The issue is an old one; it has been before the country; every member on both sides of the House has had experience of it; public opinion to a certain extent has been formed; and hon. gentlemen can judge from the feeling in their own constituencies what the feeling of the country is with regard to the continuation of the Act. I may say for the constituency I have the honor to represent that, in the first place, we do not want the Franchise Bill of 1885 any longer. We do not want the labor it imposes upon us, we want to avoid the expense and we do not want the list after it is formed, simply because we can get a better one for nothing. That is the argument used by both parties at home. My experience has been somewhat extended in this respect. I have run two elections since the Bill came into force. In the first contest not one of my opponents ventured to defend it. At the second election my opponent was forced to say that if elected he would vote to repeal the Act of 1885. To-night I am going to give a vote of greater force, perhaps, than I am usually able to give, for I will represent not only the majority, but voice the opinion of ninety-nine hundredths of my constituents.

Mr. BARRON. It seems to me that this House has not yet heard quite enough from the Ontario members regarding this unfortunate franchise law. It seems to me I heard of it before I came into this House. The hon. member for South

Victoria (Mr. Hudspeth), either last Session or the Session before, undertook to tell this House how it came that I had a seat here. He said I owed my seat not to any popularity of my own but to the extreme unpopularity of my opponent. I will not undertake here to criticise the good taste of the hon. gentleman in making such an allusion regarding my opponent, who is a particular friend of his, but will leave them to settle the matter between them. I will undertake to say, however that if there is one reason more than another why I have the honor to represent my constituency, it is the opposition to the iniquitous measure which the hon. the Minister of Justice wishes now to amend. I have often found on public platforms that the speakers who were opposed to me were opposed to the franchise law, but I found more than that. I found that even the strong Conservatives in my riding were individually and collectively opposed to the Act too. I will undertake to say, as reference has been made to the estimated cost of the Act, that it costs no less than a dollar a head for every man, woman and child in the riding I represent, and $5 for every head of a family. Yet we are told it is right and proper to continue a measure which costs the country no less than $500,000 to put it into operation, when a better franchise can be had without spending one dollar of money. Let me show in one particular how vicious this system is and how incorrect and unsafe in endeavoring to arrive at any correct franchise system. Why the judges whom you have appointed revising officers do not seem to be able to put a uniform and proper construction on the Act? The judge of the County Court at Peterboro', who was revising officer, thought it was the spirit of our legislation that every man should have a vote, and proceeded to put every name on the franchise list who was on the assessors roll. I drew his attention to the fact that there were men on the list as voters who did not possess the qualifications required by the Statute, but he would not undertake to strike them off, and our friends were put to an enormous expense in trying to prove that these people were not entitled to be on the list when the assessment roll alone proved it. The revising officer, however, would not strike them off, and thus many were on the list who, according to the Act, were not entitled to a vote. I will content myself with saying that every word which has been spoken on this side against this measure is well founded, and will be justified by the country. There never was a more unpopular measure introduced, and I take great pleasure in believing that I emphasise the opinion of the great majority of the people in my riding in voting for the amendment of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I wish only to say a word or two with reference to the working of the Act in the county I have the honor to represent. The experience of its working has been larger perhaps in that county than any other in Ontario. We had, during the election held there, in May, 1887, 1,500 names on the voters' list made up by the municipalities which did not appear on the Dominion franchise lists, so that a large number of people who were entitled to vote were not allowed to vote at the Dominion elections. These people, who had all the necessary qualifications, were disfranchised simply because the lists under this Act had not been revised for three years. This shows the Act is unworkable. The fact that the Government have found it necessary to suspend its operation for the last three or four years shows the Government consider it unworkable. The enormous expense was sufficient to deter the Government from undertaking the work of revision. I have had an instance in the county I represent of the injustice of retaining upon the Statute-book an Act of that kind. To-morrow in the County of Kent a vote will be taken on the repeal of the Scott Act, and I will guarantee to say that there are 2,000 voters in that county who ought to have the right to record their votes for or against the Act, who will be prohibited from taking any part in the election to-morrow. Were it not for this Act, these 2,000 people, who have lived a long time in the county and have a large interest in it, would have the privilege of polling their votes on this Scott Act question. This law, the carrying out of which is so expensive that the Government found it necessary to stay the proceedings under it, should be no longer allowed to remain on the Statute-book. We had a few days ago a gentleman rising in his place and proposing a committee. What for? To see if the enormous expenditure of the Grvernment could not be curtailed, and I am surprised to find the Minister of Justice opposing an amendment which would save to the people at least $1,000,000. I have no hesitation in saying you can scarcely find a man in the County of Kent, Conservative or Reformer, who will not express the opinion that the Act should be repealed. I cannot see why, if in the face of all that has been said against the Act, in the face of the fact the Government have found it unworkable and were obliged to suspend it, they do not accept the reasonable, fair and honest proposition of the leader of the Opposition. I think that it is a proposition which ought to be accepted by every man who has the welfare and the interest of this Dominion at heart. Surely, we have not enough money to spare to enable us to throw away half a million or a million dollars next summer in revising these lists. We have the local voters' lists, and, as the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Colter) said, I do not believe, that you will find a difference of 1 per cent. in the composition of these two lists. When we have a list which, for all practical purposes, meets the wishes of the people, and gives the right to vote to everyone who should have the right to vote, and which does not cost the people of the Dominion a dollar, I cannot see the use of spending a million dollars more for this purpose. If this was going to save any money in the preparation of the local voters' lists, there might be some reason for it, but, when we know that the local voters' lists have to be prepared as usual, and that not a farthing will be saved in that way, we are doing wrong in proposing to spend, as I venture to say, either directly or indirectly, at least a million dollars on this Dominion list. I therefore, hope that the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition will be accepted by this House. For my own part, I take very great pleasure in supporting it, and, if it is voted down, I hope some other efforts will be made to amend or otherwise improve this Act which, as has already been stated, is the most iniquitous Act ever placed on the Statute book.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question; divide.

Mr. SPEAKER. Call in the members.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I should be ashamed to give a silent vote upon this matter——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I really think I gave enough time for the hon. member to get up before I said "call in the members."

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth) I shall bow to your decision without dispute.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Laurier:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Eisenhauer,	McMullen,
Armstrong,	Ellis,	Meigs,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fiset,	Mills (Bothwell),
Béchard,	Fisher,	Mitchell,
Bernier,	Flynn,	Mulock,
Borden,	Gauthier,	Neveu,
Bourassa,	Gigault,	Paterson (Brant),
Bowman,	Gillmor,	Perry,

Brien,	Godbout,	Platt,
Burdett,	Guay,	Préfontaine,
Campbell,	Hale,	Rinfret,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Holton,	Robertson,
Casey,	Innes,	Rowand,
Casgrain,	Jones (Halifax),	Ste. Marie,
Charlton,	Kirk,	Scriver,
Choquette,	Landerkin,	Semple,
Chouinard,	Lang,	Somerville,
Colter,	Langelier (Quebec),	Sutherland,
Couture,	Laurier,	Thérien,
Davies,	Lavergne,	Trow,
De St. Georges,	Lister,	Turcot,
Dessaint,	Livingston,	Waldie,
Doyon,	Lovitt,	Watson,
Dupont,	Macdonald (Huron),	Weldon (St. John), and
Edgar,	McMillan (Huron),	Wilson (Elgin).—75.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Freeman,	O'Brien,
Baird,	Gordon,	Patterson (Essex),
Barnard,	Grandbois,	Perley,
Bell,	Guillet,	Porter,
Bergin,	Haggart,	Prior,
Boisvert,	Hesson,	Putnam,
Bowell,	Hickey,	Riopel,
Boyle,	Hudspeth,	Robillard,
Brown,	Jamieson,	Roome,
Bryson,	Joncas,	Ross,
Burns,	Jones (Digby),	Scarth,
Cameron,	Kenny,	Shanly,
Cargill,	Kirkpatrick,	Skinner,
Carling,	Labelle,	Small,
Carpenter,	Landry,	Smith (Ontario),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Sproule,
Chisholm,	La Rivière,	Stevenson,
Cimon,	Lépine,	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Temple,
Cockburn,	Macdowall,	Thompson (Sir John),
Coughlin,	McCulla,	Tisdale,
Curran,	McDonald (Victoria),	Tupper,
Daly,	McDougald (Pictou),	Tyrwhitt,
Daoust,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Vanasse,
Davin,	McGreevy,	Wallace,
Dawson,	McKay,	Ward,
Denison,	McKeen,	Weldon (Albert),
Desaulniers,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Cardwell),
Desjardins,	McNeill,	White (Renfrew),
Dickey,	Madill,	Wilmot,
Dickinson,	Mara,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Ferguson (Leeds&Gren),	Marshall,	Wilson (Lennox),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Mills (Annapolis),	Wood (Brockville),
Ferguson (Welland),	Moncrieff,	Wood(W'tmorel'd), and
Foster,	Montplaisir,	Wright.—105.

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

(In the Committee).

On section 2,

Mr. DAWSON. I would suggest that an amendment should be made to section 9 of the Act by adding the words in the sixth line "and does not hold a location ticket."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is moving the amendment of which he has given notice in reference to location tickets given to Indians. I would ask him not to raise that question now. I do not propose to finish this Bill at one sitting, and an opportunity will be given to him to move the amendment at a later date.

Mr. EDGAR. I would suggest that the following words should be added in the sixteenth line of this clause, after the words "assessment rolls":—

"As finally revised for municipal purposes."

Because it is not quite clear whether you mean the rolls as brought in by the assessor or as finally revised for municipal purposes; but it ought to be the rolls finally revised for municipal purposes, because in the interpretation clause of the Act, in clause *q* of the second section, the term "assessment rolls as finally revised for municipal purposes" is made use of, and this section ought to be made to correspond with that clause.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In reference to this amendment, I can say that the assessment rolls will not be revised perhaps until the month of September. The revising officer has to commence his work somewhere about the first of June, so that if he is to base the list upon the last assessment roll it should not be the last revised assessment roll. This year the roll will be finished by the first of June, but not revised.

Mr. TISDALE. The intention of the Act is to take last year.

Mr. LISTER. That would make it much more difficult for the revising officer, because the assessment roll before revision will contain the names of almost every person entitled to vote under this Act. It will make the revising officer's work very easy indeed to take the last assessment roll and make up his list from that. If he goes a year back he will find many changes have been made within the year, the list will not be reliable, and will involve a great many appeals.

Mr. CURRAN. He is entitled under the next line to obtain information from any other source, so that he could consult the new roll to complete his lists.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is just a question of convenience. If the assessment was carefully done the number of names struck off would be very few indeed. But if you take the case of an assessment roll that has been revised, it is nearly 12 months old, and you have all the changes that have taken place during those 12 months to correct on your voters' lists. Then suppose a village municipality is created within the 12 months; you would have nothing to guide you at all in the revised roll.

Mr. COLTER. Practically the fact is that the assessor must have his roll returned by the first of May. Then there are 14 days given within which appeals can be made to the Court of Revision and revision takes place in all cases before the 1st of June. If the last revised assessment roll, as revised by the county judge, were taken, it would save a great deal of labor indeed. Of course it is still subject to revision before the judge. If on this roll as finally revised before the council, there are any mistakes, then it is still subject to revision, and that would save a large amount of trouble to all who are concerned in the revision. If the assessment roll for this particular year were taken, a very large amount of trouble would be saved; in fact it is all important that we should not have the assessment roll of 1888 as a guide for the revision in 1889.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is so much in that, I think my hon. friend will not press his amendment.

Mr. LISTER. The roll of a year old would be most inaccurate.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not take that view of it. The assessment is to be finally revised by the 1st of June; the revising officer does not start to make his preliminary list until the 1st of June, and he does not finish it under the law proposed here, until the 1st of October.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There could be no object at all in the amendment that he should prepare a list of voters in the preceding year, unless it were with the assessment roll of the present year. The theory is that he shall use these incomplete assessment rolls of the current year to revise.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). The date selected for the revision of the list is an unfortunate one for the Province of Quebec. The intention is to use the most recent information possible. In all the municipalities in the Province of Quebec which are regulated by the municipal code, the assessment rolls are only made in June and July, they

are not completed before the end of July, so that they will not even be commenced when this revision of the lists is to be commenced. The result will be that a great many people who will have become qualified during the last year, will not appear on the assessment roll which will be used by the revising officer. If he does not use some other information, a good many people qualified will be disfranchised. Large cities are not regulated by the municipal code. Let us take the city of Quebec, for instance. Our assessment rolls are not completed and revised before he middle of August, and they cannot be commenced before the month of May. The actual work of the assessors only commences about the middle of May, and it takes fully a month or a month and a half for them to go through all the streets and asses all the properties. In Montreal I think the assessment rolls are made during the summer months, and they are not completed before the end of August. The result will be that in the Province of Quebec, if the date is not altered, the assessment rolls of the year will be of no use. It will be impossible to use them at all for the preparation of the lists. I think the date should be postponed unless there are great objections from the other Provinces. From what has been stated it seems that there will not be much objection to postponing the revision to a later period in Ontario. The only complaint in respect to that Province is that the revision takes place too early. There will be no harm if it is delayed.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think the same rule prevails in New Brunswick where the assessment commences the 1st of July.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will see that the provision is that it will begin as soon as possible after 1st of June. However, we will see before finally closing the Bill whether any change should be made, but the principle complained of is that we are beginning too late.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would suggest whether there is any necessity for fixing the date precisely the same in the different Provinces. There are different circumstances in the different Provinces. In Ontario it is more convenient to have the preparation of the voters' lists as soon as possible after the assessment, because the people are not very busy then. If you fix the period to suit the Province of Quebec, it would be mid-harvest in Ontario, and it would be very much more difficult to look after the final revision.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not fixed with any rigidity.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In the preparation of voters' lists it is very important there should be a time within which the revising officer shall be compelled to have the list completed, because he might delay the list on the eve of a general election, and if there was a fixed period within which the list must be returned to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, it would remove any suspicion of improper conduct.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Minister of Justice says he will consider this matter as to dates. It would be well before we alter that provision to look back at the debates on the Franchise Bill, because this subject was very fully discussed as regards all the provisions, and I think as regards dates, this date, 1st of June, was found to be the one that was most generally applicable without inconvenience to the different Provinces. In the meantime, I think we had better revive our recollection of the discussion before we make any alterations.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). A date that might be suitable for Quebec might not suit Ontario, and that is why the same date should not apply to all the Provinces; but if under the new law it was stated that it should commence as soon as possible after the final revision of the roll in each division, it would prevent any trouble.

Mr. COLTER. In the 18th line the words are indistinct and they impose a very unenviable task on the returning officer. Those officers are only human, and they are liable to pressure, and the words "from any other source" are susceptible of a very wide interpretation. There should be some limitation to those words in order to avoid any scandal, because if the returning officer is questioned as to the reason that induced him to put on certain names, he is not obliged to furnish it. I think he should be obliged to do so. If some words were added after the word "source" to this effect "duly verified by statutory declaration or other legal evidence" it would remove the objection and difficulty. It is improper that a returning officer should be placed in the unenviable position of being pressed to admit certain names by personal or political friends without there being imposed some reasonable or proper check, and we ought to impose such check in the Act. I remember, during our revision, owing to some loose clauses of this kind, the revising officer was very much embarrassed and he wished his duties to be clearly defined, and it is only reasonable to suppose that in a matter of such magnitude he should not desire to receive promiscuous information from promiscuous sources, but that the information he should act upon in determining who should be voters should be information verified either by statutory declaration or by other legal evidence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a great difference between the means of information which ought to be received by the revising officer in making a revision, which I suppose is the subject of the hon. gentleman's argument, and in making up a mere draft like this, which is the draft of a list to be placed as a notice before any proceeding of a permanent character is to be taken. The hon. gentleman will see that it is intimated how this part of the work is to be done. The revising officer prepares a list of the electors from the assessment roll. He does all that without any statutory declaration, and he does it even although the assessment roll is unrevised. Everything of that kind is done informally with a view to making up the draft. But if you impose on the electors the necessity of having statutory declarations for the purpose of placing every name on the draft and deprive the revising officer of the power of using his own observation with respect for instance as to the death of parties, the expense and difficulty of making the revision will be very much increased and there will be left upon the roll, for the time when he sits for revision, a great many names that should not be there. For instance, a man may have died in his own neighborhood, and he may know that he is deceased. If the suggestion of the hon. gentleman were adopted, it would be necessary that some one should make a statutory declaration in order to have the name struck off. That would be unreasonable, it would be nobody's business to do it, and perhaps the revising officer might have been at his funeral and yet he would wait for some one to make a statutory declaration to remove the name. That would work with special hardship this year when we have so many changes in the electoral list. Considering that the officer is a judicial officer, and above all that this is a procedure providing for the preparation of a draft of the list, it is unreasonable that the revising officer should not be able to fortify himself from other sources of information. The hon. gentleman will observe that this has been the law heretofore.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not see much force in the remark of the hon. Minister of Justice. Take a revising officers' duties as they stand now. He takes the assessors roll, which we all admit is the proper basis, and he takes the last list however old it may be. Those are all the docu-

ments he proceeds on, and which are supplied to him by law. He is then allowed to take information from any other source. Could the Minister of Justice indicate what source he could take it from?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If a man had been buried in his sight he might strike the man's name off the list.

Mr. EDGAR. A better evidence than that would be the mortuary statistics, which are supplied the revising officers in England Can the Minister suggest the propriety of a returning officer accepting a list handed in without statutory declaration by John Smith, and refusing a list put in by John Brown? Where does he get his information? It must be hearsay only and not proper evidence of any kind. In Ontario, he is a judge, and he has no special and particular means of knowing from his own knowledge who to put upon that list, and if he attempts to add any names at all I say it is unfair to somebody and it is giving a preference to whoever gives him the information which he choses voluntarily to accept. This is placing a judge in an invidious position as well as placing the community at an unfair disadvantage. As the Minister of Justice says the people would have to give evidence when they would be put in the witness box, but why could they not make declarations as well as telling the judge or writing him a letter. If a couple of months are set apart for the judge to receive declarations those who are interested will make them, or if they neglect the party managers or whoever is interested will take care that they will be made. This would be fair all around and there is no other way of making it fair. I do not see any way of doing it properly unless there is a time mentioned when those declarations can be put in, as well as a date specified beyond which they cannot put them in to have any effect. That provision as it stands is a farce, and I have no hesitation in saying that I consider the looseness of that section as the greatest blot in the whole statute.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I happen to differ from the hon. gentleman and I think that the Act, could not be viewed as a Bill for extending the electoral franchise if that change is made. An hon. friend behind me says that that section was inserted at the instance of some hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. EDGAR. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot speak for that, but I think it is so. The hon. gentleman will see that if the preliminary list is to be based on the assessment list only, except where statutory declarations are put in, that is equivalent to saying that in the majority of cases the assessment is to be almost entirely the sole evidence of the franchise. Now, if the hon. gentleman will look over the list of qualifications he will see, for instance, that "farmers' sons" are not on the assessment roll.

Mr. EDGAR. Yes; they are.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They may be in Ontario, but that is only a small portion of the entire Dominion.

Mr. EDGAR. How can the revising officer find it all out?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He has to find such information as he can get from any source whatever.

Mr. LAURIER. Any evidence, written or unwritten.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Written or unwritten. The object of the clause is to get on the first roll every person who has, by any chance, a right or a seeming right to vote, and it is with the object of having every man who has a right to vote being put upon the list. There can be no reason why a revising officer should not get every information he can. The assessment roll will help him, or, for that matter, if he knows himself that a party has a right to vote he ought to put him on. As to the argument that it puts the revising officer in an invidious position, I have no doubt it would if he were acting as a judge in the case, but he is merely asked to make as extensive enquiries as he can and to put everybody on the list who has the semblance of a right to vote. The great fear is that if you don't do that a great many persons having the right to vote will be excluded. Afterwards let there be a strict consideration as to qualification, but as to the first step I think it is clear that there should be no specification of the sources of information. Let the revising officer get the best information he can, and if any one is on the list who should not be his name can be easily removed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Must the returning officer accept this information from whatever source it comes?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He has to be the judge of that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does not the the right hon. gentleman see where that comes in. If he says that the revising officer "must receive" then he would get it right.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The revising officer in nearly every case is a judge. He is a high functionary and he has no personal interest.

Mr. EDGAR. He has a clerk.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The clerk has nothing to do with it, it is the revising officer that has to do with it. I think that the mere chance of a revising officer acting partially, or breaking his oath, or behaving in such a manner as would unfit him to be not only a revising officer but a judge at all—the mere chance that such a thing should happen is not sufficient grounds for altering this clause. We must give credit to our officers for acting with justice and the hon. gentleman knows from the experiment, however ungrateful to the hon. gentlemen opposite, that he must admit that the impartiality of the judges has not been impugned in any case so far as I am aware of.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that an example or two is better than any amount of theory wi h regard to a matter of this sort. I know that in the county that I represent the revising officer there required some proof, and that when the list on both sides (both those politically opposed to me and my supporters) was furnished there was also furnished a declaration made by some person or other who was acquainted with the facts, that those persons possessed the qualifications, and when that statutory declaration accompanied the list, then the judge put the names upon the list. Now that was not done in the adjoining constituency in the County of Kent. The hon. gentleman I suppose remembers that there were about one thousand names contested in the County of Kent list, that all sorts of technical objections and difficulties were placed in the way, and I think if I remember rightly that there were between three and four hundred of those names struck off. The expense of that was enormous and the judge upon technical grounds ruled out the objections in the other case. I think an appeal was taken from the judge to a superior court and a *mandamus* was granted to compel him to consider those cases. The result was that after a great deal of trouble and almost a whole summer's work by two or three lawyers three hundred and odd names were taken off the list. How came these names on that list? They came on the list by a provision exactly the same as that we are now discussing. Why, then, ought we undertake to permit a list to be stuffed in that way? I venture to say that not a name that is improperly put on that list can be taken off without from two to five dollars expense, and you impose all that expense in addition to what is

imposed on the public Treasury by the adoption of these loose words in this particular provision. I have given the instance in Kent as an example; what was the result of that? They were, in some cases the names of dead persons; the names of persons who had not attained their majority, the names of persons who were out of the constituency for years, and the names of some who were never in the constituency. In the municipality of East Tilbury two or three carloads of men, some of whom were never in the constituency before, were brought there and swore that they were the persons whose names were on the list, recorded their votes, and returned to Detroit. You could not prosecute those persons for perjury; you had no control over them; they were beyond your jurisdiction; What was done in that constituency may be done in others. Now, I think what this Parliament should do is to prepare a fair list, and if you do so, you want to take care that it is not made grossly inaccurate in the first instance. It is far easier to put a name on the list than to get it off, and it is no hardship, where a name is put on the list that it is not on the assessment roll, that the party should accompany the name with evidence of some sort that is sufficient to satisfy the judge that it should go on the list. The evidence should be of that character that would be taken in an ordinary tribunal. I do not say that technical accuracy should be required in the preparation of the documents, but the evidence should be such that an honest man acting as a revising officer would be satisfied that the party would be entitled to have his name on the list. If that were done, neither political party would be put to expense for the purpose of having the name taken off.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We must remember that at this stage of the enquiry, there are no facts and no proceedings at all. It has been suggested by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) that it is in the public interest that a declaration should be made; but no one is interested.

Mr. EDGAR. The public are interested.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Before a notice is put up, before anybody has even enquired what the assessment roll shall show, or what the last list of voters is. Nobody knows whose qualification is to be contested or asserted. When a man is deceased, what party is interested in having his name struck off?

Mr. EDGAR. Get the mortuary statistics.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When the hon. gentleman speaks of mortuary statistics, I confess I do not know what he is referring to. In my own Province there is no such thing as mortuary statistics, or a register of the names of those who die. But I gave an instance of how information might be in the possession of the revising officer. Other sources of information that might be in his possession are the provincial electoral lists and the assessment rolls. In some of the Provinces similar qualifications to those we prescribe are being adopted. In the Province of Nova Scotia, for instance, the franchises we have in our Act are nearly all followed out, and if the electoral rolls are prepared under the Act of the present Session, they will give the revising officer a great deal of information on these very subjects.

Mr. EDGAR. They would be very good things to name.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It would be impossible to name them with any kind of uniformity. In that Province the Bill has only passed one House; I do not know that it will become law, and I think it is advisable that sources of information of that kind should be available, not that mere hearsay or assertions should be entertained by the revising officer. I do not think the hon. member for Bothwell gave the argument additional force by suggesting erroneous decisions under the present law, but he gave the other side of the argument a great deal of force when he showed that a list was stuffed with 400 bogus names which necessitated that witnesses should be called to get them struck off. Yet you would deprive the revising officer of the right to strike off the names even when he had the means of knowing that they should not be there.

Mr. LISTER. I think the hon. member for West Ontario and the hon. Minister of Justice are at cross purposes. The lists are prepared from the voters' lists and the last assessment rolls, and by information which the revising officer can obtain from any other source. Before the preparation of the lists at all, the two political parties have of course the last voters' list and the last assessment rolls, and they will seek to have the names which are on the assessment rolls put on the voters' lists in the first instance. By furnishing the revising officer with statutory declarations that a John Smith or Henry Jones is improperly put on the list, they prevent an appeal in future to have his name put on, and in that way expense is avoided. What my hon. friend claims is that where the revising officer is permitted to take his information from any other source, anyone might go to him and say that such and such people should be put on the list. He may put them on, or he may say: "I will take evidence to verify your statements." If he puts the names on, an appeal is required to get them off; and my hon. friend argues that they should only be put on on some evidence being furnished of the *bonâ fides* of the application. Where a judge has been appointed revising officer, I do not think there has been any difficulty. There has not been any in my county, because he required that all names put on in the first place should be sustained by evidence. That prevented an appeal afterwards, and all it involved was a declaration The object of this is the prompt preparation of the list, and in that I submit that the revising officer ought to be bound by a rule that would apply to everybody. It does not involve very much trouble, it would be fair to all parties, and it would relieve the revising officer of any imputation of wrong-doing. If a lot of names are put on, people will ask who authorised them to be put on. Half of them may have to be appealed against. If they were verified by an affidavit, that difficulty would be got over.

Mr. LAURIER. I will just put this to the consideration of the First Minister and the Minister of Justice. They will agree, I am sure, that the revising officer is a judicial officer; he has to determine rights appertaining to certain parties in the community, as to who is and who is not an elector. He is to act according to judicial rules as far as they can apply. The Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister would, I am sure, agree that if there is a principle of judicial procedure which is never disputed, it is this, that a judge, who is to adjudicate on the rights of others, can never act on his own knowledge, and the reason is obvious; it is because of the impairment of justice that might result if he did so. In this case, if the judge is allowed to act on his own knowledge, what may be the result? The result may be that taking the suggestions of people which are not responsible and who may be partisans and overzealous, a number of names will be put upon the list which would not be entitled to be there, and these names would afterwards have to be contested. Anybody who claims to be an elector has the right to make a suggestion to the judge according to this. The remark just made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) shows the correctness of the suggestion we contend should be adopted. It is that the revising officer, if he happens to be a judge, will act judicially and not place a name upon the list unless there be some written evidence that the party has the right to be there. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago that the revising officer should have information written or unwritten. This is a very unsafe way of doing business.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. LAURIER. Which would lead to arbitrary consequences. The very safe practice introduced in the County of Lambton would avoid all difficulty.

Mr. DAWSON. It should not be lost sight of that there are vast districts in the Province of Ontario where there are no voters' lists, no assessment rolls and no mortuary statistics. How then is the judge to proceed? This clause is necessary and these expressions in it necessary to allow the judge to take such information as he can get and put the names of those entitled to vote on the list. There are many hundreds of miles extending along the lake shores where there is a large population now and where there are no municipalities or voters' lists or any lists, and where the population is flowing in every day and increasing rapidly. How are you going to make up the lists there if you do not give the judge the power to get information by the best means he can. I heard an hon. gentleman in speaking of his constituency say it was a hundred miles long and forty wide. I represent a constituency 1,100 miles long and 400 wide, and which contains, instead of 20,000 people, 70,000 people. Unless there be some such power as this given the judge to take all just and reasonable means he can, to get at those who are entitled to vote, you would render the Act utterly useless in such a district.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I cannot speak for constituencies like Algoma, but only for the constituency in which I unfortunately was revising barrister. I refer to North Victoria. I found a great difficulty in coming to any conclusion as to the information I should take. For instance I got letters and lists of 20 or 30 names asking to be put on. I consulted with the county judge, who was revising barrister for the South Riding. The county judges had several meetings at which they made rules, and I believe the uniform practice throughout Ontario was to insist upon evidence, such as a statutory declaration before any name would be put on the list. If you take the last assessment rolls and the lists of voters for provincial elections, you will have pretty nearly all the reliable information you can get; and then if there is any one who is left out, he should have a certain time to file a statutory declaration stating he is entitled to be on the list. I suggest this to the hon. Minister because it will be the practice anyway. You will find that nineteen twentieths of the revising officers will adopt a course of that kind, and it will be just as well, for the sake of uniformity to declare a rule which will be adopted by all the revising officers throughout the country. It will be no great hardship, if anyone finds his name not inserted on the list, to file a statutory declaration setting forth the facts which entitle him to be placed upon the roll. I have heard a great deal about the enormous expense of working this Act. There was a great deal of expense at the last revision of the lists, but I believe the Government have been considering ways and means in order to very much lessen that expense. I know the right hon. gentleman desires this House to control the votes for this House—I mean to say that he desires to settle a franchise for this House which the different Provinces will not be able to alter as they please. I do not suppose anyone would object to this, were it not on the ground of expense. A committee was appointed some time ago for the purpose of considering whether a great deal of the expense could not be cut down. The Government have taken the matter into their own hands, and, I understand, are going to print the lists themselves and do everything in their power to lessen the cost. No doubt, after this summer is over, we will know what will be the saving in that direction.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When was the committee formed?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Some time ago.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Where?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I will tell you by-and-bye. I merely say those are my views after a good deal of practical experience. It seems to me it would be a good idea to put into the Bill something to enable the different revising officers to act uniformly in this matter.

Mr. BARRON. I am glad indeed to hear my hon. friend from South Victoria (Mr. Hudspeth) speak on this Bill, because I know he has had a great deal of practical experience and is well able to speak on the subject. I do not think any greater proof could be offered to this House of the force of our objection to this section than that offered by my hon. friend. He tells us he received several letters and had personal interviews with different parties who thought their names should be on the list. The Minister of Justice tells us that the revising officer is to be permitted to act upon such information. Let it once go abroad that the revising officer is to start his preliminary list upon such information as that, and he will be inundated with such informations, and enormous expenses will be thrown upon the parties in order to get off the names which will thus be put on. In order to show how difficult it is to put a proper construction upon these words of the Statute, the Minister of Justice has stated that the revising officer is at liberty to put a name off the list if he knows of his own knowledge that the person is dead and buried, while Mr. Hodgins, who has published a work on this subject, says that the revising officer cannot act in that way as a revising barrister may act under a special provision of the Imperial Statute. Here it appears it must be done under evidence, and that no name can be struck off because of death or any other reason without such evidence. He is in the same position as that of a judge, who, as my hon. friend has stated, never proceeds on his own motion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Is that view correct?

Mr. BARRON. I think it is.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Then this provision is quite safe.

Mr. BARRON. That is in reference to striking off a name. The Minister says that the revising officer may strike off a name if he knows the person to be dead, but the law says he cannot do so until he receives evidence that the person is dead. That shows the difficulty arising from these words which the hon. gentleman refuses to strike out of the section or to amend in any way.

Mr. DALY. In connection with this matter I would quote to the House the provision of our statute in Manitoba, which may throw some light on the subject, and may give the Minister of Justice some ideas in regard to it. Clause 18 of that statute says:

"The enumerator [corresponding to the revising officer here] being duly sworn, shall obtain a certified copy or certified copies of the last revised list or lists of electors in such electoral division or part of the same, whether said lists be for municipal or local or Dominion parliamentary purposes; and, with such copies and such other information as he can obtain from the assessment rolls, registry office or otherwise, he shall proceed to prepare a separate list of electors."

In addition to that, sub-section 5 of that section provides that:

"Any person claiming to be registered as an elector may, prior to the dating and the signing of the register, apply in writing to the enumerator to have his name so registered; such application may be in form AAA of this Act, and shall be supported by an affidavit duly sworn to before any person authorised to take affidavits."

I must agree with the Opposition in reference to this matter. We had considerable experience in Manitoba in reference to it last year, when some of the enumerators undertook to take the names which were supplied to them. On

a revision before the judge, these lists were ordered to be produced, and the enumerators were asked from whom they got them, and we found that they came from the Government supporters. By this Act, it is declared that there must be a statutory declaration giving evidence that the person to be put on the list is entitled to be placed on the list, and I think if the Minister of Justice will consider the matter, he will find that he cannot adopt any better principle than the Legislature of Manitoba have adopted. This Act was amended by the present Government there when they came into power last year, but this clause remains, so that both parties are committed to it.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. Surely it must be the object of the Government to have the first list as correct as possible. If the revising officer is at liberty to take his information from any person, in a large city like Montreal one person may send to the judge 500 or 1,000 names, and it would be impossible in a city like that to ascertain whether those names were entitled to be there, and the revising officer would either have to put them on the list or leave them off. If he puts them on the list, who will be able to verify who are entitled to be there without incurring great expense? Thus a large portion of unqualified persons may be able to take part in an election. As to the question of settling the date, as far as possible, when the revising officer shall begin to make his list, I think the clause should be arranged in such a way as to take as the base of the list the last revised assessment roll, because, if you fix the 1st June—and I come again to the city of Montreal—the roll in Montreal is not begun until late in May and is never finished until August, and, in such a large city, where there are thousands of names on the assement roll, everyone can judge that the first list based on the roll of the previous year will not at all contain the electors of the city or of any electoral division for which the list is made. We had an example of that in the last election in Montreal East. The roll was some years old, and only 6,000 electors came to the poll out of 18,000. Why was that? It was because the first list had not been accurately prepared, and trouble had not been taken to see whether the persons on the list were really qualified. These two points should be settled unless the Government wish to have lists which are not accurate at all, and can be stuffed by a dishonest revising barrister. I do not mean to convey the idea that the judges who have been appointed in the Province of Quebec to act as revising barristers have been acting in that way, as far as my knowledge goes, it is the contrary, but it would be impossible for them to control that state of things. I remember that a judge of the district of Montreal was appointed the revising officer for the County of Yamaska. How could he know whether the information was right or wrong which he got from certain parties in that county, unless he went there himself and verified the statements, which he could not be supposed to do? If you want to keep the law as it is, the public in general will be left in a position of incertitude, and will not know how the list will be made, when one revising barrister insists upon having a statutory declaration, and another does not. The result will be that these officers will take such information as they think proper, and then there will be no end to the complication which will take place in the revision of these lists. These two points should be settled in these two clauses. It should be settled what shall form the basis of the list, that is, it should be the last revised assessment roll whenever it is revised, and the revising barrister should not begin his work before it is revised. Then with regard to the source of information, it should be settled by the law how the revising barrister is going to be guided in obtaining information upon which he decides who are to be electors.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. gentleman for Chambly (Mr. Préfontaine) supposes a case that might occur in the city of Montreal. I can speak from experience and I can tell him that such a case did occur in the County of Kent. There were in the list 2,000 names that had no right whatever to be there, men who never lived in the county, men who did not own a dollar's worth of property in the county, boys 15 or 16 years of age, and the names of people who had been dead for many years—these were placed on that list by the returning officer. I must protest against such a clause as that, under which he may put on names in scores at his own will, and allowing him to take any information he can get. I instanced a case that occurred in the County of Kent where a person named Mason, who had only been in the county a short time, submits to the revising barrister the names of about 60 different persons in the County of Kent, men that he never saw and knew nothing about, and these names were put upon the list, and we had to go to work and endeavor to strike them off. The consequence was that there were over 1,800 appeals against the list as it was proposed. It is outrageous to put such power as that into the hands of a single man. I believe a great many of the revising barristers are men of character and ability, who would not stoop to such work as that, but I am sorry to say that they are not all of that class, and we have a jewel in the County of Kent that I would not trust an inch, because the way he conducted the preparation of that list stamps him in my mind as a person in whom no confidence can be placed. No matter what the standpoint of the revising barrister may be, I do not see that there could be any objections to limiting him to a statutory declaration. According to this clause he takes the last revised assessment roll. Now, that roll will contain the names of nearly every person who is entitled to vote. There may be a few exceptions. There may be, as the Minister of Justice said, some people who have died, but the cases will be very few indeed. The changes that will have to be made will be very few, and it is an easy matter to get a statutory declaration of any additional names that may require to go on. But I can see the injustice that will arise if the revising barrister may do as he has already done, put on one or two thousand names of Tom, Dick and Harry, all over the country, men who nobody knows anything about. After he has done this, I ask if it is fair, is it honest, that the other side should be compelled to go to an enormous expense to strike those names off? Why, in my county the revising barrister actually refused to hear an appeal. We did not ask him to strike off the names, we only asked him to hear the evidence that we could give him that these names had no right to appear on the list. But he would not hear us, and we had to go to the High Court at Toronto and get a mandamus to compel him to hear these appeals. Then when he was compelled to hear them in the town of Chatham, notwithstanding all the objections, all the difficulties and obstructions that he could place in our way, we succeeded in striking off no less than 360 names. We forced him to admit that 360 names had been placed upon that list which had no right to be there at all. Now, I say that such a state of things should not be allowed to exist, and the Government should not persist in placing a law upon the Statute-book giving to any revising barrister such power as that. Some limits should be placed upon his power. I believe in the County of Bothwell the revising barrister would not put on anybody without reasonable evidence that he was entitled to go on. That is all we ask. We do not object to any man going on, but we say that no revising barrister should have the power of putting on names at his own will and pleasure.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. gentleman is building up arguments from a position of things that existed in the past, but which does not exist now. Under the old franchise law in Ontario, there was a much more contracted franchise than under the present law; therefore there was more room

for putting on a large number of names. But under the present law, which is manhood suffrage, I think the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) and those who are associated with him, must admit that almost every man in the country entitled to vote will be on.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Not boys of 15.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no provision in this law to put on boys of 15. If we take the last assessment roll, which is returned to the council in May, and the list is commenced to be made in June, there cannot be a very extensive change within the 30 days; therefore, I assume that it must be pretty nearly correct. But there is a fault that would arise from the other system that would be found very difficult to combat, in the event of our making it compulsory to have a statutory declaration. It would be virtually having two revisions of the list. You must get a statutory declaration to put them on in the first instance, and afterwards, when the list comes to be revised, there must be another statutory declaration to put them on. When the primary list is made up, the assessment roll is returned from the hands of the assessor, who is sworn to do his duty; and the council who revise that list, are sworn to do their duty; so it seems to me that there cannot be any very great danger when the list is made up within 30 days thereafter.

Mr. WALDIE. There does not seem to be any difficulty in getting definite information from a legitimate source. You have the voters' list and assessment roll in every municipality in Ontario, and there are responsible and respectable officers from whom information could be obtained. If they cannot procure statutory declarations in the absence of commissioners, there are municipal officers and justices of the peace. Let this information be given by justices of the peace and municipal officers, but not by indefinite and irresponsible people who may not even live in the municipality. The point is that we want to prevent irresponsible people sending names to the judge, who either must refuse or accept them, and we do not want the judge to place one party at a disadvantage by accepting names, as compared with another party.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I had no idea that the mere sending to a revising officer of lists of persons claiming to be voters was a source of information under this Act. I think the suggestion which the hon. gentleman has given as to justices and others making assertion of that right, would itself be too loose, and would not be satisfactory to me if I had to perform the duty of revising officer. I would not consider the writing of a letter or the handing to me of a set of names would be at all a "source of information." I think we ought not to be governed in legislation by the mere circumstance that some one has decided otherwise. What I propose with respect to the main section is that it should stand. I think, by to-morrow, hon. gentlemen opposite will see that it is wise to leave considerable latitude to revising officers for the purpose of enabling them to have recourse to well known and authentic sources of information, such as the assessment rolls. I quite believe we should do something to prevent the idea that mere hearsay and mere assertion is sufficient in taking this information, and having elicited from the hon. gentlemen opposite the points on which they desire amendment to the main section, we will now pass to the sub-section, which I suppose will not be opposed.

Mr. WATSON. With respect to the question as to what should be evidence before the revising barrister, the clause of the Manitoba Act was read by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), which is a very good Act, and there is virtue in it, and I may say there has been no trouble in connection with the enumerators in Manitoba. Where they require a statutory declaration, that declaration is made by the voter who wishes his name placed on the list. The person notified has to go before a justice of the peace, and the declaration is taken without cost, and is laid before the enumerator, and the name is placed on the list. I hope the Minister of Justice will place in this Act a clause similar to this contained in the Manitoba Act. From the experience of the member for South Victoria (Mr. Hudspeth), who has acted in the capacity of revising barrister, the House will do well to be guided by the suggestion thrown out. I know the revising barrister in my county would like to be placed in such a position that he could act fairly and honestly by all parties. Of course pressure can be brought to bear on revising barristers by his political friends, and he is asked to do wrong acts which he would decline to do if he was limited to the instructions laid down in the law, and if an affidavit was required to be made by any elector before his name was placed on the first list. In regard to the applications in Kent, where a man could go and place hundreds, even thousands of names on the list, it is impossible for anyone to bring evidence that they are not qualified voters; their names are probably not known, and it is almost impossible to bring evidence to satisfy a dishonest revising barrister and induce him to strike the names off. The requirement of an affidavit by an applicant who wishes to be placed on the voters list is the only fair and just method by which this law can be carried out.

Mr. MITCHELL. As it has reached half-past one o'clock and there has been so much discussion on this clause, I think the House should adjourn so as to give the Minister of Justice an opportunity to deliberate on this matter. The hon. gentleman knows that this Bill has created and always will create a great deal of trouble in the country, and that in this House it was fought for hours and days at its passage. There is a great difference of opinion as to what should be done with respect to this main section, and it would be well for the Minister to consider whether he could meet the reasonable suggestions of hon. gentlemen in order to have the matter settled.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have already agreed to do that, and what I suggested was to take the sub-sections of the clause.

Mr. BRIEN. I wish to say that although this clause may pass, the revising officer in my county—a gentleman who I believe wishes to do what is fair in the county—will not receive anything except a personal declaration. In our section of the country there were blanks sent out which contained forty or fifty names by a few men who obtained the best information they could, but many of those who were put on were only nineteen or twenty years of age. The judge thought there ought to be a statutory declaration and a personal one.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Adjourn.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think there is a great deal more in the Act that will meet with controversy. I and my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Weldon, St. John) went over this Bill very carefully together and I am sure that the hon. gentlemen are anxious to facilitate the view of the Government with regard to the despatch of business. Of course we are objecting to this because we feel it is very objectionable, but we do not propose to object to anything that is not——

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is not very objectionable.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, perhaps so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After that statement of the hon. gentleman I think that the Minister of Justice would be justified in asking that the Committee rise and report progress.

Mr. MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman wishes to know of any other objection, I have one which I think he might

consider. It is quite possible that it should happen, and I know it to have happened, that when the revising barrister went on a circuit through the riding it was left to the clerk to finish the revision of the list and some clerical errors occurred. Of course they were wholly unintentional. I have prepared a clause to the effect that when the list is prepared and before it is sent to the Secretary of State, it should be posted in the revising officer's office for a period of time so that all parties might see it and have an opportunity of correcting any clerical error that might occur.

Mr. MITCHELL. There are one or two observations I would like to make before we adjourn. The right hon. gentleman has stated that he consents to the adjournment because he finds that there are no great objections to this Bill. I want to say that there are very great objections to this Bill. The Bill is a damnable one, that is what it is. It has created more trouble and dissension and disturbance in this House than any other Bill ever brought here. I tell my right hon. friend that there is no measure that he ever put before this House which excited my ire more than this. I think it is a Bill founded on iniquity and originating in corrupt intention for the purpose of perpetuating in power the right hon. gentleman, and we are bound to watch that Bill from start to finish. I rise to enter my protest against the statement the right hon. gentleman made that there are comparatively no objections to the Bill.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose my hon. friend might not consider himself bound, but party discipline breaks up when you come to a question of this kind. The Franchise Bill is not a Bill that has received any favor on this side of the House and I am sure my friends from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and St. John (Mr. Weldon) only wish to be understood as speaking for themselves. The reason I rise is this: I do not want the First Minister, as I think he has done on other occasions, when such generous remarks have been made, and when opposition is afterwards offered—say that we are bound not to offer opposition. We do not view ourselves as bound. Those gentlemen may consider themselves bound, but if there are any objections they will be urged on the attention of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well, we will go on with the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, go on with the Bill, we can do that as well as you can.

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to the clause we have been considering and which the Minister of Justice said he would allow to stand with a view of considering the amendment, I wish to draw his attention to the fact that when the franchise law was first introduced under section 15 of the Acts of 1885 there was a provision that the revising officer should provide himself with the provincial lists as well as the others. I would suggest that this should be one of the means of the information now, especially after we have been three years without a revision. I think that the judge might apply to the provincial lists to guide him as well as to those other lists spoken of.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before passing away from this subsection I think that we should find the revising officer some specific principles by which he could be guided in putting the names on the voters' lists. If you leave the provision the same as it is in this Bill the revising officer will have any liberty he likes in putting those names on the lists.

Mr. LAURIER. I would point out to the hon. gentleman that the Minister of Justice has for consideration this section on which he is speaking. I would remind the First Minister that he has moved the adjournment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I take that back.

Several hon. MEMBERS. You cannot.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Can't I.

Mr. LAURIER. I think at this late hour of the night we should not have any ill-feeling on either side of the House. We are proceeding here like business men, and I think that we might take an adjournment at half-past one o'clock. We cannot always expect to agree on a matter of this kind, and I see no reason why we should continue to sit any longer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I appeal to this House if my remarks at all justified the hon. members who spoke after me, and particularly the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) in the language which he used. He spoke in the most insulting and unparliamentary manner without any cause whatever. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said that he had gone over the Bill with his hon. friend next him (Mr. Weldon) and this he thought was the main clause, and he did not think there was much objection to the other clauses. I said: "Well under those circumstances I thought I would be justified in asking my hon. friend the Minister of Justice to move that the Committee should rise." The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) who had been asleep apparently before that, or at all events did not hear what was said, got up in the most insulting manner and said it was an infamous Bill and an abominable Bill, after the hon. gentleman had stated himself in this debate that he approved of the Bill and voted for it because it was a correct principle and it was only the expense that caused him to change his mind. Now he says it is the most wretched and abominable Bill ever brought before this House. This language of the hon. gentlemen is quite unjustifiable and I think that I had a right to resent it.

Mr. MITCHELL. The right hon. gentleman has chosen to refer to my statement, and he has entirely misrepresented me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. I say, "Oh, yes," though. I say he has entirely misrepresented my views on this Bill. What I said, and I repeat it, and he knows it to be true, and he dare not deny it was, that when the Bill was first introduced I told him I voted against the gentlemen on this side on the principle of the source from which the people who sat in this House should be elected, that I opposed the suggestion that the voters' lists should be subject to provincial legislation, and I believed that the members sent to this House should be sent by legislation controlled by this House alone. But I denounced the details of the Bill from the start to finish, with his Indian votes and his fancy franchises, created for the purpose of corruption, and I throw back in the right hon. gentleman's teeth the assertion that I have taken any different position to-day. His object in introducing the Bill into this House was not for the purpose of getting a fair expression of the people's opinion, but for controlling the votes. I tell him there has been no Bill that the corrupt Administration which he has for years controlled, and with which he has been connected, have introduced into this Dominion that has roused people more than this Franchise Bill. He says he will not adjourn. I can sit it out as well as he can, and I am prepared to do it.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman having spoken for his party, I may speak for the party with which I am connected. The hon. gentleman knows that we oppose *toto cælo* the Bill he has introduced, that we think it an obnoxious measure in many ways. As to the Bill before the House, what the hon. member for Bothwell meant was that, apart from this first clause, there was nothing in the Bill to which we take serious objection. We intend to criticise some provisions, but I do not know any that will warrant such a discussion as that which we have had to-day. The hon.

gentleman knows that while we will fight the Bill, we will do it fairly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When I spoke as I did, it was for a purpose. Some gentlemen around me went home when the First Minister said we could adjourn, supposing that the matter was over. I know the First Minister has not been easy over this discussion to-day. We regret that it has put him to inconvenience, but when he introduced a Bill which brings up the subject of the Franchise Act, he must expect that the whole question will be discussed. I did not want to take a hostile position to that of the hon. member for Bothwell; but I did not want the First Minister to-morrow, when amendments were being moved or the discussion was being prolonged, to take any advantage of what had been said to-night by saying that there was an understanding that this should not go on. That is the reason I spoke. I have no desire to sit up all night any more than others.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. So far as I am concerned, I shall defer to the suggestion that we should adjourn, notwithstanding the suggestion of the hon. member for Brant that there may be a longer discussion than some of his friends suppose. When the discussion began in the line of improving the Act and promoting its easy and clear working, it seemed to me that some of the amendments suggested were quite useful and such as we should adopt; I had already indicated to my friends the intention of proposing them in committee. But it seems to me that this indignation to-night has been due to an entire misconception of what the First Minister said. When the suggestion came from the hon. member for Bothwell and the hon. member for St. John as to a protracted discussion, the First Minister said he saw no objection to adjourning since there was no objection to the Bill. The remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland had reference to the Act, and those of the First Minister had reference to this Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The observations I made for myself and for my hon. friend for St. John. We all on this side of the House are opposed to the principle of legislation of which this is an amendment, and we object to the amendment we have been discussing to-night on the same grounds that we objected to it when it is was in the original Bill. There were other features which in my opinion were objectionable, but I did not suppose they would involve a very long discussion. Nor did I suppose when I made the observations which I did, and which I think will be found to be strictly accurate, that I was in the slightest degree precluding any amendments which any hon. gentleman might think proper to make.

Mr. MITCHELL. Since everybody is making explanations, I may make some too. The reason I got up was the observation of the First Minister that I had pursued a course with reference to this Bill different from what I had pursued before, and it was for the purpose of setting myself right in not being placed in a false position that I got up and said what I did in order to refute the incorrect statements which the hon. First Minister made.

Committee rose and reported progress,

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1:40 a.m. (Thursday).

Mr. LAURIER.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 4th April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DIVORCE—W. G. LOWRY.

Mr. SMALL moved:

That the Bill from the Senate entitled "An Act for the relief of Wm. Gordon Lowry" be placed on the Order Paper for second reading to-morrow.

He said: My object in making this motion is simply because I understand that a number of hon. gentlemen voted against granting relief to the petitioner in this case because they had not seen the evidence. I believe that they have since read the evidence.

Motion agreed to on a division.

N. W. T.—A. R. TRACEY.

Mr. DAVIN asked, 1. Whether the Government is aware that A. R. Tracey, of Medicine Hat, has been arrested, thrown into prison, his goods seized, fined $300, with $334 costs, for making beer sold freely in the North-West Territories, but for the making of which no license is given, with the alternative of paying fine and costs, or eight months in jail? 2. Before what judge or magistrate was A. R. Tracey tried? 3. Can the Government lay before the House the particulars of the costs? 4. If not to-day, on what day can this be done?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I see, that in addition to this question, my hon. friend has a motion on the paper on the same subject, and I may as well, if the hon. gentleman will allow me to, read the report on the matter, which will be a full answer to the question as well as to the motion for papers. This is a letter from Capt. Antrobus, superintendent of Mounted Police, and it is as follows:—

"NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE,
"HEADQUARTERS A DIVISION,
"MAPLE CREEK, March 21st, 1889.

"SIR,—In accordance with instructions received from the Commissioner this evening, I have the honor to forward a report on case Regina *vs.* Tracey, from the commencement.

"Inspector Moodie wrote me from Medicine Hat stating that Mr. Barrett, Inspector of Inland Revenue had laid information against A. R. Tracey for making malt beer, and asking me to go up and take the case.

"On the 26th February I left here for that purpose, and on the train met Mr. Barrett, who was going to Medicine Hat to give evidence against Tracey.

"On the following day Tracey was brought before myself and Inspector Moodie, when the following informations (which had been previously laid before Inspector Moodie) were gone into, Mr. Gulliher acting as Crown Prosecutor, having been retained by Mr. Barrett:

"1st charge.—Did unlawfully make malt and steep grain for the purpose of malting.

"2nd charge.—Illegally had brewing apparatus in his possession.

"3rd charge.—Had unlawfully in his possession a malt floor, kiln and other malting machinery, &c.

"4th charge.—Did unlawfully brew beer, or other fermented liquor.

"Tracey pleaded 'Not guilty' to the first charge, so the evidence of Mr. Barrett and others was taken. The evidence was clear and Tracey would have withdrawn his plea of 'not guilty' had he known he could do so.

"He pleaded guilty to all the other charges. In each case we deemed it advisable (they being the first of the kind tried in the Territories) to inflict the minimum fine with costs, or in default, imprisonment, and, in addition adjudged that all the plant, &c., on the premises be confiscated. All the papers in connection with the above having been sent to His Honor the Lieutenant Governor at Regina, I am unable to send you copies of them.

"I am informed by Inspector Moodie that arrangements have been made by which the fines will be paid in about a fortnight, if not sooner.

"Mr. Barrett told Tracey in my presence that if the fines were paid, he would recommend that the plant should be released.

"Since the trials, I have seen Mr. Barrett and he told me that his department had approved of the action taken in the above matter, and had authorised him to release the plant on payment by Tracey of the fine and costs.

"The costs of the four cases amount to $34.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"W. D. ANTROBUS,

Superintendent.

W. B. AIRD, Jr.

Mr. GUAY asked, What are the names and residences of the sureties of W. B. Aird, Jr., an officer in the Customs Department at the port of Killarney, Ont.?

Mr. BOWELL. The sureties that were given for Mr. Aird were Mr. Thos. John Ryan, of Sudbury, and Mr. Martial Lemieux, of Sudbury. The sureties were entered into on the 3rd September, 1888.

THE HEREFORD RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BERNIER asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to retain, out of the subsidy in money granted to the company known as "The Hereford Railway Company," a sum sufficient to pay the wages of the workmen employed in the construction of the railway, and also for the services of the volunteers called out to restore and maintain order? If not, what action do the Government intend to take in the matter?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to that portion of the question which does not refer to the volunteers, I would say that it is not the intention of the Government to retain out of the subsidy granted to the company known as the "Hereford Railway Company," a sum sufficient to pay the wages of the men employed on the construction of that railway, as the company are, so far as it is known, able to pay their liabilities.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) In answer to the second part of the question put by the hon. gentleman, I beg to make the following statements: on November 21st last, an account was sent to the Militia Department for the conveyance of the volunteers called out for service on the Hereford Railway. This account was sent back by the Militia Department with the notification that the department did not consider they were responsible for those expenses, and that the said account ought to have been sent to the municipality, not to the Militia Department.

MANUFACTURERS' LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. LISTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would remind the First Minister that, some four weeks ago, I moved for a return relating to the Manufacturers' Life Insurance Company. The hon. gentleman admitted the importance of the motion, and promised that an investigation should be made into the subject of it. The return laid on the Table verifies the statement I then made, and I would ask the First Minister if anything has been done in the way of an investigation of the charges made by me.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Only that my time has been otherwise occupied, I intended to call attention to that subject. I will do so to morrow.

THE LATE HON. J. H. POPE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I hope the House will pardon me for calling attention for a few moments to the loss the House has sustained by the death of the late Minister of Railways. After the full, and, I may say, affectionate notice that has been given by the press, without distinction of politics, to the career of my hon. friend, I do not feel warranted in occupying the time of the House but for a few moments. My remarks, therefore, will be very short. The acquaintance between Mr. Pope and my-elf commenced as long ago as 1849, forty years ago. He was then a young man, and I was younger than I am at present, and we met on a rather memorable occasion. It was the assembly of the British American League, which met at Kingston, in consequence of the unhappy disturbances which took place at that time. Mr. Pope came as a young representative of the British inhabitants of the Eastern Townships. Looking back to the results of that meeting, which was called with a loyal intention of calming the public excitement which had been raised, threatening war between races, I can do so with some satisfaction. Mr. Pope took a very active part, for a young man, in the earnest efforts to confine the agitation which was then raging within constitutional limits. From that time our friendship has been without break, and without cloud, and (as probably the House knows) there, perhaps, were no two men in the world who were more allied to each other in sentiment, in feeling and in general action. The press has fully stated the position of Mr. Pope before he became a public man. Although he had no early advantages, he was known to have overcome that want. He was an active man of business, cool, calm and yet enterprising, uniting in himself what is not often united, great enterprise with great caution. The consequence was that every enterprise he undertook seemed to prosper, and has continued to prosper, I think, during the whole of his valuable life. He came to Parliament with a reputation already formed as being a man most likely to be a valuable representative. That expectation was not disappointed. He was one of the most influential, perhaps the most influential, representative, that ever came from the Eastern Townships. He was an Eastern Townships man; he fully understood the interests of that portion of the country; and he was looked up to, and continued to be looked up to, and supported by the other representatives of British race from that part of the country as being especially their leader. He was indeed a leader of men, having the great faculty of governing and leading men. The great faculties for business which he showed in his own affairs accompanied him to Parliament. Before he became a member of the Government he became a very prominent member of Parliament. Those who have only known him of late years, when the cares of office, declining health, and advancing years somewhat weighed upon him, cannot fully appreciate the great influence he had in Parliament. His geniality, his practical good sense, his kindliness of heart and demeanor, and his great sense of humor, untutored though it was, gave him a position in the House which was almost unexampled for a man struggling against those disadvantages to which I have alluded. You can scarcely understand how effectually he overcame them. I early learned to know his value, and was only too glad when I was able to persuade him, as I believed in the public interest, to give up his strong reluctance to take office, and come and help me in the arduous task of administering the affairs of this country. I was not disappointed, and I speak not only for myself, but for all the colleagues who now surround me, and I may say for all the colleagues whoever sat in council with him. No one can know the value of Mr. Pope who did not sit with him in council. His great administrative ability, his freedom from all narrowness or illiberality, his complete disinterestedness in his own affairs, his desire to do what was the best for his country, were so strong and so obvious to all his colleagues, that they yielded him a degree of influence which he had earned, which he deserved, and which I believe was of the greatest use and strength to the Government, as well as of great benefit to the country. His powers of administration were first shown in the Department of Agriculture. He was a practical

farmer, a farmer on a large scale, and he brought such an intimate knowledge of the subject to the management of that department that, in our opinion at least, his administration was completely successful. The same intimate acquaintance with the subjects over which he had to deal was displayed by him when, also at my urgent request, he, with reluctance, changed from the Department of Agriculture to that of Railways and Canals. The engineers employed under him were surprised at his intimate knowledge of everything connected with a railway—its construction and the construction of all the works connected with it—the railway bed, the material that should be employed, and the numerous practical questions which arise in the construction of railways—he was perfectly acquainted with them all. He had built railways himself; so, with the administration and operation of railways he was perfectly familiar. But I would say more. Of course, I know that there are hon. gentlemen opposite to me who cannot have known as well as I and his colleagues do, what Mr. Pope's merits were. I do not desire to make one single remark that would draw a dissent from any of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who I know are desirous as myself to do honor to his memory. All, therefore, that I desire now to say is that we, his colleagues, greatly reverenced him, greatly prized his ability, and deeply regret his loss. He was not only respected and esteemed, but he was beloved by those who knew him, and it is pathetic to see the mourning of the subordinates of the two departments with which he had been connected. It was a mournful duty for myself and those of my colleagues who could be spared to be present at the great meeting and the subsequent banquet given in October last to Mr. Pope by those people whom he represented so long and who knew him so well. I never saw more genuine enthusiasm in my life than was displayed by the vast number of representative men who had gathered there from all quarters of the Eastern Townships to meet him and to greet him. It was also affecting to see—you could not avoid seeing that, as they heard his faltering accents, weakened by illness, and saw his emaciated form, it was written in the minds of the mass of the audience that they were listening to him for the last time. I can say no more than to repeat that I think the country has lost a great man. The Ministry, I know, have lost a colleague whose loss they will ever deplore, and whose place they will be ill able to supply, and as for myself, I have lost my best friend in the world.

Mr. LAURIER. Those who during his political life were the opponents of Mr. Pope will readily acquiesce in almost every word—I should say, perhaps, every word—which has just fallen from the lips of the Prime Minister. Although Mr. Pope had been more than thirty years in public life, and though for the last fifteen years he has been in a most prominent position, with ever increasing responsibilities, I think it is only due to him to say that the people who knew him well still little knew what a powerful mind his was. The hon. gentleman was born at a time when, and in a community where educational advantages were not as free as they are to-day. He never had any pretension to literary culture. His qualities were not of that kind which stamp themselves at once upon the gaze of an admiring crowd; but all those who came into contact with him, in any capacity whatever, could not but appreciate more and more the great practical resources always at his command. He was always abundantly endowed with that eminent quality, without which no quality, however brilliant, can be of any avail—that quality which we bring under the term of common sense, and by means of which, in all questions of smaller importance, where the outlines are obscured and which require solution, he always gave the solution which afterwards proved the very best. There is one trait of Mr. Pope's character which has always impressed me, and which the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House, omitted to mention: that was the great perseverance with which he was endowed. Not only was he endowed with those qualities of mind I have just stated, but also with that quality of perseverance without which no permanent success can ever be achieved. Whatever he undertook he never abandoned until he had prosecuted it to a successful end. Obstacles were no impediment to him. They never caused him to flinch, or quail, or swerve. They simply aroused him to enthusiasm. Though his nature was not, perhaps, enthusiastic, he became enthusiastic the moment he had to face an obstacle. Those qualities of mind and character could not but tell in the community in which he was brought up, and they soon told, and told permanently. The right hon. gentleman has rightly said that there never was a man in the Eastern Townships who had upon his fellowmen such a hold as Mr. Pope obtained. It has been my privilege on several occasions to visit the County of Compton on professional and political matters, and I have always been impressed with this. It has been my privilege to visit many counties in the course of my political life, in many parts of Canada, and I never saw any place where the representative had such a universal hold as Mr. Pope had over the County of Compton. All creeds and nationalities were his friends; they all looked up to him; and he leaves in that section of the country a vacuum which cannot very successfully be filled up, if ever it is to be filled up. Death is always a sad event. This is as old as the world, yet every blow that falls seems to fall as heavily on those who are still spared as if it were felt for the first time. I am quite sure that to the Conservative party, to whom Mr. Pope was a tower of strength, and the First Minister, with whom he was an intimate friend, even more intimate than we supposed, the loss must be irreparable, and his party, his friends, and his family are entitled to receive from all classes of the community the full measure of sympathy in their sad bereavement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. HALL. Had it been known that this subject was to come up to-day, the members of the Eastern Townships, who were more intimately connected with Mr. Pope, would have felt it their sad duty to make more special reference to the loss they have sustained than they can to-day. That duty would naturally have fallen to the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby). In his temporary absence, I desire to say that I am sure the expressions which have fallen from the First Minister and the leader of the Opposition will be received with cordial unanimity not only by this House, but by the whole country. But in no part of it, I am sure, will these expressions of regret be more earnestly joined in, and the feeling of sorrow more deeply shared than in those eastern townships which the late Hon. M. Pope loved so well and so long and worthily represented. To the people of the Eastern Townships, with whom Mr. Pope was so intimately connected, in all their commercial and industrial enterprises, and of so many of whom he was the true and trusted friend, his loss is irreparable. Other leaders of men will be found, other statesmen may be found to replace him, but there are many in this House, and many more out of it, who, in the death of Mr. Pope, have lost a friend whose place can never be refilled.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the Service of the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1889; and in accordance with the provisions

of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the *House of Commons*.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 3rd April, 1889.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the Message and Estimates be referred to Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 4) further to amend the Revised Statutes, chap. 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the Committee will allow me to revert to the first section, I will propose one which I think will be better suited for the purpose and more in accordance with the section of the Election Act in relation to disqualification. The section I propose is almost a transcript of section 98 of the Elections Act in so far as it bears on that subject. It is as follows:—

"No person found guilty of any corrupt practice under the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act shall, for the duration of seven years after the time when he is so found guilty, be entitled to be registered on any list of voters, subject, however, to the removal of such disqualification under the provisions of section 99 of the said Act."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course the hon. Minister will amend the oath in order to cover a case of this sort, if the party's name should happen to get on the list.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That will have to be done in the Election Act.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then it will not be done at all unless the Minister brings in a Bill to amend the Election Act by amending the oath.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will look into that matter.

On section 2,

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to this section, we had a discussion, when we were last in committee, upon the question of obtaining the mortuary statistics, and some hon. members suggested a doubt whether it would be possible to get a complete return from the revising officer of the deaths which had taken place since the last list was made. Nothing can be more complete than the provisions in the Province of Ontario at least for that sort of statistics. By the Act for the registration of births, marriages and deaths, there is made the most complete possible provision for the returns of all deaths to the Registrar General. The occupier of the house in which a person dies has to make a return. Then the minister of any denomination who performs the burial service is bound either to have a certificate showing that the return has been made to the registrar of the division, or to send in a return himself, under heavy penalties. Then, in case there should be any failure in that, in case there should be no minister to perform the rite, or that the householder does not perform his duty, every duly qualified medical practitioner has to see that these certificates have been sent in, or has to send one in himself. There is a final check provided, and that is the caretaker or guardian of any cemetery or burial ground shall not allow any interment to take place unless the certificates are there, and if there is any neglect he has to make a return of the particulars. I think, therefore, in the Province of Ontario there can be no difficulty in getting very valuable and absolutely accurate information as to the deaths which have occurred since the last revision was made.

Mr. SPROULE. Speaking from some practical experience as a medical man in Ontario, I am satisfied that, in many localities, the law in that respect is entirely ignored both by the medical men and the ministers. No doubt there are places where the returns are properly made, but there are many localities, especially in the rural districts, where no attention whatever is paid to the matter.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). That may be the case in the locality with which the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) is acquainted, but there is a penalty attached to such neglect, and there should be an officer employed to compel parties to make this registration, and if they do not, to subject them to the fine which is provided by the law. I know that, through the western section of the Province, the law is observed either by the medical men or the other parties referred to by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar), and the information is ample and sufficient. I think the suggestion which has been made is a good one, that the names of all parties who may be removed by death could be obtained in the way suggested.

Mr. SPROULE. That cannot be done, because the returns are not made.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The mortuary statistics will be one of the sources of information which the revising officer should be allowed to use. In regard to this section, what I propose will not go to the full extent which was urged upon us last night as to the restrictions on revising officers, but I think it goes a fair distance, and should be accepted as a compromise in that way. This is what I suggest:

"On or as soon as possible after the first day of June in each year, the revising officer, being duly sworn as hereinbefore provided, shall cause the list of voters of the preceding year to be compared with the last assessment rolls, and shall, with all the information he can obtain from that source, and from provincial, municipal, or other official lists, records and proceedings, and by means of solemn declarations made as hereinafter provided under the Statutes made in reference to Extra-Judicial Oaths, proceed to revise each list of voters then in force under this Act, for the electoral district, or portion of an electoral district for which he is appointed, and shall prepare two supplementary lists in like form as the original list, one entitled: 'Names to be added, and corrections to be made,' and the other, 'Names to be removed.'

"The solemn declaration in this section referred to may be made by any person claiming the right to registration in the electoral district or claiming that the name of some other person should be added to or struck from the roll, and shall be to the effect that, according to his personal knowledge, or according to the best of his knowledge and belief, the grounds of which shall be stated, the persons so named are entitled to be registered or should be removed from the roll. The grounds shall be stated in the declaration, and such declaration, unless it is made by a person claiming either that he, the declarant, is entitled to be placed on the roll, shall be made by an elector of the district. The revising officer shall receive all such declarations up to the time when he transmits the roll to the Queen's Printer or the Controller of Stationery, as provided by this Act."

Mr. EDGAR. As far as I can gather, there are three points in this amendment which I would like to see changed. One difficulty will be this: According to that amendment, a statutory declaration may be made by an elector, on his information and belief in a general way, verifying a list of 100 names.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. But stating the grounds.

Mr. EDGAR. Stating the grounds that he has known something. I think that, unless the elector himself makes the declaration, some personal knowledge should be shown. The revising officers of the Province of Ontario, before they acted at the last election, and with reference to the final revision, made some rules for their own guidance. Among them was a rule requiring that no name should be put on or struck off without a statutory declaration made upon personal knowledge in each case. That, I think, is the only fair way. If they are allowed to swear to their information, it is a mockery to say that they cannot be punished for making a false declaration; because a man may swear that he believes that John Smith is the owner of a certain lot, but if John Smith does not turn out to be the owner at all, this man certainly will come under the penalties of the

Act. I think a personal knowledge is a reasonable requirement for the declarations. Then, I could not catch that any reference was made to mortuary statistics as a source of information.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The sources of information pointed out are municipal, provincial and other official records and proceedings.

Mr. EDGAR. Then, with reference to the time up to which this declaration may be received.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Down to the time that he transmits the list.

Mr. EDGAR. But that is an uncertain time. I think the public should know up to what date these can be received, and after what date they will not be received, because there is no fixed date for him to make these returns; he has got to do it on or before the first day of October. The time used to be the 1st of September, and I see it is proposed to be the 1st of October, so that he may do it at any time after the 1st of June. Nobody will know when it will be done. There should be some fixed rule. Let it be up to within a month of the last day, or the 1st of September. Then we will have uniformity, as uniformity is so desirable in some points of view.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My object was to give as much time as possible, and we give him up to the last moment

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If you allow the names to be received up to the last moment, what time will be given for contesting the right to be upon the list?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not the time to make the contestation. It is then that he sends them to the Queen's Printer. I propose that he shall receive them up to the moment of his transmitting them.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). There may be a difficulty when he could transmit them at any time. I think that either he should give notice, or that a time should be fixed.

Mr. LISTER. Some of the revising officers may be ready to make their returns to the Queen's Printer on the 5th, 6th or 7th of June. As soon as this Bill passes they will begin to make preparations. If a time could be fixed, say the 1st of July, and later, in the event of the list not being returned.

Mr. EDGAR. I see I was in error when I said that the 1st of October was the date on or before which the revising officer had to make his returns. That is the date when he shall publish the list after printing. The day is not fixed upon which he is to make his return, and I think that makes it all the more necessary that a reasonable time should be fixed.

Mr. COLTER. Would it not be possible, if this Committee does not see fit to fix a time within which these applications may be received, that the revising officer himself should publish in a newspaper printed in the district, the time up to which those declarations or applications would be received? Otherwise we might have people somewhat lax, relying upon an opportunity to put in these applications, and they may have gone off secretly without notice to the public. I think it is due to the public that there should be some notification given to them as to the particular date up to which these will be received. If the revising officer himself were to consult his own convenience and the convenience of those living in the electoral district, and were obliged to publish that time, I think it would meet the requirements of the public generally.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it would be well enough to provide for an advertisement at that stage, although it increases the expense. But when we come to the section which provides a mode in which the official shall transmit the list to the Queen's Printer, we will then consider the propriety of fixing a date before which he shall not transmit them, that is to say, that he shall not transmit them before the 1st of August.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think if there is a time stated in the Act before which a return cannot be made, the whole community will soon become acquainted with that time.

Mr. COLTER. The revising officer may have five or six hundred applications, and he may be delayed a certain time in putting these on the roll, and the consequence will be that others can come in, according to the wording of the section. There are more coming in and delaying the revising officer day after day.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It will not be a very serious delay, I think. It is only clerical work after all, when he examines the declarations. But we must not measure the operations of the Act for all time by its operations in the coming season, when the work of revision, of course, will be very heavy. But the addition and changes in future years, even if they amount to 10 per cent., will not be so very laborious.

Mr. TISDALE. The object is to get on the roll everyone's name who is entitled to be placed there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think that after the time has arrived for the revising officer to make his return he should receive names. That should end the matter. It would lead to due diligence being observed. It is stated that he shall receive names up to the 1st of August, then he will receive names up to that time and not afterwards.

Mr. DAWSON. That might do very well for constituencies, excepting large unorganised districts such as Algoma, when the 1st of August would be altogether too soon.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Reasonable time should be afforded in all cases. In my opinion two months, from the 1st of June to the 1st of August, would be ample time, and I fully agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that after that latter date the revising barrister should not accept any more names, because the people would very soon understand to present them within the time named. No doubt, in a few instances, parties would be injured, but they would be very few and would not outweigh the advantage of having a date fixed.

Mr. DAWSON. Two months would not be sufficient time in the district I represent—Algoma.

Mr. PLATT. I do not know that the people would be limited to two months, for they might commence six months earlier to do the work if they saw fit.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I hope a certain time will be fixed, and the 1st of August would be fair to both parties. If it were fixed in the Act, it would be very soon known that the time was limited within which names could be received, and, under the circumstances, it would be well to fix the time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would just say further, in support of the observations I have just made, that there is this advantage in fixing a time before which the revising officer cannot make a return, and after which names cannot be received. If the time is fixed, it will stimulate the constituencies to diligence in getting the names before the revising officers. It will also prevent the revising officers being suspected. When a large number of names are handed in by one party, the opposite party seeks delay until they can see how many additional names can be handed in. When a date is fixed beyond which names will not be received, all parties are stimulated to diligence, and at the same time we prevent the revising officer being suspected in the discharge of his duties. It would be in every way better for all parties, and especially for those who feel

themselves called upon to see that the voters' lists, as far as possible, are complete.

Mr. BARRON. The point suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is one deserving of the greatest consideration. A difficulty arose in one case I know of, and gave great trouble; I do not now refer to North Victoria, where the member for South Victoria (Mr. Hudspeth) acted as returning officer, for everything went on most satisfactorily, and I only voice the sentiment of the people when I say that everything was satisfactory when he acted as returning officer. The same may be said of South Victoria. But in the case to which I refer, there was grave suspicion that the revising officer allowed names to come in after the time fixed for receiving them, and there was great feeling in the riding on that account; and if any method can be suggested with a view to prevent such a recurrence, it should be carried out.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). There is very much in what the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) has said. There is no restriction as to the time when people may prepare lists of names which they wish to hand in to the revising officer. There is nothing to prevent parties from handing in names at any time up to 1st June. It would be very easy for either political party to work up names to hand in to the revising officer before that time. If some arrangement were entered into as regards the date, no advantage would accrue to one party over the other. The section which the Minister of Justice has prepared I think meets the case in every possible respect. If the parties are allowed up to the 1st of June, they will be able to supply the revising officers with all the information at their command.

Mr. DAWSON. To fix the 1st of June would be simply to disfranchise the district of Algoma. This date cannot be accepted unless exception is made for that district, the same as exception is made in regard to the time of holding elections.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I must confess I do not see the necessity for stipulating for a certain day, considering that all this is done to expedite the preparation of the lists. The difficulty of fixing a date in all sections of the country is very great. We are receiving communications from revising officers, not from Algoma alone, but from other distant regions, stating that it is impossible they can commence their work effectively on the 1st of June, and that they must be allowed a longer period. I point them to the fact that the Act is not rigid, and that it only says as soon as possible after the 1st of June; but if we fix the date and say that no names will be received after the 1st of August, we are fixing a time when the revising officers in some sections are only beginning their work. Thus we would be depriving some people of their right to be put on the list. Considering, moreover, that this is only the draft list, and that we are not in all future years to meet the difficulties that we shall have this year as regards the revision of the lists, I think we had better leave it free.

Mr. MULOCK. How would it do to let the revising officer give public notice of the time up to which he will receive names. If the one day does not suit in different parts of the Dominion, let the revising officer name a day that would suit his particular district, and then we will all know what is the last day up to which he will receive names.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That would increase very much the expenses. There is no use in advertising in one paper in the riding, because it only reaches one class and certain sections of the district, and in many cases the paper taken is only a weekly edition. If we provide for full and ample advertising we will increase the cost very materially indeed.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems to me that the suggestion of my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Colter) is the only way in which the difficulty can be got over. The revising officer is not bound to commence on the 1st of June, but as soon after as possible. How will the time be fixed before he transmits the lists?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I agree that he shall not transmit it earlier than a certain day.

Mr. EDGAR. If that is done it is all right as far as that is concerned. There are some other objections as to the nature of the declaration. I see the Minister of Justice in the draft has underlined the words "information and belief," and I think that will very largely, if not altogether, do away with the advantage of having a solemn declaration. If the declaration is made upon information and belief, nobody could be liable to prosecution under the Act for a false declaration. I think the Minister of Justice should return to his original idea of having "a personal knowledge."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I found on reading the draft that it only provided that the individual claiming to get on the list could make a declaration, and that there was no provision for a declaration from any other person who might wish to get names on the lists.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman confines the obligation of the declaration to the party himself.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is the way it was drawn up. I had it altered so that any other person could claim that names should be put on the list.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think another person should have a right to get names on the list, but the information should be of his own personal knowledge.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I go as far as is ever provided in relation to affidavits, that is to say, there must be personal knowledge or information and belief, stating the grounds thereof. I submit to my professional brethren that that is all that is required in regard to an affidavit. If you insist on an absolute statement based on personal knowledge on matters which depend to a great extent on facts which may not possibly be within the reach of the investigation of the person making a declaration, it would hardly do. It may be a matter of notoriety and belief, and yet, after all, only a matter of hearsay, that a man has got a deed of a farm on which he lives. If you oblige a person to swear that A. B. is the owner of that property and ought to go on the list, you subject the person who makes the declaration to the penalties of perjury, if the whole title is not as he supposes and as everybody in the neighborhood supposes. When you have to swear to title and to facts showing that certain persons are the sons of the owners, it seems to me that we ought be very careful how far we should go in matters of that kind. The argument, I think, is stronger still when we remember that in making up the assessment roll on which the list is to be founded to a great extent, the assessors act on mere information which they get on the streets and highways and do not require to have a statutory declaration for at all.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). They go around to make personal enquiries.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; they do not.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I admit the force of the argument of the Minister of Justice, but I think it would be better that a person should state his sources of information, and grounds of belief.

An hon. MEMBER. That is in the law.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The law only requires the "ground of belief," but I think that the "source of information" should be stated.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). At the last revision in the county of Kent, there were 1,800 names put on the list, and the great majority of these names were improperly on the list. They were put on by a declaration, prepared somewhat in the way provided by this Bill. There was, for instance, a Mr. Masson, who received his information from parties who were strangers to him, and he said that he was informed, and verily believed, that so-and-so was qualified to go on the list. If the hon. Minister were to allow declarations of that sort, there would be no protection whatever against names being improperly put on the list. A solemn declaration requires to be of such a character, that it will disclose the sources of information, and will inform the revising officer whether the sources of information are creditable and ought to be relied on, or not.

Mr. SPROULE. If, on the other hand, the declaration has got to be made according to personal knowledge it will keep a great many off the list who ought to be on. That is the objection we found in our county. When you come to people in the country and ask them to make a declaration, they are suspicious and they are afraid that there is something behind it. If you allow the reasonable latitude that has been laid down by the Minister of Justice, it would enable us to get all those who are entitled to be on the list without doing injustice to anyone.

Mr. EDGAR. I am satisfied, from reading the nature of the information, that it does not cover the suggestion laid by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon), that the declaration ought to show the sources of information.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is provided for separately that the person shall state the qualification. I go as far as we can go without saying that the man who makes the declaration shall disclose the name of the person whom he got the information from. I do not think there is any necessity for that, but when he states the ground of his belief he shows for instance that the person is employed as a wage earner, that he receives such and such wages, and that he believes he is so continuously employed, that his income amounts to $300 a year. I do not see that we get any additional security by compelling him to say what the source of his information is.

Mr. COLTER. This proviso will give rise to a great deal of difficulty, indeed. I know that in my own county the revising officer did receive certain declarations of this class under protest on his first revision. He found, as a consequence, that a good many minors and others not qualified to vote were improperly put on the roll; we had a great deal of difficulty in connection with the subsequent revisions, and the revising officer has informed me that he will never receive such declarations again. In the county of Norfolk, too, the revising officer would not accept any but personal declarations; the same is true, I believe, of Welland. In most of the counties where the proposed declarations have been used, they have been found to be quite unsatisfactory. Every application to be placed on the roll, I submit, should be a personal application; and if a person is afraid, or is not sufficiently interested to make a declaration showing his qualification, when he is the only person who can give satisfactory evidence of that, there is no hardship in leaving him off the list. It might be otherwise with reference to removing from the list names of persons who have died or tenants who have moved away. In these cases the declaration could be made quite properly by others.

Mr. TISDALE. I think the hon. gentleman has a misconception of my meaning, or I have a misconception of his. This declaration is an increased security for the preliminary list. The hon. gentleman is speaking of the final list.

Mr. COLTER. No; I am speaking of the preliminary list.

Mr. TISDALE. Then, I think the hon. gentleman is misinformed as to the practice in my county; and I would say this, knowing something of the practice in Ontario, that I cannot understand hon. gentlemen opposite voting for the resolution they voted for yesterday, because the assessors who prepare the rolls which they want us to accept are not legal gentlemen like the revising officers, but partisans appointed by the two political parties. I am not saying that one is better than another; five out of seven in my county are Reformers, but they are partisans, and the Conservative assessors are the same. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite want to put us in the power of those assessors, whom you cannot compel, no matter what declaration you make, to put a name on the list, without an appeal to a judge. The Minister of Justice is offering a much more reasonable proposition. He says the revising officer, who is generally a judge, shall not have the power an assessor has. There is no way to compel an assessor to put a name on the roll, and to my certain knowledge the assessors have often refused to put names on. But there is a provision that the revising officer shall put no name on unless there is a personal declaration made, and such a declaration, as every hon. member knows, is such as is properly received in a court of justice. I think myself that the Minister of Justice has gone a little too far; at the same time, I quite appreciate that in this matter we on this side of the House should be almost more than fair; but in the face of the arguments, and the allegations, and the taunts we had to submit to yesterday, I do not see that we should accept the proposition that a partisan assessor, a comparatively ignorant man, who is not subjected to anything like the restrictions imposed on the revising officer, should have the decision as to what names shall go on the assessment roll, without being interfered with except on an appeal to a judge.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman, I think, is very unfair to the assessors, and his statement is scarcely consistent with the facts. Every assessor is sworn to discharge his duties faithfully; he fixes the value of property on oath, and he is liable to prosecution if he makes a false statement. If the assessment roll is taken, there are persons there the assessed value of whose property is below the qualification for voters, and the revising officer takes the names of those parties who possess the qualifications to which the assessor has sworn.

Mr. CURRAN. As to the sufficiency of the affidavit which the Minister of Justice requires, I think the hon. Minister has gone exactly to the length he should be required to go. We find that the requirements under the present section are precisely those required for arresting, on a capias, a debtor in the Province of Quebec, who is alleged to be about to abscond, or to be making away with his property with the intention to defraud. In that case, the deponent is required to swear that he has been credibly informed, has reason to believe, and verily and in his conscience believes, and he goes on to allege the reasons for that belief. That is the same provision as is found in the proposition of the hon. Minister of Justice; the allegation is not made on personal knowledge, but on information which leads the deponent to believe that the right person is named, and he gives the reason on which he bases that belief. Under these circumstances I think we could hardly ask the Minister of Justice to go further than he has done.

Mr. BARRON. In this matter I think it is better to judge by past experience. I think there is hardly a constituency in Ontario that has not had the same experience as we have had in South Victoria. At the outset of the revision, affi-

davits were prepared on information and belief, and were widely circulated throughout the Province. In South Victoria I know that one individual who had been in the riding for only a few months, undertook to swear on his knowledge and belief, to the qualifications of several hundred voters; and each one of these, by the proposition now before the House, would be entitled to vote. But these affidavits, on the first revision, were thrown out, and someone else who could swear to the fact was required to make the affidavit. It was discovered, instead of having all the names again before the revising officer that had been before him previously, only a very small percentage of them remained. Actually some of the men who were offered originally were not of age, and when asked to make the affidavit they could not do so. From past experience, we are opposed to allowing such a rule to come into force. It would be very unwise to allow voters to be put on the lists on the ground of opinion and belief.

Mr. CURRAN. He must give the ground for his belief

Mr. BARRON. He may say my reason is: so-and-so informed me.

Mr. CURRAN. The revising officer would throw that out

Mr. BARRON. I do not know that he would or not. It would be much better to have the uniform practice continued. I think the past has shown that all voters entitled to vote were placed on, and the innovation proposed would be very unwise and dangerous.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I regret the hon. the Minister has made the amendment in the direction he has. If he has made up his mind finally to allow third parties to make application for electors, perhaps the amendment he proposes may cover the ground; but I wish to draw his attention to the fact that the better class of revising officers in the Maritime Provinces, and I believe also in Ontario—the judicial revising officers—all determined at the last revision that the application must be made either by the applicant himself or by some person who would be called on to swear of his own personal knowledge that the person whose name he presented possessed the necessary qualification. That system was fair to everybody. I object most strenuously to permission being given either side to make wholesale applications covering twenty or thirty names. Those whose constituencies cover large districts know well that if a thousand names are put on, it is impossible to have them taken off. I am perfectly satisfied that the rule the returning officers adopted in Prince Edward Island left no room for fraud. If application was made by a man who swore he was entitled to vote, as a rule he had the right. In nine cases out of ten the applications were based on facts. But if a politician can make an application to have forty or two hundred men put on the list, I do not know where this is going to end. Both sides will adopt the system and personal applications will no longer be made. An enormous loss of time and money will result if any attempt is made to strike off names which should never have been put on the lists under that system. Take large cities, such as Halifax, St. John or Montreal. Suppose application was made by John Smith, claiming that the names of fifty John Smiths should be put on, how are you going to identify them? When a man makes a personal application for himself or another, you have some means of identification, and you have further the assurance that he has made the affidavit, but if at one sweep you must enter the application on behalf of fifty John Smiths and Macdonalds, you will open the door very wide to fraud. This provision will be taken advantage of by the agents of both parties, and the result will be vexation and expense to all who seek to have the list properly revised.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is entirely astray in saying this is a new rule. It is the rule which was followed in our county when revising the lists.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I stated that in my own Province the rule was adopted by the returning officers of requiring affidavits, and I believe a similar rule was adopted in the other Maritime Provinces, and in Ontario as well.

Mr. SPROULE. The rule now proposed is the one which was carried out by the revising officer in my part of the country, and so far as I have heard, it was satisfactory to both parties. In the hon. gentleman's illustration of 1,000 names in his county being put on, he evidently exaggerates, because I do not think it is possible, in a locality where you have manhood suffrage, as was the case in Prince Edward Island, that you could find 1,000 names not on the list. On the other hand, if you compel personal declaration to be made in every instance, it will necessitate driving around the country and taking the parties, one at a time, where they can reach a magistrate, or somebody else, before whom they can make their declaration. Consequently, a large number who ought to be on the lists will not be put on. Had it not been that the very rule which we are trying to make law now, obtained in my part of the country, a great many would have been off the list who were put on, and everybody was satisfied, as far as I know.

Mr. WALDIE. The making of personal affidavits, in order to be put upon the preliminary list, is, I think, very desirable. If it is necessary to make a personal affidavit to get a name struck off the list, why not make it in the first place, and thus save all this trouble and expense afterwards. I know that the assessors are putting on nearly everyone as wage-earners, or as farmer's son, or as tenant, or as owner, and that affidavits are only necessary in the case of names not on the assessment rolls. It would be better to adopt this system, and thus have a correct list made out, than to have everybody placed on by political agents, and then have to remove the majority of those thus put on.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) has told us that, in his riding, the practice of requiring statutory declarations before names go on the lists, on personal knowledge, was not carried out at the last elections in 1886. Well, I suppose he must know what he is talking about, but, if that be the case in his riding, it was a practice which was not approved of by the revising officers who met in Toronto on the 27th December, 1886, for the purpose of considering the practice that should be followed, and to try and arrange a uniformity of practice in cases which were not provided for by statute. I have a copy of their proceedings here; they were published at the time. A resolution was moved by Judge Dean and seconded by Judge Kingsmill:

"That in the organised districts——"

And I suppose this should apply to the organised districts, and probably not to Algoma or other unorganised districts.

"That in the organised districts, no name not already on the list for the preceding year shall be entered thereupon which does not appear on the last revised assessment roll of Ontario, unless an application is made in writing by the person desiring to be put on the list, or by someone on his behalf, describing the grounds on which he claims that he should be put on the preliminary voters' list, and unless the application is filed with the revising officer, and the revising officer, in receiving such application, shall only act upon the same when it is supported by a statutory declaration made upon the personal knowledge of the attorney."

That is all we suggest now. It did no harm, but a great deal of good where it was followed out at the last revision in Ontario, and I think the unanimous consensus of opinion of the county judges of the Province of Ontario in regard to a matter which they had to administer themselves, ought to have very great weight with the members of this House.

For that reason, I really think the Minister of Justice would find that this would close the door to a great deal of opportunity for fraudulent practice.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I may have misunderstood the hon. gentleman, but does the Act as proposed to be amended by the Minister of Justice conform with the resolution of the judges?

Mr. EDGAR. No, it does not at all.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I agree entirely with the remarks made by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar), that we should not put names on the list unless there is a statutory declaration, made by the parties themselves or by some person who can speak of his own knowledge, that they are entitled to be put on. I know that was the practice adopted by the better class of revising barristers the last time. In the county of Bothwell, the revising barrister followed that course strictly. He would not put any names on the preliminary list unless he had a statutory declaration from the party himself or from some party who could speak of his own personal knowledge that he was entitled to be put on. For instance, if I had persons in my employment and I knew what salary they were getting, I could speak of my own knowledge that they were receiving an income sufficient to entitle them to be placed on the list; and in that case he would receive a statutory declaration from me, and would put on two or three, or half a dozen names on my declaration. But, unfortunately, in the county of Kent, the revising barrister took a totally different course. He accepted a statutory declaration from Tom, Dick or Harry, that he was informed and verily believed that John Jones and William Smith, and Peter Mitchell and a hundred more were entitled to be put upon that list, and the result was that nearly 2,000 names were put on the list against which appeals had to be made. We sent in appeals against over 1,800 names on that preliminary list, and when we look back and see the enormous amount of cost in money, and time, and trouble which we spent in the county of Kent in order to get the list made right, you may excuse me for speaking up and trying to get the law so amended that it will not be in the power of that revising barrister or anyone else who chooses to take the same course to act in that way in the future. What objection can there be to this? In the first place, the revising barrister is obliged to take the last revised assessment roll. When he takes that roll, he will get nearly every name in the county which is entitled to be on the list, and the other names that will have to be added by statutory declarations will be very few, and they ought to be accompanied by statutory declarations. I think the object on both sides of the House is to allow every man who is entitled to vote to get his name on the list. For my part, I do not want to see any advantage taken, but I want to see a fair and square and honest list made; but I protest against placing it in the hands of any revising barrister to accept a declaration from any person who likes to send it in, and thereby put a great number of names on the list, and then compel those who want to see the list made pure to go to the expense of getting those names off. I think the Minister of Justice ought to accept this suggestion, and not to allow those who desired to go on the list to be placed there unless they make a statutory declaration.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Speaking from the standpoint of the Province of Ontario, I may say that, after making allowance for those names which will be placed on the assessment roll by the assessors, there are two large classes that will chiefly be covered by the declarations we are now taking into account. Those are the wage-earning class, who are not referred to under the present municipal arrangement in Ontario unless they earn $400 to qualify them for the municipal franchise, and the sons of land-owners and farmers of less than 20 acres not occupying rented property. Where the limit is fixed at $300 in the case of wage-earners, I think personal knowledge of the amount of income these parties earn should be required in order to place them on the list. You may see a young man working in a locality, and someone says he is earning so much a month; but if you ask him to make his own declaration as to what he earns, it will be much more satisfactory than leaving it to any other party to make the declaration. In reference to the past, my own experience is different from that of my hon. friend from Grey. I know that in Wentworth, when we made our declarations, the revising officer required a declaration either from the person himself or from someone who was personally conversant with the facts. If a father asked that his sons should be put on the list, his statement was accepted as being within his knowledge and information; but I remember two applications which were made to the revising officer in that county, in which there was a large schedule of names certified to by one individual on his general knowledge and belief, and they were brought to him very late in the time fixed for receiving applications, and he said he felt compelled to decline to receive that list, and that list was declined and the parties were required to file separate declarations, either their own, or someone else on personal knowledge. Now, when we take this into account, that outside the work the assessors have to do, that is naturally connected with the real estate tenants of the country, there are these other classes, at least in the Province of Ontario, who will naturally find no place on the assessment roll, I think it becomes all the more important that we should require direct personal information.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I regret that this appears to be a point upon which we must continue to differ. I regret it, because I thought last night that we would be able to arrive at a compromise and a point of agreement. I know my hon. friends opposite are sincere in the earnestness with which they desire to have a restriction to personal knowledge. At the same time, I do not feel that I can go farther than I have proposed to do without adopting the strictness of requiring that the voter himself should in every case make a declaration; and when we have, as we have this year, a revision involving so many changes; and when we remember what was stated last night with regard to the expense and trouble of getting these statutory declarations, to say that in almost every riding we should have some hundreds of statutory declarations made; and when we remember also the inconvenience and difficulty of getting persons to make declarations before the election comes on, and when they take no interest in the matter, even though their rights are clear, I think that would be a serious step. I propose that my hon. friends opposite should think over the matter between this and the third reading and I shall probably do the same, and if we cannot agree upon it, we can take a vote.

Mr. COLTER. A few days ago I saw a printed circular, said to have been issued from the tower room, which was addressed to the Conservative associations throughout this country, urging Conservatives to put on the voters' lists all the names possible, and then followed this delicate suggestion, that when they are once on the list it is very difficult and expensive to get them off. The discussion that has been going on here illustrates that that doctrine has taken very deep root. When we find that facilities are given for stuffing the lists, we cannot believe that these facilities are likely to diminish the cost of preparing and revising these voters' lists. In fact it is much more expensive to remove these names than it is to get statutory declarations. Sometimes these people live a long distance away. They are asserted to be owners, they are believed to be owners, they are put

upon the list, and afterwards we have to go to considerable expense in subpœnaing them in order to get them off the list. In some cases in my own county people were put upon the list fraudulently, and when we attempted to subpœna them, they evaded service. I remember in one case we had to subpœna a mother, but she refused to attend, and that fraudulent name was retained. I am giving this as an illustration; there were a good many other similar cases. We went to a good deal of pains and expense in order to purge the list in this particular way, but we found ourselves defeated. We are now simply asking that proper steps shall be taken to prevent these frauds, and I believe that it is the duty of Parliament to take proper steps. I hold it to be an immoral suggestion that if you will only take a little trouble and stretch your consciences a little, and put a good many names upon the list, then it will be difficult and expensive for your opponents to get these names off the list.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I much regret to hear the statement of the Minister of Justice, that he felt it incumbent upon him to refuse to make any further concessions, after the emphatic statement is made that fraud, in the past, has been inflicted upon many of those who had to do with the voters' lists. I think the statement of my hon friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell), that there were 2,000 individuals fraudulently placed upon the voters' lists, ought to be sufficient to convince the Minister that some means should be devised to prevent anything of that kind in the future. The Minister says it will involve an enormous expense. I cannot see any consistency in that statement When these names are placed upon the list, a large amount of expense will be necessary in order to strike them off, much more than would be necessary if every individual had to make a declaration himself. It is a notorious fact, that just as soon as you allow one individual to make a declaration for a large number, and allow those names to be handed in, you open the door for any amount of fraud. The statement made by my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), and the charge that he made against the assessors of that county, was surprising to me. I am surprised to hear any man deliberately charge that the assessors appointed in his locality are, to a certain extent, perjurers in performing their duties. With all the assurance possible he declares from his place in this House that in one of the old counties in the Province of Ontario, not a single man who was sworn to do his duty, does it impartially. That may be the class of men in his riding, but it is not the class of men throughout the greater portion of the Province of Ontario. I say that the assessors generally do their duty honestly, and I repudiate upon their behalf the insinuation that he makes against the assessors in his own riding. Now, I cannot understand why the Minister is so desirous that there should be an open door so that any individual may hand in a large number of names, unless it be as the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Colter), said, that a circular had been sent out advising their faithful friends to see that every individual should be placed upon the assessment roll, because when they once get them there, it would take a great deal of trouble and expense to get them off. Is this the door that the Minister of Justice desires to leave open now, so that they may be able to carry out the advice that is given by that organisation? It certainly looks to me very much like a design on the part of our friends opposite to give every opportunity that this Franchise Bill, which is iniquitous in every sense now, should be rendered more so, and that they should take means whereby they may have greater facilities to defraud the electors and prevent a fair expression of their opinions at the polls. Now, it is my experience, and I think it has been the experience of the Members of Parliament, that it is absolutely necessary, in order to make the list an honest list, that a personal statutory declaration should be made by the party desiring to be placed upon the roll. That being the method adopted in the past by the judges, who were the best authorities, why cannot the Minister concede the suggestion made and adopt the course approved by these officers. Is he a judge superior to those who have the duties to perform? An hon. member, who had acted as a revising officer, last evening stated that such was the proper course, and, in fact, was the only course to prevent fraud. If the Minister is desirous of preventing fraud, why does he not adopt the course suggested by one of his own supporters, who has had practical experience in this matter? I cannot understand why he objects to allowing this amendment. If he wishes to do fairly by the electors, if he is anxious to save expense, as he professes to be, I certainly think he should adopt the course suggested, and allow this clause to stand over until he is able to come down and meet us in a fair spirit.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand that the Minister of Justice has expressed himself in the sense that he has not finally closed the matter, that he leaves it an open question; but he suggests that we pass the section now, and when the Bill comes up for its third reading, he will, after consideration, have arrived at a final conclusion in regard to it. I do not understand that the question is finally settled, but that it will be kept over until the third reading of the Bill, and the Minister will have an open mind on the subject.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I understood the Minister to say that he would give us time to consider it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said that I would consider it before the third reading.

Mr. MULOCK. To revert again to the point that a time should be stated beyond which names should not be added to the supplementary list, I understand the Minister objected to that suggestion on the ground of expense. I did not understand that the suggestion itself was not approved.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said the advertising would be expensive.

Mr. MULOCK At all events, it is desirable that some official notification should be made as to the time when the revising officer was going to sign the list. I suggest that the revising officer should announce when he intends to sign the supplementary list, and that anyone should get a copy of the order on paying for it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to fix a date before which the revising officer cannot transmit the list, so that everyone will know there is that time at least. I said it would not suit the whole Dominion to have a date after which the names should not be received; but I am quite willing to fix a date up to which they shall be received, and to provide that the list shall not be transmitted to the Queen's Printer before 1st August, or, it may be, later.

Mr. MULOCK. That is very well so far as it goes; but the revising officer may keep the list on hand, and some people may not happen to know that it has not been transmitted. It would not be unwise, in addition to the clause the Minister proposes to add, to require the revising officer, if he does not transmit the list on 1st August, to issue an order enlarging the time, so that the public may know up to what time the matter might be open.

Mr. BARRON. I draw attention to the great possibility, under the words "sources of information," of revising officers adopting different rules in almost every district. One revising officer may consider the sources of information sufficient, and another the reverse.

Mr. COLTER. I spoke last night to the Minister of Justice, and I believe he was willing to take into considera-

tion a few amendments which I desire to submit for his consideration. One amendment is with respect to the status of voters.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to adopt that, and abolish the necessity of the status being continued up to the time of the election.

Mr. COLTER. Another suggestion is with respect to this point: where property is held by the mother in the lifetime of the father, and occupied by the son of the mother during the lifetime of the father. There could very easily be a change made in that clause by striking out the words "after the death of his father, being owner of the farm, in respect to which the right of voting is claimed by or for him."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have not had time to consider that suggestion yet. I think it can be done, and I will answer the hon. gentleman when we again go into Committee on the Bill. I should be glad to receive the amendment in the meantime.

Mr. COLTER. There is another suggestion, which interferes somewhat with the principle of the Bill, and it is this: to allow the sons of tenants without requiring them to be occupants or tenants for five years. It would simplify the Act, and simplify the working of the Act very much. I have prepared an amendment which I will submit to the hon. the Minister of Justice, if he will kindly consider it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will.

On sub-section 4,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I wish to add after the words "shall transmit to the Queen's Printer," the words "not sooner than the first day of August."

Mr. EDGAR. As I understand this amendment, the revising officer shall receive the names for putting on the lists up to the first day of August?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

On sub-section 5,

Mr. COLTER. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to another point. We will suppose that there are a large number of tenants or occupants in the riding; the assessment is simply *prima facie* evidence of "value." Why ought it not be *prima facie* evidence of the ownership by those persons? Those on the assessment roll are liable to pay taxes, and if there is anything wrong in putting them on the preliminary list, the revising officer could correct it at the final revision. I propose to add after the word "value" in this section, the following:—

"And that those who are assessed as owners, tenants or occupants are entitled to be placed on the preliminary list of voters as possessing such qualification."

I think that this would lighten the labors of those concerned in the preparation of the list.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It really seems to me that this is the meaning of the section. For instance, when we say that it will be *prima facie* evidence of the "value," it surely means that it will be *prima facie* evidence of the value of A. B.'s property on which he is to go on the list.

Mr. COLTER. Suppose the revising officer finds a person entered as a tenant on the assessment roll, that does not prove conclusively that he has been a tenant for one year previous so as to qualify him under the Act. *Prima facie* he might be held to be a tenant for the year previous, for the purpose of the preminiary list, and if there is anything wrong in connection with the matter it can be changed on revision.

Mr. COLTER.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it would meet the hon. gentleman's view if the words "and qualification" were added after the word "value."

Mr. COLTER. Yes, that would do.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to repeal section 13, which provides for the appointment of a reviser's clerk In practice, it has been found that in some districts the revising officer has done the greater part of the duty himself, and the clerical expense has been small. In other sections the revising officers have imposed large duties on the clerks, and considerable sums have had to be paid. This destroys all uniformity in that particular, as we pay a clerk in one district a very much larger sum than in another. What I propose to do is to make an even allowance for each of the revising officers for clerical assistance, and let him get the clerical assistance where he likes.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice under what authority the original list has been printed by the Queen's Printer. It is not the original list that the revising officer is going to use; it is some new original list.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, it is the list of 1886. This Bill was introduced last year, and it was intended that it should fit into the scheme of printing which was then explained fully to the House.

Mr. EDGAR. The original list does not mean the original list; it means the copy printed here.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The original list does not mean any particular piece of paper; it means the list of voters.

Mr. EDGAR. I think an improvement might be made in this provision. It is certainly important that this list, as it comes back from the Queen's Printer, should be most carefully compared with the list signed by the revising officer which has been sent to the Queen's Printer. Therefore, I would suggest that in the fourth line of section 17 some such words as these, should be added—"after comparing and correcting the same with the list signed by him, he shall certify it," &c.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will make the price of voters' lists not exceeding 10 cents, instead of 25 cents, and add "reeves" and "deputy reeves," to those to whom will be transmitted copies of the lists.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It will be advisable also, to add postmasters. They could post the lists up in their offices, where the people could read them when getting their mails.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.. That would make a great number of lists. However, we will return to this section, and see whether provision cannot be made in this respect.

On section 3,

Mr. BURDETT. I would suggest to the Minister of Justice that the post office address should not be the last post office address, but the post office address given in the list.

Mr. TISDALE. That would make it more certain.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to say: "the post office address mentioned in the list, or his last post office address." There are some addresses which are not known.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I would move that the following words be added:—

"No application to insert or reject names shall be dismissed on account of error in the name or names designated therein, provided such error is corrected on the day of revision."

Sometimes a man whose name is John is called James, but I do not think anyone should be rejected on that account, if

on the revision day it is proved that the man should be on the list and his correct name can be given.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to consider that when we get through the Bill.

Mr. BURDETT. I think section 16 covers that.

On section 5,

Mr. COLTER. I mentioned last night that I thought it was proper that certain words should be added to this section, after the word "him," in the 46th line. I have submitted to the Minister of Justice an amendment, requiring the revising officer to notify the public that the lists are completed, subject to the correction of simply clerical errors, and that these clerical errors should be corrected in the presence of the parties, or of any who may choose to attend, publicly. I mentioned, at that time, a case in point. It would be very cheap, and very simple, to have this matter arranged, and I suggest that the Minister of Justice should take it into consideration.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will try and make provision for that, but I would rather reserve that until the close of our work on the Bill, because it will be necessary to see how it fits into the main Act.

Mr. MULOCK. I intimated to the Minister yesterday that I had an amendment in the line suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Colter), and I will send it to him.

Committee rose, and, it being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 4) further to amend the Revised Statutes, chapter 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise.

On sub-section 2 of section 5,

Mr. DAVIES. This is a new provision. After the lists are printed and before they are verified, should it not be the duty of the revising officer to compare them?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is this the final printing of the list?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Suppose errors are made in the printing of the lists, is there any provision in the Act by which mistakes that might occur in that way can be rectified—either by the omission of names from the list, or mistakes of the printer?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is something in that; but it was understood that before the Bill was finally passed we would try to make some provision for the correction of clerical errors.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As I understand, the list, when printed, is the list that will be handed to the deputy returning officers?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The point I want to make is, that there should be a verification of the list after it finally leaves the printer's hands, so that if there were any mistake made, as it often happens that some names are dropped out, they could be reinserted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This provides that after they are printed, they should be verified by the revising officer, and transmitted to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is the verification before the printing. What I allude to, is the verification after the list is printed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no provision for that. We agreed to reserve the question of verification of clerical errors, and I will consider that at the same time. I think it would be desirable.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How is the revising officer to verify those lists? The Queen's Printer has to print them as he receives them from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and how are they to be verified?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no method prescribed here for verifying after transmission from the Clerk of the Crown, but we are going to provide for verification.

On section 6,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to drop that section. It was a proposal to reduce the number of electors in a polling sub-division to 250 instead of 300. That was asked for in the Printing Bureau, for some reasons connected with the number of names that it would be convenient to have on a sheet, but I think it would involve too much trouble in redistributing the polling districts.

On section 9,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to refer to section 10 of the Act we are amending, which contains a special provision with respect to Prince Edward Island and British Columbia. Instead of 30th July, 1885, being the date up to which persons who had a right to vote, under the Island franchise, should continue to have the right to be placed on the list, it should be extended to the 1st of June in each year. The Act as it now stands provides that persons in the Island who are British subjects, and of full age and entitled to vote under the Island franchise, shall be entitled to be placed on the list, provided they were so entitled on 20th July, 1885. That was all right when the Act was passed. The intention was to give whoever was entitled to vote under the Island franchise, a right to be placed on the list as it was revised year by year.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand a serious difficulty has arisen, which has frustrated the intention of Parliament, as regards the operation of this section in Prince Edward Island. I understand the revising barrister ruled that those persons only are entitled to go on the list who, on 20th July, 1885, were qualified to vote; and I understand the fact to be, that in the Island very few persons were qualified to vote, because the law of the Province required that they should not only be persons assessed for poll tax, but persons who had paid poll tax, and the date fixed for the payment of poll tax was so early in the year, that it was not collected to any extent;—in fact, it had been levied, but not collected. What I was going to suggest was, that this section should include any person in the Province of Prince Edward Island who was a British subject, and was on 20th July, 1885, liable to be assessed for the payment of such poll tax, and so on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Act is all right as it stands now to enable those qualified to vote under the Island law on a particular day, namely, 20th July, 1885. There is nothing wrong in the Act, because it confers upon every person who was entitled to vote under the Island law on 20th July, 1885, a right to have his name put on the electoral list. The only object is to extend that date, and I suggest 1st June in each year, as it is the date when the preliminary list is first made up. If the amendment were carried, the result would be this, that whenever a revision takes place in each year every person entitled to vote under the Island franchise would be entitled to be placed on the electoral list.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That would be a very serious extension of the franchise given to Prince Edward Island, and a departure from the principle of the Act. What I recommend is a section that would deal with the decision of the revising barrister, which had the effect of frustrating the intention of Parliament on that subject; but I did not expect to go so far as to give to the Island the provincial franchise when we had not recognised it in other Provinces.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That has been done. On the first revision held under this statute, every person who was entitled to vote in the Island under the provincial franchise on 1st July, 1885, was entitled to be placed upon the electoral list. It was all right for the first revision. That principle was conceded.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What I understand is that the revising officer has given a decision which frustrated that even.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No; I never heard of any such decision. Every person who came forward to have his name placed on the list, if he proved before the returning officer he was entitled to vote on that day, he put his name right on. The difficulty arises that when the next revision takes place all those who became of age on the 20th day of July, or any day subsequent from 1885 to 1889, would be debarred from voting, while those who came of age previous to that would be entitled to vote. If you leave the Act as it is now, you would be creating most invidious distinctions in the Province, which cannot be the intention of the hon. gentleman. The intention of the Act was to give everybody there who was entitled to vote under the Island franchise on that date, the right of being put on the new electoral list. Now, as we are revising the Act, from year to year, that principle must be extended, or, otherwise, the hon. gentleman will see what a curious anomaly it will be. All the franchise voters will be entitled to vote who came of age before this arbitrary date, but if they came of age the following day they would not. If the hon. gentleman carries out the suggestion he made, he would be conferring the franchise on men who did not possess it under the local franchise, and he would withhold it from those who do so possess it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand the fact to be this: that on the 20th July, 1885, under the original Franchise Act, all those who were under the law of the Province entitled to vote, were entitled to be put on the list. I am informed it was held by the revising officer in Prince Edward Island, that it was not only necessary a voter should be subject to the poll tax, but that he should have paid it on the 20th July. None of them, or very few, had paid the poll tax, which had been levied only a short time before and was not collected. My information is that the intention of Parliament, as regards that class of persons, had been frustrated. The extension of that right, however, would involve a great anomaly between Prince Edward Island and the rest of the Dominion. The first principle of the Act was that there should be uniformity of franchise, and it is true that in Prince Edward Island there was an anomaly, but it was an anomaly in favor of a liberal extension to a class of persons who at that time had a right to vote in the Province. It was not the intention to recognise persons who afterwards occupied a similar position and should likewise have the right to vote under the law of the Province. That would be against the principle of the Bill. The object aimed at was that rights then accrued were not to be disturbed, but, as I understand the discussion in 1885, it was not the intention that the right should continue to others who would grow up to be in the position of poll tax payers. The hon. gentleman thinks I am misinformed as to the decision which was given by the revising officer, but we can discuss that at a later stage, it being, I presume, not necessary that any amendment should be given notice of.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was a very close attendant at the revision court, and this is the first ever I heard of that decision being given. The revising officer simply decided, as he could not help deciding—for the language was plain, that everybody who, at the arbitrary date, was entitled to vote under the Island franchise, ought to have his name on the list—that the intention of the Act was carried out. The point was, that great numbers became of age subsequent to the arbitrary date, and they wanted to go on the list. The revising officer said: "I am powerless in that matter; Parliament has fixed an arbitrary date; and, unless you are entitled to vote at that time by the Island franchise, you cannot get on the list." My object is to extend that principle to those who came of age subsequent to 1885, and I believe, that if the hon. the Minister considers for a moment what a curious anomaly will otherwise exist, he will see my amendment is in the right direction.

Mr. SPROULE. You may say the same of the ordinary assessment roll, before it has been finally revised by the judge.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I may explain in a few words that what I wish, and what I think is the principle of the Act, is to give to the young men who came of age since 1885 the same rights that the young men who came of age before 1885 possess. I presume that the Minister will go into committee on this Bill again.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

On section 11,

Mr. BURDETT. I trust I may be pardoned for making a suggestion to the Minister of Justice with regard to the witnesses' fees. I understand that as the law is proposed to be changed, that any person by declaration "of information and belief" can put on any number of names. That possibly may be wrong or it may be right; there are arguments both for and against it; but the point I wish to raise is this: that where a person puts a number of names on the list, either on his own knowledge or on information and belief, and those names are attacked, the parties attacked ought to have notices served on them to come to court, and give their evidence, and the revising officer ought then to have power to say whether they should have witness fees, and if so, how much, and by whom they should be paid. For instance, if a man chooses to make a declaration, which is substantially untrue, and in consequence gets a number of faggot votes put on the list, he ought to be compelled to pay the cost of having those votes removed. And I submit that any person whose name is put on the list, ought to be compelled, at least if he is living within the riding, to come before the court; and the revising barrister, on deciding on the validity of his vote, should then say whether he is entitled to witness fees or not, just as all persons are obliged, in Ontario, to go before a Justice of the Peace, under the Summary Convictions Act, and give evidence, and the question of fees is in the discretion of the Justice. That would remove any complaints that might be made of persons illegally asking to have names put on the list. The present system works great hardships. I can give instances in which a great many names have been put on the list by men who cared very little how much expense and trouble they occasioned to others, and large sums had to be paid to get those names off the list. I hope the hon. Minister will insert a clause to compel parties to go to the court to give evidence to sustain their votes; and if the revising officer thinks that the person who asks a name to be put on is a man of straw, let him insist upon a de-

posit being paid sufficient to cover the fees; and let a penalty be imposed for putting on bad votes. I submit that this is a proper amendment to make in the interest of both parties and in the interest of justice, in order to have an honest roll.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member was good enough to mention this matter to me, but I thought his object was sufficiently provided for in sub section 3 of section 25.

Mr. COLTER. That clause is not so interpreted in our county. I submit that it is not sufficiently definite.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Does it not provide that in the discretion of the revising officer, if the person whose name is objected to does not attend, his name is struck off?

Mr. COLTER. But the revising officer generally leans in favor of the vote. He has an alternative, and he may dismiss the appeal or strike the voters' name off. All the judges, I believe, and revising officers as well, always lean in favor of the name being retained on the list. I think there ought to be something more definite.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it would not do to compel the revising officer to strike the name off, because it might be proved that the person had a right to vote; but in that case he ought to be subject to a penalty for contempt in failing to attend.

Mr. BURDETT. I understand that the Minister of Justice interprets the clause to mean that if the party has been subpœnaed and does not attend, the revising officer may strike his name off, and he ought to do it unless good reason is shown why he does not attend.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No. I say he ought to strike the name off or fine the party for contempt, unless there is evidence to the contrary.

Mr. COLTER. The doctrine of leaning in favor of the vote, I think, is a generally acknowledged doctrine by all who have anything to do with the revising of the voters' lists.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think that presumption ought to prevail if the person applying to be put on the list has been summoned to support his application. I think there should not be any presumption in his favor; there ought to be substantial evidence to prove his qualification.

Mr. COLTER. The fact of the name being on the roll is *prima facie* evidence of its right to be there, and that has been the decision in every case. In not one case, where the party has been subpœnaed, has his name been struck off, unless there has been affirmative evidence given.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Does not the hon. gentleman agree with me that if a man's name is on the list, the burden of proof is to take it off, but that cannot prevail in the case of a witness who absent himself and prevents the question being tried. In that case the revising officer should exercise his discretion.

Mr. COLTER. Could it not be made mandatory on the revising officer to strike the name off where the party is guilty of contempt, unless he has reason to believe, from some source, that he has a justifiable excuse for not obeying the mandate of the court?

Mr. TISDALE. I can give an illustration of the result of the hon. gentleman's argument. In one instance, in Ontario, where that law prevails, they suspended half a township of men who had been freeholders for years, and because these men did not turn up, knowing as they did and everybody knowing, that they had held these farms for years, they were struck off the lists. The hon. gentleman is inconsistent, because this afternoon he induced the Minister of Justice to make the assessment roll, which in Ontario is the same as our list of voters, prevail not only as to value but as to the right of the people to vote. Now, as soon as we come to the Dominion Franchise roll, he turns round and wants to apply the opposite doctrine.

Mr. COLTER. I did provide for that particular exception in my remarks, and I think the Minister of Justice so understood me, that the name should *primâ facie* be struck off unless the revising officer had reason to believe the person who had disobeyed the subpœna was entitled to the vote, or unless the evidence of others was furnished him to that effect. These statutes should be made as clear as possible, and their interpretation as uniform as possible. As the case stands, some revising officers would strike off these people who are guilty of contempt on the ground that they were not entitled to any privileges in consequence of their conduct, while others would be guided rather by the doctrine of leaning in favor of the vote. The objection of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) could be remedied in this way. I am adverse to bogus appeals, to appeals in such a way as to cast doubts unnecessarily. The appellant might be obliged to put up a certain sum of money, say $2, as a guarantee of good faith, in the hands of the revising officer, which the latter would apply as directed. In that way we would have no wanton appeals, but simple justice.

Committee rose and reported progress.

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES.

Mr. TUPPER moved that amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 26) to amend the Act respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships, chapter 73 of the Revised Statutes, be read the second time and concurred in. He said: The only amendment is to add the word "Bermuda," so as to include that island as well as the West Indies.

Motion agreed to, and amendments concurred in.

SAFETY OF SHIPS.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 54) to amend the Revised Statutes, chapter 77, respecting the safety of ships. He said: This Bill is similar to that introduced last Session, with the exception of the first clause, which excited a certain amount of criticism in the old Bill. On consideration it was deemed expedient not to press those provisions which relate to the establishment of a load line for ships in Canada. The present Bill is, therefore, confined mainly to the improvement of the present Act, and contains the provisions in that regard which were in the former measure. The present Act, chapter 77, has certain provisions framed with the object of inducing the owners and masters of ships to take care that their ships are seaworthy. It has been found, however, in practice that as these sections which I propose to amend were drafted not precisely similar to the clause in the English Act, it is almost impossible to obtain a conviction on a prosecution under circumstances fully justifying it, considering the intention of the Act, so that in the sections of the Bill now before the House, while using the language of the Act, I propose to define "unseaworthiness," and the definition of that term I have taken from the English Act. The English Act in reference to the overloading of ships, after mentioning unseaworthy ships as open to detention, goes on to specify that detention may take place for overloading, or underloading, or improper loading, and in the present Bill I propose to use these words after the words "unseaworthy state." I have alluded to the third section. The second section is to be read in connection with the fifth section, and that relates to grain cargoes, and is taken from the English Act, chapter 43, of the Statutes of 1880. That relates chiefly to the use of shifting boards or other proper

means for the prevention of the shifting of a grain cargo. I take it that there will be no objection to that. The Bill was before the House last Session, it has been on the Order paper for some time this year, and has been in the hands of shipping men throughout the country, and I am very glad to say that no objections have been urged to these very proper amendments to our law. The only persons who could properly object, I submit, would be those reckless owners who buy up unseaworthy crafts and send them to sea utterly reckless of how life is endangered. I have introduced a section into this Bill, in consequence of the representation of the collector at the port of St. John, pointing out the possibility of an evasion of the present law regarding deck loads. He mentions that that law has been evaded at that port, though, on enquiry, he was unable to give the name of any ship that had been guilty of the evasion. However, he stated that, under sub-section 1 of section 7 of the Act, it was possible, and had been done, for a ship to clear for a port in Africa, and to go to Europe, and so evade the law. I have not heard of any evasions of that kind in any other place, but I submit, that the clause will prevent the possibility of such an evasion taking place. Section 6 of the Bill is necessary in connection with the clause referring to grain cargoes, and enables the Custom officers to go on board of a ship, to find the way in which these cargoes are stowed, and it is somewhat similar to the Act in regard to port wardens. Section 8 is an adoption of the clause in the English Act relating to contracts of service, and it is properly included in this Bill. It provides that, in every contract, there shall be a condition implied, notwithstanding anything in the contract itself, of seaworthiness on the part of the ship, and that all reasonable means to insure that seaworthiness shall be taken.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand that the hon. gentleman intends that all vessels of any size or description —for instance, small schooners of from thirty tons to seventy or eighty tons, carrying grain from one Province to another, as from Prince Edward Island to Richibucto or Shediac, or other ports on the north shore of New Brunswick—are to have shifting boards?

Mr. TUPPER. Neither in the Act on our Statute-book nor in the English Act is an exception made in regard to any vessel. It is necessary, in every case, that sufficient means shall be taken to preserve life. It is not necessary that a shifting board should be used in every case, but the necessary means must be taken, whether by sacks or bags or shifting boards. The same reason applies to every ship, no matter where it may go or what may be its size, whether it goes to Queen's, Prince Edward Island, or to any more distant place, that precautions shall be taken to ensure the safety of the ship and of the men who are on it. I understand that the construction of a ship with a shifting board involves a very trifling expense, and these shifting boards are now used by a large number of vessels both in the inland waters of Canada and in the coasting trade, especially in the carrying of grain. It is to make this general and to compel all owners to adopt those precautions, that this Bill is now introduced. The Act does not confine it to shifting boards, but says: "or other proper precautions to prevent the cargo from shifting." I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that necessary precautions should be applied to all ships alike.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think, perhaps, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine has not considered this sufficiently. It may be all right to apply these measures to long voyages, like the Atlantic voyages, but when he applies them to vessels going for a three or four or five hours run from Prince Edward Island to the mainland, or on coasting voyages, I think the hon. gentleman would do well to consider the effect of such a provision upon the trade, before he introduces it. This practice of copying English legislation is getting to be a fad with the Ministry of the day. I do not apply that in any offensive sense to the measure of the hon. gentleman, but it is not necessary always that English legislation should be adopted here. It should only be adopted as far as it can be adapted to our own case. I think the suggestion of the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has a good deal of force in it, and the Minister should consider that before he presses these amendments, because I doubt very much if it is well or in the interests of Canada for him to adopt that provision.

Mr. DAWSON. There are two classes or kinds of navigation in this Dominion. There is the navigation of the great lakes, and there is the navigation of the ocean, and they are very different in many respects. I shall say nothing in regard to ocean navigation, for there are many hon. members here who come from the Maritime Provinces who are much better qualified to speak on that subject than I can be. But with regard to the navigation of the great lakes, I may say that this Act, and the legislation which has already taken place on this subject, make, I should say, quite law enough. So far as legislation goes, the safety of ships, after the passing of this Bill, will be pretty well provided for. But what does all that amount to unless there can be some means adopted whereby the law will be enforced? I do not see any provision in this Bill for the enforcement of the law. Vessels go out on the great lakes overloaded, they go out improperly manned, without being properly provided with sails, ropes and anchors. A schooner loaded with wheat, for instance, starts from Port Arthur or some other port on the great lakes. She is so much loaded that there is scarcely two or three inches of what lake navigators call seaboard left; and the consequence is that if a storm comes up that vessel is immediately cut adrift when danger arises. A great many losses have occurred in that way. Now, I would suggest that the Custom house officers, at the different ports, should have power conferred upon them to prevent an overloaded, or unseaworthy vessel from going out. It often happens that vessels do go out, which, instead of being manned by sailors, are manned with landsmen, with men on board who have had no experience in navigation, and the result is that when the barge, or schooner, loaded with wheat, is cut adrift, they do not know what to do, and the consequence is the loss of the cargo and the loss of the men. It is very difficult always to get proper seamen on the great lakes, because there are no sailors there who make an exclusive profession of navigation. We have navigation for only six or seven months in the year, and during the remaining five or six months these men are obliged to do something else for a means of subsistence. Consequently, we cannot find as skilful men on the great lakes as on the ocean, where they are constantly engaged in navigation. But on the great lakes men who have only six months' experience are employed, and they are very often wanting in the requisite skill. Too often, also, people who get freight in schooners are not careful who they put on them. The steamers, as a rule, are well enough manned, but the schooners are generally very poorly provided for, both in equipment and in men. A case of that kind occurred some years ago at Port Arthur. A schooner, named the *Jane Hurlburt*, in the fall of the year, took on board some 30 or more navvies, and the vessel was put in tow of a steamer. She had neither sail nor oar, and they trusted entirely to the steamer to take her to her destination, which was not very far. It was late in the fall, and in passing one of the entrances to Nipigon Bay, a storm arose, blowing off the shore. The sea was not very heavy, and it was such a storm as any ordinary vessel, well manned, could have resisted. But that vessel began to fill, and the moment the sea got up the

people on the steamer cut her adrift to save themselves, and down she went with all these poor people on board, of whom not one was saved. These navvies, who were going to their work, knew nothing of navigation, knew nothing of the danger they were incurring, and they were all lost. That is not a solitary instance Now, something should be done whereby it would be impossible for vessels of this kind to go out. The Customs officer at the port from which she sailed should have authority to say: You shall not go out in that miserable plight at this season of the year; you shall not go out improperly manned. No less than twelve cases involving great loss have occurred within a few years, and 300 lives were lost in the waters of Algoma; so it is a subject upon which my constituents feel very keenly, and to which I am bound to draw the attention of the Government. There are a great many vessels on the lakes nearly worn out. The present system is to build vessels of a larger class than have hitherto been used, because they are more profitable. The consequence is that the large fleet of schooners and other sailing vessels, with some steamers, has not been renewed for several years, and consequently the vessels now afloat are becoming very unseaworthy. During the ensuing summer, and for some time to come, a careful watch should be kept over these vessels to prevent loss of life and property. I draw the attention of the Minister to this matter, so that some means may be devised whereby these vessels will not be allowed to go out when they are overloaded. A very important point is to have them properly provided with anchors and chains, and with all the appliances which would enable the sailors to save them if they were cut adrift. I have a letter from a gentleman of St. Catharines, a Mr. Carey, who is the chairman of the Seamen's Committee of Workingmen for looking after the safety of sailors. I will not trouble you by reading his letter, but Mr. Carey tells me that vessels have come into port there without a single sailor on board. In one case, a vessel in tow of a steamer was left to two landsmen who knew so little of what they had to do that people had to go on board from the shore and tie the vessel to the wharf. Now, this is a state of things that should be guarded against in the future. Another point to which I wish to call attention, is the construction of vessels. Anybody is allowed to build a vessel and to put it afloat. There was a case occurred in the Georgian Bay, of a vessel built at Little Current on the Manitoulin Island. The vessel was called the *Jane Miller*, and she was put afloat top heavy, a small vessel with an enormous upper deck arrangement. I have here a few remarks made by an experienced mariner, a man who has been on the ocean, as well as on the great lakes, and who knows all about ships in every possible way. I will read what he says:

"The duties of the Inspector of Hulls should be expanded, or a special officer should be appointed to see that new vessels on the lakes are built with the necessary stability, that the centre of gravity bears its proper relation to the centre of flotation. At present there seems to be no legal limit to the height and weight of top hamper in the shape of cabins above the main deck. The fierce and sudden gales on the lakes require as good a model of vessel as on the sea coast. A vessel may perhaps be seaworth y under section 6, and yet, if of a bad model, turn over directly she is outside the harbor. In regard to the last portion of clause 2 of section 6, I fail to see that the action of a vessel leaving port in an unseaworthy state can under any circumstances be deemed reasonable or justifiable. A summer and fall "Plimsoll load mark" should be established. The system of towing barges on the open lakes in the fall of the year is bad. In my opinion no vessel should be towed after the 1st of September, unless she is a *bona fide* sailing vessel officered, manned and equipped in every particular under the Canadian Merchant Shipping Act, so that in the event of the hawser parting she may be able to keep herself off the shore, which at present many cannot do"

I need not add a word. That is the case as I have been asked to lay it before the Government by the Boards of Trade and people of Algoma who are largely engaged in shipping, and when this Act is amended as proposed it will be sufficient to prevent lives being sacrificed, providing means be devised whereby the law will be enforced.

Mr. WALDIE. This Act is intended to apply to centre board vessels sailing on the lakes. They do not require the same shifting boards as ocean vessels do, and planks passing from the keel to the deck make a shifting board in the vessel itself, in the case of a number of small vessels employed on the lakes. Does the Act provide for these cases?

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that it applies to all vessels, but it is not necessary that every ship should have shifting boards. In the case referred to by the hon. gentleman, such would not be required. The words are, shifting boards or some other precaution; in fact, some means of preventing the cargo from shifting, but not necessarily shifting boards.

Mr. SPROULE. I gladly endorse every word said regarding the necessity of further amending the law so as to provide greater means for the safety of life and property in shipping. The hon. gentleman has spoken the sentiments of a great many people who, in the past, have suffered from defective laws and defects in the vessels themselves, and in the loading of cargoes, which causes have brought about most serious disasters. One case, that of the *Jane Ward*, was caused by, or thought to have been caused by, the cargo being placed on the deck, there not being sufficient ballast below. I believe it was clearly understood that that was the cause of the loss of that vessel. Another defect that will be provided for, by the amendment proposed, is cargoes being carried without shifting boards. A schooner carrying corn from Chicago began rolling in the trough of the sea, from the cargo shifting from side to side, and ultimately foundered. In that case, had there been a provision in the law providing for shifting boards, the loss of the vessel, and of lives, would have been prevented. Another important matter to which the hon. gentleman for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) called attention, and which I think a very important one, is that some person should have the authority to retain a vessel going out of port, either without the cargo properly arranged or being overloaded. Many vessels go out with large excursion parties without possessing life boats and life-saving apparatus needed on board for the safety of so large a number of people. Moreover, vessels go out with a very much larger number of passengers than the law allows; but if you appeal to the collector of Customs he says: While I have the authority, I only get into trouble if I stop the practice; while I have the authority I am not instructed to invariably exercise it. Accordingly what is everyone's business is no one's business, and vessels are therefore allowed to go without possessing proper life-saving apparatus, or overloaded. The objection taken by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), I do not think is a valid one, namely, that a vessel going on a trip of four or five hours should not be expected to bear the expense that would be necessary to provide shifting boards for the cargo and so on. But the hon. gentleman forgets that grain is generally not taken a short distance in bulk in vessels.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, always.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that it was usually put in sacks or something of that sort. If it is as stated by the hon. gentleman, I think the present provision should apply as much in that case as if the vessel was going 2,000 miles. I can take my own county facing on Georgian Bay, and while the distance from Owen Sound to Collingwood is only 50 miles, vessels frequently meet very disastrous storms and serious losses have occurred in that short distance, and the provisions of the law should apply as much to those vessels as to vessels going from Owen Sound to Port Arthur or Duluth. The principle involved is as good in one case as in the other. The suggestion of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), that some competent person should

inspect vessels in course of construction is a very good one, because very frequently they are constructed without possessing the strength necessary to contend against the storms they have to encounter. There should be some provision compelling the collector of Customs at every port to see that every vessel that leaves the port is properly equipped, not only with men, but with life-saving apparatus, and this is the more necessary, because many people know nothing about the requirements of equipment, or in regard to life-saving apparatus. There should be some authority to look after steamers leaving the port.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have no objection to any measure in any degree tending to provide for greater security for our shipping interests, and it is just possible that some of the clauses may be in the direction of improvement. The only objection that I raise to the Bill on its face is that it will be attended with very considerable expense to the owners of small vessels on account of providing, first, for shifting boards, and secondly for the inspection of vessels either leaving port or arriving at their destination. Any charge of that kind, no matter how small it may be, will be objected to by all who are interested in the coasting trade.

Mr. TUPPER. There is no provision for any cost for inspection.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Precisely so, but the Act relating to port wardens is continued in force. I see by one of the clauses it is provided that when a vessel arrives at a port of destination with a grain cargo any Customs house officer may proceed on board and examine into the mode in which their cargo is stowed.

Mr. TUPPER. But there is no charge.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman will observe that an ordinary Customs house officer would be a very incompetent man to see whether a cargo is properly stowed or not. It would be rendering the Bill a complete farce because any Customs house officer would know but little about the stowing of the cargo. The 9th clause provides that the Act relating to port wardens is to continue in force, therefore it will be necessary to provide that the port warden would be the proper person to inspect that vessel either before she leaves or at the port of arrival. The hon. gentleman will have to provide for that without any expense to the owner of the craft. When we go into committee I have some further matters which I will draw the hon. Minister's attention to and which we will consider more thoroughly.

Mr. TUPPER. I would remind the hon. gentleman that the port wardens are only at certain ports. I understand that inland, farther west than Montreal, there are no port wardens.

Mr. LOVITT. As I understand this Bill will apply more particularly to the inland waters than to the foreign trade, and I do not see any objection to this.

Mr. TUPPER. It does not affect our trade in any radical way, as we have the clause in the British Act relating to this in force.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The objection which I intend to make on section 5 will arise on this interpretation clause to some extent, and I, therefore, take the opportunity of stating my objections now. The idea of the hon. gentleman is, no doubt, a good one, and I suppose that this clause is a transcript of that known as the Plimsoll clause in the English Act. As the law now stands under the Port Warden's Act, any vessel loaded with grain that leaves any port in Canada, for any port outside the limits of Canada not on inland navigation, is obliged either to have shifting boards or that her cargo will be stowed in such a manner as to satisfy the port warden that she is properly loaded. The 12th, 13th, 14th and 15th clauses of the Port Warden's Act provide for this—one of these sections reads:

"That no vessel shall leave any port in Canada for a port outside of Canada, not including inland waters, unless she has obtained a certificate from the port warden that the grain cargo is properly loaded in every respect."

There is ample provision at present to prevent the improper loading of any ships sailing from Canada to foreign ports. The Bill now before the House, so far as it extends to the Maritime Provinces, is intended to apply to schooners or vessels leaving ports in New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, or Nova Scotia, for some other port in Canada. We must bear in mind that this is intended to apply to the coasting trade, because anything outside of that is already provided for in the Port Warden's Act. The hon. gentleman knows that from the Province from which I come, we ship each year immense quantities of oats on small schooners, for ports in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and he knows that all these cargoes were shipped in bulk. The practice has existed ever since I can remember, and I am sure ever since the coasting trade has existed in these Provinces, of shipping those grain cargoes in bulk. I do not recollect and I have never heard of any accident arising from that, even although they had no shifting boards. As a matter of fact, when a vessel leaves Prince Edward Island for Pictou or Shediac, or any port along the north coast of New Brunswick, she is only a few hours going over, and this provision will entail no doubt a good deal of expense on the owners of these vessels. They are not vessels which constantly carry a grain cargo and if they are obliged to put in shifting boards or any similar provision it will be very expensive. I do not think the experience in the past will justify the hon. Minister in stating to the House that this is a necessity. I would suggest to him that in this interpretation clause the word "oats" be omitted, and if so that would cover nine-tenths of the cases I refer to and would remove the objection that at present I have to the Bill.

Mr. TUPPER. The argument of the hon. gentleman goes to the extent that this legislation is inapplicable to a special class of shipping and particularly to ships engaged in carrying oats. I must candidly admit that if the legislation is improper and unjustifiable in regard to vessels carrying oats, then that section relating to the grain cargoes should not be pressed at all in any form, because it is impossible to distinguish between barley and other grains and oats. If I am unable to press upon the House the necessity of applying this law to ships engaged in carrying oats between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, I think the clause should go altogether. But, if the hon. gentleman will look at the legislation to which he referred, he will see that the distinction he made with regard to cargoes of oats is not well taken. The hon. gentleman argues that port wardens have compulsory powers in the maritime ports, and these vessels are under their supervision and control.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I said so far as vessels carrying grain from the Maritime Provinces to foreign ports are concerned.

Mr. TUPPER. Then I will grant that part of his case. But even in the case of vessels engaged in carrying grain cargoes from our ports, he will see that the law does not go so far as this Bill, because the port wardens can go to ships leaving port; the law is inapplicable to ships arriving. The Bill before the House, like English legislation, deals

with ships both arriving and departing. The other provisions regarding the Port Wardens Act are applicable only to other Provinces than Ontario, and many of these provisions are optional; that is, it is only at the suggestion of underwriters or other persons interested in the cargo that the officers take action. Where no port warden exists, we have no remedy where a ship arrives underloaded or with her cargo improperly stowed. That explains also why we give Customs officers the same powers as port wardens, without going further and constituting port wardens at the different inland ports. Then the hon. gentleman states that there will be quite a tax. There is no doubt that, with regard to the expense of making provisions in regard to the safety of the lives of crews and passengers, all our legislation is unhappily framed if expence be objectionable. In regard to the inspection of boilers and hulls, and in all those cases in which our Parliament, as well as the legislatures of other countries, have stepped in between the owner and his property for the protection of life, some expense has undoubtedly been involved; but even on that ground I would meet the hon. gentleman. I submit that this is not a real tax or burden. All careful owners of ships, all men who are not merely stirred by the gambler's impulse in connection with this trade, now certainly do take great care to see to the safety of their ships and the lives of their crews. It is better for all concerned and it pays in the end. These precautions have not injured the shipping that deals in British ports; and no ship can go to the ports of Great Britain to-day without complying with legislation such as I am submitting to Parliament; and when we see the commerce of the mother country growing as it does every day, I think the argument that this would impose a tax is not well founded. As to small vessels, there is no distinction in the English legislation, and there should be no distinction. If it is wrong that the owners should risk the lives of their crews in large ships, surely the wrong is just as great in the case of small ships, and I am informed by practical men that the expense will be trifling, involving in the case of small schooners, something like $20 to alter them so as to prevent the shifting of the cargo. If there is less danger on a short voyage, the precautions need not be so great, and there is a latitude allowed in the case of grain cargoes in that regard. But if the hon. gentleman will look at the list of casualties to shipping, reported not only by the underwriters, but in our marine reports year after year, the distressing accidents occurring on the lakes will, I am sure, induce him to make it more necessary to all interested in shipping to take some precautions for the protection of life. I might mention the cases of some accidents which were due to the absence of the shifting board. In 1887 there were the cases of disasters to the *Oriental*, the *California*, the *Asia*, the *Simcoe*, the *Zealand*, the *Columbia*, the *J. Miller* and others, in which, not only large crews, but a great many passengers were lost. In view of the same circumstances facing us as faced the mother country previous to the adoption of this legislation, I think the hon. gentleman's objection that there will be a tax upon vessels engaged in carrying cargoes of oats from Prince Edward Island is not sufficient to induce the House either to make an exception in their case, or to take what would, to my mind, be the more logical course of rejecting the clause altogether.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have had a good deal of experience myself in the business to which my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) refers. Forty years ago I was in the habit of importing oats from Prince Edward Island, and from that up to twenty years ago, I have had a great deal of experience in this line. If the hon. Minister understood the business and knew what he was talking about—I don't say that with any disrespect to him—if he knew the character of the vessels, their size and style, and the working of them, he never would have introduced such a clause as this compelling these people to put in centre-boards. In all the experience I have had, and I have had a great deal, of this particular trade, I never knew a single accident occurring to a vessel on these short coasting voyages from the causes for which the hon. gentleman's preventive measures is supposed to remedy. On the other hand, the hon. gentleman speaks of the centre board being put in for $20.

Mr. TUPPER. I said shifting board.

Mr. MITCHELL. What do you mean by shifting boards?

Mr. TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman not know?

Mr. MITCHELL. I do, but I do not think you know, or you would not say it. I presume by shifting boards the hon. gentleman means the staunches which are put in with plank or boards attached to prevent the cargo from shifting from one side to the other. Lots of these little vessels have not more than 14 or 15 feet of beam, and have no necessity for any centre boards or shifting boards, as the hon. gentleman calls them. I never heard them called shifting boards before. There is no necessity for any such protection for the class of little vessels employed in the trade between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. The hon. gentleman talks of $20 as being a trifling sum. Why, to one of these traders, that would represent a large proportion of their profits. The hon. gentleman proposes to tax shipping industry between Prince Edward Island and the mainland without any reason. The great curse of this country is the useless legislation that is forced upon it. Every new Minister thinks that he must improve on his predecessor.

Mr. TUPPER. This is a Bill of my predecessor.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not care whose it is. Every new Minister thinks he has to improve on the legislation of his predecessor, and we happen sometimes to have deputy ministers who are never satisfied unless they are disturbing the legislation or trade of the country. That Bill is just as necessary as the fifth wheel to a coach. If my hon. friend knows of defective regulations with regard to shipping cargoes of grain to Europe, let him improve them.

Mr. TUPPER. We are doing that.

Mr. MITCHELL. No one will find fault with his attempts to secure greater safety to life on an ocean voyage, but to compel these people, on a voyage of from three to five hours, to pay this tax, is an unnecessary interference with the operations of commercial men which ought not to be countenanced by this House. I am speaking of a subject I know something about. I know the trade and the manner of conducting it. As a shipowner in former years myself, having bought hundreds of these cargoes, having personally inspected them, knowing personally the manner of conducting that business, I know that this Bill, as applied to that trade, is utterly unnecessary. My hon. friend makes a mistake when he applies these general laws relating to Atlantic voyages to voyages of four or five hours duration, and he would do well to inform himself before attempting to pass legislation of that kind and disturbing the existing trade of the country.

Mr. BAIRD. From my experience as a shipper, I am disposed to believe that these provisions which would apply to deep sea or foreign going vessels do not apply with the same aptness to coasting vessels, owing to the fact that the two vessels are entirely different in shape. The coasting vessel as now built, is generally of such a character that she can carry her entire cargo on her deck and sail safely, while the shape of the sea going vessel is narrow and deep, and she is inclined to bear over on her beam ends. I understand, in the case of the latter, that the danger largely arises from careless loading. But take the ordinary

coaster, as she is now built, and bear in mind that one of the requirements of the coasting trade is that the vessel shall be shallow; bear in mind that the physical feature of the whole coast of North and South America is that we have shoal water harbors to encounter, and the American coastwise fleet are largely built with a very great beam, little depth, and considerable length. These vessels will carry, if necessary, their full load on deck and sail safely. A narrow and deep vessel on the coasting trade is almost utterly useless, that is a vessel shaped similar to a sea going vessel, giving the same proportions, and which would have to carry ballast. The coaster carrying ballast is entirely useless. If you load an ordinary coaster full of grain, and it will be found almost impossible to throw her on her beam ends, no matter what storm she may encounter. We must bear in mind that in these short voyages of a few hours, if the vessel is thrown down a little on her beam ends, she would still worry into a place of safety, while when the deep sea vessel, perhaps a few miles from land, falls into that position, it is impossible for her to recover; so that what would apply very aptly to deep water vessels does not apply with the same aptness to coasting vessels, and would become a very great burden. Ship-owners will tell you that preparing for a grain cargo in the harbor of New York is a large item of expense; fitting the vessels to receive the grain, fitting the shifting boards and all the necessary requirements is a large item, and unless the vessel is continued in that trade, it is considered unprofitable to fit her out for the grain trade of a single voyage. All gentlemen engaged in that trade will agree that taking a load of grain and then throwing away these preparations in order to take a cargo of another character is considered a great waste. A coasting vessel rarely takes her second cargo of grain. She delivers her cargo of grain, and her next load is coal or lumber or any other cargo she can get, and perhaps in a year's trade she will not have more than one or two little loads of grain. After careful investigation of this subject, I think it would almost be found impossible in the Atlantic coastwise trade to find a single case where a coastwise vessel came to grief in carrying a cargo of grain. I have had experience in carrying cargoes of corn from the port of New York to St. John and Halifax, and I never knew of a single instance where any precaution has been taken or considered necessary because of loading the vessel in bulk.

Mr. WALDIE. The inland trade of this country upon the lakes is largely with the United States, either in regard to cargoes going from Canada to United States ports, or cargoes coming from United States ports to Canadian ports. The Montreal trade, carried by way of Kingston to Collingwood or other ports on the lakes, is carried in vessels with centre boards. None of them have shifting boards. If this provision is passed, the Canadian vessel will be at a disadvantage in comparison with the American vessel, because it provides that the Canadian vessel is to be subject to inspection by a Customs officer at the port of arrival. My experience in regard to unloading vessels before the regular hours has been that we had to pay a fee to the Customs officer to allow us to unload, and I am certain that, whatever might be the intention in this Bill, we would have to pay a fee.

Mr. TUPPER. There is no authority for it.

Mr. WALDIE. I know that, but the fee is paid all the same. If this examination was made at the port of loading, before the vessel had departed, it would be reasonable and just, because it would afford a means of preventing an accident and of seeing that the vessel was in a seaworthy state before she sailed; but, when the examination is to be made at the port of arrival, I think it is unreasonable and unnecessary, and the effect of it will be to drive our Canadian schooners entirely out of the grain trade from Chicago to Collingwood, Midland and Kingston, and will leave that trade entirely in the hands of the Americans. I think such an act in regard to the large propellors that have mixed cargoes is much more needed than it is in regard to the schooners with centre-boards. The smaller vessels with centre-boards do not need this provision, and it would affect not only the through trade but the Lake Ontario trade, where there are short runs of a few hours, such as that from Toronto to Oswego. In those cases the vessels are filled with grain. They suit their cargo to the size of the vessel, and no shifting boards are required in these centre-board vessels. This Act, being made applicable to all kinds of vessels, is not the legislation which is required, and I do not think it should be passed. If it were passed, I am sure it would remain a dead letter.

Mr. CHARLTON. The necessity for shifting boards on the inland waters does not exist. All sailling vessels on the inland waters have centre-boards, and they are generally vessels of light draft and wide beam. Even without a centre-board, it would not be necessary to make this provision.

Mr. GILLMOR. Does not the centre-board extend the whole length of the keel.

M. CHARLTON. No. I would suggest to the Minister to amend sub-section 2 of section 4 by adding after the word "used" in the first line, "except on vessels having centre-boards."

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman's argument is that there is no danger of the cargo shifting when there is a centre-board. I am otherwise informed by the nautical officers of my department, but, if the hon. gentleman is right no amendment is needed, because there is a provision for other proper precautions to be taken.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is very indefinite. It is a fact that, in all the vessels sailing under the American flag on the lakes, this regulation in regard to shifting boards has never been made. They carry grain in bulk, and, as far as I know, no accident has ever occurred in consequence of that. It is entirely unnecessary to make any requirement that shifting boards should be used on inland waters. It puts our vessels at a disadvantage in competing with the American vessels for business.

Mr. WELSH. I object to one clause in this Bill. I have been engaged in the shipping trade for the last forty years, and I know that the original Act met with the approval of the English Board of Trade. For the last fifteen years, I think, we have been shipping our grain under the present Act, and there have been no accidents reported, as far as I know. Now, we are to bring our ships under the notice of the port warden, and to put shifting boards in, and to go to considerable expense, as the hon. member for Queen's Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has stated, and I quite agree with his remarks all through. I object to this provision unless the Minister can show that there has been a loss of ships or a loss of life or a loss of property through the want of this provision, because this clause will entail great cost on our coasting vessels. It will cost them $40 or $50 or $60 to carry a cargo of grain a distance of 50 miles. You might as well compel the boats on the canal here to have shifting boards to carry a cargo across the river. If the hon. gentleman makes a provision that every ship clearing out of our ports to sea shall be seaworthy and fit to carry its cargo, I have no objection, but this is a tax imposed on the coasting trade, and is working for boodle on the part of the port wardens, and I for one will move that that clause shall be struck out.

Mr. TUPPER. Is not the hon. gentleman aware that vessels engaged in the coasting trade do use these shifting boards?

Mr. WELSH. Not one; I never knew of one.

Mr. TUPPER. I am informed to the contrary by men who have had considerable experience.

Mr. WELSH. I think I have had more experience than any man in this House. If the Minister of Marine can name one instance where there has been a loss of life or property, or damage done to cargoes, for the want of these shifting boards, and all this unnecessary formula in the coasting trade, then I will pay some attention to his wishes. But he has not shown that there was any call for it. Who has cried out for it? When any legislation is wanted there is a cry for it, it is ventilated in the press. But here is a thing that no one asked for, and you know the old proverb says that what is not worth asking for is not worth having. We have not asked for this, we don't want it, and we won't have it.

Mr. TUPPER. It is true the owners of vessels do not press for reforms which compel them to take extra precautions, although a great many vessel owners, as I am fully aware, already take these precautions. But as a rule, they do not ask Parliament to pass laws to make it compulsory under pain and penalties that they should do these things. But an earnest request for this legislation has come from a large body of men who have considerable interest in the matter, organised bodies of sailors, and particularly in the Marine Association of Ontario, have been continuously pressing this question on the attention of the Government and of the public. They have, in meeting after meeting, called attention to our own marine reports, pointing out disasters which were due to the owners of vessels sending unseaworthy ships to sea, or sending out ships in an unseaworthy condition, and pointing out disasters that have occurred from the absence of proper precautions, by shifting-boards or otherwise, to prevent the cargoes from shifting. Therefore, it cannot be said, that this legislation has merely come from a desire of the officials to legislate, or to copy British legislation. But as we are adopting British legislation at the demand of these men whose lives are involved, I think there is ample cause for the Bill.

Mr. WELSH. I do not object, if there is an application from any organised body of seamen or ship owners in the Dominion for the lake service, but I am not aware that there is such an agitation for the river service. My hon. friend will remember that Picton County which he represents, is only about thirty miles from Prince Edward Island, and he knows, or he ought to know, that there are, I suppose, 40 or 50 cargoes of grain shipped across from Prince Edward Island to Pictou and New Glasgow in the course of the summer. These schooners run over with grain and they bring back coal. Now, it is only 30 or 40 or 50 miles from Prince Edward Island, and would it not be a hard thing to put these vessel owners, whose freight only amounts to $40, to an expense of $40 to put in boards to prevent shifting, and then have to tear them all out when they want to bring back a cargo? I say it is a monstrous injustice. I want the Minister to consider how the men of Pictou look at it. If you want to put it in, put it in for the lakes above Montreal, but if you apply it anywhere else, I shall ask a vote on it.

Mr. SPROULE. Because the hon. gentleman has had an experience of 40 years in shipping, and because an accident did not happen during his experience, he thinks this provision is not needed. The hon. member for Queen's said something of a similar nature; but the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) cited no less than 45 cases.

Mr. WELSH. In inland waters; I am speaking of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. This provision applies to the coasting trade, which is much like inland waters. Three or four different accidents occurred in the Georgian Bay and on the upper lakes, every one of which has been caused from the shifting of cargoes and improper loading. One was a schooner coming from Chicago with corn, and it was the belief, so far as information could be gathered, that the loss of that schooner was due to the cargo shifting and upsetting it. The steamer *Simcoe* was lost under somewhat similar circumstances in Lake Huron; and if I remember aright, the *Jane Ward* was lost in the same way. Now these are instances that come under the notice of men in everyday life. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) says he knows all about shipping. Well, he may, because he knows all about everything, but other people know about the value of human life as well as that hon. gentleman, or others who are engaged in this trade. There is an extensive trade being cultivated on the upper lakes, and large loads of grain are being brought down every week during navigation from Port Arthur to Owen Sound. A vessel will carry from 10,000 to 20,000 bushels, and in addition will have a large number of passengers, and still that vessel may have no proper provision for preventing the shifting of that grain, and in this way human life is endangered. The Minister of Marine is endeavoring to provide what experience has shown to be necessary in order to prevent the loss of life. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken says they have their port wardens in Prince Edward Island, but we have none in Owen Sound or Collingwood, we have no person whose duty it is to go on board a vessel and see that she is in a proper condition so as not to endanger human life. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Waldie) spoke of an experience in the upper lakes, I do not know whether he is an interested party or not. If he has experience he must have known that accidents have occurred from this very cause which I have mentioned. Notwithstanding what was said by my hon. friend as to the shifting of the boards, I think that is no guarantee, it is a theory that in practice has not been found to be correct, because if it had been correct these accidents that have occurred in the coasting trade in the inland waters, would not have occurred. This measure has been asked for year after year, and in giving it the Minister is only complying with requests that have been made from time to time to the various Ministers of Marine who have preceded him.

Mr. WALDIE. If this was to remedy the dangers that have been spoken of by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Sproule), I would not oppose it; but it is simply to put an expense upon the owner of the vessel and upon the cargo of the vessel after it has arrived at the port of destination. If the examination took place before the vessel left the port, there would be no objection to it.

Mr. TUPPER. Surely the hon. gentleman will not persist in saying that there is to be any tax of that kind. No officers would dare to impose a fee where none is authorised to be collected. I do not know why the hon. gentleman says that over and over again. I explained before that we do not propose to impose a single sixpence in that way. Some hon. members have urged that it would be a tax to compel the owners to take precautions to prevent their cargoes from shifting, but that would be an expense in their own interest.

Mr. WELSH. Who looks after the shipping of the ports? Because, as far as my experience goes, I have had to pay a tax on every ship I have ever loaded with grain, a tax of from $5 to $15, to the port warden for inspecting the ship and giving a certificate. I know the vessel is allowed to be cleared at the Customs without producing the port warden's certificate for a foreign port. I take it, and I think I fully understand the question, that if this Act goes into operation the port warden will be called in. and I

suppose he will want his usual fee as allowed by the Dominion Act. Am I correct or not on this point?

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is correct to a certain extent. I am not speaking in regard to the Act relating to port wardens. I am quite aware that in certain cases, where a port warden is required, he is allowed certain fees; but the hon. gentleman pointed out that every collector would come on board the ship and demand a fee for inspection. I again repeat that the Act speaks for itself. Collectors when they board ships cannot collect any fee.

Mr. KENNY. The Minister has informed the Committee that those interested in marine matters on the inland waters have asked for this Bill. There seems to be a difference of opinion as regards the necessity of the measure among hon. gentlemen who are very much better informed than I am in all matters connected with inland navigation; but, as regards the Atlantic coasting trade, the Minister has not told us that any requests have been made for this Bill as regards those waters. I must say it will be a very heavy tax if our small coasting vessels are obliged to either line their craft or put in shifting boards for cargoes of grain. While I make that statement from my own knowledge of the business, I am aware that cargoes of grain shipped from Prince Edward Island in vessels of say 30, 50, 60, or 70 tons, very frequently use shifting boards, and those cargoes are often composed of different articles and the boards are used to keep them separate. But even when the cargo is exclusively oats, vessels coming to the port of Halifax, at least, sometimes use shifting boards. I do not say that that is inevitably the case, I say it is very frequently the case. I agree with the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh) who stated that he thought a very great hardship would be imposed if small coasting vessels of 30 or 40 tons going to Pictou to load coal were obliged to put in shifting boards to make that short voyage. But if I understand the Bill aright, I do not think it proposes to oblige such vessels to use shifting boards. I should like the Minister to correct me if I am wrong. As I read the Bill it says: "Shifting boards or other proper precautions," to prevent grain cargoes from shifting.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman will read the main section he will find the other precautions, "shipping grain in bags or in barrels."

Mr. KENNY. The bill says "or otherwise." Who is to decide that question? I suppose it is to be left to the officers of the Government to decide, in some places harbor masters or port wardens and at other points Custom officers. I really do not know if the Bill is necessary as regards the inland waters, and upon that point I do not express any opinion. I do not think it is necessary in our Atlantic waters or for our coasting trade, but I do not think at the same time, it would impose any very great tax on our coasting trade. If it does, I think we should take all the precautions we can to protect our coasters. We know that many of the vessels in the fall make one voyage only, and it would be too costly to fit them up with shifting boards for one voyage. Reference has been made to the expense, $50, $60 or $70. That would not be a very large amount for a voyage from New York to Liverpool, but it would be coasting, for a vessel carrying only a small cargo of oats from Prince Edward Island to the mainland of New Brunswick or Nova Scotia. The rate of freight as we all know is very low, and I will ask the Minister to do all he possibly can to protect these coasting vessels from any unnecessary expense. I cannot remember in my experience an instance where a small coasting vessel was lost owing to the cargo shifting. We have had disasters on the Atlantic from cargoes shifting, but I am not aware of a cargo of grain in a coasting vessel ever having shifted.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not want to place my opinion against the opinion of seafaring men from the eastern Provinces, but among the workingmen who sail the vessels and are employed on the vessels on the inland lakes there is a strong feeling, there is an agitation in fact in favor of a greater extent of protection for their lives, and so far as the Bill has relation to inland waters I will give it my hearty support. It does not, however, go far enough in that direction in some particulars. I do not see why a provision as to deck loads should not be made applicable to the inland waters. As I read the law at present and the amending Act, there is no provision preventing vessels on the inland waters from placing loads on the deck to any extent whatever. I should be very glad if the Minister of Marine could see his way to providing a load line for vessels on the inland waters. As British ships have this load line to-day, I do not see why Canadian shipowners should be allowed to drown their men with any greater freedom than is allowed in England. With respect to the objection to shifting boards on the ground of expense, gentlemen who have spoken in regard to the Atlantic coasting trade may have some good reason for objecting to it, but, as regards the inland waters, the lack of these is a fruitful source of loss of life, and I hope the Minister of Marine will adhere to this provision in regard to the inland waters.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). No doubt from the remarks offered these provisions are required for the inland waters, but the general opinion of hon. members from the Maritime Provinces acquainted with the coasting trade is that it is unnecessary as regards that trade and would involve a large expense. In the opinion of the hon. member for Queen's N.B., the hon. member for Halifax and the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh), all of whom have had experience in shipping matters, this would be a very harsh provision in regard to small vessels running between Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, carrying cargoes of oats from the island to those points. The provisions respecting the inland waters and those relating to the Atlantic coasting trade should constitute separate Bills. That respecting the inland waters would meet with general satisfaction. That relating to our coasting trade would be an interference with it, and it is not necessary.

Mr. MULOCK. I quite agree with the remarks of the Minister of Marine who, when asked if any petitions had been presented by ship-builders in favor of the Bill, replied that petitions had been received in favor of the Bill from those who navigated the vessels. Speaking only from public opinion in the inland portions of the Dominion, I entirely sympathise with the object aimed at by the Bill. I do not know whether the provisions are adequate to meet the case in point, and I do not intend to offer an opinion upon that question; but it is safe to say that the absence of the protection proposed has been the cause of the loss of many valuable lives on the inland waters. We are developing an immense inland fleet for the carrying of cargoes on our great inland seas, cargoes of shifting freight, such as wheat and grain. We are building up an enormous inland port of shipment for grain at the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we also have a vast number of Canadian vessels carrying wheat from Duluth, Chicago and other American ports, and there is scarcely a limit to the extent to which that trade can be developed. It must be in the memory of many hon. gentlemen here, and I am sure that my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson) will remember, the loss of great vessels owing entirely to the shifting of cargoes. I think, speaking from memory, the propeller *Asia* foundered in the Georgian Bay from that cause alone. It is impossible for those huge propellers carrying twenty or thirty thousand bushels of grain, in a heavy sea such as there sometimes is in the inland waters, to "wear" without being cast over on their beam ends, and in such a case, if the cargo shifts the vessel cannot right, and down she goes. It has been

proved that in consequence of the enforcement of the British law, the risks from shifting cargoes have been reduced almost to nothing, and if they have had that experience on the salt water, why should we not have the same experience on our inland seas. For my part, whether any one has petitioned for this measure or not, we have the experience of the good done by a similar law in England, and if anything can be done in the same direction for the benefit of our people, it is the duty of the Minister, the duty of the Government, and the duty of this House, to do what can be done. It may be, and I dare say it is the case, that there should be a discrimination between what would be a proper regulation for vessels of large tonnage, whether propelled by steam or wind, and the case of the small schooners plying along our coast. There may be different rules to be applied, but the object aimed at by this Bill will, I think, have the sympathy of the public, and will be to the benefit of the owners and the navigators of the inland shipping.

Mr. FREEMAN. There certainly should be different rules, as has been stated, applied to ships on the seaboard and ships on the inland waters. On the southern coast of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island we have long ago learned the art of loading ships, but it appears that in the inland waters the present generation are just learning that science, and it would be greatly to be regretted if, because we understand that work, that our knowledge should in any way interfere with the proposal to ensure greater safety for life and security for cargoes. I do not see that we could be at all injured by this Bill. I would object to it very strongly if our coasting vessels were required by this Bill to put in any kind of shifting board, but there is nothing in the Act which I think would interfere with our present mode of loading ships on the seaboard. I venture to say that there is not a cargo of oats which comes from Prince Edward Island—and this kind of grain is mostly carried coastwise in Nova Scotia—that is not in some way or to some extent secured by shifting boards, and the coasters put in such shifting boards as they deem necessary for the safety of their cargo. I think, as I said before, that there is nothing in this Bill which will interfere with their carrying on their work as they have hitherto done. I have some forty or fifty years experience with vessels, and I do not know of a case in which a coasting vessel has been lost, or in which she has suffered damage by reason of the want of shifting boards. As has been well observed by the member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) this has occurred very frequently in ships crossing the Atlantic, but not in our coasting vessels.

Mr. MULOCK. They are vessels of larger tonnage.

Mr. FREEMAN. They are larger no doubt and sufficient care is not taken in stowing cargoes on the larger ships, but in the smaller ships we have no such accidents. If after a close examination there should be found anything in this Bill which would interfere with our coasting vessels it should be eliminated. As has been observed the profit of the little vessels of the Maritime Provinces for carrying oats is exceedingly small. They can scarcely sustain themselves on the freight they are getting now for carrying these cargoes and if any additional tax was imposed it would become very embarrassing indeed. It would also be a great annoyance to those vessels if officers could go aboard and indicate any kind of shifting board or the extent to which those shifting boards should be used. They might require stationary shifting boards, or indeed an officer inclined to be troublesome might put these vessels to a great deal of expense which would certainly be very much to be deplored. I think the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Welsh) who is better acquainted with this matter than I am, although I claim to have some acquaintance with shipping and the carrying of cargoes, if he sees anything in this Bill that would interfere with our coasting trade and would point it out, I feel assured that the Minister would be very willing to correct the Bill in that regard. I am sure the hon. gentleman will not oppose any reform that the fresh-water sailors require. I think it would be very wrong indeed if he would interfere with the law being as stringent as possible to prevent them destroying life and destroying their cargoes. I am sure we have no desire to do anything of the kind, but let different rules be provided for the different interests. Don't allow us in the Maritime Provinces to be hampered because the men in the inland waters do not know how to take care of their cargoes. It is natural for us down there to know how to stow ships, and it is natural for us to protect our own men. It is as natural for us to protect our men who go on the salt water as it is to protect our families in the house. We look as much after the one as we do after the other. It is not only our interest but it is part of our conscience to do so, and we do not need to be forced to do it. But with regard to those gentlemen on the inland waters, give them laws, make them look after their ships, and sailors, and property, and compel them to do it if they will not do it of their own free will, as we do in the Maritime Provinces. I trust that there is nothing in this Bill to interfere with our coasting vessels, and if there is I should oppose the Bill. I do not see that the Bill interferes with us, and I will offer no opposition to it.

Mr. TUPPER. I have a proposition to make with reference to the suggestion at the earlier part of this discussion of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). There seems to be a strong desire to strike the word "oats" out of the definition so that Act would not apply to those cargoes. I am informed by gentlemen acquainted with the shipping trade on the inland waters, who are most anxious that this Bill should pass, that it affects them so slightly that they would be willing to accept that compromise, the word "oats" being struck out; and if that meets the sense of the House, we might adopt that course.

On section 3,

Mr. TUPPER. The only alteration this section makes in the law is in defining unseaworthiness.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). You make an agent responsible.

Mr. TUPPER. That is the English provision, and I felt delicate in changing it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). When a ship comes into St. John, the agent never sees the vessel, but sends it to sea as soon as the captain says it is ready. Under this provision the agent would be obliged to go down and examine the vessel, and the result would be that he would charge a double commission.

Mr. TUPPER. That is the present law of course, and it seems to be right. If the agent sends a ship to sea without taking any step to ascertain whether it is seaworthy or not he should be punished as well as others.

Mr. WELSH. I think myself that the agent knows very little about a ship. They do not know whether it is in good order or bad order, and, therefore, I think it would be improper to hold them responsible. Make the owners and the masters liable. I think the Minister should add a clause to this Bill to provide that some person should be appointed to look after the ships. In England there is, in every shipping port, a board of trade whose duty it is to look after every ship that comes in and goes out of the port, and to see that it is seaworthy. In this Bill I see a clause which I do not like. If a vessel is to be fitted up to take a cargo the port warden should have instructions to see that she is in proper order before she takes the cargo on board.

Mr. TUPPER. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman should wait until we get through the Bill and then present that as a substantive clause.

Mr. WELSH. Very well; but you see the position you are putting a ship owner and master in. He takes his cargo from one port and he arrives at another, where he is subject to another officer coming on board who says to him: "Give me $5 or $10, or I will report you."

Mr. O'BRIEN. There were a number of petitions presented to this House by the Knights of Labor from all parts of the country, in the early part of the Session, everyone of which contained a special request to Parliament on the subject of the safety of sailors on the inland waters, and special stress was laid on the load line and some other particulars. It shows how much interest is felt in the subject when this important body should have taken the matter up as they did. I think the trouble on the inland waters is not so much from bad loading as from the class of vessels employed, and I think the Marine Department will have to go further than this Bill goes before they will satisfy the public as to the condition of the inland marine. It is from the build of the vessels much more than from the stowage of the cargo that the great disasters have occurred. That has arisen from the class of vessels which have been employed in navigating the canals and are built expressly for that purpose. We know those vessels are unfit for navigating the large lakes, and some day or other, and the sooner the better, the Marine Department will have to consider very carefully whether something cannot be done to have a much more closer inspection of the hulls upon the inland waters and adopt some rule for the certifying of vessels for the different branches of trade in which they are engaged. It is evident to anyone who knows anything about navigation that the class of vessels built to pass through the locks in canals never can be made suitable for navigating our great lakes.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the attention of the hon. the Minister was drawn to the Plimsoll Bill defining what a vessel should contain.

Mr. TUPPER. May I ask the hon. gentleman to reserve that question for discussion after these clauses are passed, because that is a portion of the Bill which was eliminated altogether.

Mr. EDGAR. Those lines are not.

Mr. TUPPER. I will explain the reason why it is impossible for us to do what the hon. gentleman requires, unless we are able to guarantee to the shipowners that when a ship is retained improperly they will be refunded all the damages incurred in consequence of the detention.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). This clause is loosely drawn. It may be in accordance with the English Act, but you leave undefined the expressions "overloading or unloading or unseaworthiness"—and those expressions convey very little definite idea as to the condition of the vessel. I fully agree that if we are to have that protection which is necessary on the inland lakes, we ought to have the clause made sufficiently compulsory. I sympathise with those who have been advocating the interests of shipowners and captains, but there are others who are equally interested. The Minister ought to explain what he means by "overloading or underloading or unseaworthy." Every class of the community is affected by this Bill. Our sailors are important to us, and they are as deeply interested as the owner or captain, and I hope the hon. gentleman will see that this clause is drawn so that it may be clearly understood.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The object of the hon. gentleman no doubt we all approve, and the discussion is limited to the question whether or not the language of the section is too vague. If a vessel goes to sea in an unseaworthy condition, the owner, master, or agent is liable to be prosecuted for a misdemeanor, but who is to determine whether her condition was unseaworthy or not? The magistrate before whom the owner may be prosecuted may be a man who knows nothing at all of the subject

Mr. TUPPER. This is not punishable by summary conviction.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has already adopted a line of legislation which attains to a large extent the end he has in view, but by different machinery. The Port Warden's Act provides, in the 14th section, that vessels going to sea must previously be inspected by the port warden, who shall report as to whether she is in a fit state to proceed to sea or not.

Mr. TUPPER. That only applies to some ports.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But if the hon. gentleman would extend the operation of this law to vessels not included in it, it seems to me he would meet the end he has in view of preventing any ship going to sea in an unseaworthy condition. The port warden would examine her, and if she were in a fit condition to leave he would give his certificate to that effect. If not, she would be compelled to remain in port. The enlargement of the existing law would therefore meet the hon. gentleman's view better perhaps than the transcript of the Plimsoll Act. The Plimsoll Act in England is worked along with the machinery of the Board of Trade; but under this Bill, although you provide that a man who sends a ship to sea in an unworthy condition is punishable as for a misdemeanor, you provide no machinery to prevent his sending her to sea in that state. You may prosecute him afterwards, but there would be difficulty in proving that the vessel was in an unseaworthy condition when she left port.

Mr. TUPPER. There is no necessity to touch that Act at present, the only object of the section to which I am alluding being to remove the vagueness that the hon. gentleman from Elgin (Mr. Wilson) has pointed out, and to meet difficulties that have arisen in prosecutions under that section. All I am doing is extending the word "unseaworthy" so as to include what I have said here is taken from the English Act in this regard:

"If it is unseaworthy so that the life of any person is likely to be endangered thereby or by reason of overloading or underloading or improper loading or by reason of being insufficiently manned or from any other cause, is guilty of a misdemeanor."

That is the only object of this section. It does not change the officers or appoint new ones or give the officers further powers, but removes the vagueness which exists as to when an infraction of the law occurs. With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for South Elgin (Mr. Wilson) it is impossible to state the exact circumstances when a ship is insufficiently manned or unseaworthy, because that will depend altogether on the circumstances in each case. That kind of case is left, as every other case is, to the criminal procedure, and evidence must be adduced that the crew is insufficient. That will have to be shown in the ordinary way by men competent to testify, but we could not lay down a hard and fast line in that respect for every ship.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I agree with the Minister of Marine, that it is very difficult to lay down a general rule, and I observe that this section provides that no prosecution shall take place without the consent of the Minister of Marine, and that is to a certain extent a protection. In regard to the agent, section 6 of the old Act says that the agent must have taken all reasonable means to see that the ship was seaworthy, and was ignorant of the unseaworthiness.

Mr. TUPPER. That is in this Act in different language.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The business of the agents is not to ensure the seaworthiness of the vessel, but to look after her equipment and her cargo. The master of the vessel is the person to look after the seaworthiness. Probably the agent has never seen the vessel.

Mr. TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would prefer these words:

"Every person who sends or attempts to send or is a party to sending or attempting to sending."

The hon. gentleman says that the agent does not send the vessel to sea, and then he could not be punished.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think the language of the old Act was better.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the language is all right as it is.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The word "person" would include the agent, and practically the agent sends the ship to sea. If my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Lovitt) sends a ship to sea, he would depend upon the master to see that the ship is seaworthy. The master would apply to the agent to ship his crew if he wanted any, but the agent has nothing to do with the seaworthiness of the vessel. I think the language of the old Act should be adopted in reference to the agent.

Mr. TUPPER. I think that is the loop hole through which every person has crawled in the past, and which I want to get rid of in this Act. Whether a ship or an old hulk is sent to sea, they plead ignorance and get scot-free. Under this language, no one could be punished who was not actively concerned is sending the ship to sea.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It is the agent who sends the ship to sea.

Mr. KENNY. If the agent is guilty of gross carelessness, he should be punished.

Mr. WELDON (St John). If the agent is to be held responsible, my hon. friend from Yarmouth, for example, will have to pay a large commission, because an agent will not look after the seaworthiness of a ship for 2½ per cent. commission. If, in regard to any of the large ships at the port of St. John, the agent said to the master that he wanted to have the ship surveyed by the port warden, probably at a cost of $20 or $30, he would lose his commission.

Mr. TUPPER. The agent will not incur a penalty if he has nothing to do with sending the ship to sea. The class of agents we want to reach and to punish is the agent who sends a ship to sea in an unseaworthy condition without being able to prove that he used reasonable means to send her in a seaworthy condition. That man ought to be punished. If it is wrong for the owner to do that, it is equally wrong for the agent to do it with the co-operation of the owner, and this imposes upon the agent the duty of seeing that what is imposed upon him by the owner should not be anything which the owner would not dare to do.

Mr. LOVITT. I have nothing to say about the wording of this Act, which the legal gentlemen can attend to; but the agent pays the bills and loads the ship and sends her to sea. If any agent came to me and said a ship was not seaworthy, I should tell him to mind his own business. I am not objecting to this Act, and I think all this talk about it has been all wrong. No agent interferes with any vessel of mine, there is a Lloyd surveyor who looks after it. Whether the agent sends her to sea or any body else, I am not prepared to say.

Mr. EDGAR. Would it not simplify matters very much to follow the words of the English Act of 1876, and leave it "every person who sends or attempts to send"?

Mr. TUPPER. I do not object to that.

On sub-section 1, section 7,

Mr. TUPPER. This section concerning deck loads I am not particularly anxious about.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not object to this clause, but I would like to know why the provisions of the general Act as to deck loads are not applicable to ships in the inland waters; because it seems to me that overloading on decks is one of the most dangerous things in connection with lake navigation.

Mr. TUPPER. This was to meet the British legislation which only concerned the Atlantic at certain seasons of the year. As the hon. gentleman will see, between the months of October and March our ships cannot enter their ports unless complying with the law as it stands in the Act referred to. This is a similar provision, and the reason we do not extend it to inland waters is because the gales do not prevail at the same time on the lakes and in the Atlantic.

Mr. EDGAR. There are storms at certain seasons on the inland waters, and there is overloading on the decks. I want to know why there is not a provision for the inland waters?

Mr. TUPPER. In my limited experience there has been no representation calling attention to that matter from either Boards of Trade or from the Knights of Labor, or the Trades Congresses who are concerned in the lives of the sailors. They have drawn attention to other provisions, but so far as my recollection goes they have not urged any legislation regarding deck loads on the inland waters, or if so, their arguments have escaped my attention. But there is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman says, and it will require a careful report from experts and those familiar with navigation, if the legislation is to take place.

Mr. McNEILL. I can assure the Minister that the question of deck loads is one of great importance indeed. I may say that opposite the windows of my own house, a vessel was lost with 30 sailors, simply by reason of deck loads.

Mr. McKAY. There is just as much need of legislation regarding deck loads as there is for anything else. There is quite a feeling on this point existing among mariners who navigate vessels on the inland waters, and who think that their lives should be protected just as much from over loading on deck as from improper loading in holds. I think the Minister would do a good act if he would insert that provision.

Mr. DAWSON. I have a statement from the Chairman of the Knights of Labor, complaining of deck loads and saying that freight is sometimes piled 12 feet high on decks in inland waters, which renders it extremely dangerous to the men on board.

Mr. TUPPER. I think, I also, received a document from the Welland organisation calling attention to the subject of deck loads, but there is no suggestion in it as to what would be the proper months. In reply to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Welsh) I might state that this clause is entirely due to a report from the Collector of Customs, St. John, N.B., wherein he states that while he is unable to give the names of vessels he can say they have evaded the present law, which simply says "from any port in Canada to any port in Europe," by clearing for Africa. Of course, they cannot go into a British port, but they go to ports in France or Spain and in that way evade the present Act.

Mr. EDGAR. Since the Minister stated he had not received information as to details, I have turned up some in-

formation I received from the same resource to which he referred. That organisation states that in their opinion all vessels should be prohibited from carrying deck loads higher than the rail top after the 1st September of each year. So they have considered the matter, and representations have been made to members of the House, and they say that piling deck loads of lumber or timber 12 or 15 feet high should be stopped. I should hope so. I suppose at this period of the Session it is not possible for sufficient consideration to be given to this matter so as to frame a provision with respect to deck loads, entirely suitable for the inland waters, but I should like an assurance from the Minister that he will have the matter considered and see what can be done at the earliest possible moment another Session.

Mr. TUPPER. I certainly will do so. While that organisation may have mentioned the months, which I had forgotten, I could not ask Parliament to act on that statement. I would, of course, have to receive the results of enquiries made by the proper officers before I could represent to Parliament that certain months would be the proper months.

Mr. ELLIS. I desire simply to point out that this regulation respecting deck loads interferes with a very important trade. I think the regulations with respect to deck loads on ocean vessels are entirely too rigid.

Mr. TUPPER. It is the law of the land.

Mr. WELDON. Two years ago the rates of insurance were 1 per cent. and 3 per cent. on deck loads. To-day the underwriters take both at the same rate.

Mr. LOVITT. Does not the hon. gentleman want to amend section 8 of the old Act?

Mr. TUPPER. The point is well taken. That is the clause relating to penalties, and it will have to be added.

Mr. BAIRD. I offer my strongest objection to the words "South America" being inserted after "West Indies." It will strike a dangerous blow to the carrying trade of New Brunswick. It must be borne in mind that the vessel best adapted for the carrying trade of South America is a broad beamed vessel of shallow draft, and one which can carry almost its entire cargo upon the deck, and if it is deprived of the privilege of carrying a deck load, that Act will drive the trade to American ports. We hope to build up a large carrying trade in lumber to South America, and the developments in that country go to show that it will become a large consumer of our lumber; and if development and consumption go on at the present ratio, I am advised that South America in the next twenty years will require the forests of North America to carry on her building operations. About a hundred million feet of lumber the product of Canada is transported in bond by rail to ports in the United States, chiefly Boston and Portland, and from there shipped to South America. We hope to divert that trade, and to build up for ourselves a large export trade with South America. This is a trade that has sprung up within the last few years, and, indeed, principally within the last two years, and we expect to do a large portion of this trade from St. John. The vessel best adapted is the broad beam coastwise schooner of perhaps 300 tons, which has a greater beam than a thousand ton foreign going vessel, but while she has a broad beam she has a draft of only 8 or 9 feet. She is able to carry the bulk of her load on deck, and is not restricted in this matter in ports in the United States, for in Portland and Boston she can carry her deck load without any restriction. Such a vessel of 300 tons could carry 400,000 feet of lumber. The restriction as to deck load would reduce that capacity about 20 per cent. At present a vessel sailing for Rosario would receive for freight, with a deck load, $8,000, which if reduced by 20 per cent would be brought down to $6,400. That would be the difference between loading at Portland or St. John. It is unreasonable to expect that the trade will thrive and prosper and develop as it has promised to do during the last two years, and particularly during the last few months, under such restrictions; but if we expect to do that trade we must be able to compete successfully with the people in the United States. If vessels cannot load as favorably at St. John as at Porland or Calais, they will go to the American ports. While I cannot appeal to the experience of the Minister, I appeal to his intelligence, and I ask him to give consideration to the question from this standpoint. If my statement cannot be contradicted, I hold that my request is a reasonable one, and the words "South America" should be left out of this Act.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not think the request is made at a reasonable time because the hon. gentleman's argument is contrary to the object and intention of the Act that has been on the Statute-book for some time, and had not been challenged until he now challenges it. His argument is against the provisions of section 7 and against the experience of those who are accustomed to this trade and who say that for a certain voyage at a certain time of the year it is dangerous in the extreme to sail ships with those deck loads. I do not think it is a fair time to make this suggestion when an amendment of this kind is proposed which does not change the present law but renders it more perfect. It is not the proper time to propose a radical change such as he proposes which is contrary to the spirit of both the Imperial Act and our Act in regard to these deck loads. As to the lower rate, and so on, for these voyages it is doubtless caused to a great extent by this legislation which prevents the ships sailing in these waters at dangerous times of the year with their cargoes stowed in a certain manner. I thank the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Lovitt) for his very important suggestion and I find we can adopt it by inserting in section 4 after sub-section 1 and section 7 the words "and section 8 of the said Act."

Mr. KENNY. As regards the remarks made by my hon. friend from Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird), it is important for us to consider that to-day in the United States these vessels, to which my hon. friend refers, can take any deck load that the master of the vessel thinks it is safe for him to carry, and that when we try to bring this trade to our own ports we are met with this legislation. It is evident that the model of vessels to which my hon. friend refers is very different from those which we have been building in the Province of Nova Scotia. I judge from the remarks he has made that they are specially built in New Brunswick to compete with the American vessels of the same model, and if in our own ports the owners of these vessels are more restricted in loading than they are in the United States, then of necessity those vessels will go to the United States ports and seek business there. I consider that the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Baird) is well worthy of consideration. It is very well for us to follow the English legislation, but we must remember that that English legislation was adopted long before vessels were specially built for this trade, which from what I have heard this evening appears to be a comparatively modern business. I think we should endeavor as far as possible to meet the suggestion of my hon. friend from Queen's, N.B.

Mr. TUPPER. Surely the hon. gentleman does not suppose that a radical change such as that which he proposes should be adopted without the slightest enquiry or any notice having been given, which would enable proper and due enquiry to be made?

Mr. ELLIS. Are you not extending your law to include ports which were not before included; you are therefore

limiting the operations of our vessels and you are curtailing, to a certain extent, trade which they are now able to carry on, at various periods of the year.

Mr. TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman means that we should drop this sub-section 2 of course the argument is in order, but the hon. gentleman's argument is just as strong and he urges it with as great earnestness against the word "West Indies" in the present Act. If a vessel is not allowed to go to the West Indies but as he claims, is allowed to go to South America, it seems an extraordinary argument that while he approves of a certain cargo at a certain time of the year being carried to South America he argues against vessels being allowed to go to the West Indies. That argument is something very hard for one not in the coasting trade to understand.

Mr. McKAY. It seems to me there is something peculiar about this. The Dominion Government have had an agent in South America trying to build up a trade between the Dominion and that country, and now we are by this legislation trying to restrict that trade. I think that there is a good deal in what the member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) says in reference to this special trade in lumber between the port of St. John and South America, and it would be well worthy of consideration by the Minister.

Mr. TUPPER. We do not propose to restrict the trade at all. The hon. gentleman will see that it is deemed by nautical experts unsafe to take a cargo loaded in a certain way—the manner of the loading is specified in section 5 of the Act. The hon. gentleman does not suppose that for the purpose of making a trade with South America that we should repeal all these laws that have been framed with a view of preserving the safety of the ships and the cargo and the lives of the crew, and change it all because there is an opportunity to send more ships and more lumber to South America.

Mr. BAIRD. It is my impression that South America is not now restricted and as the hon. Minister put it, at certain seasons in the year these restrictions come into force. That season of the year is the very season when the whole business of South America is done and to adopt this provision, as I said before, will be simply to change our vessels from the port of St. John, N.B., to the ports of Portland and Boston. You can do that most successfully under the provisions of this Act if they are adopted. I say that a vessel will not load at the port of St. John, N.B., if 20 per cent. of her carrying capacity is taken away from her. You may talk about the safety of those vessels and you may say that the e laws apply in Great Britain, but you will find that our ships engaged in this trade are of different construction. Their vessels are narrow and deep and the law that would apply to them would not apply here at all. When you go to the ports in South America you will find that every river is guarded by a sand bar which is thrown up by the action of the ocean and you have to have shallow vessel to get over that. You will find that in the United States six millions of the tonnage coastwise is of vessels that have been specially built for this particular trade and you will find that the shallow vessel is worth three times what the deep water vessel is worth. In the United States, with their experience—having built up that great trade while they let their ocean carrying trade go altogether—they have guarded with jealous care their coastwise business and they have built it up to be the greatest home trade that can be found in the world, three times greater than the home carrying trade of the United Kingdom, and Canada comes and places herself under a set of laws which prevent her competing in that trade. It is more profitable than any deep-water trade. The coaster spends her money among our own people; the foreign trade vessel spends it abroad, and she may not return for two or three years. There is a vast difference between the two classes of vessels in their profitableness to the country to which they belong; and if we expect to be able to do the carrying trade alongside of such neighbors as those we have to-day, if we expect to carry the 100,000,000 feet of lumber that goes out of Canada in bond to the United States and is shipped from American ports, if we expect that the Short Line Railway is going to amount to anything, we have to carry on as good terms, or even on more favorable terms, than it is carried from Portland and Boston. Not one vessel owner in Canada will be found willing to load his vessel at St. John when he can go to Portland and be able to carry 20 per cent. more cargo, and do it with comparative safety. The idea of losing a vessel from these deck loads is all a matter of moonshine. Everyone who knows vessels knows that they are not lost from such causes. If Mr. Plimsoll could see an American built vessel he would condemn her at once, because he would say she had too small a draft of water; but we find that these vessels outrival us in age and in every way; we find that after they are twenty years old they are still doing their work well. Nothing has been said to show that the trade is not safely done, and it is growing to a wonderful extent; and unless we are prepared to do it on as favorable terms as our neighbors we shall have to leave it alone altogether.

Mr. TUPPER. I have to remind the Committee, as from the remarks of the hon. gentleman they would not imagine, that under the Bill and the amendments, ships are allowed during this particular period to go even to the West Indies and South America with their cargoes of lumber. But all that is said is that when sailing after the 15th of November or before the 16th of March in any year, a ship, if an open decked vessel, shall not permit any cargo to be above the deck rail more than six inches or above the deck more than four feet six inches. If that is a good and proper law, which Parliament in its wisdom has seen fit to place on the Statute-book, the provision I mention is equally necessary and proper.

Mr. ELLIS. But it is not wise.

Mr. TUPPER. I said I was not particularly in love with this section. It was suggested that it was necessary to make the Act on our Statute-book proper and sufficient, and if the navigation to the West Indies at that time of year is such as to require certain loading of lumber, surely the vessel should not be permitted to sail during the same season to South American ports. But I will not press that if the Committee does not favor it.

Mr. FREEMAN. I think the difference lies here, that the vessels for South American ports are of a different build altogether from other vessels; they are constructed to carry a cargo on deck, while others are deep in the hold, and cannot carry a cargo on deck. In former days American vessels carried more than half their cargo on deck, and there are American vessels still doing that, and they are insured as cheaply by the insurance companies as deep vessels are, and perform their voyages quite as successfully. In the United States as well as in our own country ships are now being built to suit particular trades; freights have become so low that that must be done; and vessels which have to go up the shallow rivers in South America require to be built with very little draft of water. If you send a a cargo there in a deep vessel, it has to be carried up the rivers in steamers or in flat-bottomed vessels. The whole matter lies in the fact that vessels are built specially for carrying deck loads, and others for carrying cargoes under the deck, and one class is as safe as the other.

Mr. RIOPEL. These last remarks go to show that for the purpose of protecting trade it would be necessary to do away with the latter part of the clause. I do not see that we could remove that part of the clause and do justice to

the other portions of the trade. As several hon. gentlemen appear inclined to remove a portion of the clause for the sake of a particular class of trade, I would suggest that the whole clause be struck out.

Mr. LOVITT. We have all been arguing about the deck load system. Hon. gentlemen say that the deck load does not amount to anything, but it does for the underwriter. I do not think the underwriters have improved the English law; whether it is for us to frame a law like that, it is for us to decide.

On section 6,

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This section gives Customs house officers, who, under ordinary circumstances, can have very imperfect knowledge of the condition of a ship, too much power and authority. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman should insert a clause to enable the ship owner, in the event of his being dissatisfied with the decision of the Customs house officer, to have the right of appeal to the port warden or some other authority.

Mr. TUPPER. The Customs house officer has no authority at all except to go on board, inspect the ship, and make his report. The Minister has no power to take action except in the ordinary way, so that no injustice can be done to anyone. The evidence of the Custom house officer will be given in court and the owner of the ship will have every opportunity to bring up other evidence in rebuttal, when the court will be called on to decide between the two.

Mr. EDGAR. Before the Committee rises, I would like to hear from the hon. Minister of Marine whether he is not going to insert a provision analogous to the English provision with regard to load lines. In England these provisions have been retained after a severe struggle, and are found very useful. All British ships require them, and I would like to know what good reason the Minister can give why in our inland waters vessels should not be required to have load lines.

Mr. TUPPER. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has brought up this point. I am glad indeed to have been able to go as far as this Bill provides in the right direction, in the interest of a large number of mariners. But the question the hon. gentleman raises is one that has been carefully considered by my predecessor and myself. Last year provisions similar to this which he has suggested were inserted.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister is wrong in that.

Mr. TUPPER. I am speaking of the load line. We may differ as to the way that is treated, but the provisions of the old Bill were framed with a view to establish a load line. The difficulty is this: It is not, possibly, an insurmountable difficulty, but it is a very great difficulty, as we have not the same protection in Canada for the capital invested as they have in England. In England they have experienced and trained officers at every port, and they go to each ship, and settle the load line, and say where it is to be, and their word is law for the time being. They can stop or detain a ship, no matter how valuable the cargo may be, if the rule in regard to the load line is not complied with. If they do that improperly, there is a redress in England, and the Board of Trade is responsible and indemnifies the owners, and very properly so. There is a very extensive and a very expensive machinery in connection with that. A judge sits with assessors, and a careful and minute investigation is made in regard to the facts, and, in the end, should the owner be able to show that his ship was improperly detained, he is indemnified. In one year £30,000 and costs were paid over to owners for the improper detention of ships by even these highly trained officers; but it is in consequence of that difficulty that this Government has not felt justified in asking Parliament to pass similar legislation here. We have an immense number of ports, and at present we do not feel that we could ask for the establishment of a fund by which owners could be indemnified for the improper detention of ships by officers of the Government.

Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

BELLEVILLE HARBOR.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 116) respecting the Harbor of Belleville, in the Province of Ontario.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 8,

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What expenditure is contemplated under this Bill?

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that there is no change made in the present rates of dues. It is simply a transfer of these dues from the town to the commissioners.

Mr. BURDETT. I would like to have it understood that the Government is to take charge of the harbor and put it in proper repair and take the dues.

Mr. TUPPER. This Bill is simply putting the harbor of Belleville in commission in the same way as other harbors are.

Mr. BURDETT. Supposing the dues are not sufficient to do this work, should the Government borrow the money or the city?

Mr. TUPPER. I think the receipts are sufficient for the work.

Mr. BURDETT. In some instances, I think the tolls are too high, when there is so much competition between the railways and the vessels. I understand the commissioners will have power to regulate the tolls, but that they are not to be less than they are under the old Act.

Mr. TUPPER. They can reduce them.

Mr. BURDETT. There is an island in the mouth of the harbor, Mill Island, which is disappearing to some extent. It was formerly used by a lumbering company as a mill site, and, since the mill has been removed, the island is breaking away. I should like to know if the Government intend to look after that island to prevent its disappearance. I understand that a dam is to be built out to the island.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman ought to remember, as he lives in the city, that the appropriation made by Parliament last year was on condition that the city should expend a certain amount of money to protect the island to which he has referred. When the Government proceeded to dredge the harbor out of the appropriation which was made, the city not being in a position just then to advance the money, the Minister of Public Works stopped operations, as he had no power to go on. The present Bill, as my hon. friend knows, is introduced by the Government. Our friend from West Hastings (Mr. Corby) has not charge of the Bill. It is a Government Bill, to place the harbor of Belleville in precisely the same position as that of Three Rivers, and that of other harbors which are placed under the control of commissioners, with power to borrow money upon the income by fees of the harbor, to enable them to build the work which has been going on for some two or three years. I am well aware of the interest my hon.

friend has in the city of Belleville, and his knowledge of the manner in which this work has been conducted in the past, has necessitated the action which has been taken at the instance of the mayor and corporation, and every man in the city of Belleville who desires to see that harbor improved.

Mr. BURDETT. I am not disputing with the Minister of Customs as to the principle of the Bill. I quite agree that the city ought to keep its engagements with the Government and provide the money that they agreed to provide to improve the harbor. I see the name of the Minister of Marine is on the back of this Bill, but the Minister of Customs will remember that the name of the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby) is upon the back of the first Bill that was introduced relating to the same matter. I see no objection to the principle of the Bill at all. In future it will be well to understand that the Government has control over it, so that there will be no more bickerings in the city as there have been in the past.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

WESTERN COUNTIES RAILWAY.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 127) respecting the Western Counties Railway.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I mentioned the other day to the Minister of Justice, in connection with this Bill, the remarks which had been made very generally respecting the advertisement regarding the contract. The advertisement came out on the 19th March, and tenders were called for; notice was given that the specifications could be seen on the 28th of March, and that tenders would be received on the 8th of April, allowing eleven days. It did appear to those who had looked into the matter that eleven days was a very short time to allow competitors to examine plans and specifications for a work involving an expenditure of half a million dollars; and it did look upon the face of it, as if there was some intention on the part of the Government, or some predetermination of the part of the department, to give that work to some parties who had the favor of the Administration. It was not considered by those who were competent to speak upon the subject, that the time was sufficient for the competitors or contractors to come here, and examine the plans and specifications and put in their tenders. With regard to the Bill, of course, it is all right.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not know until the hon. gentleman mentioned it the other day, that the time had been as short as he said. I will make enquiries and be able to explain before the third reading of the Bill. There has been no predetermination, and I am not aware that any Minister has been aware that so short a period was allowed. The hon. gentleman remembers the explanation I gave when the Bill was introduced. We confirmed in 1887 the agreement with this company, which authorised the Minister of Railways to enter upon the work and spend the $500,000 which was provided for in the agreement for the completion of the railway between Annapolis and Digby. In order to remove any doubts it has been considered desirable that there should be a parliamentary authority, irrespective of the confirmation of the agreement for the execution of this work, and to make applicable the Expropriation Act, the Railways Act, and other enactments bearing upon the subject. It may be necessary, in order to accomplish some slight diversions, to expropriate some small pieces of land.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has this contract been awarded to which the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) referred? I suppose the First Minister has charge of that business at present.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the contract been awarded?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because there is no doubt that so short a time as 11 days would make the tendering a farce.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will ascertain about that.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—CONVEYANCE OF LANDS.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 128) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands in British Columbia.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the Minister explain the reason why the Government are re-conveying these lands to the Province of British Columbia?

Mr. DEWDNEY. As I explained the other day, this is a small portion of land which it is proposed to re-convey to British Columbia, on account of a misunderstanding that arose at the time the railway belt was conveyed to the Dominion. British Columbia was entitled to the pre-emptions and land grants made at that time, and this portion about which some misunderstanding arose was in what are known as the Sumas lands. An arrangement had been made with Mr. Derby to reclaim a certain section of land there for which he was to receive 45,000 acres. He failed in his contract, and this was at a time subsequent to the arrangement with respect to the railway belt. It was supposed, when the settlement Bill was passed, an arrangement was made by Sir Alexander Campbell, who was sent over as a Commissioner to arrange this matter with the British Columbia Government, that this land had been included in the pre-emption lands for which the British Columbia Government transferred to us 3,000,000 acres in the Peace River country. It was subsequently found upon enquiry that these 45,000 acres in the Sumas district belonged to British Columbia. In the meantime we have been dealing with them as had the British Columbia Government. There were 200,000 acres reserved, out of which these 45,000 acres were to be selected, and by arrangement between the two Governments entries were allowed to be taken by the British Columbia Government and sales made, and the money was held subject to final arrangement. It was subsequently found that British Columbia had been dealing with more than 45,000 acres. When this was ascertained, the Government stopped it, and awaited the arrival of Mr. Robson last summer. When he arrived it was determined to allow the British Columbia Government to retain the amount of the land up to 45,000 acres which they had dealt with, and this Act is for the purpose of enabling them to issue patents, which they thought they had a right to do when they were dealing with it.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 130) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, chapter 78 of the Revised Statutes.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the reason for sub-section 2.

Mr. TUPPER. The necessity for this Act was shown in connection with the steamer now plying between Halifax and Boston, and owned in Canada. That steamer is subject to our inspection laws, and it is brought into competition with two American steamers, and it is subject also to the inspection laws of the United States at Boston, while we are unable to bring the American boats plying between our ports and Boston under the provisions of our Inspection Act, as the Act does not apply to steamboats plying between any port in Canada and any port out of Canada. The object of this Bill is to enable us to apply the Inspection Act to those steamers.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:35 a. m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 5th April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LOAN OF 1888.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister of Finance intimated that he would make a statement yesterday in reply to my remarks on the 3 per cent. loan. He was not able to do so, as the House did not go into Committee of Supply. Perhaps it would suit his convenience to make it now. It is not likely that there will be any debate on it.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it is just as well to say what I have to say now as to wait until the House goes into Committee of Supply. I have read very carefully, and have considered, along with the officers of my department, the remarks that were made by my hon. friend from South Oxford the other night with reference to the loan of 1888, and the paragraph in the prospectus referring to purchases from that loan for sinking fund purposes. In order to understand the matter a little more clearly, perhaps it would be well to go back beyond the loan of 1888, and take cognisance of the fact that, as my hon. friend knows, our earlier loans had, in the different years in which they were negotiated, a sinking fund attached, by which the Government was obliged to set apart a certain amount of money each year, a percentage of the face of the loan, and with that to purchase securities under trustees, which were to be set off as against the particular loan; and these, together with the accruing interest from year to year, were to constitute a sinking fund, and a set off as regards each loan. So that, at the present time we are face to face with this fact, that, as a result of the conditions of former loans, we have to set apart on an average about $2,000,000 per year—that is, we have to buy out of securities what would be equal to $2,000,000 per year on an average to offset the loans having sinking fund attachments. There are certain limitations, of course, as to the kind of securities which can be purchased. We are precluded, as my hon. friend knows, from buying stocks of companies, which are liable to great changes, and which are not what you may call standard stocks; and the same consideration applies in almost as great a degree to municipal debentures. Then, the stocks of different Governments have also in a great many cases to be refused, because the conditions are not profitable, and they are not always considered safe; and with reference to British consols, the conditions of those are such that we have never bought them, and it would not be profitable for us to buy them, so that, as a matter of fact, we have, from the earliest period, invariably, I think, invested in our own stocks in purchasing to meet the sinking funds of the various loans; and at the present time, we are obliged to make purchases sufficient to offset to the amount of about $2,000,000, on an average, yearly. The prospectuses which were issued in connection with the other loans, had in them a clause which bound the Government to buy out of the loans, so long as they did not go above par; but left the option with the Government, when they went above par, to buy from these loans or not, as they chose. As a matter of fact, when our stocks in 1885, or about that period, came to be all above par, the sinking funds were still provided out of our own stocks, even though they went above par, and the last year we bought for that sinking fund out of 4 per cent. stocks as high as 114½ or thereabouts. The prospectus of 1888 of the loan now under discussion, carried out the same principle as was carried out in the prospectuses of the preceding loans, although I grant my hon. friend and the House that it was stated a little more explicitly, and perhaps carried with it a pledge a little more definite than the clauses of the preceding prospectuses. But there is this to be understood, that it had been the practice, from the earliest time, to pledge the Government to buy from stocks below par, or at par, and to use the option with reference to purchasing from our own stocks when they went above par; and here was a loan of which the minimum price was fixed at 92½, and which must perforce be a stock below par, and the clause in the prospectus simply expressed the intention of the Government to purchase for the sinking fund out of that stock which must necessarily be a stock below par. The Government does not hold that they are bound to purchase out of that stock for the purpose of a sinking fund, if that stock has appreciated unreasonably, or if it is apparent that there is a combination which exists for the purpose of raising the stock unduly, and it is not a difficult matter at all to judge as to whether the stock is being unduly appreciated or not. It is, of course, an advantage to buy from our own stocks generally, because we have no income tax to pay. Upon the stocks that we would buy of other Governments or colonies, I think in Great Britain we would have to pay an income tax, which would add a certain definite amount to their cost. Again, if we buy our own stocks, which are below par, it is a collateral advantage, and a decided advantage, in order to appreciate that particular stock and lay better conditions for the loan which is to succeed. So much may be stated as regards the considerations which make it necessary for us to buy a large amount for our sinking fund, as to the practice we have pursued heretofore, and as to the intention expressed by the Government, and which was simply an expression of intention, which does not bind the Government, if it be seen that there is an unreasonable appreciation. I think it is sufficient to state this fact in conclusion, which is stronger than any fancies we may indulge in with reference to the future. We have been buying out of that stock from the 1st of July of the current year. We have bought over $1,000,000 of that stock, and so far from there being any undue appreciation of the price or any evidence at all of putting up the price by combination, we have bought at a lower price than we received for the loan, £95 1s. We bought, for instance, on the 1st of July, 1888, at 94 5/16, 94⅛ and 94⅝. On the 1st of October, we bought

at 92⅝; that is net, taking into account accrued interest. On November 1st, we bought at 93¾, and on the 1st of December at 92⅝. That, I think, shows that there is not very much to be apprehended in the way of undue appreciation of these stocks. This much is to be considered, that the buying for the sinking fund, under the old prospectuses as well as under this, had the very same effect of appreciating the stock. Of course, in the other we had a wide range of choice to buy. With reference to what my hon. friend said as to the exhaustion of the loan long before its fixed time or termination, that would hold with reference to most of our stocks. For instance, if we buy some classes of our Fours, which have to expire in 1903, we would exhaust the whole stock in 11 or 12 years before the expiry of the loan; but, of course, we would simply have reduced our debt by that much. I think this is a sufficient statement to make at present, and I may, in conclusion, add my own opinion, and the opinion of the officers of my department, who are careful, and, I think, thorough men, that, taking all things into consideration, there is no ground for the alarm which was rather foreshadowed by my hon. friend, and no ground for the possible conclusion, which was also foreshadowed by my hon. friend, that this may prove an unremunerative and costly loan. Taking it all in all, I believe it can be fairly maintained that it is the best loan we have yet put upon the British market.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At present, I shall only say a few words on the subject. I fear that the hon. the Minister of Finance has not at all apprehended the probabilities—I do not speak of possibilities—that are involved in the arrangement which has been entered into. A good deal of what he has said is not really relevant to the question in hand. Several of the things he has said, I shall at a later period of the question, I am afraid, have to dispute Of course, it is quite true, and I am perfectly well aware of the fact, that it has been our habit to buy our own stocks, and it was very well that should be done under certain circumstances. But the hon. gentleman has failed entirely to appreciate the enormous difference between the engagement we have now entered into, and the engagement which was entered into before. This engagement is unlimited. It has no words of restriction whatever; it binds us to apply, not the ordinary sinking fund of one-half per cent. per annum, but a sinking fund which will begin at 10 per cent. per annum or thereabouts, to the purchase of our loan. The only point that the hon. gentleman made, and on which he appears to rely largely, is that, at this moment, we are able to buy the loan at 93½ and even lower. Well, I am afraid that will prove a very broken reed to lean upon. The hon. gentleman must be aware that the course of business is such that when a loan of the magnitude of £4,000,000 sterling is put on the English market, for a considerable period, ranging perhaps from three to eighteen months, a good deal of that is loose on the market and may, as in this case, even be repurchased at prices low or lower than we obtained. It is not during a year or six or eighteen months that the result of the hon. gentleman's arrangement is liable to be felt. It is later on that that will come into play. You can base no sort of conclusion on what can be done at present. It is when these loans have gone into the hands of permanent investors, and when they find we are compelled to expend this enormous sum from year to year, that the appreciation will begin, and that the evil results of what the hon. gentleman or his predecessor have done will become clearly manifest. Now, I do not wish to enter into the question of how far the hon. gentleman or the Government of Canada are justified, at their own will and pleasure, in importing words of qualification into a prospectus so clearly worded as this has been. There is a great deal to be considered before I can either affirm positively or positively dissent from the proposition of the hon. gentleman. I regret exceedingly that it should be necessary for a Minister of Finance of Canada, under any conceivable circumstances, to use words which have in them a savor of repudiation of an agreement which was published broadcast from one end of the United Kingdom to the other. I do not now accuse the Minister of desiring to do that. I reserve my opinion until I have further considered it. But there are complexities ahead of the hon. gentleman in regard to that loan which he does not appear at all to appreciate or understand. I tell him that he will find, when this matter comes to be more fully discussed, with all his experience and with all the evidence which he has collected, or which may have been put before him, as to our dealings with former loans under totally different conditions, they will fail entirely in an unprecedented condition of affairs like this. I promised not to keep the House long, and I will conclude by saying that I propose, at the earliest opportunity—not to-day, of course, that would be out of the question—on going into Committee of Supply, to put on record my opinion as to the risks we have run and the probable contingencies which are involved in this loan. I am sorry to say that the explanations I have heard from the hon. gentleman have not at all altered my opinion nor has he attempted, for that matter, to assail my opinion as to the meaning to be drawn from this particular clause in the prospectus. The only thing which he has said with a view to modify at all the plain meaning of these terms, is the declaration that, under certain contingencies, the Government do not intend to hold themselves bound by what appears to be the plain meaning of that prospectus.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. TUPPER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 129) to amend the Fisheries Act.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TUPPER. The Bill consists of one clause, and it is exactly the clause which was passed in this House in a Bill dealing with this and other matters in 1883. It went to the Senate, and was passed by the Senate, but several amendments to other clauses were incorporated in the Bill, which were not approved of by this House, and, it being late in the Session, the Bill was dropped. This provision is to meet the circumstances arising out of a decision in New Brunswick, in the case of Delaney and Macdonald, previous to 1883. That decision was that sub-section 5 of section 8 of the Fisheries Act did not apply to the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and that left the department powerless to prevent the sweeping of salmon from the spawning beds in the Provinces by nets. The object of this section is to eliminate those words in the Act under which the court considered that an exception existed in the case of those two Provinces, so that now it may be impossible in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, as elsewhere in Canada, to net for salmon in the inland waters.

Mr. KIRK. Does the Minister mean to say that, if this Bill becomes law, our salmon cannot be caught with nets in any waters except the tidal waters of the Dominion?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes; the catching of salmon in nets will be confined to tidal water.

Mr. KIRK. Does the hon. gentleman know what will be the effect of his Bill? Does he know the number of people in the Maritime Provinces which this provision will affect? He is disturbing an industry which will affect a

great many people there, and he will raise a storm to which he will be obliged to yield very quickly. If the people of Nova Scotia are to be prohibited from catching salmon with nets except in tidal waters, it will be simply outrageous. On the River St. Mary's, for instance, on which I live, the people fish for salmon very largely with nets. Is this law to prevent them from catching salmon at all? I think it is a most outrageous proposal.

Mr. TUPPER. The outrage is largely imaginary. The object of the legislation is in favor of the Province that the hon. gentleman thinks will be so affected, because everyone who has a knowledge of salmon fishing is aware that the salmon, on their way to the spawning beds, should not be met by nets. It was a complete surprise to the department to find that the Act had been construed at that late day in the manner that it was, and the department had acted previously on an entirely different idea, holding that they had always been able, from the time the Act was passed, to prevent injury to the salmon fishery. There is only one opinion among all those conversant with the proper means of preserving these fisheries, and that is, that it is simply destruction for the salmon fishery to net them in the non-tidal waters and in the rivers where the salmon go for spawning. There is not a word of complaint from any of the Provinces with the course that has been taken, and I venture to say that if any other course was adopted, wherever the people enjoy the benefit of the present restrictions, there would be a great outcry against it. I may remind the hon. gentleman that his idea upon the subject may, on reflection, be considered not well founded, because there was not a dissenting voice in Parliament against this very clause when it was passed in 1883. The moment the fact was brought to the attention of the Government that that construction had been placed upon the Fisheries Act, Parliament, without demur, passed those very sections in the Bill to which I allude, and when the Bill went to the Senate, other clauses, dealing with other matters, were added to it, and when the Bill was returned to this House it was dropped. All I propose is to adopt that clause which was necessary, in the opinion of every official in the department, for the protection of the salmon industry in all the Provinces, and to which Parliament itself has already agreed.

Mr. ELLIS. It appears to me that the object of this legislation is to drive out the fishermen who earn their living, for the benefit of the fly-fishermen. The fact is that the whole legislation of the country, with regard to the salmon fisheries, is for the benefit of the rich men, and the people who buy up certain portions of land, and hold them, as against the industry of the country, and the sooner public opinion compels you to put a stop to that kind of thing the better. These fly-fishermen, these rich men, have got complete possession of the department over which the hon. gentleman presides, in so far as this matter is concerned. Now, what does he propose to do? He proposes to close the St. John River, which is 300 miles long, and 200 miles of which, I think, are within the frontiers of Canada—he proposes to close it entirely against net fishermen, against men who are riparian owners, a river upon which not a single salmon is taken by the fly. Now, you propose to drive these men out of their occupation. Why should men on the Bay of Fundy, in the tidal waters, be allowed to catch salmon, and a man 50 miles up the river not be allowed to do the same thing? I call the attention of the member for Sunbury, of the member for Queen's, of the member for King's, to this Bill. It is certainly an attack upon the industry of men who get their living by fishing, and it is done simply in the interest of the rich men. It is this kind of legislation that is creating socialism throughout the country, and is the very worst legislation which you can pass.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think the case my hon. friend refers to, was a case on the Restigouche River. I was going to call the attention of the Minister to the River St. John. There are valuable fisheries on that river about 12 or 13 miles from the mouth, and further up the river in the county represented by the Minister of Finance, where, if this Act is carried into force, it will utterly destroy those fisheries. The effect of this will be entirely to prevent any fishing in the River St. John. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Ellis), that it would deprive the fishermen of the means of getting their living.

Mr. TUPPER. Does not the hon. gentleman see the force of the argument presented by the fishery inspectors, that the supply of salmon would be slowly decreased, as it is decreasing, in the tidal waters of the coasts, if these fish are netted on their way to the spawning ground? It seems to me a matter of a very few years when, if we allow that style of fishing to go on, the salmon fishery will become a thing of the past.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I remember last year the salmon fishery was very profitable.

Mr. TUPPER. There is a large decrease.

Mr. ELLIS. The best answer to the hon. gentleman that can be given are the figures of his own department. He will see, if he takes the trouble to examine them, that there is no decrease in the salmon fishery on the St. John River. One year is better than another, but there is a large quantity taken on the river from the mouth of the Bay of Fundy, I might say up the river, above tidal waters, to the entrance of the Tobique, and the head waters of the St. John River. There is no fly-fishing on the main river, yet the hon. gentleman proposes to stop people from net fishing who have carried it on for years. It is an outrage of the worst kind. The hon. gentleman does not know the character of the legislation which he proposes to this House.

Mr. KIRK. I hope the Minister will consider this matter before he passes a law like this. It is quite clear, as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) has said, that this law is entirely in the interest of fly-fishermen. He intends to prevent the poor people, farmers and fishermen, from catching even the salmon for their own tables. There are quite a number of farmers who set out nets in the rivers in order to obtain fresh fish for their own use, men who cannot afford to take time to catch salmon with a fly, and this is to be stopped entirely in the interest of the fly-fishermen. There is the St. Mary's River, which is not so large as the St. John River, but yet there are large lakes in it in which fishermen set their nets to catch salmon.

Mr. TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the point where the water is non-tidal?

Mr. KIRK. Yes.

Mr. TUPPER. How far above the tide?

Mr. KIRK. Perhaps 10 or 15 miles. There are lakes in the St. Mary's River in which farmers set their nets in season and catch salmon, yet here we are to have them stopped altogether. It is an outrage on these people that they should be stopped from catching salmon in the proper season.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would ask the Minister whether he might not be compelled to violate that law in taking salmon for the hatcheries. I do not know how they will get salmon otherwise.

Mr. TUPPER. That is a fruitful subject of discussion, but we will take the power to-day for the purpose of re-

plenishing the hatcheries. It is a debated question as to whether it would be wise to do so. Those who are against the hatcheries find a great deal of fault with the Government for going to the spawning beds to obtain salmon. They are taken for no other purpose.

Mr. ELLIS. I intend to divide the House on the third reading of this Bill.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Canadian Pacific Railway—construction $20,000

Mr. FOSTER. The item of $20,000 is required to pay expenses in connection with the arbitration between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government. The expenditure on this account up to 31st January, 1889, was $102,185.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a distinct vote for that, I notice, and it should be so specifically stated. What is the salary of L. K. Jones?

Mr. FOSTER. He gets $100 in addition to his regular salary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman states that this is for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the arbitration now pending between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway. I wish to ask the Minister of Finance what are the legal expenses up to date of the arbitration between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Dominion of Canada, and can he give us some approximation—if such a thing can be approximated—of what the total legal expenses are likely to be?

Mr. FOSTER. The expenditure on this account up to the 31st of January, 1889, has been $102,185; what the expenses between the 31st January, 1889, and the 30th June, 1889, may amount to, is not yet known.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I presume that the total of these two votes of $190,000 and $20,000 are practically for the legal expenses of that arbitration. I can hardly conceive myself how it can be possible that the legal expenses should come to as much as $210,000 by any imaginary arbitration between the Dominion and the Canadian Pacific Railway. I would like, if the hon. gentleman can do so, that he would give us some particulars. $210,000 or thereabouts for law costs strikes me, and I think will strike the country, as a frightful sum to pay.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not all for law costs. It must be remembered that there are other very heavy expenses connected with the arbitration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGAT. I mean expenses of witnesses, and so forth.

Mr. FOSTER. Witnesses have to be paid, and we had to get expert engineers to give their evidence. The locality has to be visited, and the engineers have to go carefully over the ground. All these different items of expense amount to a large sum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; but making all possible allowance, it seems an enormons sum that nearly a quarter of a million dollars, for law costs, should be required for this arbitration. What is the amount supposed to be at stake? If this goes on the lawyers will have the whole property, and it will be the old story of the oysters and the shells. The Minister of Finance is not a lawyer, and he will have some sympathy with the unfortunate Dominion of Canada, ground between the upper and the nether mill-stones in this way. What is the claim of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. FOSTER. I find that in the amount expended there is an item for "land and land damages of $11,000," an item "for construction" for $1,212, and the expenses of the arbitration, pure and simple, for last year, were $40,095. Then, the arbitration expenses from the 30th June, 1888, to the 31st January, 1889, were $62,690, making a total of $102,000 for the arbitration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the amount of the claim of the Canadian Pacific Railway? It ought to be a tremendous one to warrant such expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. The claim, I imagine, is indefinite.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should think so. It must run into millions if you are fighting it in this way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The claim is, I believe, a very large one; so large that the Government have thought it necessary to spare no pains to defend the public interest in this matter, and they have taken great trouble in getting expert engineers from various quarters in order to establish the Government side of the question. Of course the expense is very large, but I think it was requisite to protect the Government from the inordinate claims, in the view of the Government, of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The right hon. gentleman surely must have had specific claims from the Canadian Pacific Railway. They must have set up a detail of what they claim from the Government, and how that claim was made up. It would be a great advantage to the House and to the Committee to have that statement of claim before them, so that the members would be able to see precisely what it is that the Canadian Pacific Railway are claiming from the Government, and the grounds of their claim. That certainly must be in the possession of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as I understand from the statements which have been made to me, the claim of the Canadian Pacific Railway is somewhere between four and five million dollars. Very competent arbitrators have been appointed, and those arbitrators are conducting the arbitration in the way which they think the best. It is of the utmost consequence, of course, that the Canadian Government should have its side of the case presented with the very strongest force possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a very important question. Here is a claim of four or five million dollars presented by the Canadian Pacific Railway, as I understand the case, because the road which has been delivered to them was graded below the standard of the rest of the road, and below the standard, as they urge, that they were bound to accept. That is their position?

Mr. FOSTER. According to their view.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that. I am not arguing in favor of their contention, but I am merely stating the case as I understand it. Are we to understand that, further, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company allege that this road was taken over from Mr. Onderdonk, constructed according to its standard, greatly inferior to the standard used by them in the mountains, and in the work done on their portion of the road. Is that their contention?

Mr. FOSTER. I think not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can you state what it is?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We can state what it is, but I would say to the hon. gentleman that this matter is now *sub judice*, and the less discussion here the better in the interest of the Dominion. The matter is now before the arbitrators, and I do not think it would be wise, in the interest of the public, to enter into a discussion as to their claims or as to the strong opposition which the Government ought to offer to these claims, which they think are inordinate and unjust.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely the hon. gentleman does not object to say simply what their claim is. It does not interfere with the arbitrators' position to know why the Canadian Pacific Railway Company make this claim. I do not think that this can, in any way, prejudice Mr. Justice Boyd and his coadjutors. I have great confidence in the arbitrators, and no doubt the hon. gentleman has too, as he consented to their appointment. I am quite sure they will pay no attention to what passes here, and that Mr. Chancellor Boyd is perfectly able to hold his judicial mind unbiassed by statements that may be made on your right hand or on your left hand, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What we are asking for, is not the opinion of the Government on the merits of the matter in dispute, nor is it suggested that the matter should be brought here for the purpose of argument. Surely the Canadian Pacific Railway have made a specific claim against the Administration, and, if so, I suppose they have fixed it at a particular amount, which would go before the commissioner for his consideration. What we want, is that statement. There surely can be no impropriety in bringing it here, nor can it, in any way, affect the question before Mr. Chancellor Boyd, or anybody else. The Government know what the claim is, and I think the House should be put in possession of that information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can state, generally, that the claim is that the portion of the railway in British Columbia to be handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was not of such a character as they had a a right, under the contract between the Government and themselves, to receive from the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the hon. gentleman will see that when the contract was made between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government, there was a contract with Onderdonk for this British Columbia section. Do they say that that contract was not complied with by Onderdonk, or do they contend that the contract made with Orderdonk was for a road below the standard that ought to be furnished to them?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. So I understand it to be.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think that the hon. Minister of Finance last year stated that it was the intention of the Government to pay into court a certain sum—I think half a million dollars—to protect the Government against any claim, in the event of the decision being adverse to them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; there was no such statement. There was a vote of $250,000 taken to pay any deficiencies that might be found. Without admitting that any deficiency has taken place, the Minister of Railways asked for that amount.

Intercolonial Railway—Increased accommodation at Halifax $150,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This item has been in the Estimates for several years, and last Session and the Session before there was a discussion in this House with reference to the expenditure of the money. One feels some delicacy in discussing these railway matters at the present moment, in view of the loss the House has sustained by the death of

the head of the department; still we have to refer to them in general with a view of eliciting information. I do not know who has charge of this railway expenditure, but I desire to invite the attention of the Government for a few moments to it. There has been a propo-al made for the purchase of a portion of the property opposite the deep water terminus at Halifax, as one way of obtaining increased storage accommodation, which the late Minister of Railways admitted was necessary. But another proposal has been made, to bring the railway along the line of the wharves, which, if it could be accomplished, many think, and I am one of that opinion, would be more in the interest of the public and of the railway as well. By doing that, you would utilise the stores and wharves along the line of the water front, and the Government would be independent for both storage and wharfage accommodation. The present deep water terminus, although it cost a very large sum of money, really gives very little accommodation to shipping. There is room at the wharf for only two steamers, one on each side; on the south side two moderate-sized steamers could find room, but, as a matter of fact, it is only used for two steamers at a time. Therefore, it is not sufficiently commodious to accommodate the wants of the port, and an extension of the line along the water front would be of the most ultimate advantage both to the railway and the commerce of the port. I am aware that objection has been raised by some of the wharf owners to the road passing through their property. Such objections are always made; but, judging from what has taken place in other parts where railways do run along the water front, I am pursuaded myself that if this road were carried there, those objecting to it now would realise that it would be of great advantage to them in their business, and would improve the value of their property. It is known to the Government that many of the wharf owners at Halifax have signed a paper, conveying to the Government the right to pass through their property free, in the event of the road being carried along the wharves. There are others who are not willing that it should pass through their property, but I think those who are willing would have no objection to carry out their offer, even if those objecting had to be dealt with in a different manner. What I want is, that the Government should take some steps one way or the other. It is useless to bring this vote forward year after year, and leave the people of Halifax to believe that they are going to spend the money, without a dollar of it being spent for the purpose for which it was originally voted. If the Government are not prepared to deal with the matter in the broader sense, let them deal with it in the other sense, of utilising the property opposite the present terminus for obtaining more storage accommodation, though in that case they would not get any more wharfage accommodation. I hope this item will not remain a dead letter from year to year. The people of Halifax are naturally very anxious about it, and I cannot see, if the Government are in earnest, why there should be any further delay.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the Government whether he has brought down the papers I asked for with reference to the extension of eight miles, from the Derby branch to the Northern and Western Railway?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I have not.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to state that the Government own, as an adjunct to the Intercolonial, a line of railway of some 15 or 16 miles long, extending from the Intercolonial two miles west of Newcastle up to what is known as Indian Town. This line is known as the Derby Branch. On the other side of the river, extending from Chatham,

is the Northern and Western, a subsidised line extending on to Fredericton, built by Messrs. Snowball and Gibson. Another line extends to a place known as Farley's or McLaggan's Mills, at a distance of eight miles west from Indian Town. Three years ago, when these two roads were completed, a gap of eight miles was left between these two points, and the Government granted a subsidy for the construction of that break. Instead of building it as they did the Derby Branch, as a branch of the Intercolonial, they chose the other course, and subsidised the road, which subsidy Messrs. Snowball and Gibson took up, and the road was built and taken over by the Government, about eighteen months ago, as completed, subject to some small changes, as stated by the right hon. gentleman the other day in answer to my observations. This is a road which cost a good deal of money, eight miles of road, being the link between the road from Fredericton to Chatham, and that road commencing at Farley's Mills and going over eight miles to Indian Town. The proprietors of the Northern and Western, for what reason I do not know, owning that branch, which was built by the company on a subsidy given by this Parliament, have never operated or utilised it; and it is a standing blot upon the railway policy of the Government that a road which was built by means of a subsidy granted by this Government should for one and a half years, through a finely settled district of country where there is a great deal of traffic, remain closed. I was anxious to ascertain whether any, and what, correspondence had been interchanged between the Government and the proprietors of the road. It seems as if it were the interest of the Northern and Western road not to open that particular branch, but to carry the business on to Chatham. The people of Newcastle, on the other hand, desire that the branch to their town should be operated also. I think it was the duty of the Government to come to some arrangement whereby that eight miles should be run in connection with the Northern and Western road. I called at the department to know if any arrangement was made, but was met with the statement that none had been made, that the department had been willing at any time to enter into working arrangements with the Northern and Western, but that nothing had been done and that no proposals had been made to that end. From the answer of the right hon. gentleman the other day, it is evident that correspondence had been going on with the view, not so much of working that eight miles of road, as for the leasing of the Derby Branch. So far as that is concerned, that would be satisfactory to our people. I do not care whether the branch is run by the corporation that owns the Northern and Western, or by the Government, but we want it run in order that our people may get the benefit of the money expended. It is a standing blot on the railway policy of the country that after subsidising these eight miles of road they should remain unused, when they could accommodate a large section of the people on the upper part of the river. A large business is done in Newcastle, as in Chatham, because these two towns are the centres of commercial business in that district. The Northern and Western runs direct to Chatham, and being owned by people who have their interests in Chatham, leads us to suppose that naturally they wish to centre the trade there. Some steps should be taken either to lease the Derby Branch or buy that link of eight miles and operate it as an extension of the Derby Branch and a branch of the Intercolonial.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I shall inform myself on the subject at once, and bring the papers down. The hon. gentleman will then have an opportunity of discussing the subject.

Increased accommodation at Moncton..... .... $67,500

Mr. FOSTER. This is required to give much needed accommodation for housing engines, from twenty to thirty engines having to stand out in the open air, unprotected from the storms of winter, and for increased machine shop power. Many of the engines have to be sent at present to other places for repairs, owing to the want of facilities at Moncton.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Some years ago, I called the attention of the Government to the open platform at Moncton, where the passengers change cars from the Halifax and St. John Express to the Northern line. When Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Railways, I drew his attention to this, and he said he would attend to it, but still it is in the same state. It is very important that the platform should be covered, particularly for ladies and children crossing. Is it the intention of the Government to put up their own electrical apparatus there, or to make arrangements with the company?

Mr. FOSTER. We propose to put up our own apparatus.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). There is a company there which has complete apparatus, and who have a contract with the Intercolonial for water. It would be cheaper to give the work to them.

Rolling Stock.. .... $17,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have referred to the expenditure for improved railway facilities at Halifax. I desire now to draw attention, briefly, to the working and condition of the Intercolonial generally. There seems to be, throughout the Maritime Provinces generally, a very strong conviction that the Intercolonial, from some reason or other, has been worked in a most extravagant manner, that there has not been that close attention and direct supervision which is necessary for the successful working of such a large institution. It is well known, that since the Intercolonial was first opened, the traffic over that road has gone on annually increasing. The tables which have been furnished this House show, at page 17 of the Railway Reports, that, while in 1877 the number of tons of freight carried was only 420,000, in 1888 it amounted to 1,275,000. And whereas at that time there was only 613,000 passengers carried, in 1888 the number amounted to 996,000. Under these circumstances, I think the House would be justified in supposing that the ratio of increase in expense in working that road would not be in proportion to the increased freight and number of passengers carried over the road. In fact, it is well known, as a matter of business, that the larger the volume of business that can be controlled in any one way, either in manufacturing or otherwise, the smaller is the percentage of expense, and that principle applies and must apply as much to the working of a railway as it would to any other enterprise. Then, again, it is well known that roads running through less populous districts, and from smaller terminal points, as far as cities are concerned, have, under different management, been able to pay a dividend over their working expenses. Take the road from Halifax and St. John—cities of fair proportions—running through fine agricultural districts till they reach Richibucto or further north, there should be, and doubtless is, a large amount of local traffic, which of itself should be a very fair element in sustaining the road. There is a portion of that road, I am aware, through the northern part of New Brunswick and Lower Canada, which, perhaps, may place it at a disadvantage; but, taking it as a whole, running from those places I have referred to, to Quebec and Montreal, with the number of passengers going over that road and the amount of freight which has been increasing year after year, I repeat that, so far as one would be able to judge, there should be a fair and reasonable expectation that that road would pay at least its working expenses. That it has not done so has been a source of great regret to us all, and we all feel that, so long as that road is annually charged with a deficiency like $360,000 for the

last year—and we now see in the Estimates $500,000 for the current year—there will always be a feeling that it is in a measure an incubus on the country. We have been told very frequently that that road was built for the benefit of the Maritime Provinces. That road is as much, and to a greater extent, a convenience to the people of Ontario and Quebec as it is to the people of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, and therefore we feel, and take a deep interest in the economical administration of that department. We feel that that road has been, so to say, allowed to run itself; that Jack is as good as his master, and in some cases a little better; and when we see the losses which have occurred on that road, year by year and month by month, and when we see, as we unfortunately did the other day, a very sad accident occurring on that road, for which as yet no explanation has been given, in which many valuable lives were sacrificed and a large amount of Government property was destroyed, I think the Minister in charge of that department should be able to satisfy the House that some examination has taken place in reference to that accident, and that the Government are preparing to deal with those who are responsible for it, if it was, as has been stated, the result of carelessness. There is another feeling in regard to that road, which is very generally expressed, that it is managed from Ottawa instead of being managed at Moncton. The engineer of that road has, I may say, placed himself in that position with regard to the public that, whether right or wrong—and I am not going to express any opinion upon that myself, because I have not been brought in contact with the engineer of the road—there is a very general feeling, which found vent in the expression of opinion in the Halifax Chamber of Commerce the other day, that the engineer in charge was the person who had made the Intercolonial Railway unpopular throughout the Maritime Provinces, and had contributed largely to the position in which that road stands to-day. To show this Committee how deep is that feeling which exists in those Provinces to-day, I need only refer to a discussion which took place in the Senate last week, when three supporters of the Administration, the Hon. Mr. Botsford, the Hon. Mr. Dickey and the Hon. Dr. Almon, referred to this matter. The Hon. Mr. Botsford, in the course of a very long address, drew the attention of the Senate—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Order.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not in order to read extracts from the Senate proceedings.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I will say that in another place——

The CHAIRMAN. I am afraid it cannot be evaded in that way.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Then I shall say that references have been made to the road recently by three prominent supporters of the Government. One hon. gentleman says:

"When my hon. friend put this notice on the paper I certainly did not expect that so wide a field of discussion would be opened before us, and, therefore, I am not, at the present moment, in a position to follow him into that discussion; at the same time, I think, it is unfortunate that my hon. friend has not suggested anything as a remedy for this state of things. For I am bound to admit with him that there is throughout Nova Scotia, and, to some extent, as far as I know it, in New Brunswick, a very wide feeling of dissatisfaction at the management of the Intercolonial Railway."

That was followed up by an expression from another very warm supporter of the Government, who, hon. gentlemen know, would be the last to say anything of that kind unless he was driven to the conclusion that it was absolutely necessary in the public interest. Another hon. gentleman says:

"I think the inhabitants of Nova Scotia are indebted to the hon member for bringing up the state of the Intercolonial Railway before this House. I belong to a party that does not find fault with the Government unless there are very strong reasons for it, but still the Conservatives and Liberals of Halifax together have found fault with the way in which the Intercolonial Railway is managed."

There are expressions of opinion from three active and warm supporters of the Government, who, I am sure, must have been deeply pained at being placed in the position of having to record their opinions against the proper working of the Intercolonial Railway. In the Chamber of Commerce at Halifax, an equally emphatic expression was made in reference to this road, and particularly in regard to the engineer who had charge of the road, and who, in many cases, had placed himself in hostility, as they considered, to its best interests. But, looking at the expenses of the road, it would appear that, while the earnings of the road have increased—and that is pointed out with great satisfaction by the General Manager—the working expenses of every branch of the road have increased as well. On page 26 of the report we find that the working expenses for 1887-88 were $3,276,441 as against $2,828,115 the year previous, or an increase of $448,326. Then they compare with the last year the miles run by engines and by trains. The cost per mile run by engine in 1888 was 55.19 cents, as against 51.74 cents the year previous. Now, I do not pretend to be a railway man, but I cannot understand why the cost per mile run by engines should be increasing every year. The miles run by engines must be pretty much the same one year as another, and if there is more freight, of course the general results would be more favorably, as affecting the returns of the road. Then, again, we find the cost per mile run by trains in 1888, was 66.33 cents, as against 62.67 cents the previous year. The expense per mile of railway in 1888 was $3,723, as against $3,265 the previous year. Now, these things appear to me to go to prove that there has been a want of proper administration in the department, that the expenses of running this road have increased out of all proportion to the increased traffic over the road, that the increase per mile by engine, the increase per mile by trains, the increase per mile of railway, have all been out of proportion to the increased traffic on the road, whereas the percentage should have been less than it was. Now, Sir, attention has also been called on previous occasions by myself, to a certain class of freights carried over that road, entitled, coal from the Springhill Mines. We have a return furnished us, showing that while in 1879, there were only 570 tons carried, the quantity has gone up in 1887 to 192,000 tons. Whether this is an advantage to the road or not, is not, fortunately, a question for us to consider, because on page 17 of the report which I hold in my hand, they go on to say:

"Upon reference to the foregoing table it will be seen that the earnings of this railway for the year under consideration are short of the working expenses by $363,657 This result may be largely attributed to the heavy cost of keeping the traffic moving during the snowstorms of last winter, and the large volume of freight carried at unremunerative rates."

And they further observe on page 26:

"For several years past I have drawn attention in the annual report to the extremely low rate to which coal is carried, and there can be no doubt that is one of the chief causes of the annual deficit."

Now, this is not the first time that the Minister of Railways has laid this view before the House. I was not surprised, therefore, when, a short time before this House assembled, I learned that the Government had increased the rate of freight from the Springhill Mines over the Intercolonial Railway. I took the ground on previous occasions that coal from the Springhill Mines should be placed in exactly the same position as any other industry in the Maritime Provinces. It was well known that when this industry was built up at a sacrifice to the taxpayers of this country, the hon. Minister who was then in charge of the Railway Department—or if he was not, his predominating influence in the Cabinet had the effect of

securing the transmission of freight from his own county at a much lower rate than it was sent from any other county in the Province. Now, I do not object to their carrying coal at a loss, provided that they are going to carry through freight at a similar low rate; but I do most emphatically object to any interest in this country being favored at the expense of other equally important interests. I am aware that the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) had sufficient influence in this House on his return here to secure a cancellation of that revision of the tariff, and it was whispered out of doors that the hon. gentleman went so far in that matter as to refuse to second the Address on the assembling of Parliament unless that arrangement was agreed to. Be that as it may, it is one of the rumors of the corridor. I do not blame the hon. gentleman for using all proper and legitimate influence to secure what he thought was in the interest of his county, if he so considered it; but I do object—although some of my own personal and political friends took a different ground—to any preference being given to one interest over another. I am aware that at a late meeting of the Chamber of Commerce in Halifax they passed a resolution, a copy of which I hold, and my hon. colleague has, no doubt, a copy in his hand, calling upon the Government to reduce the rate down to the original price of $\frac{5}{10}$ per cent. per ton instead of the rate which they had previously charged. But that makes no alteration in my conviction in this matter. I took the ground that I am now taking long before the Chamber of Commerce moved in that matter, and I am not going to alter my opinion to-day, or to recede from the position I then took, that no one interest in this country should be favored at the expense of other equally important interests. What did we see this last winter? My firm happens to be agents for the Dominion line of steamships. The winter before last these steamers brought large cargoes of English goods, which were transmitted over the Intercolonial Railway. This year, when the winter time came on, and when it was necessary for that firm in England to know what arrangements were to be made for the winter traffic, they were much surprised to see a communication from the department at Moncton notifying us as agents that the freight on English goods had been advanced 5 per cent. Now, I do not wish to be understood as saying that that 5 per cent. was entirely over the Intercolonial Railway, because while it was about 5 per cent. on the general average, that was divided between the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. Therefore, you will observe that at this very time when they are carrying coal at a loss, they were advancing rates over the Intercolonial Railway for English goods which had formed the chief portion of their traffic during the winter time. Hon. gentlemen are aware that the item of sugar, of which large quantities come from the producing markets during the winter season to the refineries in Montreal, was carried, I believe at, 20 cents a 100 pounds; it may be reduced a cent or two now, I am not quite sure. It is in the neighborhood of 20 cents; and taking it at 20 cents per 100 lbs., they were actually charging $4 a ton to Montreal, while, at the same time, they were only charging about $1.50 a ton for coal from Springhill. Hon. gentlemen will notice the difference between those two amounts, and I might give further illustrations to show that the difference was so great, as to call for a readjustment. But what was the effect of this increase in the tariff? The agents of the Allan and Dominion lines, instead of bringing 2,000 tons, on an average, to Halifax, as they did last year, landed only 150 tons—I believe, as high as 300 or 400 tons; I am not aware of the latter number ever having been exceeded, and the quantity would be 250 or 300 tons, on an average, landed from the English steamers, for the railway, during the past winter. An advance in the rates on this freight coming over the Intercolonial Railway was a most strange and improper policy on the part of the Government, and while it was understood the Government were endeavoring to attract freight over the Intercolonial Railway by steamers from abroad, and endeavoring to build up Halifax as a winter port, and attract freight by that route, at that very time when freight was commencing to come they advanced the rate, and diverted all this large traffic to Portland instead of bringing it over our own railway. I point to this again as illustrating the improvident and unbusinesslike manner in which the Intercolonial Railway is managed, and I know that the feeling which I express here is expressed with respect to its management from this city by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, because I have heard the opinion expressed on many occasions that the party in charge of the road should be at Moncton instead of at Ottawa, and be in communication with all distant points. These are some of the larger points to which I desire to direct the attention of the House. There are many complaints respecting matters of less magnitude, but which are of equal importance to the parties concerned, which it would take the whole afternoon to explain; but I repeat that there is a general sense of dissatisfaction with the management of the road, there is a general impression that it is managed imprudently and extravagantly, that there is no proper head and no proper control, that someone is required with sufficient authority to have the road operated as it was operated during the time Mr. Brydges had charge of it, when every man knew his place and was obliged to attend to his own proper duties and nothing else. This will never be realised, and the public will never be satisfied until some person is placed there in whom the public have more confidence than they have in the engineer or party in charge of it at the present time. I make these remarks regretfully, because I have no feeling in the matter one way or the other; but public interests are concerned, and, representing an important constituency, I feel it to be my duty here to point out all these points to which I have drawn the attention of the House, and which I desire to place before the Government, particularly before the hon. Minister who, at the present, has charge of that department, and I invite his attention and their attention to a matter in which our people feel very deeply interested, and I am sure, if they look into it themselves, they will realise the truth of what I have been stating. They will realise the fact that it is unnecessary and improper to carry certain classes of goods at very low rates, while they drive away the great volume of business to foreign ports by advancing rates against them. There have been complaints with respect to the shipment of refined sugar; but I am not in a position to say that that is the fault of the Intercolonial Railway. I believe that is more the fault of the Grand Trunk. But the Government, I think, should have sufficient control and influence with the Grand Trunk Railway, to prevent the spectacle which we see every week in Halifax, of a steamer loading refined sugar in Halifax for Boston, where it is transhipped to all points in the west. I believe the Government could, if they chose to exercise that control, make arrangements with the Grand Trunk Railway, whereby the sugars of Moncton and Halifax would be transmitted to western points on terms similar to those which have been in use for many years past. My colleague, who is a director in that refinery, knows more about it than I do, and will be able to speak on that subject, but I have known as much as 1,500 or 2,000 barrels of sugar to be sent to Boston every week. If there was a proper combination or arrangement which it would be proper for the Government to make, and if they exercised that influence or control which the Government of this country could naturally exercise over a large corporation like the Grand Trunk Railway, the Government would, if they were disposed to exercise that control and influence legitimately, be able to

obtain an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway, whereby the manufactures of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would be carried over that road on the same terms on which they have been carried in past years. These are some of the points which, I repeat, it would be well for the Government to consider, and particularly in view of the unsatisfactory results of the working of this road. I might enter into the accounts, and dissect them with respect to stores and many other matters. These accounts are not all satisfactory I claim, but we have to take them as presented to us. On the whole, it would be more satisfactory if we had a more clear and explicit exhibit of the amount which the Government have on hand under this head. There is another item with respect to this road which I think is not of a satisfactory character, and that is the annual charge made on the capital account. I see in the Supplementary Estimates the very small sum of $400 only to be charged to capital account. We have under the head of capital account, amounts charged which in some cases may be proper and which in many cases I am convinced are highly improper. I made a statement in this House last year to the late lamented Minister of Railways to this effect, that I was informed that a number of coal cars had been broken up at Pictou when they could have been repaired at a cost of $70, and they were replaced by new cars costing $220, in order that they might be charged to capital account, whereas, if $70 had been expended on repairing the cars, the amount would have been charged to running expenses. I might tell that hon. gentleman that I can give him the name of my informant, and I will give it to any member of the Government who desires it, but I do not care to bring the gentleman's name before the House. Meeting him in the street a short time ago I said to him that I made the statement in the House and that it had been contradicted. He said: "You can, if necessary, use my name, and I can furnish you with the dates and the names of the parties who had these cars destroyed." When I add that my informant was a staunch supporter of the present Administration and active opponent of my own, it will show you at least that there was no political feeling in the matter, but the object was simply that the country might be aware of the manner in which the Intercolonial Railway was managed. I believe the time will come when the country will realise the fact that very large sums of money have annually been charged to capital account which should have been charged to working expenses, and which were charged to working expenses under similar circumstances by the previous Administration. This uncertainty with regard to the capital account, as to what it is going to amount to, is one of those views which, to say the least, is of a very unsatisfactory character. We are now about extending the Intercolonial Railway through the Island of Cape Breton, and I hope and trust it may be a success, but we have, in addition to the Intercolonial Railway, the Eastern Extension from New Glasgow to Canso. I pointed out last year, to the Minister at that time, that working that road as a separate branch was very unsatisfactory, and that it should be run in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. Those of us whose duty it has been to transmit freight over the Intercolonial Railway, and a portion of the Eastern Extension branch, have realised the trouble and inconvenience we are put to, by preparing a voluminous paper, and distributing the goods over one branch and another. While this Intercolonial Railway carries English goods at a certain percentage, so far as New Glasgow is concerned, the moment you reach that point, although still the goods go over the Government road, you are subjected to an arbitrary rate, and to a new arrangement entirely, which, to my mind, is a most unbusinesslike proceeding. I never could understand upon what principle the Eastern Extension Railway was run separate from the Intercolonial Railway. It is part of the Intercolonial Railway, and should be managed on the same basis; but being run separately, it will be admitted by every member of this House, that the expense must be considerably increased. These are some points to which I desire to direct the attention of the Government, and I hope that when we meet here next year, some of those glaring faults shall be remedied and that the result of the working of the Intercolonial Railway next year will show that a system of economy has been introduced, and that the loss to the country will be much less than we regret to see it is now, from the papers which have been laid before the House.

Mr. KENNY. I recognise, as my hon. colleague has mentioned, that we labor under great disadvantage to-day in discussing railway matters, owing to the ever to be regretted demise of the late esteemed and respected Minister of that department. I fully concur with several points that have been raised by my colleague, but I think, Sir, that I have heard him, in this House, point to the national mission of the Intercolonial Railway and to the fact that we never expected it would pay. I am quite prepared to go this far with him, that the people of the Maritime Provinces desire that some equilibrium should be established between the expenditure and the income of that road. My hon. friend knows, and I have mentioned it before in the House, that we could not have a national existence without this Intercolonial Railway; and that in my previous contentions and references to it in this House, I mentioned that the rates of freight should be so adjusted as to encourage the greatest possible expansion of our interprovincial trade. He knows that we did not expect the expenditure would be met immediately from income. I agree with my hon. colleague when he says that, so far, the Intercolonial Railway has been more advantageous to the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec than it has been to the Maritime Provinces. I mean by that, Sir, that the Intercolonial Railway gave to the manufacturers, and millers, and merchants of the Upper Provinces facilities for reaching one million additional consumers and that, therefore, it has been of more advantage to the people of the Upper Provinces than it has been to the people of the Maritime Provinces. My hon. colleague dwelt at length upon the rate at which coal is carried from Springhill to Montreal. He knows that any railway company in America that can secure to itself the general traffic incidental to a population such as is growing up in Springhill within the last few years, would be very glad to carry coal at a very low rate.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Three quarters of a cent is the lowest.

Mr. KENNY. I may say to my hon. colleague, that I believe the coal is carried from Pennsylvania to Massena Springs, which is about the same distance as from Springhill to Montreal, at as low a rate as it is carried over the Intercolonial Railway. I ask my hon. friend if, by carrying this 200,000 tons of coal, which I believe is the amount we carry on the Intercolonial Railway, we can build up in our country such communities as Springhill, where there is a population of six or seven thousand people in addition to others in the neighborhood who are benefited by the mines—I ask him if it would not be wise to carry coal at a low rate if we can build up such a community? For my part, I believe it would, and I believe that it is in the interest of the whole country that we should do so. As regards that Springhill rate, I may point out that my hon. colleague, when it suits him, quotes the utterances of the Chamber of Commerce. He knows very well indeed that this very Chamber of Commerce which passed the resolution to which he referred, did, at the same meeting, I believe, pass a resolution in favor of the retention of those very low rates on coal.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I stated so.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman must know that the retention of this low rate has been urged and agitated in the Halifax *Morning Chronicle*, and, therefore, my hon. colleague almost stands alone in the community from which he comes when he makes the contention that the rate is too low. I think it ought to be a satisfactory answer, as regards the freight rates on coal from Springhill, if I can say to this House that in the contention that my hon. friend has made here to-day, he stands alone from his whole Province. I think I am correct in saying that the feeling and sentiment of the people of Nova Scotia is that the management of the railway is fairly satisfactory to the people of that Province. My hon. colleague has also referred at great length to the increase in the rates of freight on British goods carried over the Intercolonial Railway during winter months. I have endeavored to inform myself on that point, and so far as I can learn the rate was raised by the Grand Trunk Railway and not by the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If my hon. friend will allow me, I stated that the increase was about five per cent., and half of that is for the Intercolonial Railway, and half for the Grand Trunk Railway. I can state that as a positive fact, as it came before me with reference to the transmission of English goods over those railways.

Mr. KENNY. As the hon. gentleman says he has positive information on that point, I am ready to accept it; but I think he will admit that the question of advance in rates did not emanate from the Intercolonial Railway, but from the Grand Trunk.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not know anything about that.

Mr. KENNY. Well, I do know that. As regards rates on British goods, my hon. friend is better informed than I am, inasmuch as his firm in Halifax is agent for one of the ocean lines of steamers. These subsidised steamers entered into an arrangement with the Grand Trunk to divert from Canadian ports all the British goods which were last year landed at Halifax; and they actually discriminated against Halifax, agreeing to carry goods at a lower rate *via* Portland than *via* Halifax. I may remark, *en passant*, that when we come to deal with the renewal of the subsidies to ocean steamers, we must insist that the terminal ports shall be in our own territory. The same remark will apply to the change which has unfortunately taken place in the rates for the transportation of refined sugars from Halifax westward. That was entirely owing, as I understand, to the combined action of the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not pretend to speak positively on that point; but the rumor runs, that these two railways, acting for some local interest in Montreal, were induced to raise their rates on those sugars, when the Intercolonial Railway was quite prepared to carry them at the rate that prevailed before. So my hon. friend's remarks left the impression that the management of the Intercolonial Railway was to blame for the rates on sugars.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I did not say that.

Mr. KENNY. But he might have left that impression. My hon. friend has pointed out one difficulty in connection with the Intercolonial in which I agree with him, that the management of the railway is at Ottawa when it should be at Moncton. Much of the dissatisfaction that exists is due to the difficulty in fixing special traffic rates. Friends of mine have come to me complaining of the delay in getting rates on the Intercolonial Railway, and I have taken the trouble to investigate their complaints, and I have found that the difficulty exists more with the western roads than with the Intercolonial, as these western roads will not give to the Intercolonial ready replies to their enquiries about rates. My hon. colleague knows that all our railway grumbling in the Maritime Provinces is necessarily with the Intercolonial Railway, as it is the only railway we deal with. In Ontario and in the Province of Quebec we frequently hear merchants complaining of rates, and the difficulty they have in making arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk. If you centralise all that grumbling, you will realise how much of the fault that is found with the Intercolonial Railway in the Maritime Provinces is accumulated. I must say, so far as my knowledge of the road goes—and, like my colleague, I do not pretend to be a railway expert—that I do not remember a time when the Intercolonial Railway was as well equipped as it is to-day with rolling stock and locomotive power; and, I believe, the road-bed is as good as any that exists in Canada. As regards my hon. colleague's reference to the capital account, it was referred to in a previous debate in this House. There seems to be, in the minds of some hon. gentlemen at least, a desire of always finding fault with the Maritime Provinces, by conveying the impression that we are a great tax and burden on the Dominion, in consequence of the expenditure on this Intercolonial Railway. I have taken the trouble to ascertain the actual cost of that road. I find that it has 926 miles of railway; and Jean's Railway Problems, which, I believe, is a recognised authority, puts the average cost of Canadian railways at $61,000 a mile, whereas the average cost of the Intercolonial Railway was less than $50,000 per mile, and for that I think the country has very good value. As my hon. friend himself pointed out, the traffic in 1878, when he was appealing to the people for re-election—and one of his powerful appeals was the manner in which the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway had developed under the Government, of which he was a member—the traffic amounted to 500,000 tons a year, whereas it is now over 1,250,000 tons a year. Of course, we all desire, as it is in the public interest, and in the interest of the Maritime Provinces, to see the expenditure approach income as nearly as possible; but I take the ground which my hon. friend took some years ago, that this road is a national highway; we could not have our national existence without it; and whilst we do not expect that it will continue to be the tax it is to-day, yet if we want to develop our interprovincial trade, we cannot expect to do it without carrying goods at comparatively reasonable rates. I have shown with regard to the rate for coal, that coal is actually carried at a lower rate on American railways. As regards the unpopularity of the road, and the gentleman who has charge of that road to-day, that gentleman has labored during the past twelve months, as my hon. friend knows, under the very great disadvantage to that, owing to the ill-health and failing strength of his Minister, it was very difficult indeed to secure from the Administration that attention to the road which under other circumstances it would have obtained. But it is much easier to find fault than it is to find a remedy. I am inclined to think that even these gentlemen, some of whom, as my hon. colleague has informed me, are my own political friends and warm supporters of the Government, when they come to examine, as some of them have recently taken the trouble to do, carefully into these matters, will find that they have jumped at conclusions. At the same time, I am quite ready to join hands with my hon. colleague in urging upon the Administration that if possible, in the reorganisation of this department, that road should be administered from at least a nearer point than Ottawa. I almost envy my colleague being in Opposition this afternoon, for it is so easy to find fault. I labor under this disadvantage: that my colleague comes here fully primed and charged, and I simply have to refer hurriedly to some of the statements he has made. As I have said, with many of my hon. colleague's remarks I am not disposed to find

fault. We are here to criticise this expenditure, and as long as we do so in a fair, impartial manner I am certain the Government will accept suggestions from both sides of the House.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I wish to correct a misapprehension into which my hon. friend fell in regard to the steamship companies discriminating against Halifax. He would lead the House to understand that the steamship companies, in their arrangements with the Grand Trunk, were actually discriminating against Halifax. Well, that arises from our geographical position. My hon. friend will see that the steamer agent at Liverpool, having to take goods to Montreal, will naturally enquire whether the consignees are in a hurry, and whether they will take the goods *viâ* Halifax or Portland. If they are willing to receive them by way of Portland, the distance from Portland to Montreal is under 300 miles, while the distance from Halifax is 800 miles, and naturally the company can bring them *viâ* Portland at a lower rate than *viâ* Halifax.

Mr. KENNY. As I understand it, if the shipper, say in Manchester, went to the agent of the Allan or Dominion line and asked what the rates of freight to Montreal were, he would be told. If you send these goods by way of Portland, we will charge a certain rate, but if you want them sent by Halifax, you would have to pay 5s. to 7s. 6d. per ton more. In other words, we are subsidising ocean mail steamers to build up other ports at the expense of Canadian ports.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman will see that it is just a question of distance, and it is 300 miles against 800 miles. Of course the bargain originates on the other side, and they have to state to the shipper that if he desires to send goods by Halifax as against Portland, the distance is 800 miles against 300 miles, and the rate consequently higher.

Mr. KENNY. This is the first year that discrimination has been made.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No, it was always existing.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think if my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) were not confined in the fetters which bind him, he would probably make a stronger indictment against the management of the Intercolonial than my hon. friend alongside of me (Mr. Jones) has made. I quite agree that the Intercolonial is not intended to be a road from which we can derive revenue, and, so far as the benefits it confers are concerned, while the Maritime Provinces are charged with this work having been built for their sole benefit to a large extent, it benefits Quebec and Ontario equally as much. No doubt there is great discontent throughout the whole of the Maritime Provinces concerning the management of this road. Whether well founded or not, it is not necessary for me to say, but the fact exists, and we find not only papers opposed to the Administration, but papers supporting the Government throughout the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick condemning the Administration on this score. The feeling is general and very strong that the road is not constructed in a way it ought to be, that its expenses are far beyond what they should be, that it is not conducted in the economical manner in which it should be conducted, and besides that it does not afford that accommodation which would naturally be expected considering the large amount of public money sunk in it. If a company owned this road and had to pay interest on the amount borrowed, they would have to close their capital account and depend upon their income for the furnishing of their rolling stock and material. We find that the lien on this road is very serious. We find a capital account of something like $45,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. $47,000,000.

Mr. KENNY.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I am taking round numbers. $45,000,000, representing an interest charge of $1,800,000 per annum. We find that the deficiency in round numbers: capital account, $750,000, and deficiency, $360,000, amounts to $1,100,000 on the year's work, making a total deficit of nearly $3,000,000. When you look around at other roads you must see there is something wrong in this. No doubt, considerable blame is attached to the engineer in charge and perhaps that gentleman's shoulders are made to bear a larger burthen than they ought, and perhaps a larger portion of the blame is due to the way the road is managed. I quite agree with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) that Ottawa is the wrong place for the head management. It should be at Moncton. Very many complaints and inconvenience arise from the fact that orders have to be received from Ottawa. When a shipper applies for rates on other roads he can at once get the information he desires, but the delays which take place on the Intercolonial in this respect are such, owing to instructions having to be received from Ottawa, that a good deal of traffic is lost to the road. The hon. gentleman spoke of the road being well equipped. No doubt there is a vast improvement, and probably what he says is quite correct, but we must remember that all that is charged to capital account. We find in the Supplementary Estimates brought down yesterday $170,000 for rolling stock, which was charged to capital account, but which other roads would have to pay out of their earnings. Great complaints exist also with regard to the mode on which the charges on freight are made. The people of Albert County complain that the rates to Halifax from there are the same as the rates from Rimouski. In one case the owner of a quarry stated he was willing to pay double rates to have the stone carried to Toronto, but he could not effect an arrangement. We find to-day that the sugar refiners of Halifax and Moncton are sending their stuff to Boston. As to Moncton, the handling has to be done there, and there is the handling at St. John, and the handling at Boston, and so on to the destination. I think it is only fair to say that that is owing more to the Grand Trunk than to the Intercolonial Railway, but I think it is probably due to the arrangement which I understand is made between the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk, which gives the Grand Trunk a controlling power it ought not to have. As I and my hon. friends have pointed out, the sugar from Halifax and Moncton is to-day going to the west by way of Boston instead of by the Intercolonial, and I find in the St. John *Telegraph* of Wednesday last that, at a meeting of the St. John Board of Trade:

"Mr. R. Cruikshank said a large amount of western freight for St. John was coming by way of Boston, instead of *via* the Intercolonial Railway, as it should He moved, that the secretary be instructed to inquire why this freight does not come by way of the Intercolonial Railway.

"Mr. Hatheway answered Mr. Cruikshank's query in a very satisfactory manner. He pointed out, that the freight from milling centres of Ontario to St. John *via* the Intercolonial Railroad was 55 cents, while from the same place to Boston, it was only 35 cents—from Boston to St. John, eight cents, allowing about three cents per barrel for insurance; the total cost by way of Boston was only about 46 cents."

Whether that is the fault of the Intercolonial or not, I am not prepared to say, but the papers are teeming every day with charges against that road. Last week, it was stated in one of the newspapers, that an offer was made to carry stone from Newcastle to Metapedia for $12 a carload, while stone was brought from Newcastle to Ottawa for the building on Wellington street, at a smaller sum.

Mr. FOSTER. That is quite wrong.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What was the rate?

Mr. FOSTER. $20 a carload.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). A certain portion of that would go to the Grand Trunk, and certainly the Inter-

colonial would not get more than $12 from Newcastle to Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. From Newcastle to the Chaudière Junction at Quebec, the rate was $20 a carload.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What quantity was carried in a car? According to the discussion the other day in reference to the building the Minister of Public Works made the rate considerably less.

Mr. FOSTER. There was no information upon the subject here then, but I stated that I would get the information. I have the information now, and the rate was $20 a carload to the Chaudière Junction.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister of Public Works stated then that the price was 12 cents per cubic foot, and that something under 12 feet would make a ton, so that would be $1.44 a ton, and certainly that is not $20 a carload.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The newspapers are making other charges against the management of this road. It is said that coal is carried to Quebec at $16 a car, when I saw a bill of lading from Springhill to St. John at $24 a car. The other day it was proposed to bring down lumber from Bathurst to St John, during the winter, over the Intercolonial Railway. At the rate of coal, that would be $6 a car, but the charge was placed at such a figure as to make it wholly unremunerative. There is another matter which is referred to in regard to the expense of that road. During the time Mr. Brydges had charge of that road, there was a great outcry made because he had a private car. Brydges' car was spoken of everywhere. It was said that this was extravagant, that Mr. Brydges was such a high and mighty power that he could not travel with common people, but must have a private car for himself. To-day we are informed that there is the official car, No. 34, for the use of Mr. Pottinger. Then there is the "Cumberland"—the old Brydges car—which is kept for the Governor General, and there is the "Ottawa," which I understand is also now the official or private car of Mr. Trites. Then we are informed that there is another car.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) What about the "Jamaica?"

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I do not know whether the "Jamaica" has gone down there yet or not. At all events, it is reported that another car is being built for the engineer-in-chief. If that is true, we shall have four official and private cars on that road instead of the one little car which Mr. Brydges had, and, in regard to which, such an attack was made upon him and upon the Government of that day. There are other charges made in the press in regard to that road every day. There was one the other day in reference to the cars furnished by Harris & Co, which, it is said, were condemned by the master car builder, but yet they were built and had afterwards to be altered in the Government shops at an enormous expense. These charges are brought every day, and they show that there must be something wrong in the management of the road. One of the last stories is the most extraordinary of all. It is that at a particular station on the Intercolonial Railway, the station master was allowed $5 a day to keep up a fire during the winter months to prevent the water freezing in the tank, but, while the $5 a day goes on, for many months there has been no water there at all, and eight months ago the tank was burnt down. The water has gone and the tank has gone, but the pay goes on forever. Whether these statements are true or not I do not know, but they are published and there does not appear to be any contradiction of them made. I believe one great objection in connection with that road is that far more employés are used than are needed, and they are employed for political purposes and not for their efficiency in regard to railways. If a private road had to employ the same number of men in proportion, they would find their accounts just as deficient as the Intercolonial. Then there is another matter which is deserving of attention, and that is the remarkable number of accidents to employés that have occurred on that road as compared with others. Looking at the returns during the past year, I find that 120 employés were more or less injured. Then there is another matter of a local nature of which I will speak, and which has created a good deal of feeling in St. John, and in regard to which the conduct of Mr. Schreiber was condemned by parties of all shades of political opinion. At the Intercolonial Railway station there was no shelter afforded for the hackmen, and things got into such a state that the hackmen practically abandoned going to the station at all. Now, I have a statement here made by a hackman who was interviewed by a reporter, in which he says:

"We never have had any proper accommodation around the station, and when we agitated for a stand inside the building so that we would not be exposed to the weather, they gave us one outside in the mud where our passengers would have to walk under the drip of the building."

I can speak of that from experience.—

"But when they did that, they promised us we could sit in the gentlemen's waiting rooms until the trains were due, and that four minutes after the train arrived, we could go inside the station, and assist our patrons with their luggage. Last night the station master and gatekeeper informed us that all privileges held by us had been taken away, and that in future we were not to come inside the building. As a result of that, he continued, we have decided to boycot the station after the 14th inst. It is a hard decision, he said, but we cannot stand outside in the winter, exposed to the biting wind and freezing atmosphere. The driver was very strong in his denunciation of their treatment, and said, among other things, that frequently they had lady passengers with heavy luggage, who were forced to carry it the whole length of the station in their search for a teamster, while when a railway magnate from Moneton, or any other place, came to the city, a coachman would be sent in to receive his satchel the moment he stepped from the car, and carry it for him to the cab waiting outside. All that the men ask is for accommodation inside the station building."

Then the reporter goes on to say:

"There are two sides in every story, and in this case no harm can be done in showing up the other side. When the railing, which has caused so much trouble, was first put up, the station master gave the coachmen the privilege of sitting in the room, until the train was coming into the station. They were then to take their stand outside. This arrangement would probably have worked all right, had not the officer whose duty it was to report offenders against the railway regulations, neglected to report the few coachmen who abused the privileges granted them. In consequence of this laxity on the part of the officer, the offending coachmen became emboldened, and finally the station master found it necessary to cancel the privileges he had given them. The withdrawal of the station privileges from those coachmen who had obeyed the regulations is, of course, a hardship."

In consequence of this difficulty the divisional superintendent went down and saw the men and agreed to make some arrangement by which they would be protected from the weather. We all know that at certain seasons of the year it is impossible for the men to remain outside, at the same time stand where they would be convenient to the public. The divisional superintendent made arrangements to furnish them a porch, they waited for some time, but the promise was not fulfilled. But upon the faith of that engagement, they resumed their position at the station, and matters went on the same as usual. But nothing was done, and on the 9th of February last, the mayor of St. John wrote to the manager. This is what I find in a local paper:

"On the 9th inst., Mayor Thorne wrote to the manager of the Government railways, calling Mr. Schreiber's attention to the terms of the arrangement made with Mr. Wallace, divisional superintendent of the Intercolonial, touching the erection of a shelter for the coachmen attending the St. John depot and politely notified Mr. Schreiber that no shelter had yet been provided by the railway. Yesterday his worship received the following extremely curt reply.

"OTTAWA, 16th February, 1889.

"Henry J. Thorne, Esq., Mayor St. John, N.B.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I have yours of the 19th instant, and in reply would beg to ask whether the city authorities of St. John have provided shelter

for the hackmen on their stands on the streets, where they stand probably two-thirds of their time.

"Yours truly,
"COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER."

Now, I do not think that was a courteous or a proper answer to send to the chief magistrate of the city of St. John, and a feeling of indignation was aroused as to the manner in which the hackmen were treated. At a meeting which was held shortly after the publication of this letter, held in connection with the Short Line, a resolution was passed, moved by Conservatives, and unanimously adopted, condemning the action of Mr. Schreiber in this matter. I give this instance to show the injustice done to the hackmen of St. John, and also to show the manner in which matters are administered, and the dissatisfaction which exists among the people. This shows that the manner in which the road is conducted is not only detrimental to the interests of the people, but to the interest of the road itself, and it shows that the road cannot be carried on as efficiently as it could be if the headquarters were at Moncton, or at some other place more convenient than Ottawa, which is at a great distance, even from the extreme western end of the line. I pointed out the mode in which freight from Moncton is in some way or other driven into other channels. This matter becomes still more important from the fact that with the opening of summer there will be two other roads in competition with the Intercolonial Railway. First, there is the road from Rivière du Loup through Temiscouata to Edmundston, and thence through the counties of New Brunswick, until it unites with the New Brunswick Railway. By that road a person leaving Rivière du Loup can reach St. John at the same time that he would arrive at Campbellton by the Intercolonial Railway. Then we have the Short Line, so you will see how important it is that rigid inquiry should be made into the management of the road, and that a more rigid economy should be practiced than has hitherto prevailed. Now, a word in regard to the stores. Of course, I am not a railway man, and I cannot understand all these things as well as a railway man, but it seems to me that there is an enormous amount of stores on hand this year, I see about half-a million dollars worth; last year, nearly $700,000 of stock in stores. It seems to me now, with the facilities we have for replenishing stores, that the keeping of such a large stock on hand opens the door to temptation to make away with them, or to waste them, although I do not say that such has been done. In the Lower Provinces we all feel an interest in this road, and a feeling of general dissatisfaction prevails regarding its management in all these particulars.

Committee rose, and it being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

GREAT NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. DAVIS moved the consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 49) respecting the Alberta and Athabasca Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to "The Great North-Western Railway Company." He said: The amendment made in the Senate is the insertion of the word "Alberta" after the words "Great North-Western."

Mr. COLBY. I beg to move:

That the said amendment be amended by leaving out Alberta after "North-West" and inserting "of Canada" after "Company" on line ten of the Bill, and in the title in line three of the same.

When this Bill was before the Senate Committee it was thought that the name too nearly resembled that of another railway company, the Great North-Western Central, and without there being an opportunity of consulting with the promoters of the Bill at the moment, the word Alberta inserted. I subsequently received a cable from the promoters in London expressing a preference to the title I propose, and I submitted that to the gentleman who made the objection in the Senate, so there can be no objection to it I presume.

Amendment agreed to, and amendments concurred in.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 68) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. EDGAR. I gave notice of an amendment the other day to be moved in Committee on this Bill, but after looking into the matter as carefully as I could, I have come to the conclusion that it is not necessary to move that amendment. However, there are some general considerations in connection with this Bill which I should like to bring before the Committee, not that I propose to move any amendment to it. From the enormous sums involved and from the great interest which the Dominion possesses in this undertaking, I think time will not be lost if I spend a few moments in directing the attention of the House to what seem to be the general considerations underlying this legislation. The company has not only been largely subsidised by the Dominion, but to-day its stock to the extent of $65,000,000 is guaranteed as to 3 per cent. interest by the Dominion, or rather interest for the next four years is to be paid upon that amount by the Dominion; and under the legislation of last Session interest at 3½ per cent. on $15,000,000 more of the securities of the company has been guaranteed by the Dominion. In fact, the prosperity of this railway is a matter of the most vital importance to Canada; the fortunes of the Dominion are largely bound up to-day with that of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and, as an American writer not long ago described it, it may be said to be a "Dominion on wheels." What is the effect of the legislation proposed? Only last Session the House was asked to concur in a proposal, and it did concur in a proposal, to guarantee interest at three and a-half per cent. per annum on $15,000,000 of the bonds of the company. That involved a charge of $525,000 a year upon the country, if the railway company did not meet the interest on those bonds. In explaining the position of the country with respect to the securities upon the railway, Sir Charles Tupper, who had charge of this Bill on behalf of the Government, in reply to some observations from this side of the House, explained the position in these words:

"Does not the hon. gentleman know that we come next to the first mortgage, that the company cannot put a dollar of additional security on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that only $35,000,000 for all this enormous work and this immense property is the entire amount that stands in front of the Government?"

Well, I suppose he was accurate last year. But when this Bill becomes law, the position of the Government will be widely different from that position, because the Government will stand behind about $120,000,000 of securities by the changes that are proposed to be made in this Bill, and it is just as well that the House should understand the position which we would then occupy. I will show the Committee how I make that out. The Canadian Pacific Railway have first mortgage bonds issued to the extent of $35,000,000, which Sir Charles Tupper referred to, upon the main line and branches, in fact upon the Canadian Pacific Railway itself. They have in one shape or another, as is shown by the schedule attached to this Bill, securities, bonds, stocks, &c., upon leased lines, to the extent of $52,000,000 more, which they propose to pay off at the same time that

they pay off or take the power to pay off or redeem the $35,000,000 bonds on the railway proper. That makes $87,000,000 which they propose to deal with in this Bill, and how do they propose to deal with it? They propose to take power to issue the consolidated debenture stock sufficient in amount to pay off not only the whole $35,000,000 but the whole $52,000,000 upon the leased lines as well, and, properly enough, they propose, that if they can make any profit by the transference of the security from the old form to the new by issuing the new at a lower rate of interest and capitalising the new issue, they shall be entitled to do it. The result will be that if they can succeed in floating the new issue over the original Canadian Pacific Railway and the leased lines at 4 per cent. and can still keep within the annual charge for interest which these securities as they now exist call for, they will be able to issue instead of $87,000,000, $109,000,000 at 4 per cent. That will be a large profit (if they were able to carry out the exchange at once) of some $21,000,000 for the Canadian Pacific Railway in that transaction. Now I know perfectly well they will not be able and they cannot possibly expect to make the whole of that $21,000,000 by the exchange, but under favorable circumstances they will be able to make a very considerable profit. I do not know how many millions of profit that will be, and I am sure it is not likely that they can even approximate it, but there is a maximum of $21,000,000 which they have an opportunity of reaching and making a profit of. I said a little while ago that we would be placed behind $120,000,000 if this Bill went through. That sum will be composed of these $109,000,000, and also of the new further issue of the consolidated debenture stock to the extent of £500 sterling per mile of their railway, which, I believe, will produce about $12,500,000, making something over $120,000,000 that will be charged upon the Canada Pacific Railway property, where, to-day, there are only $35,000,000 charged, as Sir Charles Tupper said last year. Well, the Government, of course, in respect to their guarantee of over half a million a year, will come behind that $120,000,000 just as they stand behind the $35,000,000 to-day; except in this way: whereas the $35,000,000 is only the security upon the Canadian Pacific Railway proper, the new issue of $120,000,000 will comprise the leased lines as well. The question then which, I think, the Government is bound to consider, and I suppose they have considered it, and I have no doubt they can explain to the House, is this: Does the transference of $109,000,000 to the double security of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the leased lines leave the country as good a security against loss upon their guarantee as before? I do not know how we can consider that question better than by asking this question: What proportion of the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway does the $35,000,000 of the charge upon it represent? Now, from the last annual report of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company I find that they state the cost of the railway to be $180,000,000. That is the railway upon which the $35,000,000 to-day is the first charge, and the only charge ahead of the Government. It is made up in this way: "Main line and branches, $135,000,000; Government lines, $35,000,000; equipment, $10,000,000." It may be more since that date, but that on the 31st December, 1887, was the estimate. Well now, upon that a charge of $35,000,000 is just about 20 per cent. of the cost of that railway. Let us look and see, as nearly as we can estimate, what percentage of the cost of the leased lines $52,000,000 will be, which sum is the charge we take off the leased lines and put upon to the whole concern? I am assuming for the moment that the Canadian Pacific Railway has a right to mortgage all these lines, I am assuming for the moment that they have a fee simple in these lines, and that they can mortgage them just as effectually as they have already mortgaged the main line of the railway proper for $35,000,000. But I do not think they have that right, and the Bill itself does not claim that they have a fee simple in these railways or in any of them. It only purports to mortgage the leasehold interest. That leasehold interest may or not be equivalent to the full value of the road subject to the securities. I will assume that the leasehold interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which they are putting into a blanket mortgage, is equivalent to the fee simple value. Well, what proportion will $52,000,000 bear to the value of these lines? I do not know what information the company are prepared to furnish to the House on that point, or what information the Government have on that point, but I have made a partial estimate which, I dare say, will be of some value in guiding us to an estimate of their value. I see that by far the largest and most important of these leased lines, as set forth in the schedule, is the Ontario and Quebec system. That, including the Toronto, Grey and Bruce system, forms a length (as I gather from the report of the company) of 745 miles, and I find that the charges now existing upon that portion of the line, according to the schedule, amount to just about $25,000,000. Very well, what amount per mile is $25,000,00 as a charge upon 745 miles? I think it will be found that it is $33,000 per mile of a charge to-day. I have very little hesitation in expressing a strong and positive opinion that that is the full cost of that leased system, the Ontario and Quebec, and the Toronto, Grey and Bruce. I do not believe there is $1 a mile of margin; and I will give you one reason. I have looked into the statistics of the cost of the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway; and according to returns furnished to the Ontario Legislature, and found in the Sessional Papers of that Legislature of 1877, the cost of 191 miles of this railway was only $19,208 per mile; that is the return the company made to the Government. It did not cost the company anything like that, because there was to be deducted from that $6,700 a mile of Government and municipal bonuses. However, we are not talking now of what it cost the company; we are talking about the cost of construction, from all sources. The original stock has been wiped out, of course, and the Government bonuses were all given in, and still the whole cost of the railway was $19,000 per mile; and there was a change of gauge which cost, perhaps, $3,000 or $4,000 per mile; so that the whole cost of the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway was most distinctly and positively within $25,000 per mile, and the Ontario and Quebec system, of which it forms a part, is mortgaged now for $33,000 per mile. The Credit Valley Railway is also a part of this system. There were not complete returns showing the cost of that line which I could find yesterday; but, in Toronto, engineers and others claim that it cost less than the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, and I know it did not cost more. So that if we allow that the Ontario and Quebec line from Toronto to Montreal cost considerably more than the others, $33,000 a mile is a handsome average for the cost. Well, it is for the House to consider how far that change of a security will advantage the country. Now, I have not been saying anything about the proposed increased loan of $12,500,000, which it is proposed to apply to equipment purposes, and which will come in ahead of the shareholders and ahead of the Government. So far as the shareholders are concerned, there is a provision in the Bill that they shall not be bound by the proposal unless two-thirds of them shall accept it; so I do not think we need trouble ourselves about the shareholders But the Government and Parliament have no opportunity of voting upon it or considering it after this Bill becomes law, and that is one reason why we should talk it over here. It may or may not be an advantageous thing for the company to take power to raise $12,500,000 more for equipment; but certainly

when the House is asked to grant that power, the very least we are entitled to is a full explanation of what has become of the $ 5,000,000 which less than one year was raised by the company upon the guarantee of Canada for the very purposes of equipment. The Act was passed last Session, allowing the issue of $15,000,000 of bonds, the interest of which we guaranteed, and provided three modes of expenditure: on account of capital expenditure, for buildings, permanent bridges and other improvements, $5,000,000; for rolling stock, locomotives, box cars, and passenger cars, $5,000,000; for required improvement in main line, elevators, bridges and trestles, over $4,000,000 more;—divided nearly into three equal proportions for almost exactly the very purposes for which this loan is asked to-day. If one year ago the company required to obtain at least $12,500,000 out of the $15,000,000 for these purposes, and it requires now to come to the House and ask for $10,000,000 more, I do think we ought to have some reasonable assurances that next year the company will not come again to Parliament and ask us to postpone further the position of the shareholders and the Government for another $10,000,000. We are undoubtedly entitled to explanations on that point. Then, a certain amount of security was nominally given to the Government last Session in connection with their guarantee in having the right to retain the interest which they might receive upon land sales. The principal belongs to the trustees, who hold it as security for the $15,000,000 of bonds. I would like to know, and the Government will be able to tell us at once, how much has been received by them since last Session on account of these land sales. We may gather from that some idea of how much the interest upon the net proceeds of the land sales is likely to amount to as security for their guarantee. Now, I said a little while ago that, in considering the nature of the security which would be held by the holders of the new bonds of $109,000,000, I assumed that the leased railways were leased by the company for their full value. I assumed that the interest in them was equivalent to a fee simple. Now, if the company leased them on a lease of a thousand years—a perpetual lease in fact—and if they are to pay no more rental than the charges which are upon the individual railways and which are mentioned in this schedule, it may be that the security under the new mortgage will amount to just the same as the equity of redemption, or the fee simple in those railways, over and above those charges. We have no information—and I do not know where I can find any—of the nature of these leases, which it is proposed to hand over pratically to the new securities that are to go against the property. If the whole security, covering the leased lines, is not on the whole $109,000,000 as valuable as the $35,000,000 upon the origignal loan, it is a very bad bargain for the Government, and requires explanation. I cannot imagine that it will be contended that the annual value of the whole concern or the greater part of the value of the whole concern is in these leased lines. Surely the country, which has spent so many millions upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, will not be told that the greater part of the value of the whole system now worked by the railway is in these leased lines. One would think that must be claimed because it is proposed to take $52,000,000 from them and to share that with the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the proportion of 52 to 35. The of points I have suggested are well worthy the consideration of the House, and require some explanation from the gentleman who is in charge of the Bill.

On section 3,

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I wish to change the expression, "By the vote of at least two-thirds of the shareholders," and make it read: "So to do by at least two-thirds of the votes of the shareholders."

Mr. EDGAR.

On section 4,

Mr. EDGAR. This fourth section says that the consolidated debenture stock is to be issued for the purposes mentioned in the said several sections. There are no purposes mentioned whatsoever.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes; there are. The Bill was amended in Committee and reads "for the general purposes of the company."

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In moving the amendment of which I gave notice, it will be necessary to review, at some length, perhaps, all the circumstances connected with this Canadian Pacific Railway. It will be remembered that Parliament voted a sum of money for the construction of a short line of railway to St. John and Salisbury, shortening the distance to Halifax. That vote of $250,000 was intended to complete the entire line. After the vote passed the House, it appears, from the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, at page 27:

"That an application having been made for the said subsidies by the International Railway Company, and they having agreed to conform to the necessary conditions and requirements, and having evidenced their ability to construct and operate the road, entry into contract with them was authorised by Order in Council of 9th November, 1885, and such contract was executed on the 14th December, 1885, they undertaking to complete a line from a point on the south bank of the St. Lawrence at or near Caughnawaga, about nine miles above Montreal, to connect with the Intercolonial at Moncton, by the 1st July, 1889."

It is necessary to the proper understanding of this question that these details should be placed before the House, because we are discussing this question to-night in face of full information, which we were not in face of when this question was discussed earlier in the Session. We were at that time under the impression, from statements made by the late Finance Minister in Halifax, in the first place, and subsequently in this House, that there had been a regularly signed and sealed contract and bond made between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway for the construction of that line to Salisbury to connect with the Intercolonial. Since that time, the documents which were moved for, have been brought down, and the Government have not been able to produce to this House any evidence in support of the statement made by their Finance Minister, which was made in their presence and repeated in their presence, and tending to create and establish the impression which the Minister of Finance endeavored to create in Halifax, that there was a binding contract between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the building of the line to Salisbury. They go on further to say that:

"The International Railway Company subsequently disposed of their interest in this contract to the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company, and that company were accepted as contractors by an Order in Council dated the 13th of November, 1886, the agreement made thereunder being dated the 6th of December, 1886.

"The Atlantic and North-West Railway Company, having powers under their charter to enter into arrangements for the crossing of the State of Maine, obtained from the Maine Central Railway Company the privilege of acquiring running powers for 99 years over the portion of their road between Mattawamkeag and Vanceborough, on the boundary line. These arrangements were accepted by an Order in Council of the 30th December, 1886."

"The total subsidies available under vote of Parliament for this work of railway construction, amounting, as above stated, to $250,000 a year, for a term of twenty years, it became necessary so to apportion this amount as to secure the building of the links to connect with the roads already in existence in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia leading to the harbors named.

"Accordingly, an estimate of the cost of the several sections of the surveyed line, as adopted, was made, and as the result an Order in Council was passed on the 14th June, 1886, apportioning the subsidy, the arrangement being as follows:—For the section from the River St. Lawrence to Lennoxville, $71,100. The section from Lennoxville to Moose River is covered by the International Railway, already constructed. For the section between Moose River and Mattawamkeag, a station on the Maine Central Railway, $115,500. From Mattawamkeag to Harvey Station on the New Brunswick Railway, running arrangements have been made over existing roads. For the section between Harvey and a point on the Intercolonial Railway near Salisbury Station,

$63,400. The remaining distance is by the Intercolonial Railway to Moncton.

Under these circumstances, it will be obvious to the House that the Government deliberately approved of this transfer by the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company of so much of their contract as to carry their road to Mattawamkeag, and they were aware, of course, having dealt with it by Order in Council, that, under that arrangement, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were not legally bound to go one foot beyond Mattawamkeag. Yet, under this positive and clear understanding which is now before the House, we are brought face to face with a condition of affairs which was supposed to have existed under the statement made by the late Minister of Finance. I need only repeat here one quotation from that hon. gentleman's speech. He said:

"When that company have declared by the most solemn, important and businesslike act that it is possible for them to do—by putting their hand and seal to a contract binding them to build not only the short line of railway that comes to St. John, but also the short line of railway that passes St. John by coming from Fredericton to Moncton, because that is in the bond, and that is the work with which they are immediately to grapple."

That is the statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance, in Halifax, and subsequently given by him to this House. On that occasion I said to the Minister of Finance:

"If my information is correct, they are constructing the branch from Mattawamkeag to the Central Railway, and no progress is being made on the other branch. I am aware that it is said to be under the charge of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but it appears to me the Government should exercise supervision over those roads when public money is expended on them.

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly, the contract is with them."

There you have that deliberate statement made on behalf of the Government, first at Halifax and secondly in this House, by the Minister of Finance, before his colleagues, who were aware of it, before the members of this House, some of whom were interested in the Canadian Pacific Railway, and were doubtless aware of it as the Government were aware of it. We must hold them bound as having been aware of the agreements which were made under the Order in Council, and yet they allowed this impression to go to the country day after day, which was a false one, which was a deliberate misrepresentation. I remember last Session that the Speaker decided, when a question came up here and an hon. member charged another with stating what was false or with stating a falsehood, that it was not parliamentary language to say that it was a falsehood or a false statement, but at the same time he said there was nothing unparliamentary in quoting any proof you could bring in support of the statement that the party you were referring to had made a false representation or had stated what in fact was not true. I have only in this case to refer to the statement made by the Minister of Public Works in Committee the other day, that no contract ever had existed or did exist with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the construction of a foot of that line beyond Mattawamkeag. With such a statement coming from the Government, in direct contradiction to the iterated statements of the late Minister of Finance, I leave it to this House to say whether the late Minister of Finance occupies in this matter a very creditable position before the country. I do not hold the Canadian Pacific Railway Company altogether blameless in this matter, because their representatives were present and heard the statements made by the Minister of Finance. They were parties to that statement as much as if they had made it themselves, because, if a statement is made deliberately in Parliament respecting a transaction in which others are engaged or are supposed to be concerned, and those parties sit quietly by and tacitly acquiesce in the statement of a member of this House, they become a party to that statement, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were in that respect a party to the statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance. This transaction has been one of very great interest to the people of the Maritime Provinces and to the people of my own city. The impression conveyed there has been generally accepted on the ground of the statement made by the late Minister of Finance. They were unwilling to believe, as I was unwilling to believe—I never doubted for one moment that the statement which he made was inaccurate or untrue—I was unwilling to believe that a gentleman occupying the high position in this country of the late Minister of Finance, a man who had been in charge of all these negotiations for a long time, would deliberately, for political purposes, at a time when great public interest was excited in regard to that railway and its completion, would have come down to Halifax and have made such a statement as that to which I refer. They would have been more astonished, and I think the members of this House will share that astonishment when they find that the Minister of Finance not only made that statement there, but reiterated it here deliberately in the presence of his colleagues, who, under those circumstances, shared the responsibility of that statement. I said the people of the Maritime Provinces felt great interest in the completion of that line. I hold in my hand a circular which has just been issued by the Board of Trade at Halifax, a new commercial organisation, not in competition with the Chamber of Commerce, but embracing other mercantile men in that community. It is mainly taken up with this Short Line Railway question. They say:

"Whereas the Government of the Dominion granted large subsidies to certain contractors to construct and operate a short line railway to connect the ports of St. John and Halifax with the Canadian Pacific and other Upper Province railway systems, and thus establish a complete and rapid railway communication from ocean to ocean; and

"Whereas such short line was held out to the Maritime Provinces as in some measure a compensation for the large burdens created by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and

"Whereas at the time of the granting of such aforesaid subsidies, fears were expressed that the eastern section of the road would not be built and the Government thereupon gave the fullest assurance that the contractors would be compelled to complete the whole line; and

"Whereas the contract has been acquired.——"

Observe, Mr. Chairman, how this Chamber of Commerce have been led into the statement here based upon the representation of the Minister of Finance—

"Whereas the contract has been acquired by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and such company in violation of its assurances given by its directors and in violation of the pledges given by the Government, have not begun work on the eastern section between Harvey and Moncton, and there are just fears that the eastern section will not be built; and

"Whereas the Canadian Pacific Railway Company entered into a solemn and binding contract to build and operate the aforesaid road; and

"Whereas the completion of said section is of paramount importance to the Province of Nova Scotia; be it therefore

"Resolved, That the Board of Trade strongly protest against the action of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as a breach of faith, and calls upon the Government of the Dominion to fulfil its pledges by compelling the company to forthwith proceed with the construction of such section between Harvey and Moncton."

As I observed, the members of the Chamber of Commerce were led into passing this resolution by the representations which had been made in this House and out of it, and they say here:

"Whereas the Canadian Pacific Railway Company entered into a solemn and binding contract to build and operate the aforesaid road."

Now, we find when we come to probe the thing, when all the papers are submitted to this House, that there never existed a line of obligation, of a legal obligation, on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to build one foot beyond Mattawamkeag. I say that this exhibition of Government duplicity, this exhibition of the manner in which the Government have traded on the desires of the people of the Maritime Provinces in regard to this road, is anything but creditable to the Government which

are parties to such a guilty, to such a baseless, to such a false representation; because, as I repeat, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, according to the papers which have been submitted to this House, were never obliged to build one foot beyond Mattawamkeag. The Government took good care, in the division of the subsidy, that the largest portion of it should be assigned to the road between the St. Lawrence and Mattawamkeag; and the Government were aware, or should have been aware, that the subsidy assigned for the completion of the line from Mattawamkeag to Salisbury, was insufficient, according to the estimates, to construct that line. Therefore, the Government were remiss in their duty in apportioning so much of that subsidy to the line this side of Mattawamkeag and leaving such a small proportion of it for the completion of the line to Salisbury on the Intercolonial Railway. The object they had in view we, of course, are unable to find out. The object that the Government had in concealing the true condition of affairs with respect to this company, of course is one of those things which, perhaps, will never come to light. But we have a statement made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that the cost of the construction of that line from the St. Lawrence, including the acquisition and construction as far as Mattawamkeag, has exceeded by somewhere near three millions and a quarter the estimate which they had formed when the contract was taken. I ventured to call the attention of the Railway Committee to this fact, I ventured to propound to them the desirability, the necessity in fact, of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company being called upon to say in what manner the construction of that line had cost three millions and a quarter above what was estimated at that time. I think that before the Government agreed to give them borrowing powers under this Bill, the company should have been called upon to give the Railway Committee a proof that the line actually cost the sum which they have mentioned; because every hon. member knows that there is an idea prevailing in this House and the country that a very large proportion of that money spent for the acquisition of that line from Mattawamkeag, was not spent in the construction of that line at all, but to secure a contract from other intermediatory companies who had a large advantage, a paramount advantage, the greatest advantage, in that portion of the subsidy which was assigned to that line. I think it should have been a reasonable and proper enquiry for this House to make, and that it should still make, of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that they should produce sufficient evidence to show that the statement which they have made can be borne out by the papers submitted. Now, I think that is the position of affairs to-day, and what is to be done? Some hon. members may say that if there was no legal contract to build the road beyond Mattawamkeag, why do you seek to insert a clause now to compel them to do so? My reason is simply this, because I hold the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to be parties to the announcement which was made, I hold the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as morally responsible for the construction of that line, although not legally responsible, I hold that when they and their agents, and their contractors, sat in this House and heard the Government announce, without contradiction, that they were the contractors to build that line to Salisbury on the Intercolonial Railway, they acquiesced in that statement, and morally bound themselves to carry out the contract to that extent. I say that if such were not the case we would have no further faith in companies or Governments, and in some Governments we know that members have but little faith indeed. What is going to be done under these circumstances? The Government has to do one of two things. The Government has either to insist on this clause going into that agreement and reserving a sufficient sum for the completion of the line; or they have to adopt another course, and come down to this House and ask for a grant to build it themselves as a Government undertaking. The country hold them to that task and the people of the Maritime Provinces will hold them responsible, and if they are willing to assist members in voting down the amendment I offer, then I say the Government are bound in good faith to carry out the pledges made most positively, in the first place, by the Minister of Public Works whose language is so clear and so decisive that no person could misunderstand it; and if the Government are not disposed to place that responsibility on the shoulders of the Canadian Pacific Railway, they are bound to take the next step, and ask the House for a sufficient sum to complete it. And they may take which alternative they please. If hon. gentlemen opposite will say that they will undertake the work themselves as a Goverment work and proceed with the construction of it at once, I will withdraw the amendment. I put this matter before them. I say if they are willing to declare that they will ask this House to vote sufficient money for the construction of the line at an early date, not at too remote a date, I will withdraw my amendment; but unless they give this House and through this House the people of Halifax and other parts of the Maritime Provinces the assurance that they will proceed with this work as a Government measure, I will press this House to a division at every stage of the Bill. It may be carried against me, but at least we will then see whether members of the Government can forfeit their pledged word and their honor, I may say, and make statements for political and electioneering purposes to induce the country to believe that a contract was made, signed and sealed between them and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company when such a contract never existed. If the Government are willing to place themselves in that position, I will give them an opportunity in Committee and on the third reading of the Bill. Our people are determined to know upon whose shoulders the responsibility rests. We know very well that it rests upon the Government, and we are not going to relieve them from that responsibility. But, if they will now say that they will ask Parliament for a sufficient sum to construct that branch from Harvey to Salisbury I will be satisfied, and I will withdraw my amendment. Nothing less than that will satisfy the people of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, and we have a right to expect this from the Government in redemption of their pledged faith to this House on more than one occasion. It is no use the Government trying to place the responsibility on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, when they deliberately allowed the company on their own arrangement to shuffle out of it when they were bound to finish the work; and if they deliberately allowed the company to shuffle out of that which was at least a moral obligation resting upon them, and which was more than a moral obligation, because of the statements made by Ministers, the Government should now come down and ask the House for a sufficient grant to finish it. I leave the matter with the Government, and they can take whichever course they like. If they will give me any assurance that they are prepared to ask the House to build it, I shall not proceed further; if not, I shall move the amendment of which I have given notice which reads as follows:—

That the following be added to the fourth clause after the word "whatever:" "After a sufficient amount of the proceeds of said consolidated stock has first been reserved for the completion and equipment of the railway from Mattawamkeag to Harvey and Salisbury, in the Province of New Brunswick.'"

I leave the matter there, because it is a matter in the hands of the Government, and they are the principal factors in dealing with it. We know the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but we have nothing to do with that. We have only to deal with the Administration of the day, and, therefore, I say that if the Government assist in

voting down this amendment, all they have to do is to give the assurance to this House that they will undertake to carry it out as a Government measure; and if they do neither one or the other, the House will know on whose shoulders the responsibility rests, and how much the plighted pledge of public men, in Parliament and out of it, can be relied upon. When the people find that a member of this House, occupying such a high position as the late Minister of Finance occupies in this country, and the Minister of Public Works, who holds such a high position, made deliberate statements with respect to this matter—the Minister of Public Works stating that he would take care that not a cent of money would be expended unless the whole line was completed, and that he was commissioned to speak for the Government,—I say, in the face of such strong assurances, made by such members of the Cabinet as the late Finance Minister and the present Minister of Public Works, it would be a shock to the public sentiment of this country if the people found these hon. gentlemen going back on the statements they made to this House. I trust the Government will deal with this matter, either by insisting on this clause being introduced into the Bill, or by adopting the alternative I have suggested of carrying the work out as a Government work.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that it is necessary to discuss this matter or enter into it or consider the very strong language used by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones); but I can relieve his anxiety. I can tell him now that the Government have come to an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, by which the Government will see that the road from Harvey to Salisbury is built and thereby the promises made by Sir Charles Tupper and the Minister of Public Works will be carried out.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). At what time? The hon. gentleman opposite says they have come to an arrangement by which this road will be built.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With all convenient speed.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the Government are bound to state, under these circumstances, whether they are going to build the road in one or two years. I do not wish to press them to build it within a short time; but, in view of the great interest excited, the Government should give some assurance that they will see the work undertaken at an early day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At an early day.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). We shall have to let it rest there at present.

Mr. LAURIER. This statement of the First Minister is hardly satisfactory in view of the pledge which it gives, and the House is entiled to particulars. The time is now up for Private Bills, and we may expect on Monday that the hon. gentleman will be prepared to make a fuller statement than he has now made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope the hon. gentleman will allow this Bill to pass, for if it is going to pass at all it should pass now. The Government is coming down during the Session with the whole arrangement that has been made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and they will ask the sanction of Parliament to it, and I have no doubt that the House will give that sanction. I have no doubt that it will be satisfactory to those most immediately concerned, that is to the hon. gentlemen representing the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). As has been suggested by the leader of the Government, under those circumstances we might allow the Bill to go through Committee to-night, and reserve the third reading.

An hon. MEMBER. No reserve; it is a Private Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. There is a part of this question which is a very important one and upon which I would not feel disposed to yield without more information than we have at this moment. My hon. friend (Mr. Edgar) brought forward a most important question with regard to the position of the country in connection with this Bill and upon which question no answer whatever has been given by the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We could not well understand the aim of my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Edgar) in making that speech. The only claim that the Government have got against the Canadian Pacific Railway is for the guarantee of the interest on the $15,000,000, and there are specific securities taken under the Act which gives us the land securities and which remain intact. These securities, as Parliament was convinced last Session, are more than sufficient in every way to prevent the possibility of a loss, or of the Government being called upon to pay any of that guarantee. That is the only claim against the Canadian Pacific Railway that I am aware of. The interest which we pay on the stock, as the hon. gentleman knows, is paid out of money in our own hands, and there are no other obligations that I am aware of. That being the case, the fact that the incumbrances on the different branches and leased lines is to be charged on the whole system does in no way that we are aware of or that we can discover, affect the position of the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It does seem to me that the announcement made by the First Minister shows the impropriety of our proceeding until we know exactly what the arrangement is between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway. This is not a matter of private arrangement between the Government and the country. It is an arrangement that affects the public revenues and in which the entire population of this country are interested, and, therefore, while this Bill is before the Committee and under its consideration, we are, in consequence of the announcement which the First Minister has made, entitled to know what the arrangement is that has been come to—an arrangement which, from the statement of the right hon. gentleman himself, will impose further burthens upon the people of this country. I saw no objection myself to the passage of the Bill as it stood, with some amendments. It seems to me that a company having large material interests, coming before this House and asking to be granted a charter so as to improve its financial position without detriment to the public, ought to be enabled to do so, and as no credit or security on the part of the public is required, it is none of our business; it is their business, and they ought to be permitted to judge of their own interests. But, Sir, I was rather astonished at the position taken by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) when he says that a statement was made some time ago by Sir Charles Tupper, a statement that has proved to be wholly incorrect, and because that incorrect statement has been made, he is quite willing to withdraw the motion which he proposes to make if the Government will say they will impose a further burthen on the people of this country for an enterprise that is not of any use in the slightest degree. So far as I can understand this enterprise will shorten the communication between Montreal and Halifax by about 17 miles. It seems that when Sir Charles Tupper made this statement in Halifax that it had no foundation in fact, that there was no such argeement between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that he had no authority for making

that statement. He made a statement that he must have known to be without foundation and for the purpose of taking for the moment a political advantage of my hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones).

Mr. JONES (Halifax). He made the statement in the House afterwards.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says that Sir Charles Tupper made that statement in the House afterwards, and I believe that statement was in some form or other repeated by the hon. the Minister of Public Works. This may be a reason for condemning that hon. gentleman. It may be a reason for the House censuring the conduct of that hon. gentleman as a member of the Government, and a reason for the Government keeping silent when that statement was made and undertaking to mislead the House. I do not see that is any reason for saddling the people of this country with an additional debt for the construction of 120 miles of railway that may be of no real commercial advantage to the people of this country. When the Government comes down to this House and say that they have now made an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purpose of giving effect to that promise, which had at the time it was made no foundation in fact, I hold that we are entitled to know what that arrangement is. Surely if there is an arrangement the right hon. gentleman knows what it is. Does he propose that this sort of thing shall be done piecemeal and that we are going to carry this Bill there, and then that we are going to take another step, letting one matter after another slip from the control of the House? The right hon. gentleman ought to be frank with the House. If he has entered into an engagement of this sort he has entered into an engagement not on his own behalf, but on behalf of the people of this country whose interests the members of this House are here to protect. The hon. gentleman is not in form, whatever he may be in fact, the master of the House, he is the chief of the Committee who are supposed to represent the House and speak on behalf of the House for these administrative Acts. The House would be wanting in its duty to those whom it represents, if it permitted a single step to be taken in this matter until we know precisely what the engagements are between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman is not dealing with his own money in this. We have burden after burden imposed upon the people of this country for the past ten years and these burdens have been increased to an enormous extent. The people of this country are embarrassed financially, and embarrassed in every way. The farmers of this country are not to-day worth by 25 per cent. as much as they were ten years ago in consequence of the depreciation of their property on account of these unprofitable burdens that have been imposed upon them. We know what the policy was in dealing with the old Grand Trunk Railway Company twenty or thirty years ago. It was that every time that company became embarrassed, they came to the House to ask for legislation to give it relief and then the opportunity was seized to impose some profitless enterprise upon the company and to impede its chances of further advancement in the future. Is the Canadian Pacific Railway to be dealt with in exactly the same way? Are the Government of this country, acting not on behalf of the people of this country on the whole, but acting on behalf of those in one town who are seeking to build up their interest at the expense of another, to undertake to impose on this railway company burdens that will increase its embarrassments in the future, and which will impose still further burdens upon the overburdened people of this country? The policy which the hon. gentleman is again initiating is the policy which embarrassed the Grand Trunk Railway Company and which deprived every man and woman who took any stock in that road, of every dollar of profit on what they had invested. There is not a stockholder in the original Grand Trunk enterprise who ever received either in interest or in any other form a dollar out of that company; they have lost every copper they invested. So the hon. gentleman proposes to initiate this same system with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I say it is time in the history of this country that such financial proceedings should have an end, and those who are representatives of the people in this House, will be wanting in their duty to those whom they represent if they permit anything to be done until they know what the engagement of the Government is, and until they can assume the responsibility of honestly carrying out their duty to their best judgment, and pronounce on the merits of the agreement that has been entered into between the company and the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot see any necessity for the hon. gentleman treating us to a lecture on constitutional law on this private Bill. It appears that the hon. gentleman has got mixed up on two subjects. Here is a private Bill in which the Canadian Pacific Railway ask for leave to consolidate the encumbrance on their branch lines; to consolidate their debt in fact. They ask for leave to issue certain securities, to raise certain sums of money on their property. That is the proposition. That is either right or wrong. If it is right, the House should pass it; if it is wrong, they should not do so. The hon. gentleman said himself that he saw no objection to the Bill; it was passed by a large majority in the Railway Committee, and I have no doubt the same reasons which induced the Railway Committee to report the Bill will induce the majority of this House to grant this reasonable measure. It has no connection at all with the completion of the Short Line Railway. Then, the only reason I made the statement I did to the hon. gentleman opposite was to prevent a long and weary discussion on that motion of his; and he very naturally, with the other members from the Maritime Provinces, feels specially interested in having the Short Line Railway built, and in having construction begun on that portion from Harvey to Salisbury. Well, an arrangement has been made, and it is impossible to discuss that to-night, and it is equally wrong to stop this private Bill, which has nothing to do with that question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why has this Bill been delayed for a fortnight, if it has nothing to do with it?

Mr. LISTER. The House is in favor of this Bill, but you want a secret agreement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not a secret agreement. If the House approves of the arrangement, they will vote for it; if not, they will throw it out; but whether that arrangement meets with rejection or acceptance at the hands of the House, this Bill ought to pass. The passing of this Bill is of very great importance to the company. If it should be adopted by Parliament, that should be known at once in order that the company may make the necessary financial arrangements. Its passage will be announced by cable, and the financial arrangements can then be made. It is of great interest to all parts of the country where the money will be expended. Afterwards, if the House does not approve of the arrangements made to finish the Short Line Railway from Harvey to Salisbury, that measure can be voted down, but the two things ought not to be mixed together.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You have mixed them in the past three weeks.

Mr. LISTER. They are inseparable.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are in no way inseparable, and I think the House will agree that they should not be mixed together.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I submit that this House has not the information to enable it to vote on this question. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has moved an amendment to the Bill, and he has given his reason for doing so, that certain pledges have been given by members of the Government. The leader of the Government, in order to get out of the difficulty, says that arrangements have been made for building that piece of the Short Line Railway, and on that understanding the hon. member for Halifax agrees to withdraw his amendment. Now, Sir, I submit that there is a large amount of money, perhaps $1,000,000, involved for the building of a piece of useless road that will never pay running expenses, and if that arrangement is made contingent on the passing of this Bill, before the House assents to it we have a right to know who is going to foot the bill. If it is the country I submit that this House has a right to know it now; if it is the Canadian Pacific Railway we have a right to know that too. The Premier says it is a simple question of right and wrong. I endorse that statement. The Bill has been before the Railway Committee, it has been discussed for weeks past and nobody says there is anything wrong in granting the company the privileges they ask. I go further, and I say that so large a company involving such extensive interests as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, have a right to ask anything reasonable from this House in order to enable them to carry on their business. No objection has ever been taken to the Bill on that score, and we have a right to assume that what the company asks is perfectly right. If it is perfectly right, they should get what they ask without any conditions being attached. This House should not impose upon them the expense of several millions which they have no right to impose upon them; it is a sort of penalty upon them for getting their Bill through the House. We know the immense damage which was done to the Grand Trunk Railway Company by a similar course. They were involved in difficulties which they have never been able to surmount to this day; and I protest against the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or any other company being loaded down in the same way. A company so extensive, ramified as it is through the whole country, bound up as it is with the prosperity of the country, cannot be injured in any way, without involving the country in almost corresponding injury; and it is the duty of this House to see that no such load is put upon the company as will affect its interests or through it the general interests of the country.

Mr. MITCHELL. I must say I differ from my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and my hon. friend from South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) with regard to the means we should take. But I agree in the conclusion that the company should not be loaded down and embarrassed beyond what is legitimate and fair; and so far as the Bill is concerned, they are not loaded down. The Bill before the House was passed almost unanimously by the Railway Committee, and with an amount of enthusiasm on both sides of the Committee that is rarely seen there. If there have been differences between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as rumor says there have been, I know nothing about them beyond that. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have said that they want this Bill passed and it is all they want; they do not want to have anything more forced upon them; and are gentlemen in this House on either side going to block the legislation which is so desirable and necessary for a great corporation like that, which, as my hon. friend says, is bound up with the prosperity of this country, simply because some suspicions exist that a compact has been made which is going to load them down? So far as we are concerned, all we have to do is to say whether we shall refuse to pass this Bill, which was so unanimously carried in the Railway Committee, because we have some suspicions that negotiations have been going on. I do not think this House will adopt that course. The hon. gentleman spoke about secret compacts; we know nothing about them.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). We want to know.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The Minister has said there is a compact.

Mr. MITCHELL. You say you want to know. This House has a right to know at the right time; but I say it is not right to interfere at this late stage of the Session with the passage of this Bill, the promoters of which have been kept dancing attendance on Parliament for the past six weeks.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why?

Mr. MITCHELL. How do I know why, or how do you know why? Rumor says that because the Government have been trying to get them to build a link of railway down through the Province I represent—they have been, so far as I know, all along refusing to build it, but the hon. gentleman says some arrangement has been come to—not with the Canadian Pacific Railway—and, therefore, nothing has been imposed upon them, so far as we can establish, by the legislation we are now passing.

Mr. EDGAR. He said they are to build the road.

Mr. LISTER. The agreement is signed and sealed for the building of the road.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) We want to know what it is.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not understand that. Anyway, whether an arrangement has been come to with the Canadian Pacific Railway or not, I hold that it is a private undertaking. The Bill contains in itself the obligations only which we are willing to impose on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we have no right to block a Bill of that kind at this late stage, simply because hon. gentlemen suspect that there is something behind it that ought not to be done. When the time comes for the Premier to present to the House the arrangement made, then will be the time to discuss it, and you will find me as ready as anyone to point out objections if it is a measure that ought not to be adopted. But I do hope that hon. gentlemen will not, at this late stage of the Session, block so important a measure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Does my hon. friend agree to withdraw his motion?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). After the statement made by the hon. gentleman that he was going to bring this down to a certain stage, I was willing the Bill should pass through the Committee, but in view of the points raised by hon. gentlemen here, and in view of the fact that this Bill has stood over now for three weeks, postponed from day to day by the Government until they could come to such an arrangement as the Premier says they have arrived at, no great injury to the company can result by allowing the Bill to stand until the next meeting of the House, when the First Minister can submit the arrangement he has made.

Mr. LAURIER. There is no desire on the part of the Opposition to block this measure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh.

Mr. LAURIER. I repeat there is no desire to throw any impediment in its way. I say this most distinctly. The hon. gentleman says this Bill ought to pass right off, but nobody knows better than the hon. gentleman that this Bill has been called up from day to day and allowed to stand at the request of the Government. We have given it not even an hour's discussion, and the time is up and we stand on our rights.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think the Bill in this House will not make the Government show their hand or show anything. If the hon. gentlemen will

allow the Bill to pass through, the Government will be here all the time and will be held accountable.

Committee rose.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Extension of shed to repair cars, at Richmond....$2,500

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before this item passes, I want to resume the discussion which took place before the House adjourned upon the position of the Intercolonial Railway and to recall the attention of the House to statements then made with reference to that condition. Now, it is stated that the loss on the Intercolonial Railway last year was over $363,000, it behooves us to see what are the causes of that loss. It is known to hon. gentlemen on both sides that, in addition to that loss, we lose the interest on the capital invested which amounts to over two million dollars. Putting that to one side, you will find a serious state of facts exists that we are losing at the rate of $350,000 a year, and it is proper that we should enquire into the causes of this loss. I hold the report of the Minister of Railways, and I find that the cause of this enormous loss is attributed by the chief superintendent to the fact that they are carrying coal from the Springhill Mines to the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec at losing rates. The report says:

"For several years past I have drawn attention, in the annual report, to the extremely low rate at which this coal is carried. There can be no doubt that is one of the chief causes of the annual deficit."

We have these two facts before us, that, in addition to the interest on capital expenditure, we make a loss on the running of the road besides of $360,000, which is attributed by the chief superintendent to the fact that he is compelled by the Government to carry coal from Springhill mines to the Western Provinces at a rate which does not pay, and that he has drawn attention to that every year in his annual report. The only answer given by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) was that there has grown up quite a large village or town around Springhill. That is the compensation given this country for the $350,000 loss annually incurred on the Intercolonial Railway. I think that is no compensation whatever. Springhill existed before we commenced to carry this coal at this non-paying rate, and the fact that a few hundreds or thousands of people may be congregated there does not add very much to the aggregate wealth of the country. It has only drawn these people from other employments, probably profitable employment, in order to concentrate them in this village. It is no benefit to the country that the population has increased, if that increase is the result of a decrease in other parts of the country. I want to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the $360,000 of loss incurred by this country last year, owing to improper carriage of coal at non-paying rates, does not by any means represent the actual loss which the country has incurred. I will ask the attention of the Committee for a moment while I refer to this report of the Minister of Railways. He points out that a very large sum of money was spent last year and in previous years in improving the rolling stock of that road, and the principal reason for that expenditure was to provide accommodation for the increased coal traffic. The fact is that they undertook to carry coal for nothing, and they not only lose money in carrying it but also have to provide new rolling stock for the purpose. He says:

"New rolling stock, further provision of which was necessary mainly for the accommodation of the increase of the coal traffic and other freight."

When I turn to the expenditure to find how much they spent for rolling stock last year in order to enable them to carry this coal for almost nothing, I find that the country is charged $258,334 for rolling stock. That is an expenditure and a loss which can be chargeable to the policy of the Government of carrying coal for nothing or almost nothing.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all for coal rolling stock?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not say so. I said it was in a large measure. The Minister follows up his statement by saying:

"The rates charged for coal transport are not directly remunerative to the road."

I see, by the report of the chief superintendent, that a large portion of this expenditure has been caused simply by this policy of the Government of carrying coal for nothing or almost nothing, and I read the report of the chief superintendent in another place where he says that is one of the chief causes of the deficit. More than that, I find in the Supplementary Estimates brought down yesterday that, in addition to the $258,334 for rolling stock, the Government spent, under Governor General's warrant, without a vote of the House, $170,000, making a total of $428,334 for rolling stock last year. In addition to the loss on the actual running expenses, there was charged this large amount to capital account last year for rolling stock, and the chief amount of that, according to the report of the chief superintendent, is required for the carrying of coal from Springhill at non-paying rates. They have incurred this enormous expenditure for this rolling stock in order to carry coal, and, after building this rolling stock, they find they have no place in which to house it, and they ask Parliament for a large increase of expenditure for buildings to accommodate this rolling stock. We are asked to vote $67,500 for increased accommodation at Moncton. What is that for? If I understand the report of the chief superintendent aright, this expenditure is required simply to provide accommodation for this rolling stock which has been built to carry coal for nothing. On page 17, Mr. Pottinger, the chief superintendent, says:

"It is expected that during the coming winter the volume of ocean borne traffic will increase very materially, and that the quantity of coal going to points west of the Chaudière will be greater than heretofore. To ensure the rapid transport of this freight, the box car stock is being increased by 200 cars, and there will be about 22 more locomotives in the service than there were last winter, when, as is well known, great difficulty was experienced in moving the traffic promptly, owing to the insufficiency of the engine power, in consequence of which the engines were run day and night, in order to push the freight forward, and to cause as little annoyance to shippers as possible.

"A difficulty, however, now presents itself. There is not stable room enough to house our engine stock, and no less than 20 or 30 engines are nightly exposed to the weather in the open air at Moncton. It has also been found impossible to effect the necessary repairs in the Government shops, as they are insufficient in size to receive the number of engines offering for repairs. I, therefore, propose to ask for an appropriation on capital account, to cover the cost of a full circle engine house at Moncton, an addition of 112 feet by 200 feet to the machine shops there, and some additional machinery. Unless those be provided, the engine power must suffer severely from exposure and from want of proper maintenance.

So the result is that, in order that we may force an artificial trade against the laws of nature, and carry this coal for nothing or next to nothing from the Lower Provinces, and sell it in Quebec or Montreal, we incur an annual loss on the working expenses of about $363,000, which the chief engineer attributes almost entirely to this coal traffic.

Mr. DICKEY. Will the hon. gentleman read the portion of the report which states that this is due to the coal traffic?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I read it before—

"For several years past I have drawn attention in the annual report to the extremely low rate at which this coal is carried, and there can be no doubt that it is one of the chief causes of the annual deficit."

That is at page 26. He follows up that statement with the other statement which I have given. When I was interrupted by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), I was saying that this enormous sum of $363,000 deficit on working expenses is mainly chargeable to that fact, but last

year they expended also $428,000 in the construction of rolling stock, a large portion of which is also chargeable to this carriage of coal, and in addition to this, they have to provide what the chief superintendent calls "stable room" for this rolling stock; so you find that we have $500,000 paid out for rolling stock alone, the larger portion of which is chargeable to this policy of carrying coal at non-paying rates. Therefore, I think the country is paying pretty dearly for the Springfield coal mines. I think it would be better to buy out the whole Springfield mines, to pay all the shareholders the value of their stock and to keep the men employed now in idleness for the rest of their lives. Why, this comes to nearly a million of money, adding the loss on the running expenses to the $500,000 we have to pay out for rolling stock which is properly chargeable to this cause. It makes over $900,000 during the last year, and I say the policy of the Government in continuing to carry that coal at non-paying rates cannot be defended. Still further, while we are incurring this enormous expenditure of rolling stock on the Intercolonial, we are at the same time spending millions in the construction of competing lines to destroy the trade of the Intercolonial. What will be the use of the money we are spending on that road and on the rolling stock when we know that the freight will naturally go by the shortest route, so that the Intercolonial will be kept up for the use of the Springhill coal mines, and for that only. I suppose that some day we will have a proposition made to present the Intercolonial to the Springhill coal owners. It seems to be run in their interests now, and the result is that an increase in the coal traffic is not a blessing but a curse to the country, because the more they carry the greater is the loss. I submit these figures to show that the Government, when they reconsidered their policy and revised their rates, and stopped making this difficulty, took a very wise course; and it appears there was political influence enough on the benches behind the Government to compel them to alter their course. It was stated here this afternoon that the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) kicked hard, that he would not come into the traces at all, until they went back to the old system and revised the rate to what it is now, $\frac{3}{10}$ of a cent per ton per mile. I have asked a number of engineers and others engaged in railway operations about this matter, and I don't think that in any other part of the world a parallel can be produced where a railway carries coal, or a bulky article like coal, at anything like the ruinous rate at which they have been carrying coal from the Springhill mines.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is a matter connected with my county about which I want to make some observations. I moved for some papers in connection with two or three claims that some of my constituents have on the Derby branch of the Intercolonial Railway; and I stated sometime ago when I withdrew four of these notices, that some of these matters had been settled and in three more a sum was offered which my constituents refused to accept. With respect to four of these cases, they are settled, and I have nothing more to say; but I want to say this in reference to the case of Mr. George Knight. Mr. Knight had a living spring and brook which took its rise on the side of a hill just in front of his house, and ran from there towards the river, within about one-eighth of a mile, or thereabouts, of the Derby branch of the Intercolonial Railway. The authorities of the Intercolonial came and took that man's spring and built a tank over it and absorbed the whole of it, covering up the brook through his meadow for about one-eighth of a mile, and they have refused to pay him any damages for it. Mr. Knight claimed $2,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. MITCHELL. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but I tell you it is not a small thing for a farmer who keeps a large stock of cattle and horses, to have to drive them in the winter season one-eighth of a mile to the river, and cut a hole in the ice where they may drink. In the course of that operation one of his cows slipped on the ice and he lost her. Hon. gentlemen may laugh at that kind of a thing. It is very easy for my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), who is getting all he wants done, railways built here and there and everywhere, getting the ear of the Government in such a way that he can get anything settled that he wants. But in the case of Mr. Knight his spring was entirely taken away from him, and he is put to great inconvenience for the want of it. The Government offered him $50 for his land damages and for taking away his spring and brook. I hold that was entirely unreasonable. The other day the right hon. gentleman referred these matters to the Minister of Public Works to confer with me with a view to settlement, and I thought that Mr. Knight ought to accept $500. The Minister of Public Works, with Mr. Schreiber, thought that $250 was enough. Now, Sir, I know that $250 is not enough. I consented to make the offer to Mr. Knight, and I wrote to him telling him I had done the best I could, and suggesting that rather than have a law suit in the Exchequer Court, he had better accept it. He wrote me back saying that he would lose the whole money before he would accept it. I think he is fairly entitled to get remuneration to the extent of $500, and in my opinion the man has been damaged to a greater extent than that for the reason that he has to drive his cattle during the whole winter season once or twice a day, down to the river where he has to cut a hole in the ice in order that they may drink. If the gentleman who controls that railway saw this man driving his cattle in the winter time down to the river, as I have seen farmers do, I think he would not have been so hard about it. The fact of the matter is that Mr. Schreiber, who controls this railway, is as hard as flint. He has no consideration for these poor people at all. All he cares about is to save a few dollars for the Government. I think that the right hon. gentleman will do well to reconsider this case, and to ask his acting Deputy Minister of Public Works again to look into the matter, and to see whether the statement that I am making is correct, as I know it to be, and I think he will agree that the man is fairly entitled to $500 for the damages he has sustained. Then with regard to another case, that of George R. Parker. I have not the evidence so clear about that. Mr. Parker states to me that the sum of $200 which has been paid him, and for which they have taken a receipt, is not for his land damages by the railway at all, but it is for damages to his house, which he had to move back and dig a new cellar, for which they gave him $200 as per contract. With regard to another case, that of Mr. Samuel Russell, we fixed upon a sum of $400 or $500. Mr. Russell declined to accept the $400. Mr. Schreiber has made a report upon it, in which he speaks of a receipt in full for claims and damages. Mr. Russell alleges that he never gave his receipt in full for any land damages. The receipt was for a contract job to do a certain work. I am not able to state that Mr. Russell is entitled to $2,000—I do not think he is entitled to that much—but I do think he is fairly entitled to $600 or $700 for the damages sustained. He keeps a store on the spot, with a public-house and a blacksmith shop, and they have stopped up all approach from the river to Mr. Russell's premises, and it will cost him $700 or $800 at least to make a landing, to say nothing of the damages he has sustained. Now, I would like the Minister either to give these three cases his personal attention, or to ask the Minister of Public Works to confer with the railway authorities in regard to them. There is another case, that of Thomas Flynn. When water was carried to the railway station at Newcastle they dug through the whole length of his farm, several acres, and threw up the shell rock and thus spoiled a considerable extent of land, and for this damage they never paid him a cent. The

Government have since offered $100. I wrote telling him the offer, and he replied indignantly that he had lived thus far without the money, and if they could not give him something approaching the damage done he would lose the whole rather than accept that offer. That is the position of these four claims, and I desire the Premier to have them looked into and try to come to some arrangement with respect to them. With regard to the management of the Intercolonial Railway, I am not going to say anything about it just now. My views with respect to its management were so clearly laid before the House last year that I do not think it is worth while to occupy time in setting them forth now, particularly when such plain and frank statements have been made by the member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), and the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and, therefore, I will defer any remarks till later.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice in the Auditor General's accounts last year $38,000 charged for snow sheds and snow fences. It is a matter of surprise to me that on a road which has been operated so long it should be necessary to invest such a large sum for the purpose of erecting snow sheds and snow fences. It will be remembered that the statement was made by the Government two years ago that the line was well protected as regards snow sheds and they had been erected whenever required, and it was then stated that the appropriation then made was for snow sheds to take the place of sheds worn out. Last year there was charged to capital account $38,201 for snow sheds. Again, there is an item, heating and lighting cars, $21,000. I cannot understand how such an item can be charged to capital account. $24,000 was the appropriation, and $21,000 has been charged to capital account. The manner in which the Intercolonial Railway is handled is a matter of serious consideration to the people. When we consider the statements made by the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) that the people are paying $2,500,000, between the amount we lose by operating the road and interest on the money invested in it, or about 50 cents per head for the entire population, and that from this expenditure we receive no return whatever, it is quite time the House should begin seriously to consider what is best to do with the line. No doubt, for political purposes, expenses have been made in all directions. No doubt expenses have been incurred only to better the condition of members sitting in this House, and money has been spent on building branches or lines which have been competitors to each other and which have run but a very short distance from each other. We will hear later something of the Oxford and New Glasgow line, but I will embrace the opportunity afforded in the Supplementary Estimates to deal with that whole question. When we consider all these facts, it is time the people should consider what course should be adopted in regard to this road. Over $47,000,000 are now sunk in it, and yearly we are adding to the capital account. When the late Government were in power they closed the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway, but the present Government reopened it, and have added to it yearly items such as I have been speaking of, snow fences, heating and lighting cars and even law expenses. I contend it is quite clear that a sufficient number of cars are not furnished for those worn out during each year, and this is apparent from the report of the Minister of Railways. Of first class cars there are altogether 69. Not one new one was added to take the place of those worn out. Of second class cars there are 76. Only one was put on the road and charged to working expenses. Of conductors' vans there are 79, and only one new one was placed on the road last year and charged to expenses. Of box cars there were 1,635 and only twenty new ones were put on the line and charged to running expenses, and the average life of a box car is nothing like that proportion. To the number of coal cars we have added 148. Here is an item which proves a matter of serious consequence, and that is the carriage of coal. We are quite willing, in order to assist those in love with the National Policy, to do everything possible to carry coal at reasonable rates; but when the Intercolonial Railway at the expense of the country is burdened with the carrying of coal in the interests of Springhill at an enormous loss, as is frankly admitted by the Chief Engineer of the department, it is high time to consider whether it would not be wise either to lease Springhill coal mine or make the Springhill company a present of the Intercolonial Railway if they agree to run it. It is quite clear to my mind, and I have listened to explanations during the last six years, that this is one of the Dominion's financial sinks of corruption and nothing else. It is on a par with Rideau Hall, and we shall have to have an investigation annually, for every year it is getting worse. In the interests of the people this House should closely investigate the expenditures connected with the road, and we should terminate the extravagance prevailing. I believe in some cases officials are employed and paid large salaries who, if traced up, would be found to be in many cases related to hon. gentlemen opposite. It is too bad to know that only one railway in the Dominion is owned by the Dominion, and that that line causes an annual loss of $2,500,000. I heard the Minister of Finance state a short time ago the indebtedness of the Australian colonies, and he said their *per capita* indebtedness is far in excess of ours. He did not tell us they owned their own railways and that the Australian colonies drew from the operation of their lines over $13,000,000 of clear profits a year after paying expenses, while we operate one line and have a deficit of nearly $3,000,000 annually. The evidence presented to this House of the extravagant way in which matters are handled on the Intercolonial Railway, the constantly increasing expenditure on capital account for items which should be charged to working expenses, furnish proof that the road is worked in the interests of a certain clique who are virtually sapping the life out of the line, for the maintenance of which the people are responsible. It is time this expenditure was stopped, and from year to year it is getting worse. Every year some new recommendation is brought down for a large sum to purchase rolling stock or make terminal improvements or the construction of additional or branch lines. There is some particular constituency that is thought to be not quite safe. In order to make it all right some additional sum has got to be spent in order to build some branch lines. Year after year we are adding to the mileage and to an expenditure which is virtually buried and from which we do not receive one dollar in return. I say that it is time to put a stop to this, and as far as I am concerned I shall always be ready to raise my voice—I do not care what Government is in power—against the continually increasing expenditure which is an actual loss. There is not a man in this House who, if he were conducting his own private business, would conduct it in the way which we are managing the business of the country here. We admitted that at the time of Confederation it was necessary to build the road. It was considered as a Dominion line and a necessity, in order to give us an independent outlet to the seaboard, but the very moment that line was built we should have closed the capital account and never opened it. When the people of any sections of that country wanted to get branches built they should have done it in the same way that the people in the western part of Canada do it. Look at the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway which has cost the country $1,600,000 for the purpose of accommodating three counties, because those counties are represented in this House by strong supporters of the Government. I notice that there is a considerable amount yet to be spent in order

to complete that railway, and we will give more attention to that when we come to the Supplementary Estimates. I say that it is time we should put a stop to this system, and whoever else does not I shall at all events protest against it.

Mr. ELLIS. I will not say the hard things which my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) says about the Government with regard to the Intercolonial Railway, if they will make an effort to meet the commercial requirements of the people of Halifax and St. John at the *termini* of the road. That effort has not been made at all. The complaint made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and endorsed by the hon. member opposite (Mr. Kenny) is, that the management of the road is so far removed from the centres of the population along the line that there is no convenient way of approaching the management. If Mr. Schreiber happens to be any distance from Ottawa, or if he happens to be in Ottawa and not in a mood to attend to the business of the railway, it would seem to be apparent to the people of St. John, at any rate, that he does not attend to it. The persons who represent him at Moncton have to await his will and pleasure, or to await his making up his mind on a question, and very often great delay occurs when important questions are put to them with regard to the management of the road. Again, at Halifax and St. John there are no agents of the road in the sense of persons able to make any contract or to take up any representative position with regard to giving freight rates, or making arrangements such as ought to be made in large cities. Now, Sir, it does appear that the deficit of the road increases in a larger proportion year by year as the receipts increase The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has pointed out that certain American railways are carrying coal at three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile and I presume they are making a profit. If that be so why cannot the Government of Canada make a profit on the coal that is carried on their railway. One reason of that I think is the enormous expense of the superior management of the road. There are too many officials and there is too much expense for management which does not directly reach the running of the railway. I will call your attention to this fact. In the year 1886 the loss on the running of the Intercolonial Railway alone was $106,042, and the total loss including the Eastern Extension and the Prince Edward Island Road was $190,637. In 1887 the loss on the Intercolonial Railway was $232,105 and including the Eastern Extension and Prince Edward Island Road the total loss was $311,901. In 1888 the loss on the Intercolonial Railway was $363,657 (the loss on the Intercolonial Railway has just doubled in two years) and the total loss including the Eastern Extension and Prince Edward Island Railway was $454,823. The total loss on the Intercolonial Railway in three years in the running expenses was $701,694 and on all the Government railways in the Maritime Provinces it was $956,461. Now if the statement is correct which the hon. the Minister of Finance put forward—and he put it forward with considerable effect in his Budget speech—that there was a constant growth of trade between the Provinces, why is it that with that increase of trade there is a constant increase of loss in the running of that road? It would seem to be a natural inference that if trade is increasing, the deficit at any rate should have decreased, but on the Intercolonial Railway the more business that appears to be done the greater the loss. It is not necessary, perhaps, to refer to the capital expenditure, but that has also increased $1,500,000 since 1885, and only twenty miles of railway have been added. In other words, the extent of road added has cost about $75,000 per mile. The stores account is most astonishing. We are told that in 1886 there were $719,660 worth of stores on hand; in 1887, $678,109; and in 1888, $498,634 worth of stores on hand. I did not look into the accounts sufficiently to find out myself, but I would like to know, if the Minister of Finance is good enough to tell me, if this decrease in stores is to be added to the deficit of the running expenses of the road.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not to be added to the running expenses.

Mr. ELLIS. I desire to say that it is the general impression—of course I do not know it myself—but it is the general impression of persons who know about this railway, that there is nothing like that amount of stores on hand, and that there is no inventory of the stores taken at the time that the financial auditor audits the books. I do not know whether that is true or not, but that is the general impression.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend had better not make such a statement unless he knows whether it is true or not, because those statements are damaging, so far as anything that can be said by the hon. gentleman is damaging. An inventory is taken regularly every year, yet my hon. friend states almost positively that no such inventory is taken.

Mr. ELLIS. Perhaps I have not made myself sufficiently clear. I have no doubt that somebody on the part of the railway makes some inventory of the stores, and that that statement is sent in; but no independent person like the auditor who audits the accounts goes over these stores. The statement of the railway authorities has to be taken in the end, as well as whatever report they choose to make upon the value.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a responsible officer who does it.

Mr. ELLIS. Now, Sir, with regard to the business of the road. Last fall, the Board of Trade of St. John, or some members of it together with a gentleman who sits in this House, made an effort to have a lumber business created between Bathurst and St. John. They endeavored to send down the lumber that was frozen in on the northern rivers to the port of St. John to be shipped there. But the rates which the manager of the railway proposed to charge were so high that this trade could not be carried on at all, and no business could be done. If you apply the coal rates to the lumber it should have been carried for about seven dollars a carload of 20,000 lbs, but the management of the Intercolonial Railway would not carry it for less than $20. If it is proposed to do business, surely better rates could be given than that. Why carry coal for three-tenths of a cent per mile and charge three times as much for carrying lumber. I grant that the short distance would make a difference, but it ought not to make such a difference as that, if trade is to be developed. It is a common report, I cannot speak for its truth myself, that a cargo of sugar was landed at St. John, to be carried over the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal; but the rates were so high that the owner found it to his advantage to load up his sugar on the American steamers of the International Line at St. John, carry it to Boston, reship it at Boston on the American railway, and carry it by that route to Montreal; and the street rumor, at any rate, was that he saved $3,000 by the transaction on the rates offered by the Intercolonial Railway. I do not blame the Government for these things; I trust that they will understand that I am simply speaking in the interest of the business community which I represent, so that opportunities may be afforded to us of making this road more available than it is at present. I would like to ask what kind of rolling stock the present vote is for?

Mr. FOSTER. It is to provide cars for the summer travel to Cape Breton and also from Quebec to Cacouna—three first class cars—and to fit them up with chairs, which is believed to be an economical way of providing parlor cars.

Mr. ELLIS. There was a vote last year for iron snow sheds. Have they been erected?

Mr. FOSTER. Three have been erected.

Mr. ELLIS. By whom were they built ?

Mr. FOSTER. Carrier & Lane built two, and Fleming & St. John built another.

Mr. ELLIS. I trust that the First Minister, who has charge of railway matters now, will be able to give the subject some attention himself. I am satisfied that he feels enough interest in the city of St. John to do what he can to promote its welfare. If he were in contact with the people for three or four days, he would find that a large amount of dissatisfaction exists, not only among opponents of the Government, but among all who are desirous that the trade of the city should be increased, and they find the condition of the railway a stumbling block in the way of the carrying trade.

Extension along city front at St. John, upon condition that the city provide the right of way and other necessary lands, free of charge, and assume all liability for claims for damage by reason of the track running along the street, both as regards damage to property or person or otherwise.....	$17,000

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These conditions seemed hard and fast, and it is thought expedient to alter them, as reference would have to be made to Parliament before any portion of the money could be expended. So I would suggest that it should read thus:

"Extension along city front at St. John, subject to such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may authorise and impose."

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I would ask the hon. gentleman whether it is not his intention to insert some amount for a similar purpose at Charlottetown. He was waited on by a deputation from the Board of Trade, who asked the Government to extend the railway along the wharves at Charlottetown, and he said he would take the matter into consideration; but I see nothing in the Estimates for the Prince Edward Island Railway at all. I know that the line has been extended as far as the Steam Navigation Company's wharf, and the Government have already expropriated the lands.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Representations have been made on that subject. It is under consideration, and I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will see, when the Supplementary Estimates for next year are brought down, whether Charlottetown is not taken care of.

Increased accommodation at St. John.....	$25,000

Mr. ELLIS. Would the Finance Minister be good enough to tell us what this is for ?

Mr. FOSTER. The object is to purchase a piece of land at the Mill street entrance to the St. John station yard, to give increased yard accommodation.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. Minister of Finance, in his Budget speech, quoted a great deal from the report of the Labor Commission, but we have not yet had that document before the Committee. I recollect that, in the evidence taken, it was shown that a great many employés of the railway got something like $1.50 a day, and have to work something like sixteen or eighteen hours a day. I would be glad, notwithstanding the expense of the road, if something could be taken from the salaries of the higher officials and added to the pay of these men. A good many of them live in King's and some of them live out of the town a little. There is certainly ground of complaint among the employés that they are not sufficiently paid. I do not know if the increased accommodation which my hon. colleague referred to, will afford to the St. John hackmen any relief. The railway broke faith, and that was the worst feature of the whole affair. These hackmen went upon a strike, and did not go to the station for about a week, which caused a great deal of inconvenience to travellers. The agent of the road, Mr. Wallace, came to St. John and made them a promise, and when Mr. Schreiber was called upon to fulfil the promise, he wrote an impertinent letter to the mayor. I think some accommodation should be afforded to these men. They only want a little shelter, and I think it should be given them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will see about it.

Mr. CAMPBELL There is another matter to which I should like to call the attention of the House. I had occasion to call attention to it last year slightly. I refer to the rates on the Intercolonial Railway for carrying flour. We, of course, all want to see the Intercolonial Railway pay. It has cost a large amount of money, and the deficit now amounts to a very large sum, and if we can suggest any way by which the deficit can be decreased it is only right that we should do so. About 100,000 barrels of flour go into Prince Edward Island every year, and nearly every barrel goes from western Ontario down to Charlottetown and Summerside *vid* Boston, and I believe if proper arrangements were made all that flour would be sent down to Charlottetown and Summerside by the Intercolonial Railway. The rate from Chatham, Ontario, to Halifax all last summer, and nearly the whole of this winter, was a net rate of 48 cents per barrel. Now the rate to Point Duchesne and to Pictou Landing was 58 cents a barrrel, with an additional 7 cents to take it over. That made 65 cents a barrel to Charlottetown, or about 15 cents a barrel higher than the rate *vid* Boston. The point I wish to make is this: If the same rate were applied to Pictou Landing that is given to Halifax, viz., 48 cents per barrel, and then if the flour were brought over for 5 cents, making 53 cents against 50 cents *vid* Boston, that would ensure nearly every barrel going over the Intercolonial. If you can carry flour to Halifax for 48 cents, there is no reason why you cannot carry it to Point Duchesne or Pictou Landing at the same rate, and you have the steamers running from those points to Charlottetown and Summerside. It would be better for these steamers to carry the flour at 5 cents a barrel and give employment to our own men rather than have our steamers empty and receive the flour by Boston. Now, every Saturday, can be seen steamers leaving Boston loaded down with Canadian flour going into Prince Edward Island. It would be a good thing if the system I recommend were inaugurated and the country receive the benefit of the freight which would amount to 800 cars annually. There is another thing which I think very unfair. The rate from Chatham to Dalhousie, Campbellton, and Newcastle, New Brunswick, is 75 cents per barrel; to Moncton and St. John it is 58 cents, and to Oxford Amherst, Shubenacadie and Stellarton the rate is 75 cents; while to Halifax the rate is down to 48 cents. Surely, if you can carry flour to Halifax at 48 cents a barrel you ought not to charge on 300 miles of a shorter haul 75 cents. I admit it is necessary to have a low rate to Halifax and St. John, in order to compete with the Boston route, but the rates charged to these inland points seem altogether too high. If you can carry at a profit, as I suppose you can, to Halifax, for 48 cents, there is no reason why you should charge the miners in the coal mines and the fishermen around the Baie des Chaleurs 27 cents a barrel more than you charge to Halifax. The differences are altogether too great. I hope the hon. the Minister will see the desirability of adopting such rates as will ensure the transport of flour required for Prince Edward Island over our own transcontinental line, and I have no doubt an arrangement can be made which will ensure this traffic to our own line.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I see in the Auditor General's Report an entry of "Chapman Estate, land expropriated, $240,000." Where is that ?

Mr. FOSTER. At Lévis.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) has referred to the freight on flour. I do not object to the rate on flour, which, I suppose, is based on an estimate of what it can be carried at. What I desire to bring to notice is the general complaint in Halifax that the western millers have an advantage over our own importers in this respect, that they are allowed to keep their flour in the cars or at the depot for 30 days. The idea originated from the practice adopted in Boston. It was there intended to hold the flour for a certain time for exportation, and it was found necessary to give the sea board flour a longer time than the local importers, but that does not apply to Halifax at all. There is no export from Halifax, and it is not right that the millers of the west should be allowed to keep their flour 30 days at the depot, whereas the importers at Halifax have to move it in 48 hours. That practice should be put an end to.

Mr. KENNY. My. hon. friend knows that this privilege is confined to those who send the flour abroad. A privilege is given to those who have the flour there to remove it within 48 hours, unless they export it, it may be to Lunenburg or to Liverpool. I am told that, as my hon. friend (Mr. Jones) says, the privilege is sometimes abused, but the object of the provision was to encourage the shipping of flour over the Intercolonial road.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That may be correct, but the practice which applies in regard to an American port does not apply in regard to a shipment along our own coasts. I doubt if such a construction can properly be placed upon the regulation in regard to foreign shipment. Export means export out of this country.

Mr. KENNY. As far as the Intercolonial Railway is concerned, export means shipping by water.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Export must refer to anything shipped out of the country, and in this respect the millers have been granted a privilege which I think should be discontinued.

Cape Breton Railway..... $1,100,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps the Minister will let that stand. I believe the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), who is not very well, desires to speak on that subject. He intended to speak before going into Committee of Supply, but he did not desire to delay the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Why can it not be discussed on Concurrence?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That would not facilitate the matter. The hon. gentleman has some observations which he is very desirous to make, and it will not delay the Committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman ought be here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He was here, and intended to speak before we went into Supply, but he was not very well.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If we are going to get through the Session this summer we will have to make a little more progress than we have to-day. With all deference to the hon. gentleman, I never saw, in all my experience, in any one day, such a waste of time as there has been to-day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must say, in reference to the hon. gentleman's remark, that I doubt if any single subject has come before the House for discussion for many a day which was more deserving of consideration and debate than the monstrous waste of money which has taken place on the Intercolonial Railway. We have had, I believe, less satisfaction for the $47,000,000 that we have spent upon that road than for our expenditure on any other work.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am told that the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) is out in the lobby. The fact is that he does not want to speak at this time of the night.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I cannot see that the time has been wasted in this discussion. I think we were entitled, in regard to so serious a matter, to have had some plan or proposal of the Government placed before us to put an end to the extraordinary excess of expense over income on that road, but we have not had a word from the Government on that subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The reason has been given that the business has been increasing and the revenue decreasing. The tariff has been steadily year by year reduced for the great object of encouraging trade along that road, and especially inter-provincial trade. There has been a steady reduction of rates. How can we expect that it will be otherwise? It is true that the hon. member from Charlottetown (Mr. Davies) said we were criminally liable for carrying coal at these rates.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think I used the word "criminally."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD He said it was a criminal waste of money to carry coal at three-tenths of a cent per ton. Another gentleman who sits on the same side says: It is true that coal is carried too low, and I think that the road should pay, but at the same time I think the rates on lumber are too high. Another says: I think the road ought to pay, but I think the rate on flour is too high. There is a continual pressure brought from all sides to keep down the rates of freight, and that is a reason why there is a steady increase of expenditure because there is more work done and it is not done at remunerative prices. We must have one policy or the other. We must either work that road as a commercial company would, and only consider what would pay; or we must consider it a portion of the great national highway connecting the Provinces, and built for the purpose of being the link between the Maritime Provinces and old Canada. We must either treat it as a work uniting the Provinces more closely and keep down the rates of freight, and make no profit upon it, or we must adopt the plan of a private company and put on rates such as would make the road as prosperous as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely the Minister will see that there is a totally good and broad distinction between carrying goods at the bare cost price, which might be excusable under some circumstances, and favoring a particular industry belonging to particular private individuals, and conveying goods at a dead loss, as is the case in regard to this coal. In the latter case, you must charge more on other goods, and the whole contention to-day has been that, in conveying this coal as we now do, we are conveying it at a dead loss, and at a cost to the rest of the country which is a gross injustice.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no doubt that this is not a paying rate, but, as the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has stated, it has been kept to that rate instead of being raised, because it was found that the railways from Pennsylvania to Massena were carrying coal at such a rate that, if our rate were raised, it would result in bringing in American coal, and would cut off the increasing trade between the Nova Scotia mines and Canada. It would simply transfer the coal trade from Nova Scotia to the Pennsylvania mines. As to the statement that it is unfair to encourage one industry specially, and that in this way the rates are raised on others, I must say that I do not

think any rate is too high. The Intercolonial Railway receives only $\frac{2\frac{3}{4}}{100}$ of a cent per mile for the flour going to Halifax, which is not a paying rate at all. The hon. gentleman from Kent (Mr. Campbell) says that is true, and the rate ought to be put down low at Halifax and St. John in order to compete with Boston. In order to give the trade to our own railway, there is a rebate at Halifax and St. John, and, therefore, the question is not whether the same rate should be allowed on the whole line, but simply whether at all the intermediate points a reasonable rate is charged. On the other portions of the line there is not the same reason for granting this special rebate as there is for the great ports of Halifax and St. John. But looking at it from a commercial point of view, freight don't pay at all on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. LAURIER. That shows conclusively that we cannot legislate against geography, and we had better have reciprocity.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like the hon. gentleman to say when the same principle does not apply to the carriage of flour which goes to Prince Edward Island. There are about 200,000 barrels of flour going there yearly, which now goes by way of Boston; whereas, if you allow flour going to Charlottetown to go at the same rates of carriage as to Halifax and St. John, the cars which now come back empty, would carry that flour at a profit.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a point worth consideration.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like the hon. gentleman to say why the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, that undertakes to regulate the rates of other roads, does not apply the rates that are fixed on other railways to the Intercolonial Railway. It seems to me that might be done until the road pays, and then if the Government chooses to run the road without profit, but at the same time without loss, the rates could be reduced.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think every miller in the Province of Ontario, including those of Bothwell, would protest against that doctrine. They have got now the supply of flour for the Maritime Provinces, and if my hon. friend succeeded in raising the rates for commercial purposes only, our millers would raise such a storm that even my hon. friend would feel himself bound to yield.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What quantity of coal is taken from Springhill to Quebec and Montreal?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. About 200,000 tons.

Mr. KIRK. The hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) before recess spoke of a matter to which I wish again to draw the attention of the Government, and that is the matter of operating the Eastern Extension as a separate road from the Intercolonial Railway. The result is, as the hon. member for Halifax said, to make it very much more expensive for those doing business on the Eastern Extension Railway, and it gives an advantage at any rate to Halifax over the Eastern Extension towns. For instance, flour, as has been mentioned by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), is carried from Chatham, Ont., to Halifax for 48 cents per barrel, but it costs 80 cents to take it to Antigonish, which is the station that is used by the section of the country from which I come. Now, Halifax and Antigonish are competing points for the flour trade for the eastern section of the country, and you are giving Halifax an advantage over Antigonish which is sufficient to destroy altogether the trade of the latter place. The rates are so much higher east of Halifax on the Eastern Extension, that I believe there is no flour at all taken east of Antigonish by the Intercolonial Railway. I believe the flour nearly all goes by the way of Boston for points east of Halifax; therefore, I think the Intercolonial Railway and Eastern Extension is losing a very large trade in consequence of the discrepancy with respect to flour and other articles. There is another difficulty which, I think, might be obviated if this railway was operated as one road. Passengers coming west from Antigonish can only get tickets to New Glasgow, where they have to renew, and I do not think that is a state of affairs that ought to exist.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Nobody has a better business capacity than the First Minister when he chooses to apply himself to business, which he does not very often do. Now, as I understand, we convey from the Springhill colliery 200,000 tons of coal at $\frac{3}{10}$ of a cent per ton per mile, and the enquiries I have made tend to show that $\frac{5}{10}$ of a cent per ton per mile, which is about the rate at which English railways carry coal, is the lowest rate at which it can be carried, so that on every single ton that we carry we loose $\frac{1}{5}$ of a cent per ton per mile. Now, if the hon. gentleman will make a calculation he will find that as we convey that coal 600 miles, or thereabouts, on the Intercolonial Railway, loosing $1.20 on every ton, the keeping up of this colliery costs this country $240,000 a year, not speaking of the rolling stock and all the rest of it. Now, I doubt whether it can be maintained that you sustain more than 500 miners in getting that coal out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has made a town of between 6,000 and 7,000 inhabitants. There were only 1,200 before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We cannot afford to pay a quarter of a million to build up a town of 6,000 or 7,000 people. Moreover there was a town there long ago.

Mr. AMYOT. There is a good way of making the Intercolonial Railway pay and that is to connect it with the system of railways north of the St. Lawrence. I do not pretend that we should throw millions into the hands of a private company. I do not say that those who subscribe a few thousands should receive millions from the Government. I think the Government should complete the Intercolonial Railway by connecting it with other systems of railway, when the commerce of the Intercolonial Railway could be doubled. I do not speak only for the interest of Quebec, which no doubt would be benefited if the bridge were built, but I speak of the interest of the Dominion. We talk of the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway as making one line from ocean to ocean, which is perfectly true, except that at Quebec the communication is broken. I do not mean to say that private companies should make fortunes out of the Government under that pretext. Those who favor the bridge should be proprietors of the bridge, but even supposing it should cost a few millions, that would amount to nothing compared with the importance of the work.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is this a final sum for the Cape Breton Railway?

Mr. FOSTER. It is to complete.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). When is it likely to be opened?

Mr. FOSTER. It will be completed, I think, in October next.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What has been the total cost?

Mr. FOSTER. Up to the 1st January, 1889, $1,500,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much of the $800,000 remains unspent?

Mr. FOSTER. Most of the $800,000 is spent.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There has been $2,500,000 voted. This vote of $400,000 for the construction of a bridge over the Narrows is in some respects to be regretted. Look at its position at this point of Bras d'Or Lake. We have spent

a considerable sum in building the St. Peter's Canal, and by Mr. Hyndman's report it appears that on some days from 60 to 70 vessels pass through that canal and down the lake, besides steamers, this navigation taking place from the middle of May to 31st December. This bridge is contemplated to be 1,800 feet long. Does not the Minister think it would be a very serious inconvenience to the trade at that portion of the lake to have a drawbridge, when from sixty to seventy vessels are passing through each day. I am not speaking now with respect to the location of the road. There is some difference of opinion with regard to the location, it being thought by some that the road is not properly located. On that question I will not enter, as I believe it will be discussed by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), but it involves the placing of a bridge across the Narrows, where there is so much shipping, and the Government should hesitate before placing a bridge there. It would have been better to have had a ferry there than a bridge. I have received letters from the American Bridge Company, complaining of want of facilities for obtaining information respecting this bridge, and they have the idea that it is the determination of the Government to give the work to the Bridge Company in Montreal. Whether that is so or not, I cannot say; but I am reminded by the bridge company and its agent in Halifax, that when the large expenditure of money for iron bridges was made in Nova Scotia, from $400,000 to $500,000, under the Act for that purpose, all those contracts, when open for competition, were taken by the American company at prices under those of the Montreal Company; and, therefore, I think it would be a pity if any obstacles were placed in the way of the American company competing for the work. That is the impression they entertain with respect to the matter, and if it is a fact, it is much to be deprecated, especially if that company could build the bridge for less than the Montreal company. I do not say such is the case, but such is represented to me. I repeat that the Government should hesitate before erecting a bridge at that point where it will prove a serious impediment to navigation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a general consensus of opinion that a bridge is the best means of connecting the two ends of the railway at the Narrows. The hon. gentleman quite understands that wherever there has been an attempt to perform the service by ferry, even by railway steamers with cars on board, it has always been found unsatisfactory, and it has been changed to a fixed road with a permanent bridge. The hon. gentleman may remember when the cars crossed the Susquehanna by ferry, and we now find the Grand Trunk building a tunnel at River St. Clair in order to get across the river, although they have a very complete system of steam ferries. At the Narrows there is a very high tide and in winter there is a good deal of ice, and altogether there is no certainty of continuous transport. There is such an uncertainty that there, by universal consent, as in other places, a bridge is preferable. There is no chance of there being an interruption of trade from the bridge. The draw is 100 feet wide, the vessels are all small, and there will not be any difficulty in their getting through, and the bridge when once built will be there for all time.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.). I am not going to discuss the location of the road, but I call attention to the fact that when Parliament was asked to vote a sum of money for the construction of a railway in Cape Breton, hon. members on this side of the House called attention to the fact that two or three routes had been proposed, and we insisted that before the money was voted the House should know what route would be adopted. One might cost $1,250,000, another nearly $2,000,000, and we insisted that it was monstrous to ask Parliament for a vote until the Government had come to a conclusion as to the route. The Government held that they could not do this, and gave the House no information; and the result has been pretty much as it has been in all railways constructed in the Maritime Provinces during the last three or four years. When the Government came down with the vote for the construction of the railway they said it was their intention to have a steam ferry at the Narrows, and there would be no bridge. As time went on they lengthened the contemplated line from 75 or 76 miles at a probable cost of $1,400,000 to a distance of 98 miles, which at $20,000 a mile, which was the estimate, would give about $2,000,000, without the cost of the bridge. The chief engineer in his report stated:

"The present proposition is to cross the Grand Narrows by a steam train ferry, and to this end preparations are being made, but it may be worth considering whether or not a steel bridge resting on iron cylinders filled with concrete would not be preferable. The length of such a structure would be 1,600 feet."

The Government have adopted that suggestion and Parliament is about to involve an expenditure of $400,000 for the construction of a bridge in addition to the $2,000,000, which the rest of the road is going to cost. In fact, this road in Cape Breton, which, according to the estimates brought down, would cost $1,250,000, is going to cost $3,000,000. An hon. gentleman says it will cost $4,000,000. He is better acquainted with the road than I am, but I am taking the figures of the chief engineer, $20,000 a mile, and the cost of the bridge as estimated to-night, and they come to pretty nearly $3,000,000. I say this Parliament should be very chary and very careful of voting sums of money for the construction of railways in the manner they have done heretofore, unless they know that the line has been surveyed and fixed and an estimate made of the approximate cost. It is perfectly monstrous the way in which those roads are constructed in different parts of the Dominion. You have the authority of the Minister with reference to the line and gentlemen who do not understand the location assume that he is acting on some data to justify his statement that this road is going to cost a million, but next year another million is asked and sometime afterwards another half million, and so it goes on until the road that was to cost a million dollars will cost three millions. I would ask the hon. gentleman if the construction of this iron bridge is not going to interfere with navigation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONADD. No; it does not.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) If it does not interfere with navigation well and good, but I am under the impression that it will to some extent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it will not. The crafts are all small. The hon. gentleman has been there himself and he knows.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). If this bridge does interfere with navigation it will be necessary to take power to build it by statute, because if it interferes it would be a nuisance and could be abated; and any steamer and any vessel going there and being interfered with can have the nuisance abated and taken down. The right of navigation is a paramount right, and the Governor in Council has no more power than I have to order that bridge to be built if it will interfere with navigation. He must have the authority of Parliament to build it in such a case. That is the reason why I have called the attention of the Government to this. My only object was to point out to Parliament that this is another of those roads in which Parliament has been misled to vote money on the erroneous statement made by the Minister.

Mr. FLYNN. It was my intention this evening to deal with the whole question of the railroad in the Island of Cape Breton and particularly with reference to this vote for

a bridge to cross the Narrows. I waited till after ten o'clock for an opportunity of doing so, but finding that this discussion on the Intercolonial Railway was to occupy so long a time I felt that I would not do justice to the question or to those interested if I undertook to discuss it at this late hour. I requested the leader of the Opposition to ask to have this particular item stand to some other time, but the Premier did not see his way to do so, and why he did not concede the request on this occasion I am at a loss to know. It is useless to say that the construction of this bridge across the Narrows will not obstruct the navigation to the lake. I am prepared to prove that and I think that I will convince this House (and I will take the earliest opportunity of bringing the matter forward) that this bridge will obstruct navigation. I very seldom ask any favor from this House and I think it rather strange that the First Minister has not conceded my request to let this item stand. I intended to move an amendment to Supply if the item was reached at any seasonable hour, but I thought at so late an hour as 11 o'clock, I would not have time to treat the subject as it deserves.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman can speak on Concurrence, or move in Supply?

Mr. FLYNN. Why not leave the item stand?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The reason is that it is getting so late in the Session, and we must get through the Estimates.

Mr. FLYNN. It is only one item and would not make much difference. It could be passed afterwards.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has every opportunity of speaking in Supply, and there will be no objection to that.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would ask the hon. Minister if he has any estimate for this bridge, because I am given to understand that it will ultimately cost a much larger sum than is placed in this vote to-night. Have they taken tenders for the bridge?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Are the tenders accepted?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Who are the contractors?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Messrs Reid & Isbester.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What is the amount of the tender?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it $515,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that to fully complete the bridge?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Were there any other tenderers?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Does the hon. gentleman know who they were?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not from memory. There were several.

Mr. LISTER. Were Isbester & Reid the lowest tenderers?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Did the American Company tender?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I suppose they did not get the specification on which to make their tender?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; they did.

Mr. LISTER. May I ask why the lowest tender was not accepted?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Because there were good reasons for selecting those men.

Mr. LISTER. I suppose we ought to know what the reasons were.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will bring down the papers if the hon. gentleman wants them.

Mr. LISTER. I hold a communication in my hand from respectable and reputable contractors in this country, who were able, financially and in every way, to have carried out this contract if it had been awarded to them. They inform me in this letter that there were six tenderers, that their tender was lower than that of Isbester & Co., but that their tender was passed over and given to Isbester & Co. I refer to McMahon & Co. They say they have all the capital necessary and the plant to carry on the work. They were prepared to put up whatever security the Government might think proper to exact, but, without any reason or explanation, the contract was given to men who tendered for the work at a price higher than this company was prepared to do it. I ask the First Minister why their tender should be passed over and the contract given to others who tendered at a higher price?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will bring down the papers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the papers should be brought down long before Concurrence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There will be no difficulty about that; I will bring them down on Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. LISTER. It is understood we can discuss this matter on Concurrence. I maintain that if we are to follow the principle of asking for tenders, and if people go to the trouble of investigating the whole matter and putting in a tender to the Government, then if their tender is quietly ignored and the contract awarded, not to the lowest, but to the highest tenderer, everything else being equal, you might just as well give the work without tenders at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not so.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Can the hon. gentleman tell us from memory what is the difference between the tender that was accepted and the lowest tender?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I cannot.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When this appropriation was first proposed, I asked the Minister who had charge of the matter to give us an estimate of the cost, the plan of survey and the location of the road. He told us that there were two surveys under consideration. Now, when anyone looks at the map he will see that the line chosen by the Government will be a very long line, if Louisburg is the terminal point.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It does not go to Louisburg.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, it does not go there now. What is more, anyone who looks at the geography of the place will see that the road is located for two-thirds of the distance with a lake on either side, so that if there were a population on the Island, it would have no advantage from the road except at the two extremities. The road has been located where it interferes with navigation. When the Government undertake to locate a road like this, they should ask Parliament to sanction that location. Before Parliament gives its sanction to a work that will interfere with navigation, they find that it has been located and built, and they have no option but to accept the work which has already been done without their consent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman tell us what has become of the great winter port of Canada, Louisburg? I was educated here into the belief that it was to be our great winter port. Sir Charles Tupper used to tell us that it was to be one of the *termini*—Port Moody or Vancouver was to be the terminus on one side of the continent and Louisburg on the other; and all the lines we have been voting money for during the past few years were to lead up to that harbor. Now it is abandoned, and there is nothing there but a little narrow gauge road from Sydney to Louisburg. Are we to unlearn all we have learned in the past few years about this winter port?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think Louisburg will vindicate its own character and reputation, if it is to be the great port which I believe it will be. The winter port at present is Sydney. There is an old road, I believe, between Sydney and Louisburg. I have very little doubt about the great start Cape Breton will take and the impetus to trade which will be given by the building of these roads there, and that Louisburg will vindicate itself, and that more than the anticipations held out by Sir Charles Tupper will be fulfilled.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. More than Sir Charles' expectations? Good gracious!

Oxford and New Glasgow Railway—construction. $300,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is to complete.

Mr. KIRK. When the Government asked Parliament to vote a sum of money to build this road, it was said to be in the interest of all eastern Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. It was said that it would shorten the distance for eastern Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island by 45 miles; but it turns out now, after the road has been built, that it does not shorten the distance one mile. We were told also that it was only going to cost $1,250,000 to build and equip this road; but we find that it has already cost $1,150,412, and we are now asked to vote $300,000 more. When this road was proposed, we who represented counties east of Pictou declaimed the idea of having charged to our counties an expenditure of something like $2,000,000, which we knew to be in the interest of the county of Pictou and the other two counties, Cumberland and Colchester, through which it alone passed; but Sir Charles Tupper, who was in the House at that time, convinced it that the road was not in the interest of Pictou alone, but in the interest of all eastern Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. He pointed out that the Intercolonial Railway formed two sides of a triangle, and that this road was to be the third side. He said:

"I can best illustrate to the House the position if I say that that corner of the chamber is New Glasgow, that corner is Oxford Junction, on the Intercolonial Railway, and that corner is Truro. At present the people of the whole of the eastern portion of Nova Scotia, the whole of the great county of Pictou, the county of Guysboro', the county of Antigonish, and the whole island of Cape Breton in addition, have, in order to reach Moncton in New Brunswick, to travel to Truro; and this intersection, taking the hypothenuse of seventy-five miles—that the construction of the road which I proposed to this Parliament to secure shortens the distance between the whole of that great portion of Nova Scotia and the rest of Canada by no less than from forty to forty-five miles, for every pound of freight and every passenger, that is carried. But that is not all, Sir. It brings the Pictou coal fields into communication with Canada, and gives them in distance an advantage of forty-five miles over that they now enjoy, in competing with the Springhill coal fields, which at present monopolise, to a great extent, the supply of the Intercolonial Railway and of these upper Provinces. I say, Sir, if there ever was a case presented to Parliament in which the interests—not of a section or of a small portion of the country, but the interests of the whole of this country—were involved, it was in that proposal to aid in the construction of those seventy-five miles of railway."

It was to make the distance from Moncton to New Glasgow 45 miles shorter, but it turns out, since the road has been built, that, according to the statement of the First Minister himself, and according to the Intercolonial Railway time table, that both roads are exactly the same length. The right hon. the First Minister, in answer to my question stated that the road from Oxford Junction to Pictou branch was 72 miles. He stated also that the Pictou branch was 15 miles. It is 15 miles from Pictou to Stellarton and three miles from Stellarton to New Glasgow. Now, the Short Line Railway does not tap the Pictou branch at Pictou, but about 14 miles from Stellarton; therefore, if you take 72 miles, the distance given by the First Minister, and 14 miles to Stellarton, and 3 miles to New Glasgow, you have 89 miles instead of 75. Then, the distance on the Intercolonial Railway from Oxford Junction to Truro is 46 miles, according to the time table. From Truro to New Glasgow is 43 miles, making 89 miles, so that the two roads are exactly the same length. How then is the hon. gentleman going to benefit Prince Edward Island or the great counties of Antigonish and Guysborough and all the eastern counties in Cape Breton, when all he has done is simply to spend money to accommodate the local interests of Cumberland, Colchester and Pictou. I claim that the Government have obtained a vote from Parliament by making false representations, and there ought, at least, to be some explanation. The money voted by Parliament was obtained on the representation that the road would shorten the distance, which it has not done.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. Minister in what position the claim of the old company stands for the Oxford and New Glasgow road. When we discussed that question last night, the hon. gentleman in reply to the enquiry of the hon. member for Guysborough, said that so much money had been paid on the old account, but I suppose that was for the payment of laborers which we voted some time ago.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I presume so.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Has there been any settlement between the Government and the company?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is before the courts now.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Has any payment been made?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would just ask the hon. gentleman if he contradicts the statement made by my hon. friend that we were promised 45 miles shorter road, and as a matter of fact we have not gained a mile?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I neither admit nor deny it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is either true or false. I know the hon. gentleman is not familiar with these matters, but a serious imposition has been practiced on the House in getting us to vote this money.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will enquire into that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely the hon. gentleman knows that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Indeed, I do not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman might be expected, as acting Minister of Railways, to know that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have only been acting for a short time, under the circumstances the hon. gentleman knows.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a gentleman here who can explain the matter, and he must know that simple fact.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is 26 miles shorter by Pictou than by the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. KIRK. Where does the hon. gentleman get his figures? I have a time table in my hand.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have the information of the chief engineer.

Mr. KIRK. The information the hon. gentleman gave when I put the question was not what he has just stated.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The question is not how short it is to Pictou or New Glasgow. It is the road from Oxford Junction. Parliament was not asked to carry it to Pictou or to New Glasgow so as connect with the Eastern Extension. According to the mileage, given by the chief engineer in his own book, the lines are just as far apart, two miles from Oxford Junction to Brown's Point and from that to New Glasgow.

Mr. TUPPER. What are the grades?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E I) We are talking about the distances. The hon. gentleman is very anxious to get off distances into grades. Sir Charles Tupper said the distance was shorter by 45 miles, and the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) repeated the statement the other day. It turns out now that the line does not shorten the distance, but has been built solely for local purposes.

Mr. KIRK. There was no railway then to Pictou at all.

Mr. JONES (Halifax.) It is a matter of common regret that the Government should bring down their chief engineer to endeavor to mislead the House and that he should be a party to it. We have the right to expect from the servants of this country that when they come here to give information they should give it frankly, and no man knows better than the hon. gentleman that the road from Oxford Junction to Brown's Point is 72 miles, and to reach New Glasgow 17 miles, making 89 miles. The chief engineer knows these details and the Government should know that the distance from Oxford to Truro is 46 miles, and from Truro to New Glasgow 43 miles, making 89 miles in all. You may take 89 one way and 89 the other way, and there is no difference. But if you will only call it 15 miles, it only shortens the distance two miles, as stated by the hon. member for Prince Edward. This is only a sample of the misrepresentation which has characterised the railway expenditure of this country. This was brought down for the purpose of the Conservative interest in those counties, for the purpose of securing the return of the Government candidate, on the representation of the then Finance Minister, repeated lately by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that the road was going to shorten the distance 45 miles. If the statement of a Minister of the Crown is no more to be depended upon in this regard than some statements I have had occasion to characterise to-night, I think we have arrived at a very low state of public morality and honor. We have a right to expect that when the Government bring down a proposal for the building of a great public work they shall be in a position to place before the House information of a reliable character, and when they bring a proposal to construct a branch road for a political purpose, leading the House to suppose that it is going to shorten the distance, and open up the coal fields of Pictou and the West, that it is going to shorten that road 45 miles, when they must have known it would not shorten it two miles, it is a condition of affairs which is disgraceful to the country, and to those who proposed and defend this work. We have a right to know what the actual difference is, and to see for what our money has been expended. The Government cannot wriggle out of this, they know they are in a false position in regard to it, and if they would say so at once and ask for absolution, there is enough generosity on this side to let them out of that because we have let them out of a good many bad scrapes, and one or two more would not make a great difference.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to inform the House, having ascertained the information from the chief superintendent, whether the distance is shorter between Oxford and New Glasgow by the new road for which we are now voting this money?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is a point we should know.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am told that the road is shortened, but only by seven miles.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We have the report of the chief engineer in Appendix No. 5, that the distance from Oxford Junction to Brown's Point is 67½ miles, leaving out the Pugwash Branch which is 4¾ miles. It is six miles from Brown's Point to New Glasgow, making 83½ miles. By the Intercolonial time table the distance between the two points by way of Truro is 89 miles, so that the reduction is only 5½ miles, and we have built five miles extra for the Pugwash Branch.

Intercolonial Railway—Repairs and Working Expenses..... $3,200,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is a very large increase made here for locomotive power. Will the Minister explain whether this is intended to be for new stock or for working the road simply?

Mr. FOSTER. For working the road.

Fisheries..... $231,500

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is very unfortunate that we have not had the report of the Minister of Fisheries brought down.

Mr. TUPPER. It will be laid on the Table on Monday, and I believe that is an earlier date than the report has been laid on the Table for many years; because, like some other departments, this one ends with the calendar year instead of the fiscal year.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Last year there was a discussion on this subject, and the then Minister explained that the report was delayed for reasons which would not occur again.

Mr. FOSTER. That was very late in the Session.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). We cannot discuss these items very intelligently without the Minister's report on the subject being before us. Can the Minister give us any further information as to the results of the fish-hatching establishments? Whether right or wrong—and I think my hon. colleague (Mr. Kenny) will bear me out in this—as far as we can learn from the experience in regard to the hatchery near Halifax, there has been no beneficial result flowing from it. That opinion has been very generally expressed, as I have heard, in regard to hatcheries in other places, and in regard to the hatchery near Halifax, those who profess to know have come to the conclusion that it is a complete failure. I am sorry that it is so. It was established by the Government of which I was a member under the impression that it would stock our rivers with salmon fry, but we cannot see that any advantage has resulted from it. The rivers where the spawn has been placed have not improved in proportion to the stock taken out of them. I may be referred, as I have been before, to the reports of the persons in charge of these hatcheries, and may be told that they think they are a success. I attach very little importance to reports from such interested quarters, because, of course, all those gentlemen are interested in saying that they are successful. I have had so many representations made to me in reference to the Halifax hatchery that it would take too long to explain them to-night. I understood that my hon. colleague had some persons in whom he had confidence visit that hatchery last summer, and that their report was in the same direction as

I have stated, that no great advantage had been derived from it. This is no question of blaming or censuring the Government, but I think we have reached a point in this matter where we either ought to make a very important departure or to give it up altogether. I think it is evident that the fry are placed in the rivers either too early, or from some other reason, which prevents their being of the advantage which was expected. Under these circumstances I think the Government would do well to take the earliest opportunity of ascertaining from the United States and elsewhere what the result of their enquiries have been. At present, so far as I am aware—and I say it very regretfully, because no one is more interested than myself in seeing our fisheries increased all along our shores—I have received information from reliable sources that the fish hatchery at Halifax has been a failure.

Mr. KENNY. As my hon. friend has referred to me, I may mention that I am not in a position to express myself as emphatically as he has done with regard to the results of the Halifax hatchery. There is a great conflict of opinion as to the results of this expenditure. But it is a scientific and a technical question, of which I have no practical knowledge. My hon. colleague has referred to the fact that some friends of mine visited the Sackville River to inform themselves. I was aware of the circumstance, but that was not the object of their visit. I was requested to go there myself, but my health did not permit me do so. Their object was to see the working of some of the fishways and not what the hon. gentleman supposed.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Is it the intention to rebuild the fish hatchery at Dunk River, in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. TUPPER. No, not at present.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) If the hon. gentleman has come to the conclusion from evidence in his department that these fish hatcheries are beneficial, why does he not have one in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. TUPPER. We have a considerable number of hatcheries in Canada, and the cost of maintaining them is very great. There is considerable discussion in the country as to whether, after our 12 years of experience, we should increase or diminish these hatcheries. At the present time we have great facilities for removing the fry long distances, as we are doing now in some cases from Ontario to the lower Provinces. We have two hatcheries in Nova Scotia besides those in New Brunswick, and it did not seem proper to ask Parliament for a sum to repair the breaking away of the dam at the Dunk River hatchery, the results of which had not been sufficiently satisfactory to justify that course being taken. As for myself, I have not yet come to any definite opinion as to how this system has worked, although I have in my possession an immense amount of evidence which I have read, and which will be laid on the Table on Monday. The evidence I refer to is found in the report of the superintendent of the hatcheries, in which he reviews this question very elaborately from his standpoint, and he is an enthusiastic believer in them. In other countries they are going more extensively into fish breeding every year, particularly in the United States and in the mother country. They have been wonderfully successful in hatching shad on the Pacific coast; and fortunately for us, a great many of those that were hatched in the United States waters have found their way up the Fraser River to British Columbia. Although a great deal of the fry is lost altogether from one cause or another, the fisheries have been greatly aided from the hatcheries. A good argument has been adduced in behalf of the fish-breeding system which I may mention—I am dealing very generally with the subject from the nature of the position in which we stand just now—the argument is that while the rivers have been polluted to the great destruction of fish, our fisheries would have shown a far greater falling off had these hatcheries not been started. Of that, however, I am not very competent to judge. I shall certainly make it my business to consult with people, and investigate the matter during the recess.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I regret that the same thing happens this year that has always happened—we never have a dollar for fish-breeding in Prince Edward Island when these estimates go through. How many fish hatcheries are there in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick?

Mr. TUPPER. There are two in Nova Scotia—at Sidney and Bedford; one on the St. John River at Miramichi and one at Restigouche in New Brunswick; three in Quebec and two in Ontario.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does not the hon. gentleman think that the reason he gave just now for not rebuilding the dam at Dunk River applies exceedingly well to dispensing with three or four of the hatcheries in the Maritime Provinces? The fact is that one fish hatchery is quite sufficient for the whole of the Maritime Province, and the whole enormous expense might be saved. The facilities for carrying ova from one place to another are so great now that there is no difficulty about it.

Mr. KIRK. The Minister said there were two fish hatcheries in Nova Scotia and two in New Brunswick. I have been told that there is something called a fish hatchery on Harbor Lake, in the County of Antigonish. Have you another name for it?

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Wilmot has constructed several huts at certain places in which he deposits the fry. They are cheap things, run up and left there until the next season, and not at all expensive. They are merely places in which he works with the fry.

Mr. EISENHAUER. How does the department distribute this fish over the different rivers?

Mr. TUPPER. Applications are sent in. Already a large number have been received this year, and this is about the time for distribution. The department endeavors to apportion the fry as fairly as possible in the different rivers that are considered suitable.

Mr. EISENHAUER. Has any been sent to Lahaie?

Mr. TUPPER. There is too much sawdust, I am afraid, just now.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I have not much faith in the benefit of these fishing hatcheries, because we have been allowing sawdust to get in the rivers for the last year or two. I think if the hatcheries are of so much benefit they should make up the loss of fish.

Mr. TUPPER. That is one of the arguments used by the advocates of hatcheries.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Has any fry been put into Lake St. Claire?

Mr. TUPPER. I cannot give the distribution throughout Ontario. All the applications have been received and have been scheduled, and the officers are now endeavoring to apportion the quantity of fish.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Please note Lake St. Claire.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman consider that one fish hatchery for the Maritime Provinces is quite sufficient to supply them?

Mr. TUPPER. As I intend to take up the subject I simply ask for the old vote. I dare not at present make a radical change in the system of carrying on the work and I am only asking Parliament to do what it has done for 12 years. In regard to the hatchery in question, there is an

opportunity for making a halt before asking Parliament for a sum sufficient to enable me to put that place in order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). The hon. gentleman said he did not intend to apply for more money because fish hatcheries were very expensive, and the distribution of fry could be made from other fish hatcheries.

Mr. TUPPER. And the results were not very satisfactory.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). Is the hon. gentleman prepared to say that one hatchery would supply all the wants of the Island?

Mr. TUPPER. It is claimed now that our hatcheries are not large enough, and are not as large as those hatcheries built in the United States.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Still you are going to supply all the Dominion with fry.

Mr. TUPPER. We are going to supply all we can.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then I understand we are going to suffer.

Mr. KIRK. Does the hon. gentleman find from the reports of his overseers that fish, such as salmon, are more abundant in the streams in consequence of the artificial propagation of fish?

Mr. TUPPER. There has no doubt been a decrease in the capture of salmon in late years. There are many causes to account for this; but the argument of those who speak with authority on the subject is that the decline would have been tenfold, or a thousandfold greater except for the valuable aid given by the fish hatcheries.

Mr. ELLIS. There was a statement published in a Miramichi newspaper that a few days after the deposit of a large quantity of fry in that vicinity there were large quantities in the water dead.

Mr. TUPPER. That occurs everywhere; some of the fry never reach any size or maturity. That even occurs with ordinary spawn.

Mr. KIRK. We ought soon to be able to tell whether this large expenditure on fish hatcheries is of any advantage or not. I have always supported the expenditure, and I am not opposing it now. The Minister of Justice has undertaken to propagate fish in a stream in his county, where, in a few years, the question will be thoroughly tested. If the fish can be propagated in that stream, where the Minister of Justice has built a fish-way, it will be evidence of the value of the work; but if there is a failure there, and I am watching it very closely, there will be failure anywhere.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In regard to the item of $100,000 for fishery protection steamers and vessels, I desire to ask whether the Minister thinks it necessary, now that we are again to have this year the *modus vivendi* to keep all these war steamers in commission?

Mr. TUPPER. We had the *modus vivendi*, in operation last year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You had the cruisers.

Mr. TUPPER. We have not settled on the number of cruisers required this year, and I may say that none of them were chartered for more than one season. We are asking the same sum from Parliament, but it is a matter of precaution. We may not expend the whole of it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it the intention to charter as many vessels?

Mr. TUPPER. I think we can do with a smaller number of sailing craft, if the present intention of the Government in connection with the utilisation of the *Stanley* is carried out.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is a cruiser called the *Charles Tupper*. I suppose she will be retained?

Mr. TUPPER. No; I am sorry to say she has gone to the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I). I think we might dispense with half the number of cruisers.

Mr. PLATT. What proportion of this amount goes for the protection of the fisheries in inland waters?

Mr. TUPPER. This amount of $100,000 is appropriated for those vessels which have been used in the protection of the fisheries, and we have at present a cruiser on the inland waters which is charged against this sum. It is for the protection of the very valuable fisheries in the great lakes and against poaching of every kind.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The hon. Minister has brought down a return, in response to a motion made by my colleague, with respect to fishing bounties paid on the Island. It was stated that some fishermen in Little Sands, whose names I gave to the Minister at that time, were refused their fishing bounties on account of having done lobster fishing, and that, therefore, they could not have been engaged in the deep sea fishing. I wish to state that all those gentlemen have sent me a statement in return denying positively that they fished for lobsters during 1886, and they are prepared to testify that on oath if the hon. Minister wishes it. They have sent me this memorial which I wish now to hand over to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. They point out that two parties who did fish for lobsters were paid their bounty while they who did not fish were not paid. I would ask the hon the Minister to get his commissioner, Mr. Duvar, to go down to this section of the Island and hold an enquiry into this matter.

Mr. TUPPER. I will ascertain the best means to enquire thoroughly into this matter.

Mr. LISTER. I take this opportunity of bringing before the members of the Government a matter very deeply affecting that large and important class of people in this country, the fishermen, and a matter in which they are at the present moment very much interested indeed. It is not necessary for me to say that the fishermen of this country form a very large portion of the population, and constitute a great part of the wealth-producing population of the country. To prove the correctness of that statement I would refer hon. members to the returns in the census of 1881, the last official figures that I have been able to get. I find that, in 1881, there were taken in Canada, 1,130,720 quintals of cod; of haddock, hake and pollock 192,539 quintals, and 574,503 barrels of herring. I find that, according to the last Trade and Navigation Returns, we exported from Canada last year $7,793,183 worth of fish. I find also according to these returns that the total of vessels engaged in the fishing industry in 1881, was 1,131; that there were men employed on those vessels to the number of 8,401; that there were fishing boats to the number of 30,427; men engaged on those fishing boats 51,603, and that there were 2,150,259 fathoms of net used. Hon. gentlemen will see from the statement I now make that there is an enormous sum of money invested in the business of fishing, and that there are many thousands of men engaged in that occupation, producing a very great amount of wealth and contributing a very large portion of the export trade of this country. Now, Sir, what I am particularly interested in is the exportation of the fresh fish of Canada, and more particularly so far as it relates to the fishermen of the Province of Ontario. From every Province in this Dominion, there is every year a large exportation of fresh fish to the United States. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns we imported from the United States last year only 1,914,138 pounds and we exported to the United States during that same time,

23,666,440 pounds. So far as the fresh fish caught during the summer months is concerned the United States is our only market outside of the home market. It will be seen that our exports of fresh fish to the United States are 21,753,302 pounds more than our imports, and this applies to fresh fish only. Hon. gentlemen will see how important it is that no restriction should be placed upon that trade and that any danger that restrictions might be placed upon our exports to the United States should be removed so far as we are concerned. This fresh fish is admitted free of duty in the United States, but in this country there is a duty of half a cent per pound on fresh fish imported from the United States. I would call the attention of the Minister of Customs to the fact that our total imports amount to only $51,992 and the amount of Customs collected would of course be a mere trifle. What the fishermen fear is—and they have brought it to my attention and asked that I should bring it to the attention of the Government, to the attention of the House and to the attention of members who are interested in the question as I am—what the fishermen fear is that on account of the duty on fresh fish imported into Canada from the United States, the American Government will during this year in all probability place a duty on fish exported from the Dominion of Canada. If such a duty is put on our fish it will mean a loss to the fishermen of Canada of between $100,000 and $200,000 a year. This is a very important question for these fishermen and I would ask that the Minister of Customs should look into the question. I am sure that I am voicing the feelings and wishes of every fisherman in the Dominion of Canada from British Columbia to Prince Edward Island when I say that this duty upon fresh fish coming into Canada ought to be removed. It is no advantage to us whatever and it is a constant menace to the fishermen of Canada that the United States will retaliate and put a duty on fish going into that country. Our fish compete with American fish in the markets of the United State, they can get along quite well without our fish, and if this duty is put upon Canadian fish by the American Government it means that the fishermen in Canada will lose by it to the extent of the duty. The business is a precarious one and no obstacle ought be put in the way of the fishermen of the country making the most they can out of their occupation. I feel that it is only necessary to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to the condition of affairs to induce him to seriously consider the propriety of removing the duty now put upon fresh fish brought into Canada. There is a duty of course upon pickled fish and barrelled fish coming into Canada and in the United States as well, but the United States admit our fish free of duty.

Mr. BOWELL. For immediate consumption.

Mr. LISTER. The fish goes in in June, July, August and September, and of course it is for immediate consumption, but so far as I know, there has been no duty put upon fresh fish at any time by the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a point of some considerable practical importance to a number of persons. Of course if the Government do not wish to give any opinion on it well and good, but I think an answer is due to my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister). There is no doubt that any such duty as he names, on imports to this country, is a constant provocation to certain parties in the American Congress to put similar duties on our exports, and as the importation into Canada is not one-tenth of our exportation to the United States, it is decidedly to our interest to abolish the duty, if thereby we can avoid the chance of a duty being placed on our own fish.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is scarcely the time to discuss an alteration of the tariff; but still we have heard the statement of the hon. gentleman, and it is worthy of every consideration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will you consider it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; we will.

Mr. BRIEN. This is a very important matter to the people of the section from which I come. In the constituency I have the honor to represent there are something like a hundred fishermen who, with their families, are dependent on this industry alone; and a duty of half a cent a pound placed on fresh fish would throw these men out of employment; and the fact that they have been engaged in this industry for a number of years, and no other, makes them unfit for any other employment. Therefore, I think it is very desirable, considering the small amount of revenue that accrues from this duty, the Government should remove it entirely, and not leave any provocation to the United States to impose a retaliatory duty. The matter having been brought to the notice of the Government, I have no doubt they will give it their attention. The fishermen of my district sell fully 99 per cent. of their catch in the United States; their boats go to American ports constantly; if they are deprived of the American market, they will have none at all; and if they are thrown out of this employment, they will be left in almost destitute circumstances.

Mr. PLATT. I agree with the First Minister that this is hardly the time to discuss tariff matters; but as the interests of the fishermen are very important interests, and as we may not have another opportunity this Session to bring these matters before the Government, we do so now. I have a grievance which I wish again to lay before the Minister of Customs as well as the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Fisheries. It is perhaps not so large a question as that raised by my hon. friend from Lambton, but it is one in reference to which the fishermen are complaining sorely in the district from which I come. I do not know that the tariff itself is at fault, but the regulations of the Customs Department place a duty on nearly all the twines used for fishing purposes in the inland waters. We know that twines are admitted free, but the Customs Department classes all the finer twines which are used for the manufacture of nets for catching herring and all the smaller fish in the inland waters, as threads, which are charged 20 per cent. duty. This may seem a small matter, but it is very important to the fishermen. The habit of these industrious and frugal people is to make their nets during the winter months in preparation for the summer's fishing; and their wives and families as well as themselves are employed at this work. All the twines used for the manufacture of the nets used for fishing in the inland waters are now subject to a duty of 20 per cent., which prevents these people carrying on that useful industry; and they feel the grievance all the more, because, though many of them are supporters of the National Policy and the present Government, they think that in this particular instance home industry is not encouraged, because we find that the very net which is manufactured from this dutiable thread is admitted free. A great many people have been employed in the winter months manufacturing nets for the wealthier fishermen and the merchants; but they have found it more profitable to import the nets than to have them made by these people; so that the fishermen are deprived almost completely of that source of benefit. It would be a very easy matter, it seems to me, to remedy this. I do not know why the Customs authorities have seen fit to place these finer twines on the list of dutiable threads. I was told in the Customs Department that anybody could tell that these finer twines were threads, but I never could find the dividing line between a twine and a thread; and why the manufacturers of this country require a duty to be placed upon these finer twines, which are never used as

threads, I cannot see. If the Minister of Fisheries is at all anxious to serve these people, I do not see why he should not press on the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance the advisability of changing this regulation at once. It would be a very great boon to the fishermen if that change were made even now, so that these people would have the advantage of free twine for fishing purposes as the law intends.

Mr. GILLMOR. The discussion refers more particularly to the duty on fresh fish. I represent a constituency which, being close to the State of Maine, has a special interest in that subject. The people of that constituency depend largely on fishing, and their market for the sale of their catch of fresh fish is entirely in the State of Maine. I have listened to a great deal of discussion on this fishery question. The policy on both sides has been one of retaliation, but I would like to see the Government set an example of conciliation. I think this would be a good time to take the duty of fresh fish. All through this fishery discussion I think there has been a good deal of provocation given to the Government of Canada to retaliate; but I do not think it is a profitable game. If the duty is left on, it will entail a great loss upon Canada and particularly upon the county I represent. I understand how much provocation has been given to the Government, because I know something of the habits of American fishermen; I know their disposition to encroach upon the rights of Canada. I know the men, and among the worst of them are those from Nova Scotia; they are reckless and lawless with regard to other people's rights. I do not see that it is resulting in any good. I would like to see Canada lift herself to a higher place, and set an example of conciliation. I would like to see the Government try to settle this difficulty, and not wait too long. I do not like to see the Government back down. I have a great regard for Canada and the Government of Canada, and when our Government has taken a stand, I do not like to see them back down, but my experience is that they have to back down in the long run. Let them try the policy of reconciliation, instead of that of retaliation, and thus set a good example to our American neighbors, who, no doubt, do exceedingly mean things. That, however, is no excuse for Canada doing equally mean things by retaliation. Our trade in fresh fish is, perhaps, more than that of all the lakes. The county I have the honor to represent, has a very large interest in this, and you can understand how important it is to us. Our fishermen go out and do their day's work; and instead of coming home to any part of Canada, they run right to a seaport where the fish are purchased and taken off to Boston and other American ports. I understand a good deal of the relations between Canada and the United States, living on the frontier and understanding thoroughly the American fishermen. I understand how they have encroached upon privileges that do not belong to them. I hope a new departure will be taken and our American friends set the Christian example of reconciliation.

Mr. FREEMAN. I must ask my good Nova Scotia friend to consider whether he ought not to take back what he has said about Nova Scotia fishermen. I am quite confident he is mistaken, as I have a large acquaintance with these men and many opportunities to see them.

Mr. GILLMOR. I refer to those who have gone to the States and become naturalised.

Mr. FREEMAN. I am glad the hon. gentleman has made amends so thoroughly.

Mr. BARRON. I do not wish to discuss this particular point, but would ask the House if the letter written by the American consul here regarding the spirit of retaliation would not be applicable here. The letter refers to the export duty on logs. That does not apply to the discussion now, but the letter is very interesting and might perhaps give some information concerning the relations between the two countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. KIRK. The Nova Scotia fishermen to whom my hon. friend from New Brunswick (Mr. Gillmor) alluded are those who have been expatriated owing to the bad laws of this Government, and consequently do not feel altogether pleasant towards this country. These are the men the hon. gentleman alluded to. With regard to this duty on thread to which the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) has referred, it would be an advantage to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces as well as Prince Edward, if the thread were made as cheap as possible, because fishermen in the long winter nights knit their own nets, and the material they require should be made as cheap as possible.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no duty on the thread.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent). All along the shores of Lake Erie, adjacent to the County of Kent, there are a great number of pound nets put there by Americans who come from Cleveland and Ohio. They draw out the nets and take the fish out, and the smaller fish and those of not much account they throw away. The good ones they take to Cleveland and other places. Complaints were made last year that they threw the smaller fish into the water, thus putrifying the temperature and the waters around. I believe the regulation is that the nets shall be an inch square, but the regulations are not carried out at all. The mesh is too small, so that a great many of the small fish cannot escape as they could if the mesh were wide enough. During the summer of last year there were great complaints from the people along the shore of Lake Erie, not only on account of the disagreable smell that arose from the decaying fish, but also on account of the great destruction that was allowed of the small fish, and now that another season is rapidily approaching, I hope the hon. the Minister will see that the proper law is strictly adhered to.

Mr. WATSON. Before this item passes I desire to say that a very large interest is springing up in Manitoba in regard to the export of fresh fish. The Trade and Navigation Returns show that $95,576 worth of fresh fish was exported from Manitoba last year, and nearly all that goes to the United States. The people interested in fishing in that Province were very much alarmed when it was stated that the United States were going to retaliate by putting a duty on fresh fish. That would be a severe blow to our people. The fish they export are generally pike or jackfish, which are purchassd there for about a cent a pound, so that a duty of even half a cent a pound would stop the export. Those fish are sold in Chicago for three cents a pound. They are caught in the winter time and are shipped by the cargo. I hope the Government will consider this matter favorably. I believe that the small amount which the Government derives from the duty on fish coming into the country should not weigh with them in such a matter as this, and that it should receive their serious attention, because, if the American Government should be irritated on account of this duty and should retaliate on us in that way, the result would be to wipe out this industry in Manitoba.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman know that very strong representations have been made from his Province to have an export duty put upon the fish there?

Mr. WATSON. From whom?

Mr. BOWELL. From people in your own county and in Winnipeg, because they are looking forward to the complete depletion of your lakes in regard to fish, and especially whitefish.

Mr. WATSON. Our chief exportation is pike or jackfish, and I am of opinion that the greater the facility that can be given for the exportation of those fish or their extermination, so as to allow the whitefish to increase, the better it would be. If any restrictions are to be placed on the export of fish, I would like the Minister of Customs to place them on whitefish, and allow the people to export all the jackfish they can.

Mr. PLATT. In reference to the question of twine, the Minister has stated that there is no duty on twine, but I have here a specimen manufactured by W. J. Knox, of Glasgow, which paid 20 per cent. duty, while the fishermen want it free.

Mr. HESSON. There are tons of twine made by Ryan & Son, and also in Halifax, and I do not see the necessity of importing it free. They make twine of all varieties, and I believe they could compete with any manufacturer.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I desire to say a word or two on the fishermen's bounty.

Mr. FOSTER. The item is passed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is understood that any of these items can be discussed.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a statutory item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We constantly discuss statutory items if there is anything to be said about them. That is the object of putting them on the Estimates.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; they show the expenditure of the year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They do not show the whole expenditure for the year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They show the estimated expenditure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I never before heard a refusal to allow discussion on an item because it was a statutory item.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Go on.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I understand that the amount paid to the fishermen for bounties in 1887 exceeded the $150,000 authorised by statute, and that it is the intention to reduce the amount per ton in 1888 in order to bring the expenditure within the sum authorised by statute. I do not think that is a proper thing for the Government to do, because they cannot take credit for voting this amount of $150,000. In 1876, they received $4,500,000 from the United States for the rights and privileges which the fishermen of that country had enjoyed for many years in our waters. They have received the interest or the benefit of that amount for twelve years, and they have paid this bounty for only half that time; so I think it is not fair to the fishermen of the Dominion to reduce the amount simply to keep the total within the sum voted. The fishermen of Lunenburg have not received their bounty for last year, and I am told that in other counties that has been the result. I should like to ask the Minister if that is the case?

Mr. TUPPER, The rate per man has not been reduced. The rate per ton on the ships had to be reduced, and for this reason: It is not correct to say that the amounts payable in 1887 were not according to the regulations, but perhaps the hon. gentleman's figures are taken from some purporting to be for that year. It is true that, in 1887, the amount came to $163,000, and the vote was insufficient to make the distribution among those who were properly entitled to it, so it was necessary to make a reduction in order to keep within the statutory vote.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I know that the Government cannot go beyond that, but I think the fishermen should receive some consideration at their hands.

Mr. TUPPER. The Government are powerless in the matter.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I am aware of that, but the hon. Minister should remember that the fishermen have no protection against foreign fish. Although there is a duty of 50 cents a quintal on foreign fish, it is no protection to them, because the fish come in as if there were no duty at all. I asked the Government during the earlier part of the Session whether any change was proposed in the system of bonding foreign fish, and I could not hear very distinctly the reply of the hon. Minister of Customs. I think he said they were considering the matter or something of that kind. I bring this matter to his notice now in case there may not be an opportunity later on. I think that a radical change is necessary in the system of bonding foreign fish. The Minister of Customs is well aware that these fish come in, and are allowed to be handled as much as we handle our own fish. They are allowed to be dried on the wharf, to be put in store and taken out again if necessary, and I think that some change in that system is necessary.

Geological Survey $60,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like generally to know the territory that is going to be geologically surveyed. It seems to me that a good deal more of this money is being frittered away than there need be, and we do not get any considerable new territory thoroughly surveyed and brought in. Of course I speak on a somewhat superficial examination of the hon. gentleman's reports, as the work may be more thoroughly done than I suppose.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I asked the director some few days ago to give me some information with regard to what they propose to do during the coming season, and he has furnished me a memorandum giving the names of the officers he is to send out, and the regions they are to explore. In British Columbia it is proposed to send Dr. Dawson, who has been working there the previous year, and Mr. Bowman to work on Vancouver Island. Mr. Macoun, the botanist, will be sent into the New Westminster district. In the North-West Territories it is proposed to send Mr. McConnell, who has been in the Yukon district for the last two years. It is proposed to send him to Peace River to report on the coal oil fields. That will be new work entirely. Although it has been reported that we have extensive oil districts up there, they have never been looked into very closely. In Manitoba, Mr. Tyrrell will continue his exploration about Duck Mountains. The hon. gentleman, no doubt, is aware that it is reported that there is also coal oil in that neighborhood. In Ontario, Mr. Lawson will continue his work east of Port Arthur. Mr. Bell continues his work in the Sudbury district; and Mr. Cochrane will complete the topographical details of the region about Owen Sound. In Quebec, Mr. Ingall continues his work in the phosphate regions of Buckingham and Templeton. Mr. Ells will complete a map of the Eastern Townships from Lake St. Peter to the Vermont boundary. Mr. Adams will work in Chambly county, and Mr. Low in Quebec and Portneuf counties. Mr. Bailey continues his work in connection with the Temiscouata and Madawaska districts. Mr. Chalmers continues work in southern New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Mr. Fletcher continues his work in Pictou county, and Mr. Faribault in Halifax county.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know from the Minister whether, in the North-West, where we are lords of the soil, it is the intention of the hon. gentle-

man to cause a series of borings to be made at various points, so as to give us some practical idea of the various formations. That matter has been discussed once or twice in the House. I think something was done in that direction.

Mr. DEWDNEY. So far as I have heard, there is no intention to do it this year. I may state that there are two borers in the territory, one is owned by the Galt Company, and the other by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. They have been boring the last year for their own information. On enquiry I find that the plant required for the work is very expensive, and we have no money for it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What would the cost be?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Somewhere about ten or twelve thousand dollars. To-day a good diamond drill would cost that sum. I made enquiry especially to find out the cost from Mr. Galt and also from the company, and they said it would cost ten or twelve thousand dollars to get a machine. I understand the importance of the work, and would very much like to see it undertaken. I think it would be well worth the expense, and if the House feel inclined to vote the money I should be glad to expend it in that way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think where we own the soil it is well worth while to have borings made to a reasonable depth. My information as to the cost of a diamond drill differs materially from that of the hon. gentleman. I understand it could be obtained for a much smaller sum, sufficient to enable borings to be made to a reasonable depth, say six or eight hundred feet. That would not be very expensive, as we know that in that country a great deal of the soil is alluvial. I am sure we would learn a great deal more by these borings than we are learning by these exploring expeditions. There is another point to which I would call the attention of the First Minister, who was formerly Minister of the Interior. I understand, and the Minister of Interior has indicated, that the attention of the Government has been properly called to it, that there is supposed to be most extraordinarily rich oil fields in certain portions of that territory. I have heard the area estimated as high as 80,000 or 100,000 square miles, which I take to be an exaggeration, but I have no doubt that there is considerable reason to believe that a very extensive territory there is underlaid with oil, somewhat similar I presume to the oil deposits known for centuries near the Caspian. I do not think it would be proper to retain all that territory absolutely in sovereignty, but I have a very strong impression that we would do well to retain a very large tract of that territory absolutely in the Crown. Just now, it is true, we cannot make it useful for commercial purposes, but it is not impossible that for a territory like that we might at no remote period be able to derive a very considerable revenue if we continued to keep possession of the more profitable oil district or a portion of it. I have more than once suggested to the First Minister, when he was Minister of Interior, the expediency of the Government of Canada, in its capacity as general trustee for the pubic, retaining possession of, at all events, a portion of the more valuable coal fields and probably of the more valuable mines, and I think this quite virgin coal oil field that is reported to be discovered would afford a very good opportunity of trying the experiment. Of course it is a departure from our previous policy, but it is a departure worth making and an experiment worth trying. I should like to know what the First Minister or the Minister of Interior thinks on that point.

Mr. DAVIN. I am very glad this subject has been brought up by the hon. gentleman. The subject of borers has been before the attention of persons interested in the North-West, and I brought the matter at an early period, in fact when I came down, before the attention of the Minister. The question of expense was the question that seemed to be difficult at that time. I am very glad that from the Opposition, and especially from the hon. gentleman who watches the expenditure on the part of the Government, the suggestion has come that there should be boring done in the North-West. With respect to what the hon. gentleman has said as to the course the Government should take, I entirely disapprove of it. It is the course that has been found a perfect nuisance in the North-West, that is that if the Dominion thinks it has valuable territory a system of exploiting it should be adopted that would result most beneficially to itself. The result has been already disastrous. It involves an entire mistake of the principles of political economy, an entire mistake of the relations between the Government and the public, because it supposes the relations between the Government and the public are the same as those between some large trader and the public, whereas the Government and the public interest are so mixed up that if a private individual makes a fortune out of a coal mine or out of an oil discovery you enrich the country in the best and directest way. It is a principle that an hon. gentleman, who held a high and honored place in the Government of Canada entertained strongly, and in 1883 I did everything I could to dissuade him from what I considered then to be a greengrocer policy, and I am surprised to hear this suggestion by an hon. gentleman so erudite as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) who conducts the financial criticisms on the Reform side of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Sound political economists entertain very different opinions on this subject. There is no one likely, in the future, to produce more mischief to this country than that of allowing private individuals to monopolise natural gifts which ought to belong to the whole country. I do not believe that valuable public properties should be handed over for perfectly insignificant considerations to gentlemen who happen to be favorites of the powers that be. Such cases have resulted in great disaster to this and other countries, and, unless I greatly mistake public opinion, a great deal of public property diverted in this way, will be taken back again before many years are over.

Mr. DAVIN. I quite agree as to the impropriety of handing over to any individual or number of individuals for political considerations the public domain. What I contend for is, that a Government makes an economic mistake when it thinks that it will not give a certain piece of property at the present time because at some future time it may be more valuable to it; in that way it will really retard the development of the country and in that way injure the country. The two things are wholly distinct, the position adroitly taken up in reply to me by the hon. gentleman and the position I took.

Mr. WATSON. I entirely agree with the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and also the Minister of Interior who has stated his belief that it would be a good thing to have a drill or borer make certain tests throughout Manitoba and the North-West. I believe, as a great many are led to believe, that there are many valuable deposits of oil through Manitoba and the North-West. Near Lake Dauphin they have for the past two years been boring with the result of strong indications of securing oil; but the company's engineers have found working very expensive. They have had a long haul for their machinery and have labored under many difficulties; and the Government could not do better than spend a certain sum in purchasing drills and machines and organising gangs at two or three different

places to make borings and ascertain the results. There are also no doubt valuable salt wells in Manitoba. Along the western shores of Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipegoosis salt springs have been known to exist from early days, and half breeds made all the salt they used from those springs which are on the surface, and I have no doubt by boring very valuable salt wells would be discovered. With the present long haul of salt from the Eastern Provinces, salt would be very valuable as well as petroleum. Moreover, salt will no doubt be required in the future for farming purposes. I agree with the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that a certain portion of these valuable deposits should be reserved for the public use; I would not favor the reserving of all the territory because enterprise should be encouraged in prosecuting the work. In Manitoba there have been discoveries of coal, and in south Manitoba a company has been formed to open up and develop a coal mine at Turtle Mountain. Much good would undoubtedly be done by such an expenditure being made, and better results might be obtained than from spending the money on the Geological Survey. I hope the Government will consider the matter favorably, and in the near future make the tests of which I have spoken. They will undoubtedly be in the interest of the whole Dominion in addition to benefiting the particular localities in which they are made.

Resolutions reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1:30 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 8th April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 126) to amend the Summary Convictions Act, chapter 178 of the Revised Statutes, and the Act amending the same (from the Senate).—(Sir John Thompson.)

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY—PETITION.

Mr. SHANLY asked, Has the Government received any petitions from the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company? If so, has any action been taken, or will any action be taken thereon, by the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A petition was received on the 12th March, 1889, from the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway, protesting against the granting of subsidies to railways which duplicate and compete with existing lines. No action could, of course, be taken on this petition, but it will be considered when any railway claims are laid before Parliament.

ST. GEORGE'S BRIDGE—STRUCTURAL DEFECTS.

Mr. MULOCK asked, Whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to an article in the *Engineer*, copied into last week's *Scientific American*, pointing out the structural defects in the St. George Bridge whereby the recent disaster might be accounted for? Whether any steps are being taken as to other railway bridges, to see whether they are also structurally defective for the reasons therein contained? Has the Government received any report from their inspecting officer on the subject of the disaster, and would it be in the public interest that such report should be brought down?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The attention of the Government has not been drawn by any one to this matter except by the notice of the hon. gentleman. No steps have yet been taken with regard to other railway bridges, but this subject will be attended to. The Government have not received any report from the inspecting officer on the subject of the disaster.

VICTORIA BRIDGE.

Mr. AMYOT asked, What is the total cost of the Victoria Bridge; the yearly outlay for its maintenance and management, and the yearly revenue it yields?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have no means of knowing what the total cost of the Victoria Bridge is, except by application to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I have no doubt if the hon. gentleman will apply to Mr. Hickson, he will give him every information.

LA CLOCHE ISLAND—PROVINCIAL CLAIMS.

Mr. BARRON asked, Did G. W. Burbidge, Esq., then the Deputy Minister of Justice, or any subsequent Deputy Minister of Justice, ever give an opinion, in accordance with the request of the acting Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, bearing date 19th June, 1882, preferred a second time on the 13th April, 1883, relating to the respective claims of the Government of Canada and the Provincial Government of Ontario to the Island of La Cloche and other Islands referred to in the despatch of the Under Secretary of State to the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, under date of 30th May, 1882? If yes, what was the date of the opinion? To whom was it directed? Was it in favor of the contention of the Government of Ontario, as set forth in the said despatch of 30th May, 1882? Was it in favor of the contention of the Dominion Government, as set forth in the memorandum of the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, bearing date the 13th June, 1882? If no opinion was given, why not?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Deputy Minister of Justice did give an opinion. The letter giving said opinion was dated on 30th April, 1883; it was directed to the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. The opinion was not favorable to the contention of the Ontario Government, in so far as La Cloche and other islands in the vicinity of Manitoulin Island were concerned. The opinion was favorable to the Dominion Government's claim to the La Cloche, and other islands in the vicinity of Manitoulin Island, and on the north shore of Lake Huron, but not to those on the eastern shore of Georgian Bay; but without more exact information the Deputy Minister of Justice expressed himself as unable to give a positive opinion as to the claim of the Ontario Government to the Islands last referred to.

LAKE ERIE BASS FISHING PERMITS.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Have permits been given to the Long Point Company or to any members of the same, to take bass in the waters of Lake Erie, at Long Point or elsewhere, during any part of the close season? Have permits been given to any company or individuals, to take bass in the waters of Lake Erie, at or near Pelee Island, during any part of the close season?

Mr. TUPPER. No permits were given to the Long Point Company. In 1886 the Minister of the day granted the members of the Pelee Island Club permission to angle for bass for a period of 20 days during the close season, with the provision that no fish were to be caught for sale and that all female fish were to be returned to the waters alive.

MONTCALM POST OFFICES.

Mr. THÉRIEN asked, Whether the Government have received reports respecting the opening of two post offices in the northern part of the county of Montcalm?

Mr. HAGGART. Two applications for post offices in Montcalm have been received. One at St. Marie de Salomée has been granted, and the office was opened for work on the 1st instant. The other at Ste. Famille was also granted, but has not been opened, owing to a difficulty about the site, which is expected shortly to be settled.

SAWDUST IN RIVERS.

Mr. THÉRIEN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint officers to look after the sawmill owners, and prevent their throwing sawdust into the rivers.

Mr. TUPPER. It is not the intention of the Government to appoint any further officers to look after the sawmill owners and prevent their throwing sawdust into the rivers. The ordinary fishery officers are expected to do that.

ORANGE INCORPORATION.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to introduce a Bill to incorporate the Orange Order?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This would be a private Bill, and it is not the intention of the Government to introduce such a Bill, and I am afraid, therefore, that my hon. friend (Mr Charlton) will thus be deprived of the opportunity of voting against the Bill as he did twice before.

Mr. CHARLTON. The First Minister has stepped outside of the usual course by going beyond an answer to my question. I may say that though I voted in that way before, I might not vote so again.

TORONTO SCHOOL OF INFANTRY.

Mr. MITCHELL (for Mr. McMULLEN) asked, Were tenders asked for bread supply for "C" School of Infantry, Toronto, last fall; how many tenders were received; the name and amount of each tender; the name of the successful tenderer, and the price and the term the contract is for?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. On the 5th December, 1888, tenders were invited for this service. Four tenders were received: William Carlyle, of Toronto, at $2\frac{23}{32}$ cts. per lb.; Thomas Adams, of Toronto, at 3 cts. per lb.; Johnstone Little, of Toronto, at 3 cts. per lb.; and W. H. Knowlton, of Toronto, at $3\frac{3}{4}$ cts. per lb. The contract was given to William Carlyle, at $2\frac{23}{32}$ cts. per lb, for the term of one year, commencing 1st January, 1889, he being the lowest tenderer.

REGINA BARRACKS CANTEEN.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Is the right honorable the Prime Minister, in whose departmental charge is the North-West Mounted Police Force, and who, speaking in the House of Commons on the 15th February, 1889, said, respecting the canteen at Regina barracks as managed by a civilian from Winnipeg: "I have made up my mind, on the whole, that the game is not worth the candle; we shall close that arrangement with the present caterer, giving him the notice we are allowed to give under those regulations, and allow the men to manage their own affairs by a committee of Sergeants, and buy their supplies, so as to avoid any appearance of unfairness toward the trade," aware whether any steps have been taken to carry out his orders, and that Commissioner Herchmer has canvassed his sergeants to petition for the continuance of the canteen as managed by Mr. Buchanan, thus antagonising the declared policy of the Prime Minister made to this House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In answer to this question which contains some statements of fact, which are rather contrary to the Rules of the House, I may say that formal notice to vacate the canteen on the 15th May next was given to Mr. Buchanan some time ago. I am not aware that Commissioner Herchmer has canvassed his sergeants to petition for the continuance of the canteen as managed by Mr. Buchanan. I have Commissioner Herchmer's positive assurance that he has not done so. The commissioner has recently forwarded to the department certain representations which have been made by the non-commissioned officers and constables with regard to the canteen, but I have not yet been able to give the matter consideration.

BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS.

Mr. WATSON asked, Whether the Government have yet received any report upon the subject of the claims of the Bresaylor Half-breeds for the value of their furs alleged to have been wrongfully appropriated at Battleford? If not yet received, is it expected that it will be received during this Session?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, reports have been received.

Mr. LAURIER. Will they be laid upon the Table of the House?

Mr. DEWDNEY. If they are asked for.

Mr. LAURIER. Then they cannot be obtained this Session?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not our fault.

IMPORTATION OF FISH IN BOND.

Gen. LAURIE moved for:

Copies of all correspondence with the Customs Department, instructions issued to, and reports received from, inspectors and collectors of Customs in reference to the importation of fish in bond for the purpose of subsequent exportation, together with copies of any regulations bearing on this subject framed and issued under the authority of the Customs Act.

He said: I regret that I must detain the House a little, because there are matters connected with this motion which are of considerable interest to a large number of people in the Maritime Provinces, and especially in the Province of Nova Scotia. It is necessary that I should go a little into what are apparently side issues. Under recent arrangements, the French Government have given a very large bounty on fish sold outside of the French dominions. They have done this, for the purpose of stimulating an industry which would increase the maritime population of France, and would enable them to command a larger navy than they have at present. For this purpose, they have given as much as $1.80, or about 10 francs, on each quintal of fish sold outside of France, or the French colonies. This has created a great deal of feeling, not only among the fishermen in the Lower Provinces, but also in Newfoundland, where they are exceedingly troubled on this point. A Newfoundland correspondent, writing to the Harbor Grace *Standard* from Leghorn, says:

"Every steamer from Marseilles brings 400 to 600 bales of Bank fish of excellent quality, which is retailing at 16s. and 17s., and, as you may easily imagine, our English cure——"

What is styled English cure there, is really Newfoundland or British American cure.

"——is quite neglected, and, what is still worse, perishing. You seem to be surprised that this French fish should be new and properly cured, but you forget that it is cured and salted on board the vessels which come across to Bordeaux, Marseilles and Cette, and there dried under sheds, a few days being sufficient for this operation. The French Government gives a bounty of 16 francs (shillings) per quintal on all the fish exported to Leghorn, 14 to Genoa, and 12 to Naples. The French fishermen are masters of the situation, and will very soon ruin the English colonists unless something is done. Larger vessels are now building in several French ports which are intended for this industry, and, from what we hear, a fresh impetus is to be given to the fishery."

The Newfoundland newspaper editor goes on to say, speaking of the feelings of the people of Newfoundland:

"Yes, a fresh impetus has indeed been given to this French industry, and the fact for us has a very peculiar significance. The French fishing fleet in Newfoundland waters this year numbered no fewer than 350 vessels, aggregating 35,000 tons. Their catch is estimated at one-and-a-half millions quintal. The Cape Ann *Advertiser* says that 'after supplying their home market they will have from a half to three-quarters of a million quintals to export, which, aided by the Government bounty of $2 a quintal, makes competition from either Newfoundland or Norway almost impossible.' It is with regret that we have to admit the partial truthfulness of this assertion. This bounty-fed fish of our Gallican rivals has done and is now doing much injury to our interests in the leading fishmarkets of the world. As we have before pointed out, it is only of late years that the French have entered into large competition with us in the Mediterranean. In 1884 20,000 quintals of codfish, of French cure, were imported into Northern Italy. This quantity was increased in 1885 to 100,000 quintals, while a similar rate of increase was seen in the French imports into Spain—the aggregate in the latter year amounting to the immense total of 250,000 quintals, and during the present season no fewer than 500,000 quintals of French codfish were in competition with us in these markets. Can these striking, very alarming facts, we ask, be contemplated with equanimity or composure by our people? All the more need therefore for every effort being made to lessen the French catch of codfish in the waters surrounding this coast and on the banks. And with the help of the Bait Bill, after it has received the Queen's assent, we believe that this can be accomplished to a large and gratifying extent."

Now, that shows the injury to Newfoundland that accrues from the large bounty given by the French Government, and the adoption of the system of paying this bounty in the case of fish sent into foreign markets. The Newfoundland people so thoroughly recognise this that they have decided to legislate in the most stringent way to meet the competition that their own fishermen are subjected to by the action of the French Government. I hold in my hand the statutes of Newfoundland showing how they have met this action of the French Government:

"Whereas in the interests of the fisheries of this colony, and for the preservation of the bait necessary for the pursuit of these fisheries, it is essential to regulate the exportation and sale of such bait. Be it therefore enacted by the Governor, the Legislative Council and Assembly, in Legislative Session convened, as follows:—(1) No person shall export, or cause or procure to be exported, or assist in the exportation of, or (2) Haul, catch, purchase or sell for the purpose of exportation, or (3) Sell or purchase for the purpose of sale, any herring, caplin, squid, or other bait fishes, from on or near any parts of this colony or of its dependencies, or from or in any of the bays, harbours, or other places therein, for bait purposes, without a special license, in writing, obtained from the Receiver General of this colony, which license may be in the form set forth in the schedule hereto annexed, and shall be of no avail beyond the fishing season for which it is granted.

"Every person guilty of a violation of any of the provisions of this Act, shall, for the first offence, be liable to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars, and in default of payment of any such penalty, to imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months, and for the second or any subsequent offence, to imprisonment for a period not exceeding twelve months."

But they do not stop there, they go on further to say:

"Any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this Act, in addition to the penalties provided in the fifth section hereof, shall be liable to have his vessel, or the vessel used by him, seized in manner aforesaid, her tackle, apparel, furniture and outfit, forfeited and sold by public auction."

That is pretty stringent legislation, as you will observe, but they go on still further. They find that even that will not keep the French fish out, even when they have provided against the purchase of bait in order to deprive the French fishermen of the means of catching fish. They also go further, and provide against buying fish to go into their markets to be there bonded and again sent out to those markets which they hope to secure for themselves. The same year, 1887, the colony of Newfoundland enacted:—

"It shall not be lawful for any importer of dried fish to warehouse the same in any of the ports of this colony and its dependencies without the payment of the duty herein before provided of $1.50 on every quintal so warehoused, and the provisions of any Act of this colony with regard to the warehousing of goods, on the first entry hereof, or to the allowance of the drawbacks upon exportation, shall not in either case apply or be construed to apply to such fish."

So, you see, Newfoundland will not admit them to bond at all. If they come in they shall pay the duty, they shall not be admitted to compete without paying duty. To go further, I find that the Chamber of Commerce, which is naturally composed of exporters as well as producers, men who make their living by buying and selling fish as well as those who make their living by catching fish, at their annual meeting, expressed themselves as follows:—

"The following is the opinion of the chamber in regard to the operation of our Bait Act: The wisdom of vigorously enforcing the Bait Act is already manifest, as the French fishermen's catch on the Banks is unusually short, and this fact has given an impetus to prices in this market, which have opened at 20 per cent over last year's rates The short catch above referred to will lessen the competition our Labrador cure has been subjected to in Italian and other markets during past years, and with the prospect of the increased demand and consumption, paying rates are likely to rule here for our staple."

Then, the Italian Government, finding that these fish were coming in to their market and competing in an unsatisfactory way, in an unnatural way, as they conceived, by reason of the bounty given by the French Government, caused the following notice to be published in the Canadian papers:

"The Royal Italian Consul in the Dominion of Canada hereby gives notice to Merchant Shippers of Codfish to Italian ports, that it having come to his knowledge that French caught and cured codfish have been and are shipped from Canada to the Mediterranean, begs to remind merchants that all shipments made to Italy must be provided with a Consular Certificate of Origin to be appended to the respective invoices and bills of lading, in the absence of which the special Import Tariff may be applied and levied on all other cured codfish, to the prejudice of the Maritime Provinces trade.

"Halifax, October 1."

Here we have them demanding that the fish sent out by us must be capable of identification. When we come to the practice of the United States, we find that they permit fish to be imported and retained in bond to be exported. I am informed that their regulations require that when imported, the packages cannot be broken open, the fish must be exported in the same packages in which they are imported, or otherwise duty will be charged; thus they will not be permitted to be unpacked in bond at all. Now, Sir, this being so, we now stand alone. We find that all other markets consider that these fish are treated by a bounty to the prejudice of the products of the countries to which I have referred. But we, so far as I am informed, and as my constituents believe, permit this fish to come in and be bonded and afterwards exported. I am not prepared to say under what conditions these fish are kept in bond, but I am informed they are kept in bond not under the supervision of the Customs authorities, but are simply placed in a merchant's warehouse, under an arrangement that a certain quantity has been received and that that quantity must be exported. Although the question may have been for some time one of public importance, it is evident from the statements made on the subject that of late it has become a rather serious question, and it appears from a statement prepared from the returns that only since 1887 has it assumed importance. 20,000 quintals of codfish came in from St. Pierre in 1887, 14,000 in 1888. Our fish were thus brought into competition with fish from St. Pierre, and our fish had to be placed on the market against fish subsidised by the French Government. The returns show, moreover, that before 1884 there was no fish imported from St. Pierre, and therefore this is practically a new question. To show the feeling of the fishermen, I may say that I hold in my hand

a memorial, signed by 5,000 fishermen of Nova Scotia, addressed to the Minister of Customs, setting forth:

"That during the present summer, considerable quantities of dry fish have been imported in bond from St. Pierre, into Halifax, Lunenburg and other ports in Nova Scotia, which has had a serious effect on the prices of the fish caught by our own fishermen.

"That the bounty of ten francs per quintal (a sum almost equal to the cost of production) which is paid by the Government of France on all fish sold by the fishermen of St. Pierre outside of French possessions, renders them very dangerous competitors in our own home market.

"That the French fish thus imported has not been placed in bonded warehouses as by law required, but has been handled, dried and packed in the same manner as our own fish, the only requirement being that a sufficient quantity should be entered outwards to satisfy the Customs officials that all had been exported.

"That unless prompt and decisive measures are employed to prevent a continuance of the importation of French caught fish to supply our foreign trade, most serious loss will result to those who now employ their time and capital in the prosecution of the fishing industry, including not only the fishermen themselves but also the owners and builders of the vessels employed as well as those who dry and prepare the fish for market—all of whom combined embrace a very large and important class of our population.

"That with sufficient encouragement on the part of our merchants and under the leniency of the present Customs law, there is great danger of unlimited increase in the importations of bounty protected fish in future years, the result of which, it is safe to predict, will be the ultimate destruction of the fishing industry of Nova Scotia, and the almost utter annihilation of our splendid fleet of vessels.

"The most stringent laws and regulations are in force in the Island of St. Pierre, and Canadian fishermen are granted no favors by the Customs officials of that port.

"That while the policy of the present Government is, and has always been, to afford every consistent measure of protection to the varied industries of our common country, more especially should this be the case, and in a more marked degree—when the products of our own shores are competed with in our own home-market, by simular products of other countries assisted by a bounty nearly, if not quite, equal to the actual cost of producing the same.

"Your memorialists, therefore, respectfully pray that Your Honor will be pleased to give this most important matter your serious consideration, and, if possible, cause such enactments to be made as will require that all importations of such fish be at once placed in Government warehouse under the hand of the proper official, and be exported in bond in the same state and condition, and in the same packages in which they were landed—said packages to remain unbroken, thereby exempting said article of bounty assisted fish from the operation of section 83, chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, Vol. 1.

"Trusting that Your Honor will see the immediate necessity of discriminating against bounty assisted fish when placed in competition with the production of our own fisheries,

"We have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your most obedient servants,
"(Signed by five thousand),
"W. S. BREWER."

In order to show that this is not merely the view entertained by those who actually catch the fish, but is the view entertained largely by those interested in the export of codfish, and also those who combine the business of outfitter as well as that of exporter, I may state that I hold in my hand a letter from a leading member of one of the most prominent firms in my county exporting fish to the West Indies. The writer goes on to say:

"In reference to French fish, I have noticed of late there has been quite an airing of the question through the papers, which no doubt you have seen and the greater part of which meets my views. It is my opinion they should be subjected to the same restrictions as any other dutiable goods and not allowed to bond unless in packages for export, to be strictly made under the care of the Customs Department until exported to the place of their destination. This I should think is about the general opinion."

Our feeling is this: We desire, so far as in us lies—and this House has endorsed over and over again its desire to support the National Policy—to support a policy of protecting the industries of our own people from foreign competition. We claim that this policy is not followed out in the present arrangement in connection with the fishing industry. We claim that the bounty given by the French Government, which we cannot prevent being given, but which, by legislation, we can countervail and meet in some way, will destroy our fishermen. We believe it will eventually reduce the number of our fishermen employed in our fisheries, and that, eventually, they will be found incapable of competing with those men who are receiving 10 francs, equal to $1.80,

Gen. LAURIE.

for every quintal of French fish they bring into this country. 70,000 of our people, who add $18,000,000 to the wealth of the country, will thereby be driven out of their employment and forced to seek other pursuits. It is hardly necessary to say that, living where they do and as they do, that practically means that their industry would be entirely destroyed and they would have to go elsewhere to obtain a livelihood. We say that as the Newfoundland, the Italian and the United States Governments have all dealt with this question, so we ask that this Government shall deal with it in the same way. The fishermen define a very reasonable way, and what they ask to be done is simply to enact that the same regulations shall be applicable in Nova Scotia as regards these French fish as are applied in all other cases. We are told, as a justification for permitting these fish to come in and be handled in bond as they are, that it is better they should be permitted to come, that otherwise they would go down into the markets, to which we ship our fish, and would compete with us in those markets, that they would be placed in those markets at a lower price, and that such is undesirable, and it is better that our exporters should obtain them and export them as the necessities of the market demand. But, we believe, and I have every reason to believe, that our contention is a good one, that these fish, if they could have been sent down to the West Indies to have competed with our fish, would not have been brought into Halifax and out of other markets, but would have been sent direct to that foreign market; but it is because the exporters of St. Pierre cannot place them in condition on those markets, they are sent into our markets. It is believed, and it is the contention of those who bring this subject before the country, the House and the Government, that the expense of curing these fish in St. Pierre, and preparing them for market, would practically prohibit their coming into market in competition with our fish, because the fish cannot be cured, packed, and handled as cheaply, and the packers cannot obtain materials as readily, and do not possess the same facilities, as do our men. I conceive that the position we are now assuming leaves a choice between two alternatives. Shall we take the position of Holland, a country that simply handles and exports the products of other countries, or shall we assume the position of England, and be the producer and exporter of our own goods. I claim, that if the National Policy means much, it means protection to all our industries, and it is for that reason I ask that our fishermen may receive the same protection as is accorded to other producers in this country, and that they may not be placed in direct competition to those who use our market as a slaughter market, and send in goods upon which they receive a very large bounty when they can get them into our markets as they do. It is for that reason that I make this motion and press this action, as requested by our fishermen, upon the Government.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It was quite natural that the representative of a county like Shelburne should have brought before the House a question in which he thought the people of that county were so much interested. The hon. gentleman has placed before the House, in a moderate manner, the views which he and the people he represents entertain, and with that I have no fault to find, but if the gallant gentleman had been more familiar with the details of the question he would not have fallen into some of the errors which characterise his otherwise fair and moderate statement. I am not unwilling that the fishermen of Nova Scotia should be fairly treated in every respect, but in the first place I think we have to show that they have been dealt with unfairly in the way in which the hon. gentleman has pointed out. I may remark that the fish from St. Pierre and Miquelon, as well as from Newfoundland, have been coming into the port of Halifax since, at all events, the year 1850, when I entered into business. We have always looked upon that fish as a legitimate import and as

no disadvantage to the export of our own products. The hon. gentleman, answering an objection which I suppose he anticipated would be raised by those who took a different view, said that if the fish were not sent to Halifax, they would be sent direct to the West Indies, but he went on to explain that those fish were not sufficiently cured to enable them to be sent to the West India market. I may inform the hon. gentleman—and to that extent it will strengthen his argument—that the fish from the French Islands are, as a class, superior to our own bank fish cured in our own country; that they are fit for any market in the West Indies, and as he anticipated or as others would say, this fish if they did not come to Halifax would go to the West Indies direct from St. Pierre, as they have been in the habit of being sent for many years past, and when there they would fill up the markets which are supplied, as a rule, from Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. If this fish is sent to Halifax, our people have the advantage of handling them, they have the advantage of packing them, and they have the advantage of employing their vessels to send them to the West Indies and of bringing return cargoes back to Halifax. Therefore, so far as that is concerned there is no loss to the commerce of the country. It is not unnatural, I suppose, that when a question is brought forward by interested parties, that a class of people, even fishermen, intelligent as they are, are very soon led to believe that their interests are seriously infringed from the importation of French fish. The conclusion would be that the agitation which was gotten up among the fishermen along the coast, resulted in the petition which the hon. gentleman says has been so largely signed and now presented to this House. I say, Sir, it was not at all unnatural that those people should take that view of it, because we know, if you go to parties who are interested in any branch of trade, and point out to them that the same class of goods is coming in from abroad and that they think they are not getting as much from what they are producing as they should get, that they will naturally arrive at the conclusion that it is owing to the importation of a small quantity of a similar article from another country. That was the way with regard to this French fish. I might give the House a slight history of this question, and, going back three or four years, I may point out that in 1884 there were no French fish imported into Nova Scotia at all, and the price of our bank cured at that time was $2.25 per quintal. I admit that this was a very low price for our own fish, but the price was not affected by any importation from abroad. In 1885 the price of our own bank fish was $2.75 per quintal, and there was no import of French fish to create this low price. Therefore, the French fish were not responsible for those low rates. In 1886 a small quantity of about 1,000 quintals came in from the French Islands, and the price of our fish was $1.90 and subsequently advanced as the season went on. Therefore, during this season again the importation of French fish was no factor in the low rates which prevailed for our own products. In 1887 some fish was imported in the early part of the year when our own cure opened at $3.25 per quintal, but the price subsequently advanced until in the latter part of the season it reached $4 per quintal, showing that the importation in the earlier part of the season of a small quantity of fish had no effect whatever in lowering the price of our own article. In 1880, 18,000 or 20,000 quintals of French fish were imported when our own fish was selling at $4 per quintal, a price which, I may say in presence of any gentleman who is familiar with that grade of fish, was a remunerative price indeed. Unfortunately, the catch happened to be very light in the early part of that season, and the price went up to $4 a quintal, and some fish came in from St. Pierre and sold at that rate. But the season went on, and the small quantities of French fish that came into the market were absorbed, and our own fish advanced to $4.25 per quintal. Therefore, the fish from St. Pierre had no effect whatever in lowering the price of our fish; but our fishermen, unfortunately for themselves, thought they would be able to control the prices of fish, and they kept back their catch. They did not recollect that Newfoundland, with its large catch, was alongside of us, and that fish would be imported from St. Johns if prices went too high. Although $4.25 was paid for bank fish of our own product, they still refused to bring in their fish, and they held them over till spring, and then, crowding them into the market, forced prices down to $2.25 or $2.50 per quintal, losing $2 per quintal, which they might have obtained in addition if they had brought them in early. There was not a French fish in the market to contribute to this result. All the fish from St. Pierre had gone out last fall; though to-day, I suppose, our fishermen, smarting under the losses they have suffered from their own bad judgment in not bringing their stock to market, are inclined to put them down to every cause but the legitimate cause. The hon. gentleman has referred to the quantities of French fish that go to the Mediterranean. If the hon. gentleman had read the Newfoundland papers and the reports of the Chamber of Commerce there, he would have learned that they attribute the preference that is given to the French fish in the Mediterranean ports to the fact that they are much better made, that they arrive in better condition, in much smaller quantities than the fish that come from Newfoundland. Early in the autumn their custom is to take from 10,000 to 15,000 quintals of fish from Labrador. They take them in all kinds of weather, half made, pack them damp and green, and send them to Genoa, Leghorn or Naples, and they arrive there in a condition that compares very unfavorably with the condition of the Icelandic and Norwegian fish. The fish from Iceland and Norway are sent in immensely increasing quantities to Portugal, Spain and the Mediterranean ports; and that is one of the things which have largely affected the trade of Newfoundland in that part of the world. That is, no doubt, entirely owing to the inferior quality of the fish the Newfoundlanders send there, compared with the fish which they are brought into competition with. The hon. gentleman has asked that the Government should take means of seeing that fish are handled in a different manner. The question first is, is it in the interest of commerce to exclude these fish from our ports? Next, if they are allowed to come in, should they be exceptionally dealt with? We know that the importers of wheat, when they bring it from abroad, are allowed to handle it in bond and to export it in different packages from those in which it was imported; we know that coal is not left in a bonded warehouse, but is exposed to the atmosphere; and a good many other articles are treated in the same way. Fish must naturally go into a store that is dry; a damp store would impair its value. Hence, when cargoes of fish have come in, the Customs authorities have allowed them to go into ordinary fish stores to be dried and then exported. I cannot see how that course has caused any loss to the revenue or any injury to any branch of our commerce, and I hope the Government will hesitate before they impose any restrictions upon, or hamper what may be a very necessary part of our foreign trade. We know that if these fish come to us, we can export them in bond to Portugal, where the duties are the same as ours; and now they can go to Italy as well. For these reasons I cannot see what steps can be taken, or, indeed, what steps are necessary, to make any change in this regard. These fish have been coming during the last few years, and no injury has arisen. They were not coming in this year when prices were very low, and were not contributing to those low prices. A few came in last year when all the fish our fishermen had to dispose of could have been sold at very high rates, if they had been willing to accept the market prices. Our fishing industry is a great industry,

and I do not want to say anything which could injure it in any way. But our fishermen need not be afraid; there is no condition of affairs that can arise that will enable a French fisherman to drive an English fisherman out of the trade. I know that some people in Halifax took an interest in a vessel fitted out at St Pierre; but when they came to find the immense expense attending the fitting out of a vessel there, and the different modes and habits of the people in taking fish, they saw that one good smart man from Nova Scotia shores would take double the quantity of fish in a day that a French fisherman would. They found out that it made no odds that, as the hon. gentleman stated, they grant 10 francs a quintal on all the fish they export; our fishermen have been able to hold their own. There is no class of people who are more industrious and deserving than our fishermen; and any hon. gentleman who on a fine day happened to be in the port of Lunenburg and saw five or six of these fine cutters scudding up the coast, he would think he was n the presence of the royal yacht squadron at Cowes. Those vessels are finely fitted out, and are manned with our best class of people; and the fishermen of Nova Scotia need not fear competition with the fishermen of St. Pierre-Miquelon; their habits are different, and they understand their business much better than those people do. I would be sorry to advocate any course which was going to injure any industry so important to the people of the Nova Scatia But I do not regard with any apprehension the fears which have been entertained by our fishermen in regard to the imports of late years. I believe that, if a few cargoes come, as perhaps they may come under the usual circumstances of trade, they will be absorbed and will go abroad without any injury to our own trade; and I believe that, if this matter had not been stirred up—I will not say for political reasons, because it was not that by any means; for it was raised by both sides—still, as the House will understand, the fisherman might have had the idea which he now has, that, but for French fish coming in, he could get so much more for his own. It was, therefore, very easy to get as many signatures to that petition as the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) has referred to. These are some of the details which are quite familiar to the Minister of Customs, who has observed the working of this matter in Halifax before, and I think he will bear me out in saying that every precaution has been taken to see that no injury to the revenue has occurred.

Mr. BURNS. It may be that the duty recently imposed on English codfish has been the same as that imposed on French codfish, but it was not so until a recent date. On many occasions I called the attention of the Minister of Customs to the fact that the practice prevailed in Halifax of bringing in French codfish and exporting them as English or Canadian codfish to Italy, in order to avoid the duty imposed in that country on French fish.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There was never a quintal of French fish sent from Halifax to Italy at any time.

Mr. BURNS. I am advised to the contrary. In the county I represent, there are some of the largest fish establishments in the world, and I am informed by the managers of those establishments that that practice prevailed very largely in Halifax, and, in fact, all over Nova Scotia, and by it a great injustice was done to our fishermen, as fish caught by the French had the advantage over ours of a bounty of 10 francs a quintal. I have been informed that these fish were brought into Halifax and sent in British bottoms to Italy, and so evaded duty, because, in the absence of a treaty between Italy and France, a duty is imposed in the former country on French fish, and thus an injustice is alleged to have been done to our fishermen. As to the importation of fish in bond for the purpose of exportation, I am not prepared to say whether a great injustice is done in that way or not, but my impression is that it does operate to the disadvantage of our own fishermen, as they are brought into undue competition with fish which are caught under the bounty system. I desire now again to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to this, and to press upon him the necessity of giving consideration to the complaint that I have made on behalf of the fishermen in my county, by ascertaining if this practice has prevailed, and, if it does not prevail now, to what extent it has prevailed in former years, because I am informed that it did prevail to a considerable extent, and that it became so notorious that some international complications resulted and that questions are even now being followed up in connection therewith.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I ask leave to make a short explanation. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) has referred to the export of fish from Halifax to Italy. The only cargo that, in my recollection, was shipped from Halifax to Italy was shipped by my own firm; and probably owing to some such representations as the hon. gentleman has referred to, that cargo was seized by the Italian Government as French fish, though it had the properly certificated papers from the consul and the Custom house. I immediately cabled to the High Commissioner in London, Sir Charles Tupper, and sent a member of my firm over; and I am bound to admit here that Sir Charles Tupper took the most prompt and energetic steps in the matter, and, through the Foreign Office, made the most decided representations to the Italian Government, which resulted in the release, in a week or two, of this cargo; but owing to the detention, we sustained a loss instead of making a profit, and I am now, through the High Commissioner, prosecuting a claim against the Italian Government for having improperly interfered with my property. That matter is now in the hands of the British Government, and Sir Charles Tupper says he thinks the claim is a very proper one. I say publicly that I found the greatest advantage in having a gentleman of such large experience as Sir Charles Tupper in London, having communication with the Foreign Office, and through the Foreign Office with all the consuls and with the Italian Government. But for that, I believe we would have had to submit to the injustice of paying two shillings a quintal more on our cargo; but the fact that we are prosecuting that claim against the Italian Government, and are bound to prosecute it to the end, is the best proof I can give that there was no French fish on that vessel.

Mr. BURNS. Of course, I accept unreservedly the statement of the hon. gentleman that there were no French fish on his vessel, but I think the very fact of the detention of his vessel must prove that such a practice had prevailed. The attention of the Italian Government must have been called to the circumstance that French fish were being shipped to Italy in British bottoms, and there must have been some such foundation for the seizure of the hon. gentleman's cargo.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). -I understand that the report was made from Newfoundland by some one who was interested in the business, though I do not suppose it was intended to injure me. There was no other shipload of fish sent to Italy from Halifax except that one.

Mr. EISENHAUER. A few days ago, I referred to this matter. The hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) has gone very thoroughly over the points which I would desire to bring before the House. Our fishermen are of the opinion that if a more rigid system were followed in regard to those bonded fish, it would have the effect of keeping a large quantity of these foreign fish out of the country, and that would raise the price of our own fish. Whether that would be the case or not, I am not prepared to say. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) seems to think that the importation of foreign fish does not affect the price of our fish. The county I

represent is interested very largely in this matter, and they are, as the Minister of Customs is aware, pressing for a change in the bonding system. As the Minister knows, we are not allowed to send our fish loose into the American market. We have to send them in packages when we send our fish in bond for exportation to the West Indies and other countries, and our fishermen claim that our Government should insist that foreign fish coming into the Dominion should come in in packages. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) has contended that we would lose the employment of the labor of our own men, by having those fish come in in packages instead of in bulk. I think in this respect we have a just claim, and I hope the Minister of Customs will consider this matter. I understand a very large petition has come in asking for this change, and it will be for the Government to make enquiry into the matter after the Session, and see whether it will not be beneficial to the fishermen generally to grant them their request.

Mr. FLYNN. There can be no doubt that the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces are under the impression that the importation of French bounty-fed fish into Halifax has the effect of lowering the price of Canadian fish. I do not know whether the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) asked to have a more rigid bounty system or not, but there is no doubt that if these fish were put into a damp warehouse they would be injured. There may be something in what the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has said, that if these fish were not purchased in Halifax in bond they would be sent direct from the French islands to the West Indies, and might, perhaps, thus lower the price of our fish; but, at all events, the fishermen of our Provinces say that the Government of this country, having adopted the National Policy in everything else, ought to extend it to the protection of the fishermen. For everything we consume we have to pay a great deal more than we did before the introduction of the National Policy, and yet the product of our industry, fish, is not protected in any way. Our fishermen know that their French competitors enjoy the advantage of a bounty of ten francs a quintal on fish, or $1.80, by means of which the Frenchmen can undersell them. The fishermen of the Maritime Provinces feel very much aggrieved at the fact that, while they have to pay high duties on everything they consume, they have to compete with the bounty-fed French fishermen whose fish, coming into Halifax from St. Pierre and Miquelon, lowers the price of the Canadian article. If you are going to continue the bonding system, I cannot see how it can be remedied, or what remedy the Minister of Customs would suggest. Dry fish are not like any other property which you can put into a bonded warehouse and keep there until sent out of the country. They must be put in a dry place and carefully kept. I do not see what the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) asks for, or what he hopes to obtain, unless it be the prohibition of these fish altogether. However, I shall wait until the papers come down.

Mr. EISENHAUER. If we had free access to the American market, there would be considerably less danger of the West Indian market being overstocked, and of the price of our fish being thereby reduced. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) said that we had the market of the whole world for our fish. If he had studied the question he would not have made that remark, for with our mode of curing bank fish we can only have two markets: the West Indies and the United States. We are met in the United States by a duty of 50 cents per quintal, so that very few of our fry fish, bank cured, have found their way there. The cure for all this depression in the West India markets would be reciprocity with the United States. Had we free trade with the United States, large quantities of our fish would be sold there, and we would not find the West Indies glutted as they often are at present. I hope before a year or two at the most the Government will bring about reciprocity with the United States, and the hon. the Minister of Customs probably will not then be troubled by many requests on the part of our fishermen for a change in the bonding system.

Mr. KENNY. My hon. and gallant friend for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) has very happily commemorated his return to the House, after his long enforced absence, by bringing to the notice of the House a matter which very much concerns the fishermen of Nova Scotia. I remember, in 1887, when I presumed to say something which affected the fishermen of Nova Scotia, my hon. colleague was pleased to say that I did not know what I was talking about. Last year my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) was pleased to express himself in exactly the same language. I did not find fault with that hon. gentleman. The idea was not original, the language was not original, and it so happened that when he made use of that expression he was sitting alongside the now vacant seat of my hon. friend from Halifax. But there seems to be, to-day, a difference of opinion between these hon. gentlemen. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer), who is quite as practical in his knowledge of fishery matters as the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), has expressed his opinion, though in a very guarded manner, that the importation of this bounty-fed French fish is injurious to the fishermen of Nova Scotia; and I was very much amused, the other evening, when the fishery estimates were under consideration in this House, to find that so earnest and so zealous was the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) to put himself on record in that expression of opinion before my hon. and gallant friend from Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), that he took advantage of the discussion on the fishery estimates to emphasise his opinion on that matter. I find no fault with him for doing so, because, if I am correctly informed, in 1887, when he was running his election in Lunenburg County, which is one of the most prosperous and enterprising counties in our Province, and where the fishing industry is one of the largest, my hon. friend stated to his constituents that when he came here and had a voice in the legislation of this country, he would raise his voice to prevent the importation of these bounty-fed French fish. If I am wrong, I am here to be corrected; I should be sorry, indeed, to make any such statement if I did not believe it to be true. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) says, loud enough for everybody in this House to hear, that the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) did not make that statement. Now, if the member for Lunenburg says that he did not, I shall immediately withdraw it, but I have been told that such was the case. I mention it here to-day to show the appeals that have been made by hon. gentlemen representing fishing constituencies in Nova Scotia when running their last election. The request of my hon. friend from Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) seems to me a very reasonable one. He simply asks that this French fish which comes into our jurisdiction shall be treated in exactly the same manner as it would be treated if it went into the United States—that it should be imported and exported in the original packages. I would remind my hon. friend the Minister of Customs that, if I am not mistaken, this matter has been very frequently brought to his attention, and I sincerely hope that this year it will receive some action at his hands. It is within the knowledge of gentlemen who take an interest in these fishery questions, that fish to the value of nearly half a million dollars, passes through the United States in bond from the Lower Provinces to the West India market. I think I am correct in the figures—it amounts to very nearly half a million dollars. Of course, hon. gentlemen who are familiar with that trade recognise that that freight takes that course from the fact that the United States have facilities for shipping that fish by steamer which, unfortunately, do not exist in the Cana-

dian ports, and if the American people, and if our own exporters of fish, can transmit in bond so large an amount of fish south to the West Indian market, I see no difficulty why the Customs regulations of Canada should not be so arranged as that the fish should be imported and handled only in bond, and only in the original packages, when it comes within our own territory. Now, Sir, my hon. friend the senior member for Halifax has pointed out that during the years 1884, 1885 and 1887, very low prices prevailed for codfish in Canadian markets. In 1884 he puts it at $2.25 per quintal. Now, the French fish, as he no doubt correctly informs us, did not come into our market at that date. Just imagine what would have been the result if it had come into our market, receiving $1.80 a quintal bounty, when our fishermen were only receiving $2.25, or $2.75, or even $3.25. Now, this French fish comes early into our market, and regulates the price of fish for the whole season. After Halifax, the largest market for fish in Nova Scotia is the community represented by the hon. member for Lunenburg, and I am told that in the year 1888, one of the dates to which my hon. colleague has referred, when the market opened in Lunenburg in the spring of 1888, the price was fixed at $4:50 a quintal, but subsequently there was an importation of French fish from St. Pierre, which cost only $4 per quintal, and the price of fish consequently receded to $3.50 per quintal; but the sellers of fish would not submit to it, and as the catch was short in 1888, the price which generally prevailed was $4 per quintal, as stated by my hon. colleague. But even then, Sir, I contend that our fishermen lost 50 cents a quintal on all their catch of 1888, owing to the importation of this French fish. Now, Sir, we all know that on the Grand Banks where this fish is caught, our vessels have to compete with, and are alongside of the French vessels; that the outfit of our vessels, as a rule, is more expensive, and they are at a greater distance from their homes, and in the result on the whole catch they are handicapped by this excessive bounty of $1.80 per quintal. Sir, when the price of fish is low, hon. gentlemen who are familiar with this trade will recognise at what a very great disadvantage the Canadian fisherman is placed, because hon. gentlemen who are familiar with that trade know that in the Island of St. Pierre we cannot land a fish; we would not be allowed under any circumstances to land a fish. We are also competing with the American fishermen, and the American fishermen are protected by their own Government against this French fish in the exact manner in which my hon. and gallant friend from Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) asked that the Canadian fishermen should be protected. We have to fish in common waters, we have to meet in a foreign market in competition, and we do ask as a simple matter of justice to our fishermen, that the same regulations should be enforced in Canada as prevail in the United States. My hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Flynn) has very forcibly pointed out that we have adopted in this country, and it has been confirmed by the people at the polls, a policy of protection for our industries; and we simply ask that the same measure of protection should be applied to this industry, and the way we propose is one which involves no injustice to any portion of our people. I have pointed out the protection which is afforded to the French fishermen, I have pointed out the protection which is afforded to the American fishermen. I desire to point out that this fish is brought from St. Pierre in foreign vessels very frequently, giving employment to foreign coasting vessels, which are in active competition with our own. My hon. colleague has referred in very eloquent terms to the magnificent fleet of fishing vessels which we have on our Atlantic coast, and they are certainly a very great credit to our Province, and we take exceeding pride in them. In making this contention to-day our desire is simply that this fine fleet of vessels shall be increased and improved.

Mr. KENNY.

The large petition which my hon. friend from Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) presented, shows the active interest which the fishermen in the county he represents take in this question. The expressions of opinion which we have had from hon. members from Nova Scotia, from the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), and the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer), show conclusively that that interest is not confined to the constituency represented by my hon. friend from Shelburne. I know that in the constituency which I have the honor to represent, in conjunction with the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), the fishermen take, generally, the same view exactly as do the fishermen in other parts of the Province, and they consider that an injustice is done them by the present regulations. My hon. colleague has referred to the fact that, so far, no irregularities are reported as having occurred in the handling of this French fish; but he must admit, as an experienced business man, that the system is liable to be abused.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No.

Mr. KENNY. My hon. colleague says no. I appeal to business men in this House whether a system which permits bonded goods to go into private stores, where there is no Customs officer to superintend them, as there are in bonding stores, is not likely to be abused, especially when there may be a lot of bonded goods on one side and a lot of free goods on the other. Whilst I cheerfully admit it has never come to my knowledge that the privilege has been abused, yet it is one very likely and liable and open to be abused, and I think that is one argument against the present system. My hon. colleague, in a matter which was under discussion, I think, within the latter days of the past week, I said, stood alone for his Province in a certain contention he made. I have to repeat that again to-day. My hon. colleague in the contention which he makes stands alone for his native Province; there is not another member from Nova Scotia to-day who takes the view of this question which my hon. colleague takes, and, therefore, although I am not so experienced as he is in fishing matters, I feel quite gratified in knowing that all the members from Nova Scotia except my hon. colleague entertain the same views on this question as I do. My hon. colleague contends that since 1850, since he has been in business, so far as he knows no disadvantages have accrued to our fishermen from the importing of this French fish. However that may be, the fishermen who are the most immediately concerned and interested in this matter, evidently are of the opinion that the present regulations are disadvantageous to them, and ask for a change. But why should we not also, in a matter of this kind, be guided by the legislation which has been enacted in the colony of Newfoundland, a colony where fishing is nearly the sole industry; and my hon. and gallant friend from Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) has read to the House very interesting and instructive notes giving us the exact manner in which the law is administered there, and showing how jealously the Government of that colony protects its fishermen. It is no unreasonable request we are making to-day off the Government of our own country, and I sincerely hope that the Minister of Customs—and if I were disposed to find fault with him I should have to say that, in my humble opinion, he ought to have moved sooner in this matter—will enact such regulations as will ensure to our fishermen in this matter that measure of protection to which they are entitled and which they have not received hitherto. The fact of so large a quantity of our fish having been transported and trans-shipped through ports in the United States shows conclusively that any of our merchants who desire to import this fish from St. Pierre in bond will be able to do so. If the Government accede to the request we make to-day in the name of the fishermen of Nova Scotia, no great injustice will be done

those merchants, because, if they still desire to handle this fish, they can do it, as it is done by their competitors in New York and Boston, in bond. My colleague has also referred to the fact that we shall still have to meet this competition in the foreign markets, and, in proof of that, he has instanced the great increase in the fishing industry in the north of Europe. That is an argument which might be used on this side of the House as a contention in favor of giving greater consideration to our fishermen than they have hitherto received, and the fact of this great competition in this industry shows the necessity which exists of watching jealously the rights of our own fishermen. I trust the Government, and especially the Minister of Customs, with whom I have had many conversations on this subject, will take this matter into their serious consideration, and we shall have, at an early date, the imposition of such regulations as will give to our fishermen that fair measure of protection which the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) has asked in the motion he has made, and which, after all, is simply giving to them the same measure of protection which the United States give to their fishermen, with whom ours are such active competitors.

Mr. BOWELL. The question brought before the House by the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) is not a new one to the department. Some three years ago, when on a visit to Halifax, my attention was called to similar complaints to those which have now been presented. I made a personal investigation into the matter so far as I possibly could at that time. I met a large deputation of members of the Board of Trade. I must confess they were composed of both sides of politics, and, as the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has said, those who agree with him politically were very strongly in favor of adopting the course which has been suggested by the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) and the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), while members belonging to the party to which I belong and supporters of the Government, took the other view. In fact it was a question which was then treated from a commercial standpoint, irrespective altogether of politics. After fully investigating the matter and enquiring from the collector of Customs the course which had been pursued in the past, I was informed that no change had been made, that the provisions of the law which have existed since Confederation still continue upon the Statute-book and were carried out at Halifax, that is the clause which gives the power to the collector of Customs, or such other officer as may be chosen, to adopt such regulations as he may think best in the interests of the revenue, and to allow the packing and repacking of any fish which is brought into the country while in bond. The clause reads as follows:—

"During the regular warehouse hours, and subject to such regulations as the collector or proper officer of Customs at the warehouse may see fit to adopt, as well for the carrying and taking of such goods to the warehouse, as for other purposes, such importer may sort, pack, repack, or make such lawful requirements respecting the same, in order to the preservation or legal disposal thereof, and may take therefrom, samples (and so on) for the purposes of sale or exportation."

I then made enquiry, as to whether the privileges that were given by the collector, under the authority of that clause, had been abused by any of the merchants, and I was assured by him that such had not been the case in the past. The papers, when they are brought down, will show that the inspectors could find no case in which the privileges ceded to importers and merchants had ever been violated under that clause. In looking at the question, from what has been termed by some hon. gentlemen who have spoken, the National Policy standpoint, which is to provide, as far as possible, labor for our artisans and our laborers, and freight for the vessels belonging to those who are engaged in maritime pursuits, I came to the conclusion at that time, that until it could be shown that the privileges granted by the law, had been violated, either directly or indirectly, that this change would not be in the interest of the shippers, or of the merchants, or of the laborers in Halifax, or those who have warehouses and wharves, which were used for the purpose of resorting and repacking this fish. Being unable to come to the conclusion, that a change would be beneficial, I found myself, whether fortunately or unfortunately, exactly in accord for once with the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones).

Mr. JONES (Halifax). You are sure to be right then.

Mr. BOWELL. I am sorry I cannot say that the hon. gentleman is right upon all occasions. I admit that in the United States the practice is precisely that which the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) has pointed out. When my attention was called to the practice which had prevailed in this country, and also the restrictions which were placed upon imports to the United States, and upon fish in particular, I made enquiry, and I found that the fish there when placed in bond must be exported in the same packages, without any sorting or re-packing. Now, in this particular practice adopted in Canada, I am sure the member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) will give the Government and the department over which I preside credit for carrying out a policy which is a little more liberal than that, and especially will he give us credit when that policy is in the interests of our shippers and our laborers. If a change be made in the regulations, as has been suggested, then there would be a restriction placed upon the importation of fish which is not placed by the law upon any other article. It is true that coal is imported, and, knowing the difficulty which presented itself in the bonding of coal, one of the first regulations which I suggested, and which was carried out by the Government, was to allow importers of coal to bond the article in their yards, making an entry of the full quantity when imported, and obliging them to account for it, either weekly, or fortnightly, or monthly—large railway enterprises and companies were given a longer time in which to make their entries and their returns, than others—so that while the revenue was protected in that respect, the merchant and the importer of coal had not to pay the full amount of duty until the coal was sold. The same system prevails in the bonding of pig iron, and bar iron, and all larger articles which are bulky and very heavy; they are allowed to go into the merchants' yards, exposed almost to any person who might go into the yard to take them away, but no ill result has been found to follow from that practice, and, consequently, I think the House will agree with me in saying that it would be a very great hardship if the merchants were compelled by regulations of the kind to which I have referred, to place coal in bonded warehouses under lock and key which would be held by Customs lockers. Until some injury can be shown to result from this practice, I do not think it would in the interest of the trade that it should be interferred with. When the ex-member for Lunenburg, the member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), and the member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns), called my attention to the articles which have been published in the papers relative to charges which had been made against certain Halifax merchants, that they had been importing French fish and in the curing of it under the practice which had prevailed that they had substituted Canadian fish therefor and exported them to Italy, thereby enabling them to have it entered at a lower rate of duty than if it were French bounty-paid fish, I at once referred all the letters and newspaper articles to the Inspector of Customs for the Province of Nova Scotia, who after enquiry made a very full and exhaustive report which will be brought down, he was unable to discover that the law had been in any respect violated. I have also been unable to find by the investigations which I have caused to be made that the equivalent of the fish imported has ever been exported for

that which has been imported. If that were done it would be a direct violation not only of the rules and regulations of the department, but of the law of the land, and any person who would do that in making his export entry would have to commit a fraud upon the revenue and make a false declaration. I have failed yet to find that any of the merchants who have been interested in this particular trade have violated the law. If they turn to clause 103 of the Customs Act, and to many other clauses in the Act, they will find that if that were done it imposes a very heavy penalty upon them. I am as anxious, and I am sure my colleagues are equally as anxious, to protect the fishermen, as any Government can possibly be. The Government have endeavored to assist the fishermen, by putting upon the free list most of the articles which they use, and the Government has also, as an indirect protection, granted them a bounty of a sum at least equal to the interest received from the American Government for giving permission to fish in our waters. I am unable to give an opinion as to the quality of the fish. I understood my hon. friend from Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), to say that in the repacking and sorting of the French fish which is imported into Canada, that Canadian fish of an inferior quality were substituted for them.

Gen. LAURIE. I never said so.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I understood the hon. member to say so.

Gen. LAURIE. I never alluded to any interchange of fish at all.

Mr. BOWELL. I understood the hon. gentleman to say so. I made a note of his remarks: "equivalents exported for that which was imported."

Gen. LAURIE. I said "could be exported."

Mr. BOWELL. I am pointing out that I am unable to discover that any fraud has been perpetrated upon the revenue. If the fish were inferior, then I could understand that we might need to substitute Canadian fish, for the purposes of exportation. If, on the contrary, they were superior fish, there could be no possible object in doing so, unless there was a desire to impose on the foreign merchant who purchased them, under the impression that they were French fish; but I am under the impression that those who consumed the fish in Italy would know inferior fish just as well as we could, and a practice of that kind could not prevail for any length of time without being discovered. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) pointed out, I thought, somewhat clearly, that if any disadvantage to our fishermen had arisen from their obtaining a lower price for their fish than they would otherwise have done, it was their own fault, for, instead of selling their catch when they could obtain a good price, they retained it, as many merchants do their goods, in the hope of a rise, and instead of rising, fish fell in the market; and then, for some reason or other, they come to the conclusion that the fall in the value arose from the importation of French fish into this country which came into competition with theirs. But French fish, or any other fish, could not come into competition with Canadian fish, unless it were smuggled in, or having been brought in in bond, it were allowed to be taken out of the warehouse, or from the wharves, and to be taken into the market, and sold.

Mr. KIRK. Except Newfoundland fish.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no proposition to interfere with Newfoundland fish that I am aware of.

Mr. KIRK. Newfoundland fish come in free of duty.

Mr. BOWELL. I am discussing the effect of the importation of French fish, bonded and cured in this country, and the effects of such a system on the fish market of Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman wants to divert me from that point by introducing a new question altogether, which we shall be prepared to debate when necessary. If the hon. gentleman, with his free trade views, thinks that we should impose a much heavier duty than we have now on Newfoundland and French fish and other fish, I am not prepared to say I would not go with him, and I could only congratulate myself and the House and the country on having another accession to the ranks of the National Policy party. I might say a few words in reference to the charge which has been made, that merchants in Canada who ship to Italy had been substituting Canadian fish for French fish in order to obtain access to that market. When the papers are laid upon the Table it will be shown that my officers could obtain no evidence whatever to justify that charge. I was very glad of it, because it would be a reflection upon our shippers and our largest merchants, who have been occupied in this particular trade for many years; speaking individually, I have sufficient evidence to justify me in believing that almost any amount of fraud can be perpetrated when duties are to be evaded. However, there has been no evidence adduced to my department to show that any of the merchants have been guilty of it in this instance, and I take this opportunity to bear testimony to the honesty of the merchants of the Maritime Provinces in that respect. I do not know that any more rigid system would afford any greater protection to the revenue, but if it can be shown that the fishermen can be protected any better than they are by the adoption of the rigid system which prevails in the United States, I shall be prepared to recommend its adoption to my colleagues; but the House must not forget that if that system is enforced in this country, it must of necessity deprive the laborers and artisans of the seaport towns from which these exportations take place, of the labor which they now receive in unloading, unpacking, repacking and loading again for exportation; it will deprive the warehouse men of the rents and fees they receive for the use and occupation of their wharves and warehouses where the fish are dried, packed and re-sorted; and it will deprive the vessels of this country of that quantity of freight. But if it cannot be shown that our fishermen have received in the past, or will receive in the future, any injury from the continuance of a practice which has prevailed ever since Confederation, then, I believe, and I think the House will agree with me, that it will be in the interest of the Dominion and everyone concerned, that no change should be made. But if, I repeat, it can be shown that the fishermen are injured in any way, directly or indirectly, by the practice now prevailing, I shall be very glad to recommend its discontinuance. I was a little surprised at the statement made by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), that he was informed, or understood that these fish were placed in the private warehouses of merchants in Halifax, and were without any Customs supervision.

Mr. KENNY. I beg to correct the hon. Minister. I certainly said so, but that system prevails not only at Halifax, but wherever the fish are imported. They are placed in what are called the fish warehouses. I think that point was referred to by my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Flynn) and other speakers, who showed the difficulty there is in handling fish in ordinary bonded stores, which are frequently built of stone, and are damp. If I am in error, I should like any hon. gentleman who is better informed than I, to correct me; but I understand that the fish are placed in the private warehouses of merchants at Halifax and the outports.

Mr. BOWELL. What I intended to say in reply to that statement was, that they are to a certain extent placed in the fish warehouses or sheds under somewhat similar circumstances to those which my hon. friend has referred. I had made particular enquiry as to whether this was done without any Customs surveillance, as to whether the fish when imported was allowed to go into these warehouses in bond with-

out the Customs officials supervising the landing of the fish or watching them while they were in bond, and ascertaining beyond doubt that the fish exported were those which had been in bond. In every case I have been assured by the Customs officials in Halifax and other ports in the Maritime Provinces that such is not the case; they have assured me that in all cases where foreign fish, whether French or Newfoundland fish, or any other foreign fish, are landed, they are received under the supervision of Customs officials, and when exported they take care to see, in repacking, resorting and reloading, that the fish exported are those which were in bond. I was afraid the House would be under the impression that there was no strict supervision whatever over the management of this particular branch of Customs. If that should be the case, I have been misinformed both by my inspectors and the different collectors.

Mr. KENNY. As this is a matter which concerns the merchants of Halifax who are 1,000 miles from here, I may be allowed to interrupt the hon. the Minister of Customs to say that I am afraid that he is leaving the impression on the House that I intended to insinuate that there have been irregularities in the management of Customs with regard to this matter. I have never heard of any. I can confirm what the hon. the Minister has said, from what I have heard in connection with the trade. To my knowledge, we have never had any irregularity. My contention is, however, that this is a matter which is open to be abused, because, necessarily, these fish in bond cannot be subjected, to the same mode of treatment to which all other classes of goods in bond are subjected, and to which our fish, when we ship to the United States in bond, is subjected to in that country.

Mr. BOWELL. I am sorry the hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I did not intend to leave the impression on the House that he had made any imputation, directly or indirectly, against the merchants of Halifax. On the contrary, what I took down was that they were allowed to enter without customary supervision. What I wanted to point out was what my hon. friend has said, that I made special enquiry into that very point, and I found by the reports from the inspectors and the Customs officials, whose duty it is to look after the interests of the revenue in this particular, that the supervision over the importation of fish was precisely the same as it would be over the importation of coal or pig iron, or anything else, and that no irregularity existed in the Customs Department in the city of Halifax, or in any other part of the Maritime Provinces, in this respect. I have given as plainly as I can the reasons which induce the department not to interfere with the practice which has prevailed in the past. I was under the impression, and I have not yet heard anything to change my mind, that the practice has not been abused. I cannot understand how the fishermen of Nova Scotia can have their interests interfered with by allowing the foreign article to come into the country and be reshipped out of it again, any more than I can understand how the importation of a million gallons of whiskey placed in bond and reshipped out of the country could interfere with the market of the distillers in this country. There is only one way in which it could, and that would be by substituting water for the whiskey in the barrel, which has been done occasionally, and by that means committing fraud. A fraud somewhat similar might be practiced with regard to the fish. If the fish were brought into the country and went into consumption without paying duty, or if they were an inferior fish which would go into consumption and the better quality taken out, so that the merchant would receive the higher price for that better quality, it would be for his advantage; and, *vice versa*, if they sent out the inferior article, and sold the better article in the country, to take the place of the inferior article, I could understand that would interfere with the merchants, not only in the Maritime Provinces, but in the whole Dominion. I shall esteem it a favor, if it can be pointed out to the department where any particular instance has occurred in which the market has been interfered with, or any fraud perpetrated under the system which has prevailed. No doubt, under all regulations, frauds may be perpetrated, no matter how strict the surveillance. In our bonded warehouses, siphons have been placed in barrels, in the upper story, and the liquor abstracted from the puncheons, and water substituted, and we did not find it out until the liquor was all gone. I do not pretend to argue that the ingenuity of man is not such that he cannot find means to commit fraud, no matter how strict the regulations may be, or how binding the oath he has to take, but until fraud is shown to have been committed, I do not think it would be advisable to change the system. The moment a single instance is pointed out to me where the rules have been abused, and the fishermen have suffered, or where the revenue has been defrauded, I will make further investigations, and devise regulations still more stringent, if necessary, than those which prevail in the United States.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I must say I agree with the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and the hon. the Minister of Customs in this matter. I cannot see how the importation of fish in bond for subsequent export, can in any way interfere with the trade of our own fishermen. It is admitted on all sides that the importation of these fish in bond has not given rise to any irregularities or fraud, and it does seem to me that the motion of the hon. gentleman from Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), that these fish should be admitted in bond after they have been put in casks, would amount to this, that the work and labor now given to the people in Halifax in taking the fish in bulk and putting them in packages would be transferred to the laborers at St. Pierre-Miquelon. We must recollect that there are but two markets open to our fish, the West Indies and the United States. We know that during the last two years there has been a great development in the fishing industry in the county of Lunenburg, so much so that to-day a very large fleet of fishermen are engaged in the capturing and curing of these fish, and the result is that the markets are glutted. Those who have a knowledge of the trade know well that the West India market is at any time comparatively small, and that the shipment of two or three schooner loads to one of the islands would glut the market. The remedy is not to be found by hampering trade, by prohibiting the importation of fish into the country, but by the opening up of new markets. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has expressed, no doubt, the very strong and sincere sympathy which he feels for the fishermen, but I would ask if he has devoted his attention for any length of time to discovering how the market for our fish can be enlarged? He has been told by one of the most practical and experienced men in the trade that it is essential we should obtain, in order to fully develop that industry, free admission into the markets of the United States. I am in hopes that he will even yet see eye to eye with hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, not only in reference to this question, but also in regard to all other maritime interests. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman whether it would not be well for him to bring that influence, which he must have with the Government, to bear in order to treat the fishermen as favorably as the Government treat the coal owners of Springhill. There is a market, though it is true it is a limited one, for these fish in Montreal; but, owing to the regulations, and owing to the tariff on the Intercolonial Railway, the distance is so great and the expense is so great that we cannot ship that fish to Montreal and make it pay. I believe the cost of transferring a barrel of fish from Halifax to Montreal is 60 cents, and that makes some $50 on a carload of fish. The

hon. gentleman supports a Government which levies that tax on the fishing industry, while at the same time it takes care that the capitalists of Springhill shall be allowed to carry coal from Springhill to Montreal at about $4 a car, reckoning it at three-tenths of a cent a ton. The hon. gentleman knows that if the freight on the fish were reduced to the same rate to which the Government have reduced the rates on coal, a large and profitable trade might be developed, and his supporters who are engaged in the fishing industry would be largely benefitted. But I think it is perfectly plain that the hon. gentleman is bound to keep the low freights on the coal, and he does not seem to be very much concerned about the high rates on the fish. I am certain that, if that question was submitted to an arbitration by gentlemen from the Province of Ontario, and they were told that the Halifax fishermen had to pay $50 a car for transporting fish to Montreal, while the Springhill miners have to pay only $4 a car for coal, they would decide that it was a great injustice to the fishermen. I do not mean to argue that a whole carload of fish should be carried for $4, but where there is that enormous discrepancy between the prices, it must be seen that there is a discrimination between the fishermen and the coal capitalists. I rose to call the attention of the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) to this subject, knowing his interest in the poor fishermen of Nova Scotia, and I hope he will bring his influence to bear in order to induce the Minister to reduce the railway tariff, which is now almost prohibitory, on fish from Halifax to Montreal; and, when he has succeeded in that, I will ask him to go further and to throw his influence in to obtain the opening to these fishermen of the greatest market they have in the world. You talk about the development of the Lunenburg shipping interest in the last few years, but no man dare put bounds to the development which this fishing industry would have in a few years under those circumstances, and no one knows that better than the hon. gentleman.

Mr. TUPPER. Did the hon. gentleman say that the freight on coal from Halifax to Montreal was $4 a car?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I said it was three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile.

Mr. TUPPER. He must mean $4 a ton. It is sold in Montreal for about that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I made that statement the other day, in the presence of the chief superintendent, and I understood it to be accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite as correct.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman said it was $4 a car for coal against $50 a car for fish. I understand that the rate on coal per ton from Springhill to Montreal is $1.80, and on 15 tons—the quantity that the larger cars carry—the rate would be about $25 a car.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The rate per ton is about $1.50.

Mr. FREEMAN. I have observed with a great deal of interest the gingerly manner in which the friends of the fishermen on the other side of the House have treated this question; and now, from the fishing question, they have gone over to the coal question. I expected, when this question came up, that the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) would have shown his usual interest in the fishermen. I expected that he would declare himself, as he generally has done, the friend of the fishermen and would have stood up for their interests. Now, that the interests of the fishermen are affected by the importation of French fish into Halifax, there can be no doubt. Before I left my own county in the Province of Nova Scotia, this matter was brought to my attention, and I was requested by a number of fishermen, who are friends of mine, to look after their interests, as far as I could, when this matter came up for discussion, as it was expected it would. I am very happy to be here to-day to say a few words in favor of the fishermen. Our own fishermen ought to be protected against all foreign fishermen. The fishing industry is one of very great importance. The value of the fish exported from this country annually is $7,793,000, and there are but a few industries which are more important than the fishing industry. Perhaps there is no industry that is more capable of development than the fishing industry, and there is no class of the people more deserving of the protection and the care of the Government than are the fishermen of Nova Scotia. From time to time, when we have heard the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) speaking of his interest in the fishermen and pleading for favors for the fishermen, and condemning the Government when they seemed to show a lack of interest in the fishing industry and the fishermen of Nova Scotia, I have felt my heart warm to him, and have wished that he would come and take his place on this side of the House. I must, therefore, to-day express my disappointment, when I find his own interest, and the interest of his firm, and of the merchants in Halifax, hiding from his vision the interests of the fishermen. I was much more surprised when I found the hon. gentleman from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), employed to take a hand in against the fishermen, and endeavor to divert the attention of the House from the subject which was under consideration, and to take it to the Intercolonial Railway—a subject which hon. gentlemen opposite keep always on hand—and to the question of the Nova Scotia coal which comes up here over the Intercolonial Railway. They keep that always ready to come in and make up for any little deficiency when they make complaints against the Government. I would like to ask what the duty of coal has to do with the fishing interests of Nova Scotia? I would like to know how this Intercolonial Railway affects the fishermen of Nova Scotia? That is the industry, and that the phase of it, which we are talking about now, and have been talking about this afternoon—it is the dried codfish that we are talking about, not the fresh fish. When we come to the fresh fish question—and that is a very important question, and I intend to say a word about it—then we have another and quite a different phase of this question. We are talking now about the dried codfish portion of this industry; and, I say, that when the French fishermen get a bounty on their fish, when they are allowed to carry their fish into Halifax, and there, under the guise of being bonded, are exposed in stores, stores owned by individual firms, or individual men engaged in the fishery, when they are allowed to be piled up alongside of piles of Nova Scotia fish, I say, when this is allowed to be done, it is a manifest injustice to the fishermen of Nova Scotia, and it interferes with the price of Nova Scotia fish beyond all question. Gentlemen learned in the law make dispute about this matter, but it has nothing to do with the fishing interests. It is a very easy matter for them to make out a nice case here, but when you present that case to the fishermen of Nova Scotia, they will set it aside in a very brief but a very energetic manner, and they will show you that, notwithstanding all the sophistry thrown around this question, it really interferes with the price of their fish, and they ask of the Minister of Customs and the Government that they shall be protected; and I trust that before we leave this question the Minister of Customs will see that it requires something more than a mere nominal care for these fish when they are put in these Halifax stores. Why, Sir, it is very possible that the men who have the oversight of these fish know as much about the difference between French caught and cured fish, and the Nova Scotia caught and cured fish, as they do between a California orange and a Demerara orange. There is every difference between the two. Indeed it requires a man skilled in these matters to

discover whether a pile of fish that was pointed out to him in the early part of the season as French fish, has not been taken away altogether and a pile of Nova Scotia fish put there. I am not accusing any of the merchants of Halifax of doing anything of this kind. But we know that merchants, as well as captains of ships—even the Minister of Customs, sometimes—make mistakes in matters like this; the merchants in stores make mistakes sometimes and imagine that they have paid the duty when they really have not, and it requires the Minister of Customs to point out these goods to them, but when he does so he does not accuse them very harshly, he does not say that have been guilty of any criminal offence; he simply asks them to pay the fine, and they pay it and go on again. These men who have French fish piled up in their stores—they do not make a mistake, oh, no, it is their employés who handle the fish who make the mistake; and they take away the French fish and put a pile of Nova Scotia fish in its place; and in this way there is a great deal of French fish passed through the fish markets in Nova Scotia. I was a little surprised at the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) not taking a more active part in this matter. I have before me a memorandum showing that at the time of his election that hon. gentleman condemned the importation of French fish into Nova Scotia. He declared that he would not buy any French fish, that he was opposed to its importation into Nova Scotia. I expected that he would come out again in the old fashion way. He belongs to a race of men who do not quibble when they talk about grievances. He has blood running in his veins that makes men prompt to talk about their grievances and to enforce a remedy; and I expected that he would have manifested that disposition which I know belongs to him, and that he would have condemned this importation of French fish with that vehemence of which he is capable, and spoken in favor of the large number of fishermen, of noble men, the large fish industry in the county of Lunenburg. There is no county surpassing the county of Lunenburg in the number of its fishermen, and in the importance of that industry. I was in hopes he would have risen and spoken with that vehemence which is characteristic of him, in favor of the fishermen of his county, and in condemnation of this practice, which is constantly increasing, of allowing French fish to come into the Province of Nova Scotia. Now, Sir, I want to say a word about the fresh fish industry. I am very sorry to say, that the people of these Upper Provinces have but very little idea of our fishing industry; they have but a slight idea of the importance, and of the value of our fish in Nova Scotia. Since I have been in Ottawa, I have been endeavoring to get a piece of Nova Scotia fish to eat, but I have entirely failed. Sir, if I had not advanced so far in the journey of life, I think I would make an effort in some way, to get some good Nova Scotia fish into Quebec and Ontario, to show the people what we have got down in Nova Scotia in the shape of good fish. I do hope that, now we are going to have the Short Line finished, now that we are going to have this great railway completed, now that Nova Scotia is going to be as near to Montreal as it is to those beautiful ports in the United States which our friends opposite love so well—I do hope that our ports in Nova Scotia, these poor commonplace towns down by the sea, will in some respects equal these wonderful cities in this land over which flies the great eagle that we hear about. I hope now, Sir, that these hon. gentlemen will second us in our efforts to supply this country with fresh fish. Sir, if we are assisted in this matter, if we are encouraged in this matter, not only by the Government but by all the loyal men of this Dominion, I feel satisfied that we will not be so desirous of seeking markets under foreign flags, and that we will be able to find an outlet for our fresh fish in these Upper Provinces. There is now a very large trade, and a continually increasing trade will grow up between the Lower Provinces and the Upper Provinces in fresh fish. Then, Sir, I feel satisfied that another very important object will be gained by Nova Scotia supplying the Upper Provinces with her fresh fish. I hardly need to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that it is well known that Nova Scotia has supplied statesmen for this Dominion since Confederation. I was asked the other day how it was that we had done so, and whether we had a stock of statesmen lying in reserve. When I replied in the affirmative, I was asked how we had managed to manufacture them in such abundance and of such ability, and someone suggested that it must be because of our fish. Well, Sir, I believe that is a fact. People require fresh fish, not fish that has been lying round two or three days and been hawked round like the fish here. If we had the Short Line completed—and it all depends upon the Short Line—I am sure we would be able to supply all the Dominion with fresh fish, and also with statesmen equal to those who have been sent here from Nova Scotia. I trust the Minister of Customs will take this matter into consideration. Knowing the energetic manner in which the Minister conducts the business of his department, I feel very delicate in saying anything about the matter, for I do not consider I shall be able to make him break his record. I do not think there is any back down in the Minister of Customs. I have known some occasions when I should have been happy if he would have backed down, but he is the last man to back down, and he adheres to his views very determinedly. I suggest that the Minister of Customs should pay a visit to Nova Scotia and study up the fishery question, and study our fishing industries. He should travel through the Province and visit the county of Queen's, and look at the manner in which our fishing is conducted, and, after visiting Nova Scotia, he should travel also through Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick and spend three or four months by the sea. He would return here a different man, being much benefitted by the sea air, and the information he would obtain would be of benefit to the Government, and he would then be able to meet hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House when they again bring up the fisheries question. I hope he will pay us a visit and investigate the requirements of our fishermen. Above all, I desire that our fishermen should be fully protected against all foreign encroachments, for this is important to our fishing industry. For some time they were led away with the idea of unrestricted reciprocity. Some few years ago reciprocity was the great word on our shores, and the fishermen were led by gentlemen of the persuasion of hon. gentlemen opposite to believe that if they had reciprocity simply they would have everything necessary for their welfare, that the fish would give a kind of reciprocity, and in return for the kindness of fishermen offering them very nice bait, they would take hold of the lines a little more readily. So they were to obtain not only the market of the United States without paying duty, but they were to obtain an increased quantity of fish. They are getting their eyes opened now, they are beginning fully to understand the importance of the fishing industry, and if to-morrow the question were put to our fishermen whether they would be better off with the privilege of our fish entering the American market free of duty, and giving the Americans the privilege of using our fisheries, I believe they would hesitate a long time before they would decide that they would do so.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No.

Mr. FREEMAN. The hon. gentleman says no; I say yes. I am not prepared to say what our fishermen would do, but I am prepared to say they would hesitate before they would freely give away our fisheries and so allow the Americans to come in and take charge of our harbors, our bays, and our country, and all our fisheries, for the privilege

of our sending in fish free. I am bound to say, as one living among fishermen, that that would be paying too dearly for the privilege of the removal of the duty, and I am satisfied that if we were to give up our fishing privileges for the removal of that duty, five years, two years would not elapse before we would rue our bargain and be very glad indeed to get back into the position we occupied before such bargain was made. One of the great objections I have to this fad of unrestricted reciprocity advocated by the other side of the House, is, that we give up our fisheries. I believe while there are mines of wealth in the Upper Provinces, there is no industry equal to the fishing industry in the Dominion. It is ever developing. A discussion was had the other day on fertilisers; we require no fertilisers for our fishing grounds; our fish produce their own fertilisers. We have a mine of wealth there in the fisheries that hon. gentlemen are unaware of. I desire to impress upon the House the necessity of looking well into the fishery question, and of guarding the interests of our fishermen. The merchants know well how to protect themselves, and they never allow their interests to be tampered with; but the fishermen are not in that position, they desire Parliament to protect them and watch over their interests; and, in the name of the fishermen of my own Province, I call upon the Government to protect our fishermen against all foreigners, whether French, Yankees, or people from any other country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to make a statement in correction of a remark I offered respecting the cost of carrying fish and coal between Halifax and Montreal. Estimating the distance at 722 miles, and calculating the charge at 60 cents a barrel for fish, and 7 cents per ton per mile for coal, the charge is $4.80 per ton for fish, and $2.16 per ton for coal. These figures on a car load would give $48 per car load for fish, and $21.60 for coal.

RETURN ORDERED.

Copies of all correspondence between Mr. Allan Wright, or his solicitor, with the Government of Canada, or any of its officers, in reference to a claim for damages in connection with the Indian Town Branch of the Intercolonial Railway, and also any report from any of the Government officers in reference to the same subject.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

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

After Recess.

MANUFACTURERS' LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I stated that on Monday I would speak as to the motion of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), with relation to the Manufacturers' Insurance Company. I do not see that the hon. gentleman is in his place, but whenever he arrives in the House I shall take the opportunity of speaking on the subject.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 68) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. EDGAR. There is, I suppose, sufficient time before us this evening for certain explanations which the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), who has this Bill in charge, did not appear to be able to make on the last occasion we were in Committee on this Bill, owing to the shortness of the time at our disposal. I dare say that the hon. gentleman will now give us some information on one or two points which, I think, are material in considering this Bill. For instance, last Session the House authorised the issue of $15,000,000 in bonds by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and also authorised the Government to guarantee the interest on these bonds for fifty years. These bonds were largely appropriated by the terms of the legislation to the same purpose exactly as it is proposed to appropriate about twelve and a half million dollars of the consolidated debenture stock which is to be issued under this Bill. It is not quite a year since that issue of $15,000,000 was placed at the disposal of the company for the purpose of improvements upon the railway, and I think the House is certainly entitled to know how it comes to pass that within one short year the Canadian Pacific Railway Company require an issue of twelve and a half millions more of bonds for the improvements of the railway; not for original construction, but for improvements such as wharves, plant and equipments. My recollection is that in the correspondence which was laid before the House last Session, between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway that the president of the railway assured the Government that if that issue of $15,000,000 were guaranteed by the Government it would supply all that was necessary for the requirements and equipment of that road, so the Canadian Pacific Railway would require nothing further for a long time to come. I think on that point the promoter of the Bill should give the House some information.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think it is a pity that the hon. gentleman did not ask for this information at the Railway Committee.

Mr. EDGAR. I did ask for it, and I could not get it.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. There were officers of the company there who would have given the hon. gentleman all the information that he seeks for. I may say with regard to the loan guaranteed by the Government last year, that all that the company is responsible for with regard to that legislation, and all that the Government have to look to, is the payment of the interest by the company, and ample security was taken then to secure the country against any loss. This Bill does not propose to interfere with that security in any way. All the priorities then existing on behalf of the Government or now existing, will remain in force, and nothing in this Bill affects any of the securities. That security is now a charge on the company, and the debenture stock is not to supersede any of the securities of the Government. The £500 sterling a mile comes in ahead of the stock, and to some extent comes in ahead of the interest which the company are to pay on the $15,000,000 loan, but this £500 a mile is to be spent in improvements on the company's property, such as improving the roadway, bridges, trestle-work, &c. It is, in fact, for the purpose of improving the earning power of the company and thereby enabling it the better to pay the interest on the loan. In point of fact, instead of this security being ahead of the Government security, it is actually rendering the company better able to pay the interest on the $15,000,000. The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) went into an elaborate calculation, the other day, to show that last year the interest on this loan came after the $35,000,000 bonds, but that now it was coming after $121,000,000. In answer to the statement I would say that this Bill does not in the least change the original position of the company with regard to the security of the Government. All those fixed charges which are mentioned in the schedule of this Act, amounting to upwards of $4,000,000, were then ahead of the interest on this loan, but these fixed charges were distributed over the branches of the line, and it is now proposed to make them come in equally over the branches and the main line. The equity of redemption on the main line without those fixed charges, is not as valuable, I submit, as the equity of redemption would be to-day over the whole property of the company subject to all these fixed charges. The earning power of the main line is increased by the feeding it receives

from the branch lines, and without this feeding from the branch lines the main line would be able to earn very little. If all these feeding lines were owned by independent companies or by antagonistic companies, they would take all the cream of the earnings from the main line and leave nothing but the skim milk for that line to earn. The main line without those branches would be of very little assistance to either the Dominion or the company. The equity of redemption over the whole property, after it has got this consolidated debenture stock upon it, will be worth more to the company, and therefore render it better able to pay the interest on the $15,000,000 loan than the main line itself with only $35,000,000 against it. I think, Sir, that this is the main subject upon which the hon. gentleman spoke. I submit that this measure, which is destined to promote the efficiency and earning power of the company, will put the company in a better postion to earn the interest on the $15,000,000 loan. The hon. gentleman says that last year the company got a certain sum of money, and this year they are coming down with this Bill. All I can say is that if the hon. gentleman had asked the question in the Railway Committee, he would have found where that money had gone. I cannot tell him now from memory; but I can tell him that it takes a great deal of money to build and operate a railway of this magnitude, extending from ocean to ocean. After it has been running for a few years, a great many temporary works have to be replaced with permanent works. In the distance from Quebec to Vancouver a great many trestles and temporary bridges have to be rebuilt or improved; a great many wharves and elevators have to be constructed; sidings have to be put down here and there, and, although each siding may only cost $2,000 or $3,000, when you consider the length of the line, in the aggregate, they cost a large sum of money, and a million dollars really does not go very far. The company do not say when they intend to issue this stock, but when it is issued it will be put to the best use in making this road what we all desire it to be, a great national highway worthy of the country.

Mr. EDGAR. I think my hon. friend is not at all accurate when he says that this new issue of consolidated debenture stock does not place a large sum of money ahead of the Government guarantee. I only ask for information in reference to the new issue of £500 sterling per mile, which I was told by the solicitor of the company in the Railway Committee was equivalent to $12,500,000. Beyond any question whatever, that is sought to be placed as an entirely new charge on the company ahead of the Government guarantee.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It is to increase the earning power.

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose the theory is that it will increase the earning power, but that does not prevent it being placed as a new mortgage ahead of the Government guarantee. But in the case of any small private railway company, which came to ask for power to make a new issue of securities, I think the House would enquire why the issue made a year ago was insufficient. The hon. gentleman says I ought to have asked that question in the Railway Committee. I did ask it, but I think we all remember that there was another question of an inter-provincial character raised in that committee, which was absorbing so much of the discussion on that occasion, that a question about a mere matter of detail, involving $15,000,000 or $20,000,000 could not be listened to. There is plenty of time this evening; the House is not going to prorogue at Easter, I understand; and, in a matter involving so many millions, I think we ought to be given the time, and I intend to take the time, in endeavoring to get this information. I think it would be deplorable if somebody did not rise in the House and try to get information on points like this; and I do not offer the slightest apology to anybody for doing it; I hold that it is my duty to do it. With reference to the $15,000,000 authorised last year and guaranteed, I find in the schedule that there were $5,000,000 for bridges, trestles, reducing grades, and other improvements; $5,000,000 for rolling stock, locomotives, box cars, &c.; and $5,000,000 for elevators, filling trestles, sidings, docks, &c. That these are all admirable purposes, and most essential for a great undertaking like this, I do not deny; but the alarming feature is that after getting these sums one year ago for these purposes, which are not purposes of original construction, the company come to the House and ask authority to issue $12,500,000 more for the same sort of purposes. If that sort of thing is to go on continually, I think we ought to know it; but I hope the case is not as bad as that, and I had hoped the hon. gentleman would give us some explanation of what had become of the $15,000,000—whether it had been expended, or whether there was any sum in reserve, and whether or not the whole of this $12,500,000 would be required presently; but he does not vouchsafe that information, and I suppose we shall have to draw our own conclusions. The hon. gentleman says that the rearrangement of the securities does not affect the position of the Government. Well, I think the position of the Government has two or three aspects. In the first place, there is the guarantee which they gave to pay $525,000 a year if the company does not do it. To guarantee half a million a year for fifty years is not a trifling matter, but one about which we may well have a little discussion. I have no doubt the principal of this loan is perfectly well secured by the lands, but the Government do not guarantee the principal; they only guarantee the interest. There is some security for the interest if the road goes on and is successfully run; but there is no absolute security for that interest, and, therefore, if the Government will not do it, the House is interested in seeing to the position of the country. There is another interest which the House and the country have in this matter. An increase in the charges of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Vancouver to Montreal is created to the extent of at least $52,000,000 plus the $12,500,000, that is $64,500,000 altogether. Is it not of vast importance to the people of this country that that line should not be overcharged and overloaded, because we know that all the burdens put on it in the way of interest have to be met by the tolls charged on freight and passengers carried over the line, and that the whole country will pay them. Every $10,000,000 which we have put on that road has to be paid by the people of the North-West and old Canada who pay tolls and tariffs to the company; and therefore the whole country is interested in seeing that it is not unreasonably charged. The hon. gentleman says this does not really make a new charge. There is no use, I think, in talking in that way to this House. It may possibly not be a bad arrangement, but it undoubtedly creates a charge. There is now $35,000,000 on the line from Vancouver to Montreal, and there is $52,000,000 on the leased lines. They are two separate systems: one is the line built and assisted by the country; the other is the system of railways which the company have secured for their own business purposes, which of course are very likely, wise purposes, and will contribute to the business of the company. I think I showed the other night that the $35,000,000 is just 20 per cent. of the cost of the line from Montreal to Vancouver. I think I showed, and I do not think it will be disputed, that the $52,000,000 on these other lines is the full amount of the cost, is 100 per cent of their cost. It is a matter which we should consider, whether it is a good bargain for us to agree to that. I do not know what the earnings on the leased lines are, representing that charge of $52,000,000. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can show us that, although the

cost of the leased lines is nothing like the cost of the other, the earning powers are much more, and that, therefore, they can stand a much larger mortgage. If he can give us some information of that kind, there would be some argument in it, but it is clear, from the argument of cost of the two systems, there can be no justification for this blanket mortgage. The only justification can be that the earning power of the one system—the leased system—is five times greater than the earning power of the other. The hon. gentleman says it is necessary for the main line to make these connections, so that they will contribute freight and traffic to it. That may be so, and I have no doubt it is so, but they have those connections already; they have got all those leases to-day; we are not giving them power now to secure lines that they have not already secured, so there is no argument in that. I do not know why it would not be well to make two systems of securities, if there is any reasonable doubt that this is loading down the line from Montreal to Vancouver to put $87,000,000 on it when there are only $35,000,000 really on that road. Why not state that the $52,000,000 covering all these leased lines shall be consolidated, and let that remain a blanket mortgage on those lines, while the $35,000,000 remains as a mortgage on the Government line? That would leave the Government line not loaded more than it is to-day, and it would be for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to work out those two systems in unison. Suppose the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should, year after year, find that they want ten, or twelve, or fifteen millions of dollars, as they have found for two years past, to build up these trestles, which I understood and stated on a former occasion in this House were only temporary and would have to be reconstructed some day. Supposing the company should come here year after year and say that this enormous system must be loaded up year after year, and state that this is necessary in order to build elevators, and permanent way, and new trestles and so on; and suppose, at last, that they find they cannot float their bonds, that they have been asking the public to take too many of them, what would be the result? I suppose the main line would revert to the Government. We are so enormously interested in it that I suppose the country would not permit the main line to fail. Then we would find that the whole main line would be saddled with a sum of $131,000,000 instead of $35,000,000. We might, under other circumstances, say that we would drop the leased lines and go on with the line which the country built. For the honor of the country we would have to maintain it, and, if this Bill passes, we would find the whole thing loaded on to that Government line. You cannot disentangle the two systems. You will have to take the whole thing with double the mileage which the Government undertook to build. These are matters which it is worth while for the Government to bear in mind. I do not want to delay this Bill to-night, but, in the public interest, it is of vast importance that we should understand where we are standing to-day if we pass this Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. I understood from the right hon. gentleman, last Friday, that the Government had entered into an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the construction of a line from Harvey to Salisbury. Can the hon. gentleman give us some more information on this point?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot do it to-night, and for this reason: I stated that the Government had entered into an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in relation to the construction of that road. At that time, although the agreement had been settled between the Government and the railway company, it had not passed formally into an Order in Council. After that conversation took place, it did pass into a Minute of Council, but it has not yet become an Order in Council. I suppose it will to-night, and that I may be able to lay it before the House to-morrow.

Mr. LAURIER. If this were a public measure, I would certainly feel it my duty to oppose it until all the details of the agreement which is said to be made between the Government and the company were before the House; but, as it is a private measure, I do not want to retard its passing, because it is a separate question. The hon. gentleman says that this is intended to promote the efficiency of the company. Very well, but he must expect, when he comes down with his proposition to which reference has been made, that we shall have a great deal to say in regard to it, because, if the agreement is what we expect it to be, it will be found that all the pledges given three years ago by the Minister of Railways, speaking for the Government, have been altogether lost sight of and violated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will postpone that question until the agreement comes down, but the hon. gentleman will find that those pledges have not been violated.

Mr. LAURIER. I will be delighted to find that that is so, and I shall be much surprised.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think, after the statements which have been made by my hon. friends as to the financial effect of this proposal, by the country guaranteeing the interest on this money, the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill should give the Committee some information on the subject.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I do not think the hon. gentleman was in when I spoke. I tried to-night to show that the Government last year did take all due security for the payment of the interest on those bonds, and that the money here which now goes ahead of them is for the purpose of increasing the earning power of the road, and thereby giving additional security that the interest will be paid. The shareholders are putting this ahead of them, they are not interfering in any way with the earning power of the company to pay the interest on these bonds. The hon. gentleman asked about these £500 a mile. He will remember that he was told in the Committee this was a provision not all for immediate use, but for use in the future, and the speech he has made is more intended for a meeting of shareholders than for the House. This Bill has to be approved of by the shareholders before it becomes law.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What portion of the $15,000,000 has already been expended, and what remains in the hands of the company?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I cannot really say. It is being expended now very fast from one end to the other, over the whole 5,000 miles of railway.

On sub-section 3,

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. the Minister of Justice ought to give some information in regard to the statement made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). If the effect of this Bill is to be such as that hon. gentleman says it will, it is but just to the House that the hon. the Minister should give this information. No doubt the hon. gentleman who is promoting this Bill is a very high authority in the House, but he is not in the Government just yet, and we would like to see a member of the Government state whether the Bill will bring about the consequences predicted by the hon. member for West Ontario. The Government are responsible for it, although it is a private member who introduced it. As for myself, I desire to say that I will not be responsible for the consequences of this Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government are in no way responsible for this Bill. It stands before the House like any other Private Bill. The hon. gentleman must have misunderstood the argument of the hon. member for Ontario, or he would not have called upon me for information as to the mode in which this Bill affects the security of the Government, because I presume it is in relation to that subject he desires me to speak. The hon. gentleman will remember that the guarantee last Session was based upon the security of the land grant to the company, and the mortgage to secure the payment of the interest was taken upon that land grant. This Bill, although it increases the fixed charges on the railway, has no relation to the land grant of the company and does not propose any charges which will affect that grant.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. the Minister of Justice knows well that there is no security given to the Government—that the only security which the Government have is of this nature: When the lands——

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. A clause to that effect is in the Bill. It does not affect the lands.

Mr. EDGAR. The lands are mortgaged, and it could not affect them. All the lands that the company had unsold were mortgaged to secure the principal of the $15,000,000 bonds, and when those lands were sold, and realised upon, after paying the cost of doing so, and after paying some $3,500,000 of outstanding land grant bonds, the net surplus was to be paid in to the Government, who were to hold it as trustees for the holders of the bonds, to secure the principal, and the principal alone. If it should happen, and when it should happen, that there would be a net balance in the hands of the Government of that money, the Government was to pay 3½ per cent. interest upon it, and as that interest accrued, from the Government to the company, the company could deduct from it whatever money they had to pay on their guarantee; and that is, in so far as the land is concerned, I think, the hon. the Minister of Justice will bear me out in saying, all the security the Government took for the loan. But it will be recollected that the Finance Minister said that was a matter of small import, because the Canadian Pacific Railway were going to earn so much every year that they would be able to pay this out of their net profit, and that there was only $35,000,000 of mortgage, at any rate, ahead of them on this great undertaking. That is so, but it is not going to be so any longer. Perhaps the Government can tell us how much they owe the Canadian Pacific Railway in respect of interest on those sales? The Government will, perhaps, tell us if anything like enough has been realised to pay the land grant bonds outstanding, or how long it will be before sufficient will be realised? I do not say there is no security in that respect, but it is somewhat remote, and the Government should take care to guard generally against any impairing of the general security of the company.

Mr. MITCHELL. The matter resolves itself into a very small compass. The only claim the Government have against the company at all is for the $15,000,000 for which they have the security of the lands, and Parliament agreed to confirm the arrangement which the Government made last year in relation to those lands, and I believe the Government got ample security in those lands for the repayment of that money. The Bill under consideration is intended to enable the company to amalgamate and consolidate their security, and get money at a cheaper rate, and thus lower the fixed charges upon that property. It will also enable them, and that is the only salient feature of the Bill, to issue, to the extent of £500 sterling a mile, bonds for the purpose of putting on additional rolling stock, elevators, and keeping the line in a complete and efficient state. I do not think there is anything to fear from the passage of this Bill. It is purely a private and domestic matter, and at this late stage of the Session we ought to pass it without further delay.

Mr. MULOCK. I will just endorse what has fallen from the hon. member for Northumberland. I understand the only possible contention can be that, to the extent of these $500, the security of the Government, as endorsers of the £15,000 000 loan might be postponed. If the 13,000,000 acres of land which are mortgaged to give that endorsement are not worth the amount of our liability, then our whole venture in the North-West has turned out a failure. I am willing to take the chances of the security being adequate; but even if it were not, the £500 per mile will enhance the value of the property, increase its earning power, and improve rather than diminish our security. From a business stand point and as a business risk, I see no danger whatever. I do not think it will be in the slightest degree impaired, provided the £500 sterling is invested as required by the Act, and we have a right to assume that the company will see that there is no misapplication of that fund, and for that reason I am willing to take my share of the responsibility in supporting this legislation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The security mentioned by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) is correct except in one particular and that is that the lands are pledged for the payment of the interest as well as the principal, the principal first and after that the interest.

On section 8 (new),

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to the suggestion of the Minister of Justice, that I was mistaken in saying that the lands were not to pay interest, I can show that I was not mistaken; for section 4 says:

"It shall be a condition of the mortgage that the net proceeds of the sale shall from time to time be paid over to the Government, the company at its option may pay over other moneys to the Government, the whole to constitute a fund to be set apart and held by the Government exclusively, for the purpose of settling the principal of the said bonds."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. And after the payment of the principal it secures the interest.

Mr. EDGAR. It does not say so.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I would ask that in section 8, the words "this Act of incorporation or otherwise" be struck out, and the following inserted, "the Act which authorised its incorporation." This is the clause which was drafted by the Minister of Justice in order to show that it does not affect the lands which were granted by way of subsidy to the company.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the Committee rises, I would like to understand who is correct with reference to the security we hold on the lands for the payment of these bonds. I understand the agreement to be last year, that 15,000,000 acres of land were given exclusively for the payment of these bonds. As that land is sold, the money arising from the sale is paid into the Government and held as a trust fund exclusively for that purpose. Supposing that the contingency arises that the interest of the bonds we have guaranteed is not paid, and we have to pay it. The Minister of Justice will not contend that he can abstract from that principal trust fund, that he can take anything of it to pay the interest. He cannot do it. That fund must remain until the whole amount of the principal of the bonds is paid off; and if we paid out the interest on the guarantee in the meantime we could not touch that money to recoup ourselves. So that practically we have the security placed in our hands for the payment of the principal of the bonds, which bonds are not held by us, but held by third parties, and we are trustees to receive the proceeds of the land and hold them as security for payment of the principal money. If in the meantime we are called upon to implement our guarantee to pay the interest on these bonds, we have no security for repayment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The agreement with the Government distinctly provides the contrary, as I understand it. The lands are security for the principal first, and then for any arrears of interest.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The lands are security as payment for the interests until the land realises the full amount of the principal.

Mr. MULOCK. We are not making a new contract. The contract of 1887 is not being varied and it is not being prejudiced.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

DIVORCE—SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 123) for the relief of George McDonald Bagwell.—(Mr. Brown.)

Bill (No. 124) for the relief of Arthur Wand.—(Mr. Small.)

DIVORCE—WILLIAM HENRY MIDDLETON.

Mr. SMALL moved second reading of Bill (No. 125) for the relief of William Henry Middleton.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin.) To my mind the evidence given in this case is not sufficient to warrant this House in passing this Bill. The evidence is incomplete and unsatisfactory, it is not such as would convict any person in a court of law. The only real evidence produced was that of the Pullman car conductor. We find that he states that a lady took passage from Ottawa to Boston. At St. Albans she was joined by some individual. Who that individual was is not stated. He took tickets for Boston and took a sleeper in a Pullman car. It is contended that the two parties occupied one section. The conductor then was asked whether he was sure with respect to the names of these individuals. He stated that he was, and then he was asked how he could be sure as to these persons. He said that on his return to Ottawa some of the officials of the road had asked him whether or not there was a lady and gentleman left St. Albans together for Boston, and it was on that account he remembered it. Further on he was asked whether there were any other parties on the sleeper. He said he did not remember, he thought not. A year and a-half afterwards this Pullman car conductor, who did not know that circumstance, pretended to be able to identify, by photo., the two parties as those who had gone from St. Albans to Boston. If he did not remember whether there were any others on the car or not, he could scarcely be able to swear definitely whether those parties had been the ones who had taken passage from St. Albans and gone to Boston. He was cross examined as to whether he thought they were husband and wife; he said he thought they were. Other questions were asked him and very unsatisfactory replies obtained. I contend that on such evidence, and this is the only evidence upon which even a suspicion can be conveyed, it is not sufficient evidence on which to dissolve the tie of matrimony. It is an unreasonable proposition. If we leave that evidence and go to the evidence of the detective in Detroit, that evidence is not sufficient because the circumstances connected with it are not enough to show there was any guilt whatever as regards the parties.

Mr. LISTER. He was coming out of the room, that was all.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). At ten o'clock in the day a man was seen coming out of the room, and he was going down into the city very likely, and his coming out of the room at that hour is not sufficient to entitle a husband to a divorce from his wife. The detective stated that he went to the door and heard someone talking. He was asked as to whether he heard what they were talking about, and he said he could not hear anything further than the the man cough. The man came out of the room. The detective went and rapped at the door, and the lady asked, who was there? The detective said that a person was there desirous of seeing Mrs. Howard, the name under which she was registered at the hotel. In a few minutes she came to the door, and the detective spoke to her. The detective said: "Are you Mrs. Howard?" The reply was: "I am." The detective replied: "Your correct name is not Mrs. Howard, but Mrs. Middleton," and she answered "Yes." If she were desirous of concealing her name, if she were guilty, as it is represented she was guilty, she would not so readily have said that her name was Mrs. Middleton. If you take the evidence of the servant, I say that is not sufficient to prove this case. There is not any of the evidence which will show any guilt on the part of Mrs. Middleton. If you take the subsequent evidence, it is all of a circumstantial character and is not sufficiently strong to justify an Act of divorce. I contend, therefore, that it is unreasonable that this House should be called on to grant a divorce in this case. It might be said that more evidence could have been offered, that a greater amount of evidence could have been presented to the Committee of the Senate. If there could have been more evidence produced it should have been advanced, and we have on right to allow a Bill of this kind to pass, for if there is more evidence it should have been furnished. The Bill should be rejected on this occasion, and it could be reintroduced next year, if there was more evidence that could be produced and laid before the Committee of the Senate. I shall, therefore, take pleasure in voting against granting the relief asked for in this Bill.

Mr. LISTER. The simplicity of the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House is astonishing. If there ever was a case in which the applicant is entitled to a divorce it is this case. What does the evidence show? That on the day in question she left her home without the knowledge of her husband, went on the train on which it is said this man joined her; her sister met her there; the Pullman car conductor the day afterwards was asked about the incident, and that brought to his mind the fact that these two people had occupied the same berth on that train on that night. If we follow them to Detroit we find they occupied the same room, that the detective swore that Hamilton came out of the room; that he, the detective, then went into the room and found this woman in her night dress and with a shawl around her shoulders. If that does not convince the hon. gentleman that there is something wrong in the state of Denmark, I do not know what will.

Mr. WILSON. I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the hour has expired for Private Bills,

Mr. SPEAKER: There is one minute more.

Bill read the second time, on a division.

MANUFACTURERS' LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to speak on the motion of my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) respecting the Manufacturers' Insurance Company. It would appear from the hon. gentleman's remarks that an undue return had been made with respect to the formation of this company, and with respect to the deposit of the money. This statement of the hon. gentleman was based on a letter that appeared in one of the Toronto papers, signed by Mr. Maclennan—now Judge Maclennan—as solicitor for Sir Alexander

Campbell. The whole thing has arisen from misapprehension, which the House will understand when I explain the matter. The Manufacturers' Insurance Company was got up in Toronto and the promoters formed a provisional board of directors, who proceeded to get sufficient stock subscribed and a sufficient fund raised to enable them to procure a charter. At that time Sir Alexander Campbell was in England. I was asked to become the president of the company, and I agreed to do so. Sir Alexander had left the conduct of his business, or of some of his business, in the hands of Mr. Frederick Barwick, barrister, Toronto, whom everybody knows. Mr. Barwick wrote to Sir Alexander Campbell stating that the company was being formed, that I had agreed to become the president, and asking him to become vice-president and to take the necessary stock. Sir Alexander Campbell answered him by a telegram which I have the permission of both Sir Alexander Campbell and Mr. Barwick to read. The telegram is this:

"Letter received. Answer, yes; subscribe same amount as Macdonald.

"CAMPBELL."

The Macdonald named being myself. Sir Alexander Campbell followed up that cable message by the following letter:—

"LONDON, ENGLAND.

"MY DEAR BARWICK,

"I have your note of the 6th. The letter of Mr. Carlile with reference to the Manufacturers' Life and Indemnity Insurance Company was closed with your own. I do not intend to allow the fact of my holding the office of Lieutenant Governor to interfere in the least with my ordinary pursuits, which are not very numerous, and do not involve anything other than the responsibilities of such a position as you now suggest to me to take in the Manufacturers' Life and Indemnity Insurance Company. And in reply to your note I beg to say, that with the conditions you make with reference to securing the strength and stability of the company, I will very gladly accept the position of first vice-president under Sir John Macdonald. I see in Mr. Carlile's letter that he says Sir John Macdonald has taken stock, which I shall be very glad to do also on my return, to such an amount as I may think reasonable. Should it be necessary to fix this amount in the meantime, you may subscribe for me to the amount as Sir John Macdonald has subscribed.

"Faithfully yours,

"A. CAMPBELL."

Then apparently Mr. Barwick asked for an answer before the receipt of his first "cable," and Sir Alexander Campbell says:

"I have just cabled you. Letter received. Answer yes. Conditions as indicated. Subscribe same amount as Macdonald."

On this Mr. Barwick very naturally thought himself at liberty to subscribe the stock which he did as the company were anxious to get into operation without delay, and the necessary amount of the percentage on the stock subscribed to the same extent as myself was paid. Then it was advertised that the company was being formed; I was announced as president, and Sir Alexander Campbell, Mr. George Gooderham, of Toronto, a well known gentleman, and Mr. Bell, of Guelph, as vice-presidents. After all this Sir Alexander Campbell came back from England and, on considering matters, changed his mind. He thought that he would not take the stock, that he would not accept the vice-presidency nor be connected with the company, for reasons which I need not for the purposes of this statement enter upon. He stated that he would rather not do so; and after some discussion, and as there were plenty of subscribers for the stock, and as, of course, it would be impossible to insist upon his being vice-president if he did not choose to be vice-president, his stock was cancelled and the company was formed without him. I have in my possession correspondence of April the 3rd, just the other day, which I am privileged to read. It is a letter to Sir Alexander Campbell from Mr. Gooderham, the first vice-president of the company. It is as follows:—

"TORONTO, 3rd April, 1889.

"HON. SIR ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, K.C.M.G.,
"Toronto.

"DEAR SIR,—You are doubtless aware that the attention of Parliament has been drawn to the fact that you appear as a shareholder to the extent of $10,000 in the original list of shareholders of the Manufacturers' Life Insurance Company, returned to the Government under oath of the proper officer of the company, and that you have denied over the signature of your solicitor in the *Toronto World* of September last that you were ever connected with the company either as a shareholder or one of its vice-presidents.

"These statements, without more from the company, will be calculated to leave it in a very false position, and one which its enemies would be only too ready to take advantage of. I, therefore, write to request that you will kindly permit me, as an act of justice to my company, to lay before Parliament your cable from England to Mr. F. D. Barwick, authorising him to subscribe stock upon your behalf, such portions of your letter to him as confirm the cable and are germane to the matter, and the power of attorney authorising the subscription of stock signed by Mr. Barwick on your behalf. I desire these for the purpose of showing why the provisional directors represented you as a shareholder and vice-president of the company. It was upon the faith of these representations, among others, that I, myself, became a shareholder and vice-president of the company. I certainly never thought of blaming the provisional directors under the circumstances for making these representations, and if any one else has, it has not come to my knowledge. I desire also to say that since hearing your explanations, which I was only lately favored with, I freely admit that you acted entirely within your rights on the matter, and further that it would be most unjust to you to reflect upon your action which, in the light of your recent explanation, places your conduct beyond adverse criticism.

"I shall take the earliest opportunity of having the matter laid before Parliament when I trust both yourself and the company will be relieved from any imputation in the matter.'

"Faithfully yours,

"GEO. GOODERHAM."

To which Sir Alexander Campbell replied:

"TORONTO, 3rd April, 1889.

"GEO. GOODERHAM, Esq.,
"Toronto.

"DEAR SIR,—I am in receipt of your favor of to-day, in which you ask my permission to lay before Parliament my cable and letter to Mr. F. D. Barwick of 20th April, 1887, which you are quite at liberty to do.

"I regret exceedingly that you consider that the letter of my solicitor to the *Toronto World* of September last to which you allude, should have placed your company in a false position, but I found that the public press in articles commendatory of the company were still associating my name with it and I felt it was necessary that I should correct this.

"In view of your assurance that you do not hold me blameworthy, it is not necessary that I should state here the grounds upon which I considered myself obliged to take the course I did."

"Yours faithfully,

"A. CAMPBELL."

IMPORTATION OF FISH IN BOND.

Mr. EISENHAUER. During the debate this afternoon on the motion of the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), the hon. member for Queen's, N. S. (Mr. Freeman) stated that I had given a pledge to my constituents that I would oppose the importation of any foreign fish. I wish to deny emphatically that I made any such pledge.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COOK moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 9) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This Bill was referred to a Select Committee some time ago, and the Committee, I understand, threw it out without much consideration. I consider it a Bill of some importance to the public at large. When the public are landed at a station, I think they should be provided with a platform, and I think that their baggage should be carried with care and should not be smashed as it often has been by the employés of railway companies. Still, the Bill met the fate it did in the Committee, from the fact stated by the Minister of Justice, that, in his estimation, it was not properly drawn. If hon. gentlemen are more interested in railroad companies than in the public, then they may reject this Bill, and I am going to give them the opportunity of doing it. I move that the House go into Committee on the Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Committee of Supply!

Mr. COOK. Yes; I may say, as it has been jocularly thrown across the House, into Committee of Supply. There is probably a supply in the pockets of a great many gentlemen.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Before the question is put, it is only fair to the Committee, of which I was a member as well as the hon. gentleman, to state that the Bill was not unceremoniously reported upon by the Committee. The Bill is a short one, containing only three clauses. The Committee fully heard the hon. gentleman's explanations of it; I think they heard them a second time, after giving two or three persons interested in railway enterprises an opportunity to present their arguments against it. On the occasion of the second reading of the Bill, I called the attention of the House to what I considered were grave objections to its passage. The first section imposed upon a railway company the necessity of having a platform at every stopping place to enable the passengers to alight, preventing, as I thought, the stopping of trains for the convenience of passengers at accommodation stopping places, preventing trains stopping at street crossings, and preventing the convenient despatch of excursion trains, which are very long, and for which it would be impossible to erect platforms of sufficient length. The attention of the Committee was called to several instances, as to one of which the hon. gentleman made a complaint, of the inconvenience of passengers not being allowed to leave a train before it could reach a platform beside which another train was drawn up. The other feature of this Bill relating to the treatment of the baggage of passengers I also called attention to. I showed that the penalty would always fall on the company, even though the employees of the company might be solely culpable, and notwithstanding any precautions the company might have taken for the proper treatment of passengers' baggage. It was on these considerations that I recommended the House not to assent to the Bill; and, therefore, with the view of disposing of the matter, I move that the House do not go into Committee on the Bill, but that the Bill be taken into consideration this day six months.

Amendment agreed to, on a division.

FRAUD IN THE SALE OF NURSERY STOCK.

Mr. BOYLE moved second reading of Bill (No. 6) to prevent the practice of fraud by tree peddlers and commission men in the sale of nursery stock.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no objection to this Bill being read a second time, with the understanding that it will be sent to the Committee which has been specially appointed to look into all these matters which come under the criminal law, and that my hon. friend who has this Bill in charge shall be added to the Committee.

Mr. LAURIER. When this Bill was up before, the hon. mover of the Bill expressed himself as ready to discuss it. There are strong objections to this Bill being read a second time at all. If the hon. gentleman has any explanation to give, I would call on him to do so now.

Mr. BOYLE. In rising to move the second reading of this Bill, I do not know that I need detain the House at any great length in proving the existence of the evil which it aims at. I have, no doubt, every member here present will recall instances of the frauds of tree peddlers and nurserymen in the sale of nursery stock. The first clause of the Bill reads as follows:—

"No person, and no agent of any corporation or association, shall sell or offer for sale any tree, plant, shrub or vine or other nursery stock not grown in Canada without first filing with the Secretary of State of Canada an affidavit setting forth his name, age, occupation and residence, and if an agent, the name, occupation and residence of his principal, and a statement as to where the nursery stock aforesaid to be sold is grown, together with a bond to Her Majesty in the penal sum of dollars, conditioned to save harmless any citizen of Canada who is defrauded by any false or fraudulent representations as to the place where such stock sold by such person, corporation or association was grown, or as to its quality, variety or hardiness for climate: Provided, that the bond aforesaid shall, when the principal is a resident of Canada, be given by such principal and not by the agent."

I propose to fill up the blank with the sum of $1,000. I do not wish to be understood as casting any reflections on the business or occupation of selling nursery stock, or in any way impugning the character or integrity of the majority of the people engaged in this occupation. Now, I would be very far from desiring to do anything which would in any way interfere with the exercise by these men of a safe and necessary occupation; but I do not think these people will in the least be affected by this measure. My own opinion is that by removing from the path of competition those who are found to be worthless and unnecessary, those who practice fraud and dishonesty, the occupation of the honest dealer will be made but the more remunerative. I fancy that no man engaged in that business will find any difficulty in obtaining security to the extent of $1,000, either by the aid of some reputable person of good financial standing or by the bond of some reputable guarantee company. No person desiring to traffic honestly and to conduct his business in a legitimate manner would object to this measure, but would rather be favorable to it. Nor do I desire to say that the farmers, fruit growers and others, which this Bill is intended to protect, are, in any way, unable to look after their own interests. I believe the majority have sufficient shrewdness and prudence in business management to take care of themselves; but, unfortunately, there is a sufficiently large portion who have not given sufficient consideration to the matter, and who are apt to become the victims of fraudulent and dishonest men, and it is the duty of Parliament, so far as it can, to legislate for the protection of this minority. I may be asked why the Bill does not give protection against other frauds? I freely admit that legislation might be extended further in this direction, but I think this measure is sufficient, as an experiment, at present, and, when we see how well it will work, we can extend the principle further. This class of fraud differs from others in this respect: that it takes a much longer time to be discovered, and thus makes detection more difficult. An order is taken from the fruit dealer or grower in which certain varieties of fruit are specified and recommended for hardiness, adaptability and other valuable considerations; it is duly filled, and no one but an expert can say that the goods are not true to their name, and as represented. It is only after they have been delivered and paid for, it is only after the fruit-grower has expended his patient toil upon them and has lost years of toil, and also the use of his land, that he discovers the fraud, and for this reason legislation ought to be directed specially against this class of fraud. Perhaps a more important objection raised against the Bill is that it seeks to discriminate against foreign nurseries in favor of our own. I admit some such discrimination is provided for in this Bill. I admit that is a feature of this Bill; and my reason for making this discrimination is that I want to strike at the root of the evil. It is among foreign nurserymen that the evil exists. So soon as an order is taken by one of these agents, he hies himself to one of the foreign nurseries or buys at auction lots of the rubbish and refuse of American nurseries, which he labels according to the orders he has taken, and ships to the persons who gave him the orders, and the fraud is not discovered until too late. I have received a letter from a nurseryman residing in the west who recites the methods adopted by one of these nursery dealers some years ago. He says:

"One of the largest swindles was perpetrated in 1872 and 1873, by a bogus firm from Ohio whose agents overrun the country claiming to sell new varieties of extraordinary merit and who to better carry out their swindle, carried wax fruit in jars. Their orders were filled with ordinary stock from a bankrupt American nursery and the varieties were labeled to suit their orders It was claimed by many that this firm carried out of the country more than $100,000 and that too in spite of warnings in the press, which were given by parties who had become suspicious and made investigation just about the time the stock was delivered."

Another letter bearing on the subject I have received from a gentleman in Nova Scotia who complains as follows:—

"The delivery is invariably attempted by a different party from the one taking the order or making the contract as agent. The article is never of the class stipulated, treelets frequently being dead beyond recovery. The article may be refused, but it is left upon the premises, the deliverer professing to know nothing of the terms made by his predecessor. The recipient of the goods refuses payment and in consequence is sued at a remote district perhaps 200 or 300 miles distant. The plaintiffs live in a foreign state and are not required to make any deposit in security for costs of defendant should the latter win the suit. The consequence is that if the defendant gained the suit upon trial he would have to bear his own costs besides loss of time. Again, as frequently happens, the defendants are summoned for appearance at these remote distances in the midst of seed-time or harvest. The consequence of these adverse conditions is that they will pay amounts not exceeding $50 rather than undergo the outlay, loss of time and direct expenditure of money from the outset. The claim may be a swindle as palpable as the nose upon a man's face, yet, under the circumstances enumerated they will rather pay the claim than risk the loss of perhaps double the amount.

"These itinerant peddlers are usually destitute of character and invariably impecunious. The loss of a suit at law by such individuals results in nothing better to the defendants than having to pay their own costs, on the principle that 'nothing can be had of cat but the skin.'

"These foreign agents serve no useful purpose on agriculture or horticulture for now there is abundance of local seed-grower nurseries, &c., the products of which are better adapted to our climate than the foreign articles."

I hold that no such objection can be raised against our own nurserymen. They accept *bonâ fide* orders through their own agents and are scrupulous to execute their orders with great exactness, as the very existence of their business depends on the integrity with which the orders are executed. I do not therefore propose to hamper them by unnecessary restrictions. A year ago, for reasons best known to this House, our Government saw fit to reduce the duty on nursery stock, and thus expose our nurserymen to the fierce competition of the foreign nurserymen. It was claimed that the Americans admitted our nursery stock free, but so soon as our nurserymen entered their markets, they were met by so many restrictions, local restrictions, municipal taxes, license laws, and other restrictions of a like character, that they were prevented from having any chance in the free trade market of the United States. The New York State Legislature enacted that:

"No person shall be authorised to travel from place to place within this State, for the purpose of carrying to sell or exposing to sale any goods, wares or merchandise of the growth, produce or manufacture of any foreign country, unless he shall have obtained a license as a hawker and peddler, in the manner hereinafter directed."

Mr. CHARLTON. In what manner?

Mr. BOYLE. By license.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the difficulty in getting a license?

Mr. BOYLE. There is none in getting the license, but it costs $50 per annum. Michigan enacts:

"No person shall be authorised to travel from place to place within this State, for the purpose of carrying to sell or exposing to sale any goods, wares or merchandise, or to take orders for the purchase of goods, wares or merchandise by sample lists or catalogue, unless he shall have obtained a license as a hawker or peddler, in the manner hereinafter directed."

The subsequent section imposes a license of fifty dollars for one year. Another section provides:

"Nothing contained in this chapter (or Act) shall be construed to prevent any mechanic, manufacturer or nurseryman residing in the State from selling his work or production by sample or otherwise without license, nor shall any wholesale merchant having a regular place of business within the State be prevented by anything herein contained from selling by sample without license, but no merchant shall be allowed to peddle or to employ others to peddle goods not his own manufacture without the license herein provided."

This State enactment prevents not only for selling by hawking or peddling, but also taking orders for any foreign product. The State laws of Massachusetts provide that:

"Any person may go about from town to town or from place to place in the same town exposing for sale and selling fruits, provisions, live animals, brooms, agricultural implements, hand tools used in making boots and shoes, fuel, newspapers, books, pamphlets, agricultural products, of the United States and the product of his own labor or the labor of his family; but nothing in this section shall be so construed as to include among the things that may be so exposed for sale or sold any articles of the growth or produce of foreign countries."

Section 4 provides:

"That license may be granted upon certain conditions for selling wares not mentioned above (that is articles the growth or produce of any foreign country) to any person who is or who has declared his intention of becoming a citizen of the United States and applicant must make oath to this effect."

Vermont, also, has restrictive laws upon foreign products and requires every licensed peddler to be a citizen of the United States. The Revised Statutes of Maine provide as follows:—

"Whoever except as hereinafter provided travels from town to town or place to place in any town on foot or by any kind of land or water conveyance, carrying or offering for sale any goods, wares or merchandise, whole or by sample, forfeits not less than $50 nor more than $200 and all property thus unlawfully carried; but this provision does not apply to commission merchants and commercial brokers travelling from place to place in the city or town where they reside, and selling or offering to sell goods by sample or otherwise; nor to any citizen of the State selling fish, fruit, provisions, farming utensils or other articles lawfully raised or manufactured in the United States."

Another enactment provides for the issue of the licenses and fees to be paid. The most rigid and arbitrary of all the provisions is that in the State of Minnesota, which is the last with which I will trouble the House, and I ask the special attention of the hon. members to this law. It provides as follows:—

"Sec. 1. It shall be unlawful for any person, corporation or association to sell or offer for sale any tree, plant, shrub or vine not grown in the State of Minnesota, without first filing with the Secretary of State an affidavit setting forth his name, age, occupation and residence, and, if an agent, the name, occupation and residence of his principal, and a statement as to where the nursery stock aforesaid to be sold is grown, together with a bond to the State of Minnesota in the penal sum of two thousand ($2,000) dollars, conditioned to save harmless any citizen of this State who shall be defrauded by any false or fraudulent representations as to the place where such stock sold by such person, corporation or association was grown, or as to its hardiness for climate: Provided, that the bond aforesaid shall, when the principal is a resident of this State, be given by such principal, and not by the agent.

"Sec. 2. The Secretary of the State shall, on the full compliance with foregoing provisions, give the applicant aforesaid a certificate under his official seal, setting forth in detail the facts showing a full compliance by said applicant with the provisions of this Act. And said applicant shall exhibit the same or a certified copy thereof to any person to whom stock is offered for sale.

"Sec. 3. Any person whether in the capacity of principal or agent, who shall sell, or offer for sale any foreign-grown nursery stock within this State, shall furnish to the purchaser of such stock a duplicate order, with a contract specifying that such stock is true to name as represented."

Section 4 provides for the punishment of anyone who infringes the other clauses of the Act. It will be noticed that, while these provisions apply to some extent to citizens of other States, and as between one State and another, they all apply against Canada. I hold that, if it is lawful for New York, Maine and other States to prevent foreign produce being sold in those States, it cannot be wrong for us to enact this Bill. If Michigan and some other States can say that the citizens of no other country shall sell trees in those States, it is not wrong for us to enact as I propose we shall to-night. And, if this law of the State of Minnesota is right and my Bill is almost a copy of it—it is right for us to enact the same law, especially as our nurserymen are exposed to competition with the nurserymen of the United States. We should have the right to pass legislation here similar to that. There is no violation of international comity, there is no breach of the rules of courtesy which should obtain between ourselves and foreign countries, and I hope that this Parliament will permit this Bill to become law.

Mr. BROWN. The Committee on Frauds have examined a great number of witnesses, and the members of that Committee have been astonished beyond measure at the divers way and means by which unsuspecting men have been defrauded of large sums of money; and I am sure that the people of this country will hail with pleasure any legislation in the direction of punishing the people who pursue this system of defrauding and cheating the farming community. The hon. gentleman has stated to the House in a concise manner the facts in regard to his Bill, which, in many respects, are similar to those which have been brought to light by the Committee on Frauds. Probably to-morrow that Committee will be able to report to the House, but I may say now that I believe that report will show that the most atrocious and scandalous frauds have been perpetrated, in regard to grape vines, where men in the Province of Ontario have been practically ruined in consequence of believing in the declaration of the men who sold them these vines, and charged them perhaps $1.50 apiece for them, on the guarantee that they were exceedingly prolific. The forms of agreement were very ingeniously drawn, and, after the vines were tested, the purchasers found they were not only no better than vines which they could have obtained in Canada at one tenth of the price, but were a great deal worse. I am sure that any legislation of this kind will be hailed with satisfaction, because the evidence which has been given before the Frauds Committee shows that the people have been swindled not only in regard to vines but in every conceivable thing that the farmer requires, and, up to this time, there has been no mode by which these swindlers can be attacked. Some people say that the farmers ought to know what they are about, and not allow themselves to be gulled in that way. But as my hon. friend says there ought to be something done for the protection of the minority, who are not so strong-minded and not so able to resist the arts of these travelling schemers. I have great pleasure in giving my support to so admirable a measure.

Mr. COLTER. I have perused this Bill and I believe there are a great many things in it which are of importance to the farming community, But these frauds which the hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle) wants to prevent, are not confined to foreign grown nursery stock at all. I know very well that some of these frauds are perpetrated by our own nurserymen. A few months ago I was consulted professionally by a gentleman who bought a stock from one of these nurseries. It is not proper for me to allude to it more particularly, but this nursery is not very far distant from the constituency of the hon. member for Monck. After the trees had come into bearing he found they were not at all true to sample. He had not preserved the contract as against this nursery firm, and his case was practically hopeless. He was damaged to a great extent, and as a matter of fact he was obliged to grub out those very trees. We ought to have some protection such as that which is foreshadowed here against foreign grown nursery stock, against the nursery stock that is grown in our own country. Contracts of this nature differ materially from ordinary contracts. The purchaser and the seller are not on equal terms. The seller of this nursery stock knows, or ought to know, what the varieties are, but the purchaser cannot tell from handling the trees, what these varieties are. Therefore, when a person sells any nursery stock, falsely representing its quality, he is guilty of a fraud, and this fraud ought to be punishable. Besides, if we are to have some provision of this kind, and we were to strike out of the first clause the words "not grown in Canada," there would be no invidious distinction between our own nurserymen and those on the other side. If our own nurserymen intend to do what is right there would be no harm whatever in striking out this invidious distinction; and if we made a similar correction elsewhere through the Bill, I believe a very great benefit would be conferred upon farmers, and no harm whatever would be done to our own honest nurserymen.

Mr. BARRON. I listened to the remarks of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) with a good deal of interest, and I can certainly endorse every word he said regarding the frauds perpetrated upon farmers. This Committee, of which he was chairman, took a good deal of evidence, and I am sure that the report, when it is brought in, will be of very great use indeed. I do not think, however, that the hon. member pursued his usual industry prior to speaking upon this particular Bill, for I fail to see that it is directed against fraud in the manner in which legislation is proposed to be directed by virtue of the work of his Committee. He appears to support this Bill because he thinks it is a protection against fraud; I, on the other hand, oppose this Bill because I think it is calculated to perpetuate a fraud. It is calculated to deprive farmers who buy fruit trees of the benefit of two markets; it is calculated to prevent the importation into this country of fruit trees the result of which, by coming into competition with home nurseries, would give the farmers of our country cheaper fruit trees. I, therefore, oppose the Bill for the reason that it is in effect introducing the protectionist principle, and preventing the farmers from having the benefit of purchasing their fruit trees and nursery stock in as cheap a manner as possible. I, therefore, move that the Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be read this day six months.

Amendment negatived on a division, and Bill read the second time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that Bill (No. 6) be referred to the Select Committee on Bills Nos. 16, 9 and 13, and that Mr. Boyle's name be added to that Committee.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I regret exceedingly that the Government has seen proper to adopt this course in reference to this Bill. I think if they had considered the interest, the welfare, and the friendly relations of this country with our neighbors across the line, they would not have adopted the course of referring this Bill to a sub-committee. The hon. gentleman who had charge of the sub-committee has not yet reported the proceedings of that Committee to this House, and I think it was not fair nor parliamentary that they should refer to the proceedings and make use of the evidence obtained by that Committee, and retail it to this House, until such time as the Bill has been presented to the House. I am very much surprised indeed that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) should go so far out of his way, having had a Committee under his control which he ought to have reported to this House long ago, that he should come down here when a Bill of this importance is under discussion, and there retail what he conceives to be the gross wrongs and injustices that had been inflicted upon the farmers of this country. And yet, Sir, with all these serious charges, and he in possession of them, allows two or three months of the Session to elapse without making a report to this House upon which to found the Bill, and to put the other members of this House in possession of the information he had obtained. I say that if he is chairman of that Committee he has done a gross injustice to the members of this House, and he ought in all fairness come down and allow the other members of the House an opportunity of acquiring the information he has obtained. Sir, we find that this Bill introduced early in the Session, and presented a few days after the opening, has been delayed and allowed to remain upon the Order Paper from that time to the present. Has it been on account of the reasons of the promoters of the Bill? Or has it been from the desire of the Government? Am I to understand that the Government feel justified in allowing this Bill to become law, and thereby keep the promises that they have made? I will appeal to them whether

they have not given their friends to understand that this Bill should not become law this Session. I would ask if the Government have not led those interested in nursery stock on the other side of the line to understand that this Bill would not be allowed to become law. It is trifling with this House for the First Minister or the Minister of Justice to refer this Bill to a Committee whereby to strangle it. They should have the manliness, the fortitude, the determination to treat this Bill in a fair and equitable manner. They should allow the people of the United States to know distinctly whether they are going to allow this Bill to become law or not, and not relegate it to a Committee to be slaughtered there. The promoter of the Bill has introduced a Bill, of what nature? He says that in the United Stated peddlers are charged $50 for the privilege of peddling fruit trees, if they go from one State to another or even among citizens of one State, and he pretends to say that the nurserymen or agents selling fruit trees should likewise pay a tax here. This is a State tax for revenue purposes. This is quite a different Bill. Does the United States impose upon agents receiving trees from Canada going into the United States a bond that those trees shall be in such and such a condition? What would be the result if this Bill becomes the law of the land? It would virtually exclude every nurseryman from one end of the country to the other from having the opportunity of selecting fruit trees from nurserymen of the very best standing in the United States. It would compel our people to accept fruit trees from our own nurserymen, and our nurserymen could bring whatever fruit trees they felt disposed to from the other side, take them to their own nurseries and distribute fruit trees grown there throughout Canada. I ask this House whether we should treat in this unfair and unjust manner those who are carrying on business as agents of nurserymen on the other side, and compel them to give a bond that the trees would be as specified, and that the nurserymen, if they appointed sub-agents, should give a bond and come to the Secretary of State's office here and register their names. If this Bill should become law it really means the prohibition of the importation of nursery trees from the United States to Canada. Are the Government prepared to place a measure on the Statute-book to prevent nursery stock coming from the United States? The Americans allow small fruits to go from Canada to the United States. Is this the kind of feeling the Government wish to encourage between this country and the United States? Is this what we are to expect as a sort of compensation for allowing Americans to fish in our waters? Are the Government going to compel the Americans to pay a little homage to us on account of fruit trees? It is unfair to adopt this course in regard to this Bill. I ask them to come forward and say whether they will or will not allow this Bill to become law. I appeal to the First Minister, and ask whether he has not already promised those engaged in the business on the other side that such a Bill as this would not become the law of the country at the present time. I appeal to him as to whether he has not already undertaken that this Bill should not become law during the present Session. If such be the case, it is wrong to leave these agents, who are anxious to know whether their business is going to be interfered with, in doubt as to the Government's policy. The First Minister claims to be the friend of his country, he claims that he desires to do everything in the interests of the Dominion, and yet it is unreasonable that he should consider this Bill merely for the sake of not giving offence to the hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle). Such is not the course any hon. gentleman should take in this House. It would be more manly to say what he intended to do and what he did not intend to do, and we must view with the most serious apprehension the passage of this Bill. I am opposed, therefore, to this Bill going to a Special Committee. I believe its reference would be injurious to the public interests and detrimental to the best interests of Canada, and if it be referred to that Committee I have no guarantee and no reason for believing that those engaged in the nursery business can carry on their trade during the coming season. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle), may bring strong pressure to bear to allow the Bill to pass into law, and thereby those engaged in the nursery business would be hampered in conducting their business during the coming season. For these reasons and for other reasons I consider that the course pursued by the First Minister and the Government is hardly a fair one for those engaged in the trade in Canada and is not fair to the people of the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle), in the course of his remarks, gave us an indication of the reasons that actuated him in bringing this Bill into this House. He tells us that a year ago the Government removed the duty from nursery stock, and that, in consequence of this, Canadian nurserymen have since been subjected to a fierce competition from American dealers in nursery stock, and it is for this reason that he desires to give them protection again in the indirect manner that this Bill proposes. It is, therefore, that this fierce competition may be remedied, it is for that purpose that the Bill is brought before this House. The hon. gentleman spoke of rubbish being brought from American nurseries. I know something about nursery stock, and I have bought nursery stock both from Canadian and American nurserymen, and it is a very good thing for the farmers of Canada that we have American competition in this matter. We get from the Rochester nurseries, the most extensive on this continent, the best class of stock obtainable, and it is a great boon to the farmers to be able to obtain that stock, and any impediment placed in the way of obtaining it is one detrimental to the interests of the farmers at large, however it may affect the interests of the nurserymen in the county of Monck. This Bill, if it should become law, would inevitably produce irritation. The first clause provides that a Canadian nurseryman may give a bond himself. It says: The principal may give a bond and that bond shall enable him to employ any number of agents in Canada. But a principal of a nursery stock firm in the United States is not permitted to give his bond, although I am told by some of them they are perfectly willing to do so, but his bond is to be exacted for every agent and every employé of that firm selling stock in Canada. Now, some of those nursery farmers employ two or three hundred agents, and the agents work for them, some probably for a few days or some probably for a month or two, and to exact bonds of a thousand dollars each from those agents is simply to prevent them from the privilege of doing business in Canada at all. This would be interpreted as a most unjust provision, and as a cowardly provision as well, because it aims indirectly to do that which the Government does not dare to do directly, for if it comes into force it will prevent those persons from doing business in this country at all. In Congress last session a Bill was introduced by Mr. Baker, I think, who I believe is the member for Monroe County, New York, which is the seat of the great nursery interest of the State of New York and of the United States. This Bill in the preamble sets forth the fact that the Bill introduced in the Canadian Parliament by Mr. Boyle—that gentleman's name is mentioned—was a reason for calling on the Congress of the United States to retaliate, and as an act of retaliation they proposed among other things to place a duty of five cents a dozen on eggs. Our exportation of eggs to the United States in one year was about fourteen million dozens, amounting to more than $2,000,000 in value, and a duty upon eggs would effect every housewife in this country. I do not know of any duty upon any article which would have a more disastrous effect on the fortunes of the party opposite than a duty im-

posed upon eggs by the American Government, because that duty would bring the argument home to so many families in this Dominion that free trade was a good thing and that an import duty on Canadian products into the United States was a bad thing. I believe the Government ought not to permit this Bill to pass a second reading in this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has passed its second reading.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is an unfair Bill, because it provides that the owner of an American stock nursery must give a bond for every single man whom he employs in Canada, while only one bond is exacted from a Canadian nursery owner who may employ any number of agents. That is a very unfair provision and it is a provision that would provoke a bad feeling and provoke retaliation as well. If you want to shut out American nursery stock, impose a duty on it squarely, but do not attempt to shut it out by this flank movement which will, in my opinion, be productive of very bad results.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) charged the Government with introducing a Bill trying to carry by a side wind what they dare not do directly and openly. Now, my hon. friend from Monck (Mr. Boyle) took up this subject of his own accord. He is a member of Parliament. He acted according to his own lights and opinions and introduced this Bill, certainly not at the request, or at the instance, suggestion or knowledge of the Government. He introduced it as an independent member of Parliament, and we have now arrived at its consideration and its second reading has been carried. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that a Mr. Baker introduced a Bill into Congress, and if the hon. gentleman will look at that Bill introduced by this Mr. Baker he will see it was a most ridiculous piece of legislation, and that it certainly would be laughed out of either House of Congress the moment it was brought to a vote. If we in this Parliament cannot introduce any Bill, or discuss any financial or fiscal policy; If we cannot prevent frauds upon our own people for fear that some man at some date may make a motion in Congress, why we might as well dissolve ourselves at once. We in this Parliament are to consider what the interests of this country are, and the suggestion that because Mr. Baker says: if we prevent useless trees, vines or shrubs to be fraudulently brought into Canada they in the States will put a duty upon our goods, ought not to deter us doing our duty by our own people. My hon. friend beside me says that if we pass an Act declaring that the selling of sawdust, pine hams or wooden nutmegs should be punished, we do not do so lest they would have a retaliatory Act in the United States. I think it will be remembered that we passed an Act prohibiting oleomargarine as being a fraud upon our farmers, and we were not afraid that any retaliatory Act of Congress would be held over our heads because if a fraud is practiced on our people we wish to punish that fraud. The details of this Act can be fully considered in Committee, and I think myself that his provisions are of very great use. The very fact that my hon. friend from Monck (Mr. Boyle) has introduced this Bill has warned fraudulent agents that they are watched, and that if they do sell fraudulent goods there is a law here to punish them. The second reading has been passed, and the suggestion is simply that this Bill should be sent to the Committee. I have no doubt that it will be well and fully considered. Neither of the hon. gentlemen opposite have said one word upon the fact that similar legislation indeed more severe legislation has been passed in four of the States of the Union. They have no objections that those States should protect their farmers from fraud; they have no objection that those Legislatures should protect their farmers from being swindled, as our farmers have been swindled by a parcel of men coming into this country running through the country and selling those trees, grape vines and other shrubs, and then running out of the country and leaving our farmers with this valueless property on hand and with the loss of their money. As to the details of the Act allow them to be judged by the Committee. I think that the farmers of the country will understand who are their friends when they find that there is such a strong advocacy by hon. gentlemen opposite against the interests of the farmer, when a member on this side of the House tries to prevent them from being swindled.

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. gentleman states that the hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle), is an independent member of the House, that he can do just as he pleases, and that he introduced this Bill without the advice or even the knowledge of the Government. I have a suspicion that if the right hon. gentleman said to the member for Monck: "Now, you have introduced this Bill, you have put yourself on record, you have shown to your fruit growing constituents what are your desires on their behalf, but it is not judicious to force through the measure as it is at present, you had better withdraw the Bill." I believe that if the right hon. gentleman used such language to the hon. member for Monck, the Bill would have been withdrawn. Therefore, I say that I hold the right hon. gentleman and his Government responsible for the principle of this Bill, though, of course, the details might be settled in Committee hereafter. Since the Government did not prevent this Bill from going to the second reading, they are responsible for the Bill, for we all know they can prevent any of their supporters from forcing a Bill to the second reading if they so desire. After the announcement made in Washington by the right hon. gentleman's accredited diplomatic agent at that port, Mr. Erastus Wiman, and telegraphed from there, I think that both this country and the United States expected that this Bill would be choked at an early stage of its infantile existence. Such not being the fact, however, we have to deal with it now. The hon. gentleman asks us if we are to be debarred from legislating against frauds on farmers for fear some one would propose retaliation in the United States Congress, and he ridicules the idea that Mr Baker's Bill could be accepted by that Congress. Of course, nobody asks the House to refrain from such legislation for fear retaliation would be proposed in Congress, but we ask the House to refrain because retaliation would be likely to carry there. We all know the temper of that Congress. Instead of its being ridiculous to suppose that the Baker Bill could be accepted, it is likely to pass; and if the hon. gentleman does not wish to laugh at the interests of the farmers and everybody concerned, he should not laugh at the idea of retaliation being carried in response to the distinct challenge which this Bill gives. The hon. gentleman said that three or four States had similar legislation to this. Well, I think when he remembers that the States have not power to deal with commerce or to regulate the importation of articles into those States, he will see that he was mistaken in making that statement, and will have to modify it. They have internal laws dealing with frauds, of course, as any Province of this Dominion might have; but no State can make a law forbidding the importation of foreign goods except under certain conditions, and the hon. gentleman knows it. Every hon. gentleman opposite who has spoken on this question speaks as if the frauds supposed to be perpetrated by nursery agents were perpetrated by Yankees who have come over here to swindle the Canadian farmer. In the first place, I do not think these frauds are numerous. I never heard any one in my constituency complain of being defrauded by Yankee nursery stock. But the men who sell these goods throughout Canada are not Americans; they are our own

citizens; and to say that every one who sells American nursery stock is habitually dishonest or habitually practices fraud on the farmers, is to insult some of the best men in our own country. The class of men who sell American nursery stock, in my county at all events, and I suppose it is the same elsewhere, comprise some of the best and most respected citizens in the county, men often above the average of the ordinary citizen; and to say that these men habitually practice frauds, while they are equal to or perhaps above the standard of the men who represent Canadian nursery agents, is to insult not only the class to which they belong, but the whole community.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say any such thing.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman did not say it in so many words, but he distinctly assumed in his language that this was a statute to prevent frauds. Now, who is charged with practicing the fraud? Not the nursery owner, because he does not bring his trees to Canada and offer them for sale; it is the agent who persuades the farmer to buy, and who is usually a good, respectable Canadian farmer, and who is chosen for that position just because he is a well known respectable farmer in his neighborhood; and to insinuate or assume, as the right hon. gentleman directly did, that these men practice frauds on the farmers, is an insult to the class to which they belong, and an insult which they will be likely to resent. As my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) treated fully the subject of retaliation, I will say nothing about that except to reiterate that there is no reason to believe that the Canadian citizens who are agents of American nurserymen cheat any more than agents for Canadian nurserymen. I believe neither of them cheat; I have never seen any cheating by them; and to say that either of these classes cheat is an insult which I cannot hear without protest.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I do not think it is a question of the dishonesty of the agent so much as it is a question of the dishonesty of the men who supply the agent with the stock. No agent can judge the kind of stock which he gets at the time, and which he distributes to the farmers; he may think he is selling a good stock, when he is selling a poor one. I have been victimised myself by an honest agent who bought the stock and sold it to me, and after waiting two or three years, I found that the kind of stock which had been ordered had not been supplied to the agent, nor by him to me. Therefore, the charge is not against the agent who sells in Canada, but against the men who supply him. I may say that the American nurserymen sell their stock wherever they can in their own market, and they send to Canada what they have left on hand so as not to reduce the price in their own country; so that Canada has been made a market for the refuse stock of American nurserymen. If the Canadian nurseryman defrauds the purchaser, the purchaser has a right of action, and can get at the man who defrauds him; but he has not the same means of action against the American nurseryman.

Mr. CASEY. He can get at the agent.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). The agent is not responsible, because he may be an innocent man, and I believe he generally is; he cannot judge of the kind of stock furnished him, but he has to depend on the character of the men who supply it to him; and if the right hon. gentleman made the charge, it was not against the agents, but against the men who supply the refuse stock of the United States to the Canadian agents.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no doubt the hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle), when he introduced that measure did it on his own motion, without consulting the Government at all; for I believe if he had consulted the Government, the Prime Minister would have told him that he had better not bring that subject forward, at least in the manner he has done. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman who addressed the House a little while ago that we ought not to be deterred from bringing forward any measure which we think in the interest of the country for fear of retaliation by the United States. If we were to announce such a doctrine, it would be tantamount to giving up our independence. So far I agree with him, and I would agree with the Prime Minister except for this fact, that the title of this Bill is misleading. It is not to prevent fraud, but to prevent a certain kind of commerce between the two countries. We have reciprocity in the articles mentioned in the Bill; and if it were adopted, the consequence would be that this trade which is now going on on the frontier would be put an end to; the American producer could not find a market in our country for his goods. This must be the object of the Bill, as is apparent from the language of the hon. mover himself; and not daring to put that on the Bill itself, he gave it another title. What we find in it are not provisions to prevent fraud, but simply provisions to prevent trade, and for this reason we oppose it on this side.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) who spoke a moment or two ago, showed clearly, I think, the difficulties that would surround the enactment of a law of this kind. The hon. gentleman defends the character of the agents in this country, and says the First Minister in attacking the character of those agents must certainly have been incorrect, and I agree with him in that respect. But unfortunately by this Bill, as I read it, it would be the agent who would suffer. If the gentleman is deceived, as the hon. member for Welland said he is, it is not likely that he is ever constantly deceived. Yet the agent who supplied that bad stock from the United States, who is the agent under this Bill, would have to provide the bond and the security, and he would have to suffer by forfeiting his security if the stock turned out too bad.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The principal would furnish the agent with security.

Mr. FISHER. I very much doubt that. He might and might not, as the case might be, and there is no provision in the Bill to make any difference in this respect. The hon. member for Welland also pointed out another thing which is of importance in regard to the working of this Bill. Very frequently agents remain only one year with the one employer, and it is often impossible to tell how the stock sold is going to turn out until two or three years after it is planted, so that by that time the agent would no longer be in the same employ. How long will the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill provide for the holding of this security? There is another question of far more importance, and that is the international question, in which the honor of the country is really concerned. Only last year we put upon our free list, in consequence of the action of the United States Government, plants, shrubs and trees, and I believe this Bill is simply a subterfuge for the purpose of doing away with the effect of that policy. On several occasions hon. gentlemen opposite have accused the United States of acting unfairly and dishonestly towards us in making Customs regulations and putting charges upon articles in violation of their agreement with us, such as putting duty upon the cans in which our fish were preserved. We have in no measured terms condemned the United States for such action; we declared that they had trailed their honor in the dust. I should regret to see our Government attempting to put us on the

low level our friends opposite feel justified in putting the Americans. I regret that not very long ago the present Government did that by putting a duty on the peach baskets in which all the peaches were imported into this country. I protested against that; I protest against another attempt to trail our honor in the dust and put us on a lower plane of international honor than any other Government has succeeded in doing. As I read this Bill, I look upon it as a means by which we shall get escape from the contract we made last year with the United States to put upon our free list trees, shrubs and other such articles. We do so in letter, but if this Bill becomes law we will do the contrary in spirit. We will be proceeding in the way the Government desired us to go last year when they refused at first to put these articles on the free list, despite our statutory offer. This is the principal reason why I object to the Bill. I object also on the general principle that we are going to cause an increase in the price of the article to the agriculturist without protecting, in the slightest degree, our nurserymen.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether the Bill will have the effect attributed to it or not, but it is very clear that it is our duty, as far as we can by legislation, to remove it. I know that in the section of country where I come from, it is a very common thing to find, when our farmers take their fruits to the agricultural shows and label them according to the names given when the trees were sold, that disputes constantly arise, and they are obliged to send the fruits to experts for the purpose of getting them renamed, and it turns out in nearly every instance that the fruit trees sold to them were not properly named, or were not sold according to name at all. Instead of getting, as they supposed they were getting, first-class trees of certain varieties, they found that they were supplied with inferior trees of other varieties. The same thing is true with regard to grape vines. I remember distinctly some few years ago a gentleman, who sold grape vines through my section of the country, and who said he was prepared to sell a large number of varieties, and who sold them at the rate of 50 cents each, representing them to be very superior quality, told some of his friends before leaving that he supplied those orders out of vines which he purchased at half a cent apiece, and that all the different varieties came out of the same lot. When we know that such frauds are perpetrated on the agriculturists, it is time we should put an end to them. We find also that the trees sold in our country are not true to name. They almost invariably turn out to be something different from what they were represented to be at the time they were sold. In my own garden I do not think in a single instance, the trees I bought turned out true to their name, and when I showed the fruit, I was told generally that they were not properly named, and on sending them to the exhibition they received there names entirely different. It is time a Bill of this kind should pass. The contention of hon. gentlemen that we ought not to attempt to legislate to protect our people for fear of encurring the displeasure of our neighbors seems to be a childish matter. We are here to look after our own people, we have the machinery to legislate, and we are here to protect the interests of our people, and to punish crime and fraud wherever we find it. If we have no rights in Canada, but are always to depend upon foreigners in the conduct of our affairs, the sooner we know it the better. It is apparently the cue of hon. gentlemen opposite whenever a measure is introduced to protect our own people to cry it down. They would make out that we have no national rights, that our Parliament has no authority, and that we ought not to do anything which a self-protecting people considers itself empowered to do. I think we ought to be ashamed of ourselves as a Canadian Parliament if we acknowledged that we were standing in such a position to-day, and, whether it is in this line or in another line when people are prepared to prey on our farmers or our merchants or any other class of our people, we should be always ready to protect their rights, as far as Canadian Parliament can do it, irrespective of what other people may say or do about it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the hon. gentleman who proposes this Bill and the gentlemen who support this Bill have not given us any sufficient reason for passing it. The Prime Minister has said that four States of the Union have adopted something similar to this Bill. I do not see how that is possible when the Constitution of the United States provides that matters of trade and commerce are vested in the United States. The first clause of this Bill says that:

"No person, and no agent of any corporation or association, shall sell or offer for sale any tree, &c."

That is not a prohibition against fraud, but against trade. It applies not only to a man who offers bad or spurious stock on the market, but to the very best that can be produced, precisely such as the farmer may order, as much as to a man who supplies stock which is different from that which has been ordered. How does the hon. gentleman propose to protect the farmers against what he calls fraud? Take the Northern Spy apple tree. That will be planted out eight or ten years before it will bear. The purchaser and the vendor may both be in their graves before that. How does the hon. gentleman propose to prevent fraud in that case? The most of those who are engaged in fruit growing will know the tree by its appearance. In nine cases out of ten, the farmer knows the tree when he sees it, and, if he does not, this legislation cannot afford him the least protection. The farmer knows, for instance, that the Rhode Island Greening grows almost horizontally, and not in the same way as the Spy, or the Baldwin, or several other varieties. If he cannot detect the variety by its appearance I do not see how he is to be protected by this Bill. It is not like a manufactured article in regard to which, within 24 hours, you can tell whether you have been defrauded or not, by calling in an expert to examine it. In the case of trees you have to wait until they bear. The fact is, that this is a measure designed to prevent the free importation of American fruit trees into this country, and it would be better to put a duty on them if the hon. gentleman wants to place an impediment in the way of that reciprocal trade which was adopted last year. Certainly the hon. gentleman does not expect to get this Bill through the House this Session. If the leader of the Government wants to get through the business before Easter it is useless to have measures of this sort brought forward at this period of the Session. If measures of this kind are withdrawn on both sides, and if the Government withdraw measures which they do not think it absolutely necessary to pass, I think they will be able to get through in the time, but if this sort of thing is to go on that idea must be abandoned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend says he does not understand how any State in the United States could pass a Bill like this. If he will take the Bill introduced by my hon. friend from Monck (Mr. Boyle), and will follow it word by word, I will read him the Act of the State of Minnesota, right across the line, which prevents any Canadian tree grower from going into that State at all:

"*An Act to prevent the practice of Fraud by tree peddlers and commission men in the sale of nursery stock*:

"Be it enacted by the State of Minnesota:

"It shall be unlawful for any person, corporation or association to sell or offer for sale any tree, plant, shrub or vine not grown in the State of Minnesota, without first filing with the Secretary of State an affidavit setting forth his name, age, occupation and residence; and, if an agent, the name, occupation and residence of his principal, and a statement as to where the nursery stock aforesaid to be sold is grown, together with a bond to the State of Minnesota in the penal sum of $4,000, conditioned to save harmless any citizen of this State who shall be defrauded by any false or fraudulent misrepresentations as to the

place where such stock sold by such person, corporation or association was grown, or as to its hardiness for climate: Provided, that the bond aforesaid shall, when the principal is a resident of this State, be given by such principal and not by the agent"

Mr. LAURIER. Is that constitutional?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am reading an Act of the State. It is for the Supreme Court of the United States to decide that question. The Act is in force.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Supreme Court, in the case of Brown against the State of Maryland, decided that question many years ago. Chief Justice Marshall declared that the State has no right to do anything of that sort.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This Act was passed long after Chief Justice Marshall was dead.

Motion agreed to, and Bill referred to Select Committee.

WRECKING IN CANADIAN WATERS.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) moved that the order for second reading of Bill (No. 7) to admit vessels registered in the United States of America to wrecking, towing and coasting privileges in Canadian waters, be discharged and the Bill withdrawn.

Motion agreed to, and Bill withdrawn.

LICENSING OF STATIONARY ENGINEERS.

Mr. COOK moved second reading of Bill (No. 8) to provide for the examination and licensing of all persons employed as stationary engineers, and all persons having charge of steam boilers and other devices under pressure. He said: The Canadian Association of Stationary Engineers is an important organisation. It numbers between 5,000 and 6,000 people in this country. This Bill has the support of all the labor organisations in the country. Petitions in its favor have been presented to the House from the District Assembly, Knights of Labor, Toronto; from Ernest Wyoke and others, Stratford, Ontario; Edward Carney and others, Toronto; W. Roth and others, Toronto; Toronto Typographical Union; Trades and Labor Council, Toronto; Local Assembly, No. 2056, Knights of Labor, St. Catharines; Local Assembly, No. 2513, Knights of Labor, Port Dalhousie, Ontario; Hand-in-Hand Assembly, No. 5743, Knights of Labor, Toronto; Cigarmakers Union, No. 58, Montreal; River Front Local Assembly, No. 7628, Knights of Labor, Montreal; Local Assembly, No. 3449, St. Thomas, Ont.; Local Assembly, No. 2305, Knights of Labor, Toronto, Ont.; District Assembly, No. 236, Knights of Labor, Uxbridge, Ont.; Cigarmakers' Union, No. 140, St. Catharines, Ont.; Trades and Labor Council, city of London, Ont.; Odilon Parizeau *et al.*, Montreal, Que.; Canadian Marine Engineers Association, Montreal; Canadian Association of Stationary Engineers, Stratford; and a petition of 1,650 inhabitants of the city of Toronto sent to the Secretary of State. This petition was intended for the House, but it was wrongly drawn by the promoters and it had to be sent to the Secretary of State. It embraces a large number of the manufacturers of the city of Toronto, such firms as that of Christie, Brown & Co., and others. I have also letters from all the different organisations urging the passage of this Act. However, as I find a number of gentlemen in this House who object to its provisions with reference to pressure, I propose that the Bill shall be confined to engines of 25 horse power. I propose also to exempt the marine engineers. The marine engineers of the Dominion of Canada have already to undergo a strict examination, and it will not be necessary to have them pass an examination under this Bill provided they have certificates from the steamboat engineers of the Dominion. I also propose to exempt private houses; but the 25 horse power, without any reference to private houses, will exempt private houses. Now, I will read a report made by this Canadian Association of Stationary Engineers last year:

"A body of intelligent and respectable citizens. Having no objects that can be criticised, no plans not warranted by sound common sense, and a regard for the rights of others; wishing that justice may be meted out to all, believing that the importance of the profession of steam engineering has never been placed in its proper light before the public. Knowing as we do the important part the stationary engineer takes in the manufacturing interests of this growing and prosperous country. We feel constrained to call the attention of the steam user and the general public to the requirements of the age, and the adoption of such measures as will secure the best service for the steam user, and the greatest immunity from loss of property, limb and life, thereby helping the employer, the employee, and securing a benefit for the general public.

"The use of steam involves great danger, where it is used, or under the control of those who do not understand its power, who do not know the simple adjuncts that only can insure safety, or who have not the necessary skill, sobriety or integrity. The reputable engineers of this country, who have honestly adopted the profession as their business and occupation, feel called upon to speak, when they see the great number and increase of criminally fatal boiler explosions, the total disregard for economy, and the great loss of time and money in managing the light repairs about any steam plant. The rapid growth of manufacturing interests have attracted all kinds of incompetent and careless men into the ranks of the stationary engineers who cast an odium on the business and materially assist to spread death and destruction in connection with the use of steam. We know that boiler explosions are not accidents and can be prevented, and we believe that in these enlightened times a man should understand his business before taking charge of any device under steam pressure, and that he should be held responsible for his actions. Our responsibilities are as great as those of steamboat engineers, who have to pass a board of examiners and procure a license before taking charge of engines and boilers. This was done for the protection of the public and the steamboat owner, in the case of steamboats, the law goes even further, the boilers as well as engineers are subject to Government inspection. During 1887 we have records of 215 boiler explosions by which 376 persons were killed outright, and injuring some fatally and many very seriously 455 persons. The Hartford Inspection and Insurance Company report that up to the year 1885 they had made in all 560 797 inspections and had discovered 303,718 defects, 6,216 of which were considered dangerous, this gives us the alarming result that 1½ per cent. of the boilers were working under dangerous conditions, that more explosions do not occur is because the necessary conditions were not all present at one time.

"Thus we see that explosions can be prevented, 1st by placing only examined and certificated persons in charge of boilers, and by passing a law to the effect that all boilers shall be examined by Government inspectors, if this were done there is no doubt that a much greater safety and economy would result. The making of laws for these purposes are not new, in nearly every city of any importance on this continent, ordinances to this effect have been passed, viz: The cities of New York, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Cincinnatti, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis and Montreal. The District of Columbia and the State of Indiana have passed such a law, and in the States of New York, Ohio, Illinois and Tennessee such laws are now pending. In France the law is very stringent, the boilers are inspected during construction, and are under Government control all the time, and explosions are things of the past. In the German States also very strong Government measures are the law, and the destruction of property, limb and life is reduced to nil. As to steam boilers we know that science and experience show how absolute safety can be had, hence we are justified in asking the strong arm of the law to step in between mistaken economy, ignorance and the lives and safety of the citizens.

"We believe that we are requesting nothing unreasonable, nothing unjustifiable, nothing to which the steam user or the public at large will object, but that we are asking only what is absolutely necessary for the better protection of property, limb and life. We know that common sense, right and justice are at our side, while seeking to place such a law on our Statute-books, and we feel assured that the Bill now before the House will receive that measure of thought and earnest consideration usually bestowed on matters of such importance."

"We have the honor to be,
"Gentlemen,
"Yours faithfully,
"THE CANADIAN ASS'N. STATIONARY ENGINEERS."

I have also a communication from a gentleman furnishing me with statistics, a gentleman who is very anxious for the passage of this Bill. He says that in 1886 there were 160 explosions of boilers, 308 people killed, 413 injured, of whom it is estimated that one-half died. In 1887 there were 215 boiler explosions, 376 people killed outright, 455 injured. In 1888 there were 136 boiler explosions, 234 people killed outright, and 297 injured; or a total in the three years of 511 boiler explosions, 968 people killed outright and 1,165 injured.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that in Canada?

Mr. COOK. I also find that since 1882 ——

Mr. HESSON. Where did these explosions take place?

Mr. COOK. I am reading you the letter as it was sent to me.

Mr. TUPPER. Whereabouts were the explosions?

Mr. HESSON. Is that in Canada or in France?

Mr. COOK. I am reading the statistics as they were given to me.

Mr. TUPPER. Tell us where they took place?

Mr. COOK. He did not tell me that.

Mr. HESSON. In the whole world?

Mr. COOK. I do not suppose it was in the whole world. Perhaps some of the hon. gentleman's constituents could tell him, there is an association there. I have a letter from the association in the town of Stratford in which they speak of——

Mr. HESSON. Are these statistics from Canada or from the United States?

Mr. COOK——

"They also find that since 1882 the organisation of stationary engineers numbers now, in round numbers, 5,000 men. They never had an explosion of any boiler under their care."

The statement is made that explosions are consequent upon employing incompetent men. The members of the association, which numbers 5,000 men, have never had an explosion of a boiler of any kind. It is not necessary to mention the names of the writers of all the letters I have received. I have received a letter from Stratford, from W. Bates, secretary of the association; also from the Hamilton Association of Stationary Engineers, from a similar association in Montreal, from a similar association of Toronto, from the Canadian Marine Engineers of Toronto, from the President of the Canadian Marine Engineers Association of Toronto, in which he speaks of several narrow escapes from accident that occurred lately in that city. He speaks of a narrow escape at the Cyclorama, because the party in charge was not capable of knowing the pressure on the boiler. The indicator only showed 15 lbs. whereas he had from 75 to 80 lbs. There was a narrow escape of an explosion also at an establishment where the public frequent, and another at one of the hotels. I hope the Minister of Justice will not endeavor to relegate this Bill to his slaughtering committee. He has already to-day sent a Bill to that Committee from which he certainly knows it will not emerge again this Session. I shall protest against a similar course being taken in the case of this Bill, and if the hon. gentleman insists on sending it to a Committee he must take the responsibility of doing so.

Mr. TUPPER. I think that on reflection it will be seen that the hon. gentleman's measure is rather crude and ill-considered. He virtually admits that in stating that he proposes, should the Bill be sent to a Committee, to eliminate engines above 25 horse power, cases of marine engines, and cases of private houses. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to a very important fact in connection with his proposed legislation and that is, that, in order to get it before this House properly, it has been necessary for the hon. gentleman to connect it with the criminal law, and he deals in that way only with one part, and that not the most important part, of a very important question, and that is with respect to the certificates of the engineers, while he leaves the engines alone, whereas the statistics show that the explosions are almost exclusively due to the character of the engines and boilers themselves. With that part of the subject the hon. gentleman's Bill is silent, and with that part of the subject the local legislation alone can deal, and no doubt the hon. gentleman was aware of that fact. I will now point out another difficulty in connection with this legislation being made desirable and effective by this method of dealing with only a part of the subject, and it is this: The hon. gentleman has failed to provide proper machinery for carrying the Bill into operation. While we have provided, in case of marine engines and steamboats, a regularly paid staff of officers, the hon. gentleman proposes that the work shall be done by men who may be willing to come and receive fees. The hon. gentleman, in his Bill, has merely suggested the possibility, while making it a offence for a man to attend to this duty without possessing a certificate, of obtaining the services of examiners by the payment of fees; but he has taken no means to secure a proper examining staff of inspectors, because there is a provision of the Bill setting forth that these officers shall be paid by such fees as they may obtain from such men as may present themselves for examination. I appeal to the hon. gentleman himself as to whether it is not highly dangerous, and even opposed to the intention he has in view, to endeavor to force upon the House or to ask the House to sanction legislation of that ill-considered nature and incomplete character by dealing with only one part of, and by no means the most important part of his subject. The engines may be of the poorest character imaginable and badly constructed, improperly manufactured, and yet the hon. gentleman's Bill does not provide for accidents that are likely to arise from this cause, but it simply provides that no man shall be in charge of such poorly constructed engine unless he has passed an examination before one of the inspectors whom he hopes to obtain. I do not intend to raise the other point, which might be raised, as to whether the Bill is in order in regard to the charge it contemplates. It might be said that the charges are to be fees and for certain work done; but the danger to the public is that while the Bill might be effectual in suddenly stopping steam engines in the country and motive power for a large number of factories and industries, it falls short of obtaining a competent staff to see that the provisions of the Bill are properly carried out. I submit that it would be more logical and more consistent with the interests of the country at large and also with those of the engineers and the public, that means should be first devised for the establishment of a competent staff for the examination of candidates before we attempt to make it criminal for engineers and laborers to enter upon their work without certificates, as a certificate cannot now be obtained from anyone since there is no officer to grant it. I might conclude by reading a quotation from the report of the chief mechanical engineer, J. R. Arnoldi. In the first portion of his report he deals with the clauses which the hon. gentleman has suggested would be eliminated from this Bill in Committee. He says:

"In regard to establishments where engines are in use, it is but natural to assume that the interested proprietors will employ competent men to manage them, and it is found, in general experience, that the greater portion of men in charge of ordinary engines and boilers, who give careful and constant attention to their work and most satisfaction to their employers, are men who rise from being ordinary workmen, and even laborers in their own employ, and few, if any, of these men could pass the examinations called for by this Act.

"As mechanical officer in charge of the machinery, boilers, &c., of the Parliament and departmental buildings, Ottawa, and other Government buildings elsewhere in the Dominion, with a constant experience of 16 years, I fail to see any necessity for this Bill, and I do not consider it practicable."

I might supplement that statement made by this gentleman of considerable experience, and say that I do not know at this moment of any similar legislation to this in any country. The House is aware that this Parliament has legislated already in regard to marine engines, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cook) will study that legislation he will see that Parliament was careful to deal with a more important subject before dealing with this portion of it and that is to provide for the proper inspection of the engines themselves.

Mr. COOK. The boilers, not the engines.

Mr. TUPPER. The engines and the boilers as well, as the hon. gentleman will see if he reads the Act. He will find that Parliament made careful provision as to what style of boiler and what style of engine Parliament deemed it proper to permit a steamer to carry, and that Parliament appointed a regular staff, paid not by fees but by a fixed salary to inspect and deal with those subjects. Under those circumstances I beg to move:

That this Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time this day six months.

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil). Mr. Speaker, this is a question which I think the hon. gentleman who has introduced the Bill (Mr. Cook) has not much knowledge of and I hope the hon. gentleman will excuse me if I as a manufacturer and as a man who has been connected with steam boilers for many years express my views on the subject. Had the hon. member been thoroughly acquainted with the facts he would never have stated in the preamble of the Bill that the danger lay in stationary engines or in those devices worked by steam power. The danger does not lie in the steam engine nor in the want of proper qualification by stationary engineers or those who work steam engines, but the danger lies in the manner of producing the steam and in the steam boiler itself. In all our municipalities in the different Provinces there are inspectors appointed who are called "boiler inspectors" and who especially look after the safety of those boilers. I know that in the municipalities of Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, Quebec and other large cities in which a number of steam boilers are worked there are efficient officers to look after the examination of boilers and to see that they are sound and in good order before the owners are granted licenses to work them. If the hon. member who introduced this Bill (Mr. Cook) meant in any way to guard against the destruction of life and property he should have introduced a bill referring only to steam boilers and not to steam engines. But the hon. gentleman proposes to deal with steam engines which are as harmless as the babe unborn; if you leave the steam out of them. The steam engine without the steam boiler is not in the least dangerous to life, and there is no reason for legislation in regard to it. If the hon. gentleman intended to protect life he should have framed his Bill so as to prevent the licensing of men who are ignorant of the strength of a boiler and of its capability for bearing steam pressure. There are few engineers engaged in our workshops who will undertake to have anything to do with steam boilers, for that matter is left entirely to the fireman. I admit that in some places we have engineers acting as firemen, but the employer can always secure that the engineer so engaged is a thoroughly competent fireman and that his training is such as to warrant him being so employed with safety. In my opinion this Bill is *ultra vires* of the Dominion Legislature. I think the powers which it assumes to take belongs entirely to the Provinces or to the municipalities where those boilers may be situated, and I do not believe that this House should be asked to waste time in considering it. It is very true as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has said that the Dominion Government has power to deal with marine engines, for they are operated upon the waters of the Dominion and in different places, but I think that the regulations as regards stationary engines should be left to the provincial or municipal authorities or to the discretion of the manufacturers, who employ men to take charge of these engines. I think that the figures that the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook) gave us with reference to the destruction of life in Canada from the explosion of steam boilers are a little wild. I am satisfied that no 260 persons have been killed from this cause, and I believe that the hon. gentleman would not save one-third or one-tenth or any part of the number from any protection that might be afforded by this Bill. I hope that the time will not be wasted in discussing this Bill which would be of no practical advantage and which would only throw more labor on those who have in charge the conduct of manufacturing concerns in this Dominion.

Mr. IVES. There is one feature of this question which has not been referred to by hon. gentlemen who have opposed the second reading of the Bill. I noticed that the hon. member who moved the second reading has shown that nearly all the petitions in its favor come from unions of stationary engineers or labor organisations. I was not surprised at that because if the title of this Bill had been "An Act to render it possible for all stationary engineers to obtain employment at high prices from the manufacturers of the country" the title would have been appropriate to the effect that the passage of this Act would have. I consider this Bill to be a very mischievous and a very meddlesome piece of legislation. There are a vast number of small manufacturing industries all over the Dominion using engines of from 25 to 100 horse power which would be seriously affected by the passage of this Act. The result would be that they would be unable any longer to employ the competent men they have been in the habit of employing at a moderate rate of wages, and they would be obliged to employ a class of men with far higher qualifications, to whom they would have to pay a much higher rate of wages than their business would enable them to pay. The passage of this Bill would simply mean the stoppage of the business of a man with a small engine engaged in manufacturing in a small way. Although he might have had a man in his employ for three of four years who had worked satisfactorily and well without any accident, he would be liable to a penalty if he any longer continued to employ him. The hon. gentleman has not shown any need of this measure. He has read statistics of a number of deaths which have occurred from explosions of boilers in 1886, 1887 and 1888. He would not tell us to what an extent of territory those statistics referred; but they unquestionably refer to the whole world. So far as Canada is concerned, I follow the newspapers with considerable regularity, and we are not often shocked by accounts of boiler explosions. I am not aware that we have had any loss of life at all through explosions of stationary boilers. As an hon member has said, the danger is not with the engineer who runs the engine, but it is in the boiler itself; and if the boiler is a good boiler, there is practically no danger at all. I am strongly opposed to this measure, because I think it is mischievous and meddlesome, and would interfere with the business of a large number of small manufacturers who could not afford to pay the wages required to employ the class of engineers prescribed by this Bill.

Mr. WATSON. I believe some good might be done by the passage of a Bill of this description. I would be in favor of some slight amendments to it, but I entirely differ from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and from the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) with regard to the cause of the explosions of boilers. They seem to think that explosions are altogether due to the defective condition of the boilers. I have a practical knowledge of these matters, and I say that in almost every instance the cause of a boiler explosion is the incompetency of the man handling the boiler. I have had some considerable experience for years in the construction and repairing of boilers, and there has hardly been an instance within my knowledge of an accident occurring through the defective construction of a boiler. The explosion is always caused by the water being too low in the boiler, and by the fireman not being competent to handle it. With regard to small manufacturers being injured by the passing of this Bill, any person who could not undergo the examination required by sub-section 4 of section 9, and get a certificate which would only cost him $2 a year, would not be a fit and competent

person to fire any boiler. So far from that provision being a hardship on the owners of small steam appliances, I say it would be a great benefit to them. If their firemen had to undergo some such examination, they would devote themselves to preparing for it. A great many people innocently have property destroyed in consequence of employing incompetent men. I know no instances in which men are more deceived, and in which greater loss of property takes place, than in having incompetent firemen and engineers. In the case of threshing machine boilers, in nearly all instances in which they are injured or damaged and made practically worthless after running two or three seasons, this is in consequence of incompetent men being in charge of them. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Wilson) has stated that the steam engine is as harmless as the unborn child. He must know, in speaking of an engineer, that in a great many cases the man who runs the engine is also the fireman. I had hoped that the principle of this Bill would have been adopted, and I should have been prepared to suggest two or three amendments; but apparently the intention of the House is to defeat the Bill entirely. I think the fact of gentlemen objecting to a Bill of this description because it is advocated by trades and labor unions should not defeat it. As a rule, these men are working not only for their own interests, but for the interests of the general public. I know of no measure which would be of greater benefit to the owners of steam appliances than in requiring the men who take charge of those appliances to undergo an examination.

Mr. MACDOWALL. As the hon member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has spoken in favor of this Bill, and as I believe it is directly contrary to the interest of the North-West, I feel bound to congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of Marine for the action he has taken in moving the amendment. The hon. member for Marquette says that anybody should be able to pass the examination which is stipulated in sub-section 4 of section 9, but I will call attention to sub-section 2 of section 9, where you will find that a second-class engineer is required to have a very thorough knowledge of his duties; in fact, he has to pass a very severe examination. A great many men in the North-West who are thoroughly capable of running such an engine would not be able to pass such an examination.

Mr. WATSON. 200 horse power?

Mr. MACDOWALL. Yes, I believe they would not only run a 200-horse power engine, but when difficulties arise, though perhaps not men of very high education, they are men of practical training which they can be put to use. I do not underrate the importance of imposing proper restrictions upon engineers in large factories or large centres, where a large number of people are employed, but in out-of-the-way places, like many in the North-West—and this Bill applies to the whole of Canada—it would be very detrimental to the interest of the people to do so. If the Bill were to apply to the whole country it would be very detrimental to the interests of our people. We know that the first thing it is necessary to have in a newly-formed settlement is a grist mill, and these mills are very often started by men of small means and without technical knowledge. These men are perfectly capable of running such a mill, and I think deserve every encouragement; but, if this Bill should become law, it would take away from them the right to run such a mill, and throw the whole thing into the hands of trade unionists. In centres such as Winnipeg, or Prince Albert, or Calgary, in the North-West, there would be very few certified engineers, and the public works there might be shut down at any time from the sheer impossibility of getting such engineers. Another objection is clause 2, which provides for the appointment of an inspector, and the inspector must have a certain knowledge. Now, there are some settlements in the North-West, and, I believe, in British Columbia, where it would be impossible to find men with the knowledge requisite to be an inspector who could grant certificates, and, in that case, the engineers there would have to come down to some large centre in order to pass an examination, and if there should be any difficulty between the employer and the engineer necessitating the employment of another engineer, the latter would have to be brought from eastern Canada, since none could be found in the west.

Mr. COOK. I was somewhat surprised at the assertion of the hon. the Minister of Marine respecting the provisions covered by this Bill; but he is a young man who has not been very long in the Government, and of whom, therefore, too much must not be expected. He stated this was different from the Steamboat Inspection Act, because these boilers could not be made perfect. Is he not aware that there is no inspection of boilers for steamboats when manufactured. Is he not aware that there is no Act by which steamboat boilers must be inspected when manufactured. In Germany and some other countries no steamboat boiler can be manufactured without its being subject to the inspection of the Government inspector, but we have no such inspection here. Last Session a deputation waited on the Government in reference to this matter. The hon. gentleman then was an independent member of the House, and the Minister of Finance occupied the position then that the hon. gentleman does now. This deputation declared that they had the assurance of the then Minister that they had proved their case and that legislation would be introduced. He did not say when, but he gave them to understand that they should have legislation this year. But the present Minister of Marine declares we are not to have legislation at all. He, also, in speaking about inspectors, asks where they are to come from? Well, they will come, perhaps, just as the Minister of Marine came, from father to son; an inspector might be made just as the Minister of Marine has been made. The hon. gentleman spoke also of the differences existing between the Bill I am promoting and the Inspection Act for steamboats. Why, the hon. gentleman must know that I, as an independent member of this House, have no right to introduce a Bill such as the Steamboat Inspection Act, by which I would ask the expenditure of money by the Government. He ought to know that it is the duty of the Government to take matters of this sort off the hands of private members and make them Government legislation. I expected that was what the hon. member would do. I did not expect him to defy the members who are supporting this measure by saying that it would never pass. I did not suppose he was going to fly in the face of all the labor organisations in this country, and I believe a large number of manufacturers are in favor of it. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) is of course a large manufacturer. He has large steam mills, and, perhaps, he would have to pay $5 a month more to an engineer if this Bill became law. I am also a manufacturer, and I have a number of men employed and an engineer, and I conceived the idea a few years ago that it would be to my advantage to have a capable man to manage the steam department of my mills. But I am perhaps not so extensively engaged in the manufacturing business as the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Wilson). I believe he runs about a fifteen horse power machine making tissue paper. I believe he has about as much horse power as you would find generally in a threshing mill on a farm. I propose to exempt him. Everything up to the extent of twenty-five horse power shall be exempted, so that he will not come within the provisions of the Act. He need not feel so very much alarmed. We know that at the explosion of the Ammonia Works at Toronto, a few weeks ago, a man was killed. That

was in consequence of the incapacity of the party who was in charge of the steam power. If the Government are determined that this Bill shall not pass, I think the course pursued by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries more acceptable than that pursued by the Minister of Justice on a former occasion with reference to a Bill of my own, and also a fairer proposition than that made to-night, with regard to the Bill of the hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle), which was referred to a Select Committee that will never see the light of day. If the Government are prepared to take the responsibility of moving the three months' hoist, I must do my duty. As regards the framing of the Bill, I think the parties most interested—the manufacturers as well as those who are coming within its practical working—have attested their approval of the manner in which it has been drawn. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Wilson) objected to that, and said I did not understand exactly what I was doing. The hon. gentleman appears to have the knowledge of the whole House, upon which questions of machinery, with the fifteen horse power running his tissue paper business.

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil). The hon. gentleman ought to know since he poses as having a great knowledge of our manufacturing interests, that the mill I run requires 400 horse power instead of 15.

Amendment agreed to, on a division.

COMBINATIONS IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE.

Mr. WALLACE moved second reading of Bill (No. 11) for the prevention and supression of combinations formed in restraint of trade. He said: The importance of this question, not only in Canada but in the United States and in other countries of the world, has brought it very prominently before the attention of all the people of these countries. In the United States, perhaps, these combinations and trusts have attained their greatest magnitude and importance. We find there that the important products, the important industries, the important manufactures are, to a large extent, under the control of these trusts and combinations. The Standard Oil Company is one example of a trust where one vast company controls the whole production of oil in the United States. We find also that, in the refining or manufacturing of sugar, almost the whole of the sugar produced and sold in the United States is under the control of one vast trust, which has been declared by the courts of the United States to be illegal. We find also that other industries in the United States are under the control of these combinations, and that has been found to be so profitable in the United States that Canadians, watching the enormous profits which have been made in that country in that way, have gone into the same business. In regard to coal, for instance, we find that a combination was formed in the city of Ottawa on exactly the same lines as the cotton seed oil trust, the standard oil trust, and the sugar trust in the United States—a trust formed by those who were interested in order to control not only their own business but the business done by others. From the investigations which we held last winter—and they were pretty thoroughly made—we found that the coal men in the city of Ottawa controlled not only their own business in the combination, but controlled also all those who started or wished to engage in the business of importing or selling coal. We found that three men, with an aggregate capital of $15,000, after paying enormous bonuses to those who were not in the ring—$10,000 to one man, $5,000 to another, and to others less or greater sums than these—divided amongst themselves, on a capital of $15,000, after paying all expenses of management, and all the expenses of the combination, $33,000. We found that, in the city of Toronto, the coal men had a still more iniquitous system, for, while they had a combination which controlled and regulated the price of coal, they had some most pernicious rules and regulations, which I am satisfied are contrary to the laws of Canada as they exist to-day. I quote from the report of last year:

"The most arbitrary rules are enacted. Detectives are employed and the dealers placed under surveillance—oaths of fidelity to the constitution and rules are required not only of the members, but also of their salesmen, and the oaths in the case of these employés are made in some cases retroactive as well as prospective. All violations of oaths are adjudicated upon by the executive committee referred to, the penalties being heavy fines or expulsion. One-sixth of all fines goes into the general funds of the Coal Branch, and the remaining five-sixths are divided amongst the importers. The record showed three different fines imposed of $1,000 each. Thus the public is presented with the extraordinary spectacle of a mercantile association arrogating to itself powers conferred upon law courts alone, with, in this instance, the judges in the case virtually condoning perjury by the acceptance of fines to be divided amongst the importers. This phenomenon is not the less painful or less objectionable in character from the association which perpetrates it being distinguished by the respectable title of 'The Coal Branch of the Toronto Board of Trade.'"

Now, with reference to the manner in which the Toronto coal ring disposed of their coal, this is what we found. In cases where the Dominion or the Local Government, or charitable or public institutions asked for tenders for the supply of coal, the coal ring met and decided at what price those Governments or those institutions should get their coal, and they put up at auction to the members the privilege of supplying the coal at those prices. In some instances, as much as $1,500 was paid as a bonus for the privilege of supplying the Dominion or the Local Government. In another case $1,399 was paid, and in other cases smaller sums. Even in the case of charitable institutions, the privileges were put up to auction and large sums were paid. Of course, the money was made in the profit out of the selling of the coal, not the legitimate profit, but the illegitimate profit which they required in order to pay these large bonuses to the ring. That was the effect in Toronto. We find that these coal organisations are still in existence. We find the organisation in Toronto, and we find it in Ottawa, but in Ottawa public opinion has been brought to bear so strongly that coal which was sold at $8.50 a ton during the whole winter of 1887-88 was sold at about $6, or in some cases $5 75 a ton during the present winter. We know that the price of coal in the United States was almost exactly the same this year as it was last year, and that the cost of freight was almost precisely the same; and the fact of coal being sold in Ottawa for at least $2.50 per ton less shows either that the dealers were very magnanimous or generous this year, or that they were robbing the public last year. We find another large combination existing in Canada. A few years ago the Wholesale Grocers' Guild was formed in this country, and two years ago they succeeded in inducing the sugar refiners of Canada to enter into an agreement with them. We find, from the sworn evidence taken last year, that the Wholesale Grocers' Guild had attempted before, but unsuccessfully, to induce the sugar refiners to join with them; but two years ago an agreement was come to between the sugar refiners and the Wholesale Grocers' Guild. At first, they wanted to make the sugar refiners agree that they would sell only to the members of the guild. To this they would not agree, but they induced them to agree that they should sell to the members of the Wholesale Grocers' Guild at a certain price, and to all who were outside the guild at about a quarter of a cent per pound more than to those who were inside the guild. This agreement has been changed several times, so that during our investigation last year we found it stood at $\frac{1}{8}$ of a cent advance to all who were not members of the Wholesale Grocers' Guild, and 2½ per cent. discount, making about 30 cents per 100 pounds, or 90 cents per barrel, that those who were not members of the guild had to pay higher than those who were members. We found that they also had an agreement by which they were to sell at a certain advance

to the retail trade; so that we had an arrangement that I contend was objectionable and illegal in two directions; in the first place, those members of the wholesale trade who did not choose to become members of the Wholesale Grocers' Guild, were almost debarred from entering into the sale of sugar at all; they were placed at an immense disadvantage, and illegal and improper disadvantage, while sure and certain profits were secured to all those who were members of the Wholesale Grocers' Guild, because the price at which they were to sell to retailers was a fixed profit regulated by the guild. Now, this arrangement was found to be so satifactory to them that they extended it in other directions. They not only had combinations with the sugar refiners, but they also had combinations by which they secured a large profit on the sale of their tobacco, on the sale of their starch, and on the sale of other commodities that they deal in. So that a large portion of the commodities dealt in by the wholesale trade were under regulations by which they secured fixed profits and by which they shut others out from participating in the purchase of them, even the members of the wholesale trade who did, perhaps, as large or larger business than themselves, and they shut them out except at advanced prices, and then they would secure their profits in selling to retailers. The effect of this was inevitably to increase the price to the consumer, and it was wrong in principle besides. Then we go on to some other lines of business. We investigated the manufacture of binders' twine, and though we found that last year the price had not been increased higher than the price that was paid in the United States, we found that a combination already existed, that they regulated the price, that they regulated the output of each manufacturing establishment, and that they were a close combination among themselves. We have still more objectionable evidence to produce this year, for we find that these binding twine manufacturers have increased the price of the twine out of all proportion; that though the raw material, manila, has not increased in price, they have largely increased the price of twine, as much as 50 per cent. over the price it was last year. Another combination that we investigated last year was that of coffin-makers and undertakers, and we found that to be a most objectionable organisation. The coffin-makers and manufacturers of coffin supplies had undertaken to sell to none but members of the Undertakers' Association. In order to become a member of the Undertakers' Association, a man had to get the consent of three out of four of the nearest undertakers living to him; of course, in a small town that was impossible. If there were but two undertakers there, they did not want another man coming in to cut up the business, and the three nearest undertakers had to give their consent before a man could start in the business. The result was, as we have numerous letters to prove, and the evidence before the committee to prove, that they became a close corporation and no body could enter the business. Their freedom was interfered with, and they could not enter into the business of undertaking because the manufacturers of coffins and of coffin makers' supplies were prevented from selling them goods The result of this was injurious and unjust to those who wished to engage in a legitimate business, and who had all the qualifications and capital necessary for engaging in it. Then we have other combinations springing up during the present year. I have in my hand an advertisement clipped from a newspaper the other day, which reads as follows:

"Salt. The undersigned are sole salesmen for Canadian salt. Address L. Rightmyer & Co, Clinton.

"JOHN RANSFORD, *Secretary.*"

What does that mean? That means that on the first day of March last an agreement went into force to this effect: A number of men formed a syndicate and went to the manufacturers of salt in Canada, who were then and had been for several years past, selling salt delivered on the cars by the carload at 55 cents a barrel. They sent to these salt manufacturers and said: "We will give you seventy cents a barrel for the product of your salt wells for the next 12 months, instead of 55 cents, the price at which you have been selling for several years past." They were anxious to make such a favorable bargain, and the syndicate bought all the products of all the salt wells in Canada for 12 months, and paid 70 cents a barrel, which the manufacturers were selling before for 55 cents, and they immediately raised the price to $1.05 a barrel by the carload, so that they increased the price of salt over 90 cents in one day, and every farmer who had previously been buying his salt delivered at his station by the single barrel for 90 cents to $1, is to-day paying $1.50. I think this act is illegal, it is an injustice; it is more than that, it is a robbery of the farming community, and I propose by the legislation we have here to put a stop to these iniquities. Now, there are many other objectionable undertakings, combinations and trusts formed in Canada; they are being formed every day. Those that have been formed have been found to work well; they have been found very profitable to those engaged in them, and a great encouragement is given in other lines of business, and in other lines of production, to form combinations in their respective lines. Another very objectionable combination is that of fire insurance associations in Canada. This does not extend to the insurance of farm property, but I believe it extends to all other kinds of property in Canada. They formed an insurance combination some years ago including all but the mutual companies; and the result has been exactly the same as in other combinations. The first or immediate effect is to raise the price, and that was the case in Canada. The prices for insurance was raised, and raised most inequitably. Very little attention was paid to the character of the insured, to what we call the moral hazard, and a cast iron arrangement was formed that did injustice to many individuals besides increasing the price of their insurance, and it was very unjust and unfair in its application. Then we find in biscuits and confectionery that combinations have been formed. In biscuits we take an American price list of articles that are sold in Ottawa; and we find that biscuits can be imported and pay a large duty and be sold cheaper than Canadian biscuits. But we are told: Look at the duty on the sugar, look at the duty on the lard. Well, the duty on the sugar in Canada, I apprehend, is not as high as the duty on sugar in the United States. As a matter of fact, the prices of the article are about the same in both countries. Two weeks ago granulated sugar was cheaper in Canada than in the United States, to-day it may be a little dearer; it varies in that way, but the average price is pretty nearly the same in Canada as in the United States. Lard is dearer in Canada than in the United States, because we have a duty here and the Americans pay the duty and bring it in largely. Flour, also, is a little dearer here; but the whole difference in the cost of the raw material will not make a difference of half a cent a pound, while in many cases we find a difference in the price of the articles purchased on each side to be three cents or four cents per pound. We are told that the remedy for this state of affairs is to abolish the tariff, that the tariff is responsible for "trusts" in Canada. I deny it. What has the tariff to do with the insurance combination, or with the coal combination, yet the latter is the most iniquitous combination in Canada to-day, that is the combination on hard coal. There is no combination on soft coal, on which there is a duty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not so.

Mr. WALLACE (York). Our information sworn before the Committee said it was so. Then we have a combination of wholesale grocers. What has that to do with the tariff? They are not manufacturers, they are simply men

who handle the goods, and yet it is one of the most iniquitous combinations in Canada and is one of the least justifiable. They tell us it is necessary to the prosperity of their trade. I deny it. In Toronto there had not been for 15 years, I believe, a single case of a wholesale grocer failing, while every other business whether mercantile, manufacturing, banking or otherwise, showed failures, and the record is not broken except by the wholesale grocers. Of course we do not wish them to fail or to have any break in their prosperity. But they were prosperous before 1884, when they formed their combination, and they can prosper without their combination now. Then there is the question of salt. What would abolishing the duty on salt do? It is free when it is brought in from the old country, and it is free for fishermen's uses, no matter from what country it may come. This iniquitous combination of salt has nothing to do with manufacturing. A man goes and buys the product of all the manufacturers. The manufacturers are not breaking the law and should not be punished, but the individual who forms the combination and then doubles the price, breaks the law. We have 600,000 farmers in Canada among whom there is no combination, and in fact a combination would be impossible among them. We have perhaps 1,800 or 2,000 flour millers, with perhaps the largest capital invested of any manufacturing industry here to day, and there is no combination among them. We have the manufacturers of agricultural implements, and H. A. Massey of Toronto, Mr. Copp of Hamilton, and A. W. Morris of Montreal, three of the largest manufacturers in those articles, all swore there was no combination in their goods. Are the manufacturers, which have no combination, going to ruin? No, they are prosperous; they have their ups and downs and are more prosperous some years than other years, but they do not find it necessary to give up business. Mr. John Abel, a large manufacturer, says it is absolutely necessary for the existence of manufacturers that these combinations should be stopped. It is said that some of the combinations of manufacturers have been built up by the National Policy. Our investigation, I am glad to say, showed that very few of the worst combinations were those produced by the National Policy. But if there be any combination in Canada of manufacturers built up by the National Policy, they have no right to have those combinations and they had better take warning that they are not wanted in this country. The very essence of the National Policy and what we claimed for it was that, although for a time the price of the manufactured article might perhaps be a little dearer, the competition of the various manufacturers in the country would cause the price to be reduced. I am glad to say that this is the universal effect, and as a result of the National Policy we have cheaper goods than ever we could have had without the National Policy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Your Bill says the contrary.

Mr. WALLACE (York). My Bill says nothing of the kind. I repeat, we have cheaper goods than we could have had otherwise, and also a better quality of goods. This excrescence or incubus on our manufacturing industries should not be allowed to exist. If this is always the result of the National Policy, the National Policy will have to go with it. I propose to strike these combinations out, and to compel manufacturers and producers whatever class or rank to go on as other classes of the people have gone on, and they have been prosperous and successful in this country. The Bill I proposed at first was the one of which I gave notice at the end of last Session. I have gone ever it carefully, and I intend to ask the House to permit its substitution by the second Bill which I have the honor to submit. The objection made to the old Bill was that it created a new offence, and the judges might perhaps interpret the Bill more severely than was intended. This new Bill does not create a new offence. It simply states what the law of England and Canada to-day is and has been for years past, and fixes a penalty for offences against the law and warns them not to break it. It does not interfere in the slightest degree with the legitimate trade and commerce of the country. It has not that object, and it could not effect that object. The law simply permits industries to be carried on, it permits healthy rivalry between commerce and manufacturers, it gives every man in Canada an equal chance, which the law of the country is bound to give him, and it gives equality all round. It has been said that, by taking off the duties on those articles, the evil would be cured. As I pointed out in the case of salt, such legislation would not punish the evil doer, because there is no duty on the article. This is one of the most important subjects that could engage the attention of the House. It is a great evil and a growing evil, and it affects every man, whether farmer, mechanic or any other class. But we were told the other day, by a member of the Board of Trade of Toronto, that the combination of the wholesale grocers in Toronto promoted morality, that all the other business men were not doing their business after a straightforward legal means and were doing crooked business, whilst that they in the combination were doing a straightforward business and promoting morality and honesty. In answer to that I have a letter from a gentleman in the town of Woodstock, which I will take the liberty of reading to this House. It is as follows:—

"WOODSTOCK, ONT., 12th March, 1889.

"Mr. CLARK WALLACE, M.P., Ottawa.

"Dear Sir,—I write to express my warm approval of your anti-combines Bill. I am a grocer of 30 years experience and have done the largest business here for the past 15 years, and our business here is in a very bad state on account of the combines viz, the Grocers' Guild, about 60 per cent of my turnover is now at fixed prices and very soon we will not be able to buy even a wax candle except at a price fixed by the guild, the result of which is that eleven new grocery stores have started here during the past three months. No doubt travellers induce them to start by telling them that they can buy as cheap as the largest stores and as so and so has made money so can they possibly, showing them their orders booked, but that is not all; I find that respectable houses in both wholesale and retail who conscientiously abide by the terms of the guild, are being undermined by small jobbing houses who may not invoice goods at less than guild prices but who give them baits and also cash to secure their orders which cash is charged to expenses and winked at by the principals. This appears to be increasing to such an extent that I fear before very long that the large firms that were so anxious to form the guild will be the first to get out of it.

"I have taken a decided stand for the last month and have not purchased any goods at fixed prices when I could avoid it and when I cannot get over it, and now I mean to buy from whoever fixes me the largest rebate. This is very demoralising but self protection demands it. I have spoken to the leading grocerymen here and they all agree with me that the guild is wrong, and as it was found that combinations of labor were not correct and that one man's labor was worth more than another's. So it will be found that combinations of capital are also wrong. Surely a man's capital, credit and experience, should be worth something to him, but the grocers guild sell goods at fixed prices to any one on credit totally ignoring the fact that the very essence of a business transaction is the risk. Wishing you much success with your Bill,

"Yours respectfully,

"JAMES SCOTT"

I have received also letters and resolutions from the Dominion Grange, from the Knights of Labor and from the retail grocers of Montreal, Kingston, Toronto, Quebec, Sherbrooke, Windsor, St. Catharines and Hamilton. Almost all Canada has in some form or other signified its approval of a measure that would tend to put down these illegal combinations in trade and therefore I beg to move the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. SPEAKER. This cannot be moved in amendment. The Bill must be first read the second time.

Mr. GUILLET. I think that this House will certainly not approve of relegating this important matter to the Committee of Banking and Commerce in view of the fact that we have already the evidence of some 65 witnesses who have given their sworn testimony before a Committee of this House in reference to the operation of these combinations. I do not propose to detain the House at this late hour with any lengthened remarks on this important subject. It is a matter which has excited the interest of the entire people throughout this Dominion, for all classes and sections feel that they are being oppressed by unreasonable exactions from the operation of these combinations. The farmer, the mechanic, the laborer, and in fact all the toilers by hand or brain and even most of our merchants and manufacturers have denounced those combinations. It must be remembered that there are very few indeed who are indentified with these combinations and that the opponents of this Bill are only those who are immediately interested in upholding the combinations or who belong to or profit by them. There is no opposition to this Bill from any other source and for the very simple reason that the investigations of the Committee have thrown such a flood of light upon the operations of these combinations show that those interested in the combines have substantial reasons for opposing the passing of this law. The reason for the opposition to this Bill from those interested in the combines may be expressed in the old couplet:

"No rogue e'er felt the halter draw
With good opinion of the law."

It is charged that those combinations are due entirely to the National Policy, but that phase of the subject has been very satisfactorily dealt with by the mover of this Bill, and I need not dwell upon it to any considerable extent. Certainly if the National Policy has to any extent been responsible for encouraging combinations it must get the credit of having protected the country from similar and worse foreign combinations which had we not the National Policy would have ruthlessly laid waste our industries. Those combinations are not confined to Canada. They are more powerful and more oppressive in the United States than they are here, and we even find that they have found their way into free trade England. We know that in England now, they have the salt combine and the tin combine and the syndicates in steel, iron and copper, and we know that those combinations are now felt to be most oppressive in England. I have an extract here from the London *Grocer* bearing on this matter which I will read. It is as follows:—

"Since the salt union came into existence the prices of all descriptions of salt have been steadily raised until common salt, which was selling at 3s. to 5s. per ton is now quoted at 7s to 10s 6d per ton. The quotations for lump and other qualities have also been increased by about 100 per cent., while some of the finer qualities have been raised 125 per cent."

It is certain that these combinations which exist in foreign countries would have found their way here and had a disastrous effect in our own. It will be found on investigation that there are many articles of English manufacture imported, such as pickles, Nestlé's Food, blues of various kinds and a large variety of grocers' sundries, which are placed under agreements, and which must be sold at fixed prices by the merchant who deals in them, owing to the foreign manufacturers having imposed restrictions on their agents. So that it is not only in coal, in oatmeal, which is not to any considerable extent manufactured under a protective policy, that we have found combinations, and they would have existed even if there had been no National Policy. The people have adopted the National Policy, however, on the good faith and understanding that there should be no restriction on competition. They were assured that the competition that existed in the country would bring reasonable prices, and that condition of things was realised until these combinations were formed. Therefore, I say that in order to keep good faith with the country, they must be suppressed in order that the National Policy may do its proper work. It has been shown that the effect of competition in various lines has been to bring the price down to a level below that at which goods could be imported if there was no protective policy in the country. We find that it is only in a few lines that there are combinations; the vast majority of manufacturers in the country, including the iron and woollen manufacturers, have not combined. Those who have attempted to justify these combinations have claimed that there has been excessive competition. There was little proof of this before the committee of investigation. It was shown that there had been no excessive competition, which had been alleged on behalf of the sugar combination, as having driven the dealers in sugar to combine together in order to protect themselves from competition that was demoralising the trade. The investigation showed that the condition of things against which they complained had existed many years; there had been no demoralisation, no bankruptcy, no failures; and I have extracted the evidence of Mr. Ince, a member of the firm of Perkins & Ince, of Toronto, who came to give evidence on behalf of the Grocers' Guild, which had formed the sugar combination. He was asked:

"Q. Do you know of any failures in Toronto within the last ten years? A. I think there is one I think Bryan, Ewart & Murray's has occurred within ten years, and there have been others.

"Q. Within the last five years? A. I cannot remember any, I am happy to say. I am very much pleased to say that the grocery trade of Toronto is in a good position, which I think is due to care, and I am happy to say there have been very few failures."

The sugar combination at that time was but a year old; and yet in the previous five years there had not been one failure. I think that is most satisfactory, showing a healthy condition of the grocery trade at that time, and the condition of things then was not different from what it had been for fifteen years. The fact was that the merchants were prosperous, but they were not growing rich fast enough to suit themselves, and they made a combination with the view, as they admitted, of raising prices; and the effect has been to raise prices considerably, and the people have had to pay them; the money has had to come out of the people's pockets; and this Act is intended to suppress the combinations of these gentlemen who have had their hands in the people's pockets so long, and to compel them to withdraw their hands. Competition safeguards the prosperity of the country; it is the life of trade; and all classes have to meet it. The farmers have to meet it from the immigrants who are coming in. They go into the unsettled portions of the North-West, and you find an increased production of the various products of the farmers, and they have to meet the competition of that production. Then, in all kinds of manufactures and trades, you will find the same thing. The carriage maker or the woollen man who is manufacturing on a small scale has to compete at a great disadvantage with those who manufacture on a large scale. The same rule applies to the tinner, the clothier, the blacksmith, and people in all lines of business; they have to submit to competition, they have to toil harder, and to satisfy themselves with fewer of the comforts of life. Why, then, should there be combinations in a few lines of manufacture to oppress others? I say it is a condition essential to the prosperity of the country that there should be free competition, and no monopoly to compel people to pay excessive prices. The effect of such a state of things would be to impoverish the masses and to drive people from the country. But we are told that free trade will cure it all. But it has been shown that these exactions and combinations occur in free trade countries; it has been shown that in salt, in steel and in copper they have raised prices enormously. It is preferable to have the combinations in our own country; we can deal with them here; we cannot deal with these foreign combinations; but we can

see that the combinations in our midst are brought to the bar of justice and that they pay the penalty. Then, we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that unrestricted reciprocity will cure these evils. Why, combinations on the other side are one hundred fold more numerous than they are in this country. I have a list of them here, and I will read to the House some of the articles which are subject to combinations in the United States:

"The Standard Oil Trust and American Cotton Oil Trust have sown their seed in a fertile soil, and the rank growth is to-day polluting the air and stifling the existence of healthy life and progress It is currently reported and believed that "trust" monopolies have drawn within their grasp not only kerosene oil and cotton seed oil, but sugar, oatmeal, starch, white cornmeal, straw paper, pearled barley, coal, straw-board, castor-oil, linseed-oil, lard, school slate, oil cloth, salt, cattle, gas, street railways, whiskey, rubber, steel, steel rails, steel and iron beams, nails, wrought-iron pipes, iron nuts, stoves, lead copper, envelopes, paper bags, paving pitch, cordage, coke, reaping and binding and mowing machines, threshing machines, ploughs, glass and water works, and the list is growing day by day. Millions of dollars in cash or property, are being drawn into the vortex."

And yet hon members opposite think we must cure these evils by unrestricted reciprocity. What they say practically amounts to this: the jackals are abroad in this country, let us introduce a horde of American wolves to drive out the jackals. They say the hawks are carrying off the chickens and they would prevent that by permitting the American eagle and vulture to carry off our lambs. We find the system of the National Policy infested with parasites, and they cry out: "kill the National Policy." We say the good tree bears good fruit, but there are fungus growth and excrescences, and we will prune the good tree. They call on us, however, to cut it down, but I say that is unreasonable; we ought to preserve to the people the benefits of the National Policy which they have approved so often. Let us grapple with the evils which have grown up under it. On the other side of the line their Legislatures found they were paralysed by wealthy and powerful trusts. That is not the case with us. This Legislature will deal with these combines. We will yet see such a tumult about their heads as will very much surprise a great many people; and these combines will no longer exist after the Bill becomes law. I do not think I ought to take up the time of the House at greater length. There are some points that might be raised as to the position and grasping character of these trusts, but I do think this House will sympathise with those who have been arbitrarily excluded from the exercise of those privileges which they hereto enjoyed, as citizens of a free country, in purchasing their goods as they could do before these combines were formed. In the formation of these combines there has been unwarranted interference with freedom and civil rights. It is not to be borne that people should be compelled to pay so large an increase on the price of these articles and be subjected to insufferable exactions, as have been those who refused to enter the combines. Consider the case of the wholesale grocers, such as Mr. Joseph or Mr. Matthewson, of Montreal. It is well known that the sales of a wholesale grocer in sugar amounts to about $300,000 a year, representing on an average about 15,000 barrels of sugar. These men, who have been excluded from the right of purchasing from refiners, have to pay 90 cents per barrel more for sugar than those in the trust, or $12,000 out of their hard earnings, just because they could not reconcile their conscience to taking a solemn oath of secrecy and obedience to the dictates and rules of a trust; and because they refused to prostitute their consciences they were subjected to a taxation of $12,000. These trusts have placed their hands on the sacred ark of freedom, and should be put under the ban of the law.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for Hamilton proposes that this Bill should be sent to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. I think, after the second reading that would be the proper thing to do with it, because, as it stands, it would be perfectly unworkable. I will call the attention of the House to some of the provisions. The hon. gentleman proposes to punish as a special misdemeanor the granting to any person, who is a party to a combination, any facility which is not granted to other parties. A railway company may say: we will carry coal for so much if you will take a train load of it, but if you want simply a carload, we will not carry it for any such figure. And so, a combination made for putting up the price of an article might not be reached at all, nor would that made by a railway company for a rate be reached except under a special provision of this sort. So far as a combination of that is concerned, if it is to be effectively reached, it must be by some such principle as is recognised in the United States in the interstate commerce legislation. It shall also be a misdemanor to unreasonably enhance the market price of an article or commodity which is an object of trade, but it would be utterly unreasonable to expect a judge to undertake to say what an unreasonable enhancing of the price would be. Would it be 5, 10 or 20 per cent.? That must be done by Parliament.

"For unduly restraining the traffic in any such article or commodity."

What is the undue restraint? Now, take an instance: The cotton manufacturers of Canada may have the capacity to manufacture 24,000,000 pounds per year. A surplus is created, and the only way to restore the relation between production and consumption is to stop manufacturing for a few months, and all parties agree to do that. They would come under the operation of this Act.

Mr. WALLACE. I have given notice of a motion to amend this by another Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have only the opportunity of considering the Bill which is before the House. The other is not before the House. I am pointing out the impracticable character of the measure before us. I have found that its provisions are largely unworkable. I think the object the hon. gentleman has undertaken to perform is, in many respects, a laudable object, but it could not be accomplished as his Bill now stands. I will not enter into discussion as to how far the Customs laws produce the state of things the hon. gentleman is trying to remedy, but I may point out that the hon. gentleman's Bill he asks us to read the second time will not accomplish its purposes. If the House reads the Bill the second time it will be necessary to send to the Committee where its provisions are being considered.

Mr. BROWN. Very large interests are at stake in the various sections of the trade and manufacture of Canada daily, and I desire very much to have the opportunity of being heard before the Committee to explain my views on the question. I move that the Bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. WALLACE. I must oppose this proposal, because I think it is simply an attempt to burke the Bill. That is the only object. There has been no matter brought up in this House that has received more thorough investigation from a Committee than this question of combinations. In the Committee last year 63 witnesses were examined and 26 meetings were held, and the other members of that Committee can tell the House that the subject was exhaustively considered. Of the 63 witnesses who were examined, 40 were members of combinations themselves, and they were here defending those combinations, and had the utmost opportunity of giving their views. I think they gave their opinions fully before a Committee of this House under oath, and it is not necessary now to refer this Bill to a Committee. I will, therefore, oppose the reference to a Committee, and, if necessary, I will ask the House to divide upon the proposition.

Mr. FISHER. We must not imagine for an instant that the Bill of the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) is the Bill of the Committee of last year. That Bill is an evolution of the hon. gentleman's own brain from the evidence adduced before the Committee, as he considered it. The Bill was only brought before the Committee at its last sitting, and it was not accepted by the Committee because the Committee did not think it was at that time in a position to bring in a Bill.

Mr. WALLACE. I was only referring to the report of the Committee which was unanimously adopted.

Mr. FISHER. That is perfectly true, but I do not wish the House to imagine that this was a Bill adopted by the Committee. I concur with the statement of the hon. gentleman that the Committee very thoroughly investigated this question and examined a number of witnesses, and I think the report is exhaustive on the subject of combines. Therefore I do not think it will be necessary to summon witnesses before the Banking and Commerce Committee, but I do think it is necessary that the clauses of the Bill should be examined and that some material changes should be made in it by the Banking and Commerce or some other Committee of this House. It might go into Committee of the Whole, and be threshed out there, but I think it would be better to send it to the Committee on Banking and Commerce and let them thresh it out.

Mr. COCKBURN. As seconder of this motion, I emphatically protest against the suggestion that I did so with the view to burke this Bill. The hon. gentleman has had this Bill before the House for a few weeks, and during that time he has found it necessary to make serious alterations in it. His own ideas were apparently so crude and hastily formed that he has had to propose certain material alterations, and I thought it was necessary that we should give him further time to consider his measure, and therefore I thought it was only right that the Bill should go before its natural committee, the Committee on Banking and Commerce I think it is the most important commercial Bill which has come before the House this Session. It may arrange or disarrange the whole commerce of the country, and therefore the House will see, and I think even my hon. friend from York (Mr. Wallace) himself will acknowledge the propriety of that motion being adopted, and that it is not intended to burke a Bill which has for its intent so much to benefit the interests of the country.

Mr. SPROULE I do not think anyone in this House will agree with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Cockburn) or with the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown), because, at this late state of Session, it is evident that it will be almost impossible, if not altogether impossible, to have that Bill considered by the Committee and brought back to the House in time to pass it. The First Minister asks us in the first place to suspend the debate which is taking place on one of the most important Bills before the House in reference to these unlawful and unreasonable combinations which have sprung up in this country during the last few years and then it is proposed to send it to a Committee. We must look upon this as a most important measure. If we judge it from the interests which are involved, if we judge it from the manner in which devices have been brought to bear on the legislators of this country in connection with it, if we judge it by the restrictions on trade which it proposes to obviate, restrictions which enhance the price to the consumer and reduce it to the producer, we must see how important it is. Why, therefore, should we attempt to burke it by this device at this time, or why should an attempt be made to prevent the debate taking? It is because the debate would lay bare a state of things which is disgraceful to the country, and which would show the people of the country facts that they would insist upon their representatives legislating on the subject in such an emphatic manner that they could not avoid doing so. We all know that, if this motion is carried, it will do away with the Bill for the present year at any rate. Procrastination is the thief of time, and we do not know what may happen before another Session, we do not know what devices may be brought forward before another Session takes place. Though it is late in the Session when this Bill is proposed for the second reading, the hon. gentleman is not to blame for that. The Bill has been on the paper for sometime, and it has stood, when it has been called, at the request of the Government, at the request of hon. members who profess to desire to put a law of this kind on the Statute-book of this country. Now, without giving time for discussion, and on the plea that it is late in the night or early in the morning, it is asked that this Bill should be relegated to a Committee so that it will not have time to be passed this Session. However, I for one propose to go on with this discussion. What are the objects of these trade combinations?

Mr. SPEAKER. The question now is to refer the Bill to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and the hon. gentleman cannot go into the merits at this time. He can only discuss the opportuneness of the motion.

Mr. SPROULE. I think, if I prove that the necessities of the time are such as to require that immediate attention should be given to this Bill, I shall establish the fact that it should not be sent to that Committee, because everyone will admit that, if it goes to that Committee, it is impossible that it should become law this Session. The eyes of the people of Canada are to-day directed towards the legislators in this Parliament, and those who feel that they are injured by reason of these unlawful combinations expect that every member here will endeavor to pass some law which will restrain them. If we fail to do that, it will be looked upon as an indication of a disposition on the part of this Parliament to put the matter off. It will appear as if the operators in these nefarious lines had brought their operations to bear on the legislators of the country in order to prevent the passage of the Bill. I think the experience of a few days or weeks will prove the truth of what I say, because the efforts which have been made to prevent the passage of this Bill by manufacturers and middlemen and others who have resorted to illegal means for that purpose are so well known to hon. members that many of them dislike to refer to them. I think we will find that the people in general will imagine that these means have been resorted to for the express purpose of burking legislation on this subject during this present Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would just point out to the hon. gentleman that I suppose he does not expect to get through the Bill to-night. Well, then, if he does not get through the Bill to-night, it will stand over till next Monday.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that it is on the Orders of the day among Government Orders.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes; so it was, but if you choose to take it out of the hands of the Government, you must manage it after your own fashion.

Mr. CURRAN. I merely wish to say that there are a certain number of persons interested in various branches of trade, railway companies, insurance companies and others, who are anxious to be heard before the Committee on Banking and Commerce, who have representations to make; and in view of the discussion of this Bill, and the many defects that were pointed out, and which could have

been much more elaborated by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and as we are now having a brand new Bill substituted for that originally submitted, certainly the hon. member ought not to try to block those who merely wish to have an opportunity of presenting their views to the ordinary Committee of Banking and Commerce, where the Bill can be put through in one day, and legislation had upon this subject during the present Session.

Mr. WALLACE. On the statement of the Premier that an opportunity will be given to have the Bill put through after it has been referred from the Banking and Commerce Committee, I accept the suggestion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot promise that. I will promise the opportunity if the House chooses to give it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:55 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 9th April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 122) respecting the collection of certain tolls and dues therein mentioned.—(Sir John Thompson.)

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. TUPPER moved third reading of Bill (No. 129) to amend the Fisheries Act.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Before the Bill is passed, I wish to call the attention of the Minister to the question whether this Act is constitutional or not. Since the Bill was before the House last, I have had an opportunity of looking into the case of Delaney and McDonald, and I find the question was distinctly raised there as to whether the provision was not *ultra vires*. The only distinction which I make between section 6 of the old Act and this Bill is that the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were then excepted, and are now included. The law as it read at that time was:

"The use of nets or other apparatus which capture salmon shall, except in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, be confined to tidal waters."

That exception is eliminated. The question was raised in that case as to whether that did not amount to a prohibition of the right of a riparian proprietor to fish in front of his land; but, as the court decided that the Province of New Brunswick was not included in the section, they expressed no opinion on that question. My hon. friend will observe, however, that the court were very cautious in reserving their views on that point, and I remember that, in the case of the Queen against Robertson, which I argued myself before the Supreme Court here, there was very much doubt felt as to whether this would come within the powers of this Parliament. There is also another point to which I would call the Minister's attention. Under the seventh section it is provided that:

"The Minister, or any fishery officer authorised to such effect, shall have power to define the tidal boundary of estuary fishing for the purposes of this Act."

That simply leaves it within the power of the Minister, or of the fishery officer, to do away with the rights of riparian proprietors, and this will be a very important matter, especially in regard to the St. John River. The influence of the tide is felt very largely on that river for a distance of 70 miles from its mouth, but it is not a tidal river, because the tide is checked by the falls at the mouth of the river. There are very important salmon fisheries on that river, particularly in what is called the Long Reach, and those are very valuable to the riparian proprietors; but this Bill will have the effect of destroying the rights of those proprietors. Between Fredericton and St. John, a distance of 85 miles, the whole of the fishing may be stopped because these are not tidal waters in the legal sense, although the influence of the tide is felt in that river probably for a distance of 6 or 7 miles above Fredericton. I do not think the fisheries vary from one year to another; one year we have a good season and another year a bad season, but I do not think there has been a great deal of diminution. I have heard complaints from persons on the rivers as to parties putting their nets there. It seems to me that one consequence of this Act will be practically to deprive the owners along the rivers of the right which was secured to them under the Act of Confederation.

Mr. ELLIS. I object to this Bill on several grounds. The Minister himself, in introducing it, and again in moving the second reading, stated that it applied to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick alone. But that is not correct. I find that it goes much further than stated by the Minister, and that it applies to the rivers in Ontario as well. However, I am not concerned about the Ontario people. If they do not care to look after themselves, it is not the business of the Lower Provinces members to do it for them. The underlying objection in my mind to the Bill is that it takes away the riparian rights of the people on the rivers of these Provinces for the benefit of fly-fishermen. As regards the St. John River there is a distance of 220 miles from its mouth to the junction to the Tobique River, and along that distance no fish was ever taken by fly. From time immemorial the riparian owners have exercised the privilege, and the absolute right, of placing nets from the shore and taking salmon. It is now proposed to take that right from them entirely. Then, 60 miles from the mouth of the Tobique River to the forks, the right of fishing by nets has existed from the time the settlers first went upon that river. No salmon, so far as I am aware, has ever been taken by the fly on the Tobique River below the forks; a few are occasionally taken above the forks for 30 or 40 miles up, with the fly. So the object appears to be to preserve the St. John River for the benefit of fly-fishermen at the head of the Tobique River. The effect of the measure will be to deprive all the people of the Province of New Brunswick along the river of the privilege they have heretofore enjoyed of fishing with the net. The next section of the Bill gives power to the fishery inspector to define what is a tidal river. It is left entirely with that officer to declare where the tide ends and where it begins. The tide is felt 60 miles up the river from the mouth, by the mere backing up of the water, so that this section leaves a very large discretion to the officer. It cannot be contended that there is any great decrease in the amount of the salmon catch in that river. If the hon. gentleman is sincerely desirous of protecting the fishermen, he had better turn his attention to the Restigouche River, where fly fishermen are slaughtering the fish. There has been a constant effort on the part of both the Local and the General Governments to transfer the rights of the people of these fisheries to lessees. I know that in our own Province it has created a great deal of hard feeling. Last year on the Tobique River where some persons were fishing, they were attacked and a lady was killed in her canoe. A striking circumstance in connection with the matter was that a

clergyman of the Church of England thought it his duty to write an article to the public press, showing the feeling which existed, and in a measure palliating that feeling, because the people were being deprived of their rights For these reasons I believe that the Bill is objectionable, and I, therefore, move that it be not now read the third time, but that it be read this day six months.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before making any observations upon this Bill, I would like to ask the Minister to state the reasons for which he asks this House to pass this measure, and upon what authority, whether upon representations of the people, or upon the mere motion of the officers of the department? As soon as the Minister answers this question, I will make some observations upon this subject. In the meantime, I reserve my right to reply.

Mr. TUPPER. I reserve my right to speak when the proper time comes. The hon. gentleman was not in the House when we took the Bill into Committee, and I was asked a number of questions. The point which the hon. gentleman wishes to raise, he can raise just as well before I have stated my views. As to the points raised by both the members from the city of St. John, I decline to be cross-examined at this stage.

Mr. MITCHELL. As the hon. gentleman declines to be cross-examined, as he chooses to call it, I must state any objections I entertain against this Bill. I have no hesitation in saying, that it is an outrageous Bill, one that never should be passed by this Parliament. It is an interference with the rights of the people, it is a Bill that, so far as I know and believe, has not been asked for by the people of that part of the country to which it particularly applies—the Maritime Provinces. There are numerous rivers in the Province from which I come, commencing with the Richibucto, Restigouche, Miramichi, Nipisiguit, Kouchibouguac, and other rivers, where the people residing on their banks, have farms, and own the riparian rights, and use the rivers for fishing purposes, and this Bill proposes to deprive them of their rights. I have asked, for the purpose of obtaining information, the grounds upon which the hon. gentleman has introduced this Bill. I have asked the hon. gentleman to state whether—I speak only for the Province of New Brunswick, but, I dare say, it applies equally to Nova Scotia, and, very likely, in some way, to the Province of Quebec—there is a single petition from any one of the inhabitants of one of those localities, asking for the passage of such a measure as this is. I will take my own river by way of illustration, a river which is, perhaps, 200 miles long. The tidal water runs on one branch about 40 miles from the mouth of the river, on the other branch, perhaps, 45 or 50 miles, and there is a stretch of 100 miles on those branches where the people now have an inalienable right to catch fish under regulations established by the Fishery Department under authority of law, but this Bill will deprive them of the right to fish and set nets. Is this House prepared, at the arbitrary will, and on the recommendation of officers of the department, to pass a Bill that will sweep away, by half-a-dozen lines of print, the rights of thousands of people settled along those rivers? From time immemorial, before the Minister of Marine was thought of, before his immediate ancestor was born, the people along those rivers have enjoyed those rights under regulations, first, of the Local Legislature, to set nets under certain restrictions, namely, that they should not extend more than one-third across the channel in non-tidal waters; and, afterwards, in 1867, when further conditions were imposed, by which there should be a certain distance allowed between the different nets, so that the fish might have a chance to propagate. But this Bill comes in, and at the arbitrary will of the officers of the department, a fishery officer shall have the power to declare that not a net shall be set on the river. Is that the kind of legislation this House will put up with? I have asked information from the hon. gentleman, and he has treated me in a cavalier manner, and in a manner which no man who has been a few months in office should treat an hon. member who has for years occupied a place in this House, and who for years was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and who, because I was not in the House when he made his explanation, now declines to be cross-examined or questioned by myself. If the hon. gentleman intends to conduct business in that way, he will not be a very great success. He will find that sugar will catch more flies than vinegar, and that it is wiser to civilly answer questions put in a civil manner and to furnish the information we have a right to obtain, especially with respect to a measure of this kind which is going to sweep away the riparian rights of thousands of people in the Maritime Provinces who have to-day an inalienable right to the fishing I think this House will never consent to a measure of that sweeping character; certainly it will not do so before we obtain an explanation as to the authority in which this is proposed to be done; whether the people have requested it, whether any petitions have been presented, and I am ready to say now and I do believe that not a single petition from a single inhabitant of the Maritime Provinces has been presented requesting that this Bill should pass into law. I endorse what has been said by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis), and the hon. member for the county of St. John (Mr. Weldon), that this is a measure no doubt inspired by the sporting men of the country, by the fly fishermen, by the men who obtain leases of the fishing, by the men who get the exclusive right from the Local Legislature to fish with the fly in the different rivers of the Province, because the Province has the right to lease these fishing privileges. We have no power to control them, the courts have decided that question; and these men, who are mostly foreigners from the United States and elsewhere, come in to prevent the settlers—the men born on the soil, whose ancestors have enjoyed these rights and exercised them for generations—now enjoying the fishing privileges; and we are asked to permit all their rights to be swept away simply because a few foreign fishermen come in to fish during four or five weeks each year, and who desire to keep the rivers supplied with fish for their sport in remuneration of the small payment they make. It is, however, far more important for the country that the men who have enjoyed these privileges, and who have an inalienable right to them, should not be deprived of getting fish to feed their families. I shall be one of the last men who would desire to destroy the fisheries of our rivers. I know as much about them and a little more than does the hon. Minister, for it is a matter to which I gave great attention during the period I held office as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and both before and since that period; and I contend that the fisheries of our country are as well protected to-day as they ever were, that there are no abuses existing that cannot be easily remedied, and, I believe, that with the guardianship we have upon the rivers now, there is no necessity for depriving the people who have inalienable rights to the privilege of fishing, of taking the fish as food for themselves and their families, or for purposes of trade. There is a stretch on the river which runs through my county for 60 miles above tidal water, where every farmer has ten, fifteen, or twenty fathoms of net run into the river, not an illimitable quantity, but a quantity according to the regulations laid down by the department over which the hon. gentleman presides. It is proposed, without any explanation from the hon. Minister, to pass a measure which will take away this right, and I ask the House never to pass such a measure. It is an outrageous measure, and one to

which the House should never consent; and I trust it will not pass it, certainly without some explanation which we have not yet obtained.

Mr. TUPPER. Perhaps it would be as well to dispose of the outrageous feature of this measure at the outset, and I think the hon. gentleman will find, if he will take the trouble to look at the speeches he made in this House, that one of the best arguments in favor of the Bill now under consideration was made by himself in 1883 when a Bill was introduced with this clause, was passed in this House without division, then went to the Senate, was there passed and sent back. As I explained the other day when the hon. gentleman was not here, this Bill is framed to meet the same circumstances and the same conditions the former Bill was intended to meet. The hon. gentleman spoke, as he nearly always does, under great excitement and made statements to-day, and in order to induce the House to accept them as worthy of reflection, he dwelt on the fact that he was experienced and had filled the office of Minister of Marine and Fisheries for some time, and was, therefore, able to speak on that subject. I prefer his calmer, clearer reasoning in 1883 to the statement he has made to-day in anger, simply because I did not see fit to be cross-examined on the third reading of the Bill, when I had explained it fully in committee. In 1883 the hon. gentleman understood the subject, and he has evidently forgotten it, because he now seems to think that we are perpetrating an outrage upon the fishermen of this Province in passing legislation of this character through the House. I am able to tell that hon. gentleman that up to 1883 he thought that this very legislation was the law of the land, and the litigation in the courts of New Brunswick actually arose over a license signed by his own hand, and executed by him as Minister of Marine, granting those valuable fisheries which he now wishes the riparian owner to enjoy undisturbed and uncontrolled—granting those fisheries for the purpose of fly fishing. The hon. gentleman will find, if he looks up the discussion which took place in 1883, that when the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries (the present Minister of Customs) had charge of the Bill the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) took this legal ground that he has taken to-day, and mentioned, as he has now mentioned, the points that have been raised in the courts additional to those which have been judicially pronounced upon. The hon. gentleman from St. John then argued the legal phase of this question, and the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Bowell) was supported in a very clear and very able argument by the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). I will read some of the hon. gentleman's remarks, as he has forgotten, apparently, what they were.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have not forgotten a line of them.

Mr. TUPPER Then the hon. gentleman must think that every one else has forgotten it. Before quoting the hon. gentleman I may say that from 1867 up to 1882 the department had proceeded upon the idea that the Act should be construed as this Bill seeks now to have it construed, and on that idea the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and his successors acted in controlling those non-tidal waters, and so preventing the spawning beds of the salmon being overfished or unduly fished. The member for Northumberland acted under this impression, and the courts intervened and said that while that was true and while that was the meaning of the Act in every river but those in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, in consequence of the section which I propose to amend, yet the non-tidal rivers of those two Provinces were entirely exempt from the operations of the Act. A Bill similar to this was introduced then, and the hon. member for Northumberland, instead of abusing the Minister of the day, instead of cross-questioning him, instead of making charges that he was endeavoring to perpetrate an outrage, or that he was favoring one class of people against another, supported that Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. What lease was it? Was it the Rowe or Robinson lease?

Mr. TUPPER. How many leases did the hon. gentleman grant?

Mr. MITCHELL. I will answer the hon. gentleman when I get a chance.

Mr. TUPPER. That was the lease granted to Mr. Robinson in 1874. The member for Northumberland then said:

"I may say, of course, it is necessary that legislation should be had with regard to the fisheries, and that the Dominion statute which governs them should be amended and altered, so as to suit what is now believed to be the law of the land."

As I have before explained, he believed this present Bill to be the law of the land. And he continues:

"But which is very different from what was believed to be the law of the land some time ago."

He continued to say:

"I think the Ministry deserve credit for endeavoring to meet the case as it has arisen, but it is a difficult one, indeed."

The hon. gentleman goes on to review those difficulties, and to meet the legal contentions of the member for St. John, with regard to the matter.

Mr. MITCHELL. Better read my remarks.

Mr. TUPPER. I have read them, and the hon. gentleman will find them quite instructive, but as I agreed with all that he said, or most of it, I will not trouble the House further than to quote the following:—

"I think it is not unwise, and that my hon. friend from the County of St. John, on consideration, will see, that between the choice of two evils, whether we shall allow unlimited fishing by these proprietors or require of all persons desirous of fishing, having a proprietary right to fish, to go to the Government and ask for a license, and that whether one horn or the other of the dilemma be adopted, I think my hon. friend will say that, in the interests of the protection of the fisheries, it is better to trust the Government of the day, whoever they may be, than to allow the unlimited fishing which proprietors will naturally exercise if no restrictions are placed upon them."

And so on in that direction, and the effect of the hon. gentleman's moderate and calm advice was to induce the House, without division, to pass this Bill. This Bill which is now before the House contains the same clause as the previous Bill on which the hon. gentleman then spoke. It is unnecessary for me now to reply to the points which the hon. gentleman has raised, for they were raised in committee when the hon. gentleman was absent, but in a little less vigorous fashion than they were raised by him to-day. In reply to the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), I might state that he seems to have mistaken the object which the Government have in view in connection with this legislation. I am able to tell him that instead of this being simply in the interests of fly fishermen who pay their fees, not to us, but to Local Government, and from whom we do not get any revenue at all, I may tell him that this Bill is in the interests of all the tidal fisheries. This Bill is intended to preserve to the fishermen on the tidal waters the salmon fishery, because it goes without saying that if unlimited and uncontrolled netting is allowed to go on, on the spawning ground of the salmon above the tidal waters the salmon fisheries will become absolutely destroyed. I would give to the hon. member for St. John statistics to show that in the River St. John, to which he alluded, the fact of allowing the law to stand as it now stands, and of allowing unrestricted netting in the spawning grounds of the salmon, is every day more clearly seen to be to the detriment of the fishermen, and that not merely in the non-tidal part of the river, but in the tidal portion of the river itself. For in-

stance, taking the four counties in which the tidal portion of the river is situated, St. John, King's, Queen's and Sunbury, the catch in 1887 was 197,252 pounds, and in 1888 it was 173,365 pounds, or a decrease of 23,887 pounds. Now, in the counties where the river is non-tidal, York, Carleton and Victoria, the catch in 1887 was 52,448 pounds, and in 1888, 29,250 pounds, or a decrease of 23,198 pounds.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Can you give us the particulars of the harbor fisheries?

Mr. TUPPER. No, I have not the returns for the harbor with me. But that is sufficient, I think, to show that there is a serious and alarming decrease in those very waters where this astonishing practice is carried on. Can the hon. gentleman who knows so much, and who ill brooks any difference of opinion from his own on fishery matters, name any country outside of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to-day where it is allowed to net salmon in the spawning beds, either for the pretended benefit of the riparian proprietor or the residents, or anybody else. It is an anomaly which exists there, and which was never intended to exist, and which that hon. gentleman himself has explained in this House has never been entertained as a construction of our legislation from the beginning down to 1883; and the officers in the department under him have continually urged upon the department since that time that unless some legislation of this character were introduced, these fisheries would be completely ruined. So there is no radical change proposed. There is only an interpretation of this Act in the sense in which the Government intended it should be read in 1883, and before that time. In reference to the point raised by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), I would submit briefly, as he himself admits, that the courts have not gone so far in the contention that was raised in this case, that he, I believe, is not prepared seriously to argue that the British North America Act, and under it, our right to regulate the fisheries, would make it *ultra vires*, or impossible for this Parliament legally to pass legislation for the avowed and sole object of regulating and preserving the fisheries. If we have no power in this Parliament to pass a regulation of this kind, then all our regulations should go by the board which have in view a restriction of fishing. There is not an absolute and total denial of the right to fish above the tide, because, although that subject is not mentioned in this Bill, the Act, when read with it, leaves this state of things, that where it will not injure the spawning beds of the salmon, or where salmon can be fished above the tide, without injury to the tidal fisheries, it will be seen that the next section, providing for a license being obtained from the Minister of Marine, such as was given heretofore, would prevent the recovery of a penalty and a successful prosecution.

Mr. ELLIS. By the legislation which the hon. gentleman has proposed, the sixth section, giving the right to issue a license, will no longer apply.

Mr. TUPPER. I am not referring to the sixth section. I am referring to the next section, and the only section in the Act, not in the Bill, which provides for the recovery of a penalty. As the hon. gentleman will see, the Bill before the House does not in its terms refer to a penalty, and before any disastrous effect would occur to the person fishing where fishing is prohibited, it would be necessary to show that he had no license, because the penalty is for fishing in those prohibited waters without license and without permission. So that, even in that respect, the hon. gentleman has not been able to make good the point that by this Bill absolute prohibition is enacted, that will prevent the setting of a net or fishing for salmon by nets in a non-tidal portion of the river. With reference to the other matter alluded to, it is not, perhaps, necessary to speak at great length; that is, a portion of the general Act which enables fishery officers to fix the point where the tidal water ends and the non-tidal water begins. That was considered long ago necessary for the purpose of certainty, for the benefit of the fishermen concerned, as well as the more easy carrying out of these regulations. Instead of leaving the matter to be decided in the courts of law, where the expense of expert testimony, witnesses, etc., would be incurred, the Legislature decided in the original Bill that it would be wise to enable the officers to determine the character of the waters, and to define them; and in practice that provision has not been unduly exercised, but it is exercised at any time in reason. The effort is to find as near as may be where the waters meet, and that point is fixed and determined upon. I think I have covered, in a very summary way, the points raised. This subject, if fully discussed, would take much longer time than the House is, perhaps, prepared to give to it; but I am glad to know that even if these points have been briefly discussed, they were considered carefully by Parliament before. We make the system uniform by this Bill. It is the system that now obtains in all the other Provinces besides Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and it is not an unpopular system. It is a system which has worked well, and which the Government from 1867 to 1882 supposed to be in force throughout the Dominion.

Mr. MITCHELL. Would the hon. gentleman please read that portion of the speech he referred to, in which I expressed a different view from what I do now? for he has not read it yet.

Mr. TUPPER. I read the portion of the speech which I think established the statements I made. I will send the hon. gentleman the *Hansard*, and I have no doubt the House will be willing to hear his explanation of it.

Mr. KIRK. When this question was before the House a few days ago, I asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if it was the intention of the Bill to prohibit the catching of salmon with nets in other than tidal waters, and his answer was yes, it would be confined to tidal waters.

Mr. TUPPER. That is what the Bill states.

Mr. KIRK. If I understood the Minister correctly, he has stated just now that the Government have the right to issue licenses to fish in those waters. The Bill has only one clause, but it means a great deal:

"The use of nets or other apparatus for the capture of salmon shall be confined to tidal waters, and any fishery officer may determine the length and place of each net or other apparatus used in any of the waters of Canada."

According to this Bill, it is quite clear that nets cannot be set in waters other than tidal waters in the Dominion of Canada, and the fishery overseers are given the power of saying how long the net shall be. I did not know that they had that power before. There is a provision in this law which prohibits the use of swing nets. That is in the old law, so that it is not an alteration. Now, it appears to me, and it has been the feeling always in Nova Scotia, that the law was oppressive and has been always quite stringent enough. In the ninth section, the law provides that in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick salmon shall not be taken between the 15th of August and the 1st of March. At all other seasons of the year, no salmon shall be taken. That is a very stringent law. There is only a short season in Nova Scotia when salmon can be caught, April, May, June and July, four months; and we are prohibited from catching fish with nets during the remaining eight months. I am firm in the belief that if the officers of the Government were made to do their duty, as they should, the salmon would be quite sufficiently protected under the present law. In sub-section 7, section 8, the law requires that nets shall not be set closer to each

other than 250 yards, and the officers have the power to determine that the nets shall be set at a greater distance apart than 250 yards. It also provides that nets shall not be set within 200 yards of the mouth of any stream, nor in pools where salmon come to spawn. These are very stringent provisions which, if properly enforced, would sufficiently protect the salmon. But they are not enforced. The officers, as a general rule, are only noted for drawing their salaries. The salmon are thus allowed to be destroyed in consequence of the dilatoriness of the officers of the department. It does appear to me that it is about time for this Government to cease restricting the liberties of the people, whom they are driving away by their legislation as fast as they can. The hon. the Minister of Marine was scarcely appointed to that office when he passed an order forbidding the dropping of sawdust into the streams from saw mills, and closed down nearly all the mills in the Province of Nova Scotia in the interests of the salmon fisheries. What is to become of the men who work in the woods at the lumber business? They will have to leave the country. Having driven these men away, he now proposes to drive others away by prohibiting them from catching salmon. He ought to know that the farmers who came and settled on these streams did not come because of the value of the land, in many cases, but because the streams afforded them the means of providing food and support for their families, and in this way they enjoyed the privilege of fishing for salmon up to the present. Now, we are to be told that they are not to catch for their own table. It is a monstrous proposition, and the hon. gentleman will find it is considered monstrous when he comes down among the people who are in the habit of fishing salmon.

Mr. BURNS. In the remarks I am about to make on this subject, I will not attempt to deal with the constitutional question involved. That is a matter I leave to the determination of the legal minds of the House, but more especially to the determination of the law officers of the Government, who, I presume, gave it serious consideration before introducing this Bill. I desire to express an opinion entirely different from that expressed by the hon. member for Northumberland, whose opinion I have a very great respect for, but who, I am afraid, has allowed his somewhat bellicose disposition this evening to run away with his judgment. For the purpose of making a point, he has named to the House several rivers, which impliedly would be affected by the operations of this Bill. He has named the Richibucto the Buctouche, Tabusintac, Kouchibouguac—and he might have gone on and cited a number of others in which there are no salmon at all. On the whole north shore of New Brunswick there are only two salmon rivers, in any portion of which nets have been set, namely, the Restigouche and the Miramichi. Now, the opinion I have to express, and it is an opinion I have formed after careful observation, and can express with confidence, is that it is materially necessary, in the interests of the salmon fisheries of the northern part of New Brunswick especially—I do not propose to deal with the River St. John, because I am not so familiar with that locality—that fishing by nets should be prohibited in non-tidal waters. To day I believe there are in the Restigouche only two or three nets above the point called the head of the tide. On the Miramichi there are perhaps a larger number, but whether that number be great or small, in the interests of the coast fishery, which is the commercial salmon fishery of New Brunswick, it is absolutely essential and necessary that fishing by net should be prohibited in non-tidal waters. The number of fish that have been caught in the nets above tidal waters may not be very large, but they are usually caught at the season of the year when they are full of spawn. If it is necessary to protect the spawning grounds at all, it is necessary to prohibit the use of nets. It has been stated that this legislation is introduced at the instance and for the benefit of sportsmen. Well, I have no particular prejudice in favor of so-called sportsmen, in favor of those who come from abroad and monopolize our streams because they may happen to have more money than those who live on them; but I will do them this justice, that to the sportsmen a very considerable amount of credit is due for the manner in which they contribute to the protection of the streams. It is in their interest that the streams should be protected, and the fish allowed to propagate. It is also in the interests of the Provinces that this legislation should be passed, because anything you can do to enhance the value of the up-river fisheries, the fly fisheries, will be a benefit to the Province. So that not only from a provincial, but from a Dominion and a commercial standpoint, there are important reasons why this legislation should go through. As regards the last provision of the Bill, which prohibits the use of swing nets in catching of salmon, I must confess I was considerably alarmed when I first read the Bill, but my apprehensions have been removed by statements from the Minister of Marine and his deputy, that the term swing nets used in the Bill is not meant to apply to that part of salmon nets which are commonly called swings. On every stand of salmon nets, there are certain portions or extensions from the main net which are called swings, and naturally the salmon fishermen on the coast were considerably alarmed on reading this Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman state what he means by swing nets?

Mr. BURNS. If the Minister permits me, I will give the definition of it. It is a net fastened at one end, loose at the other end, with the exception that it may be perhaps kept from moving to a great distance by a line fastening it. In other words, one end being fastened, the other end is at liberty to swing right or left to a certain distance. So that term of swing nets cannot apply to the swings now used in connection with the salmon nets; in fact this provision has been in the Fishery Act for the last twenty years, and, therefore, no apprehension can be felt on that score. If I had not received that explanation and that definition and had not found that the term had been in the Act for the last twenty years, I should have felt it my duty to my constituents to oppose this Bill, but because my apprehensions have been allayed, and I believe it is very necessary in the interests of the coast salmon fisheries of New Brunswick, that fishing with nets in non-tidal waters should be prohibited, I shall vote for the Bill.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain, in a few words, the vote I am going to give on this matter. I find in the Revised Statutes the Fishery Act, section 8, sub-section 5, the general law of the country that excepts from its effects the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and the lakes in the Province of Ontario. I am at a loss to understand the grounds for such an exception—because we should have a general law for the whole Dominion—and there was not a single reason why those Provinces, in so far as fisheries are concerned, should not be under the general law of the country. Therefore, I shall vote for the amendment moved by the hon. gentleman. I wish it to be understood that I am expressing no opinion on the question of jurisdiction and should that question be brought up, I should have further remarks to offer to the House. The sawdust matter was also brought up. I, for one, am opposed to sawdust being let in the rivers by mill owners, in so far as it tends to destroy the fish. I shall, therefore, favor any law that will prevent sawdust being thrown in the rivers. We could not guard the fishing by too many wise measures, for the fish is rapidly decreasing in our inland waters. Our rivers fall into larger rivers or into the

sea and serve as tributaries to the larger rivers or receive fish from them; and if you do not protect it at the mouth of the river, you diminish its quantity. It is an important source of wealth for the Dominion and we ought to preserve it by every possible means. I shall, therefore, vote for the amendment moved by the hon. Minister.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The Minister will recollect that, up to the year 1882, the Dominion claimed the exclusive right to deal with riparian owners, but in the case of the Queen against Robertson, which I argued before the Supreme Court, the point was raised, and it was decided in favor of the riparian proprietor. I contend that the effect of this Act is simply to destroy that right. First, I say, that this is not within the power of the Dominion Parliament; and secondly, it interferes with property and civil rights, and I think it is very important that it should be considered in that view. You must take this Act in connection with other sections of the old Act. The Act in the Revised Statutes is simply the old Act of 1868, which was passed when the Parliament of Canada supposed they had a right to deal with these matters. My hon. friend has said that the penalty cannot be enforced, because a man can get a license to fish above the tidal waters; but my hon. friend must see that, when he has eliminated that provision as to a license, the fishery officer has no power to grant a license, because Parliament will have declared that no nets, or other apparatus, can be used at all in non-tidal waters. The next clause says he shall not fish without a license, except with a rod and line, in the manner known as fly surface fishing. So, unless he can fish with a fly, he is prohibited from fishing in non-tidal waters, and all the rights which the courts have held as incident to a man's right of property are taken away.

Mr TUPPER. Supposing this Bill became law, and a prosecution was undertaken against a party for fishing in non-tidal waters, and the defendant produced a license under the next section of the Act, could the penalty be recovered?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I say yes, and I will show my hon. friend why. Take sub-section 6 of section 7 of the 31st Victoria, chapter 60. The hon. gentleman repeals sub section 5 altogether. Sub-section 6 declares that:

"The use of nets or other apparatus which capture salmon shall, except in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, be confined to tidal waters; and any fishery officer may determine the length and place of each net or other apparatus used in any of the waters of the Dominion."

So far, my hon. friend's amendment is precisely the same as this Act, eliminating the exception in favor of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, but then it goes on:

"Provided, that nothing contained in this section shall prevent the use of nets for catching salmon in the lakes of the Province of Ontario, nor preclude the Minister from authorising, by special fishery licenses or leases, the capture of salmon by nets in fresh water streams."

That proviso is taken away, and you must read sub-section 7 in connection with that.

"The Minister, or any fishery officer authorised to such effect, shall have power to define the tidal boundary of estuary fishing for the purposes of this Act; and above the actual limit so to be laid down, it shall be unlawful without the special fishery lease or license, above provided for."

Mr. TUPPER If my hon. friend will allow me, I would point out to him that while he is quite right in saying that the immediately preceding section will be gone, the words "above provided for" will not refer to that, but they will refer to the beginning of the Act, which provides for the granting of leases and licenses.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Here is sub-section 5, which the Minister eliminates from the Act.

Mr. TUPPER. You have read that.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I will read it from the Revised Statutes:

"The use of nets or other apparatus for the capture of salmon shall, except in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, be confined to tidal waters, and any fishery officer may determine the length and place of each net or other apparatus used in any of the waters of Canada; but nothing contained in this section shall prevent the use of nets for catching salmon in the lakes of the Province of Ontario, or preclude the Minister of Marine and Fisheries from authorising, by special fishery licenses or leases, the capture of salmon by nets in fresh water streams; provided, that no one shall fish for or catch salmon with swing nets in any of the waters of Canada"

What does my hon. friend propose to do? He proposes to repeal that section, and what does he say?

"The use of nets or other apparatus for the capture of salmon shall be confined to tidal waters, and any fishery officer may determine the length and place of each net or other apparatus used in any of the waters of Canada; provided, that no one shall fish for or catch salmon with swing nets in any of the waters of Canada."

So the proviso as to special fishery licenses has disappeared. Then how can my hon. friend say that the Minister or any other officer can issue a license to set a net without a special fishery license? I say that, under the present Act, no Minister nor fishery officer can over-ride the law. The law says that no net shall be used in tidal waters in those Provinces except under the authority of licenses, which are repealed, so there can be no fishing by nets or by any other apparatus, not even by hook and line. The effect will be that in the River St. John no fishing can be done between the mouth of the river and the junction of the River Tobique, a distance of 220 miles; no man can put a net or cast a line in that river. My hon. friend has stated that in York county in one year there were 52,000 fish caught, and in another year 29,000. In the counties of King's and Queen's, 190,000 were caught one year, and 150,000 the next year. My hon. friend cited these statistics for the purpose of showing that salmon fishing was diminishing. No doubt one year may be better than another, but, on the whole, there has been but little diminution. Then, again, in the harbor of St. John there is a large fishery going on, likewise in the Bay of Fundy. But I take these statistics to show that the people who catch salmon in the River St. John, in the counties which are not spawning grounds, will be deprived by this law of the right to take a single salmon. It does not touch the spawning ground at all. It has been pointed out by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) and the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Kirk), that the people have had these rights all along. They have held these rights by virtue of the ownership of the river bank, and the effect of this will be to prevent them from fishing except by rod in any part where the Minister chooses to decide that the waters are tidal waters. It seems to me that this is an infringement on the rights of parties. We find that it was contended under the 19th rule which was issued in June, 1879, by the department, that fishing for salmon except under the authority of a lease or license, was forbidden. It was contended that that was not the prohibition but only a regulation of the fishery. But the Chief Justice, in the case of Delaney *vs.* McDonald, said this:

"I do not so read it. But admitting that it might be so construed, I cannot find anything in the Act giving the Minister of Marine the authority to require a person who has by law the exclusive right of fishing, to take out a license to fish in front of his own land."

Now, I say the effect of all this will be to deprive a number of people of rights which they have heretofore exercised. I think it is a good deal, as the hon. member for Guysborough said, that the officers are not as active as they ought to be in protecting the fisheries. My hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Burns) spoke about other rivers which are salmon

fisheries In those rivers the salmon fisheries were destroyed to a large extent before Confederation by the numerous mills on the large streams. He speaks of the Restigouche, and he says there were only three rivers where salmon are caught, the Restigouche, the Miramichi and Nepisiguet. The Restigouche and the Nepisiguet empty into the Bay of Chaleur, and both are practically owned by individuals who do not allow anybody there except fly fishermen. The Nepisiguet is owned by a St. John club, and the Restigouche by a New York club; and except a few proprietors like Mr. McDonald, there are but few riparian owners, so that these rivers are, practically, given up to fly-fishermen. I have heard people complain of the nets put by the fishermen outside of the Bay of Chaleur, and assert were it not for the regulations which compel the nets to be taken up from Saturday night to Monday morning, the river fisheries would be entirely destroyed. The Miramichi River flows through the county of Northumberland, and on a large portion of it there are many people who earn their living from these fisheries. The spawning grounds are above. The people outside of the mouth of the river or in the harbor of St. John catch the fish on their passage up or down. The feeling among the people is that this will be a great injustice to them; and having looked into this matter carefully, I believe that their feeling is well founded.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to an explanation. In relation to this matter the hon. Minister of Marine has chosen to say that I have spoken with a good deal of temper. Well, Sir, it is not a matter of suprise that I should speak with some temper when I find the livelihood of a large portion of the people of my county taken away by an arbitrary Act like this. I do not think I spoke with unusual warmth, but, if I did so, I think this House will excuse me under the circumstances. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman refused to give me the explanations which I asked of him before I made any remarks at all. He refused to tell me whether any single individual on the whole of these rivers had asked for this Bill, and he very flippantly replied that I was absent from my place when the Bill was in committee, that he had given the explanation there and would not give them again. He did more. He took up a speech made by me in 1883.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman rose to speak, giving as a reason that he wished to make a personal explanation. I would remind him that what he is saying now is not a personal explanation.

Mr. MITCHELL. I was coming to it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If there is any objection, I move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. MITCHELL. I may say that I did not rise to speak under false pretences. I was coming to the explanation, I was approaching it when I stated that the Minister quoted a speech made by myself in 1883, when I was endeavoring to protect the fisheries of the country against the extreme view taken by the hon. gentleman from the County of St. John in relation to what the law was. He quoted from my speech, and he said that the member for Northumberland had better read that speech and refresh his memory, and he spoke in that flippant manner which he is apt to use in this House. He quoted—what? He quoted two short paragraphs of a speech, four columns in length, and I challenge any one to say whether my speech would warrant the assumption which the hon. gentleman drew, and by which he tried to mislead this House as to what my opinions were at that time. Sir, I have no hesitation in saying that the inference the hon. gentleman drew from that printed speech in the *Hansard* was an unfair one, an unjust one, an untrue one. My object on that occasion was to stand by the Ministry of the day and to help them to preserve some kind of control over the net fishing of the country. The contention of the hon. gentleman from the county of St. John on that occasion went to show that inasmuch as the courts of the land had decided in the case of the Queen *vs* Robertson, that the whole system of proprietary rights was changed by the decision of the court, the Government had no power to issue licenses and practically had no control over the fisheries of the country. My contention, on the other hand, was that it was necessary for the safety of these fisheries that the Government should preserve some control in some way, not to take away the rights of the people, but to regulate the exercise of those rights, the manner of setting nets, the length of the nets and the period during which these nets should be set. I will not take up the time of the House by reading that speech at length, but I will tell the hon. gentleman now that he cannot find a single line in it from start to finish that will sustain the position he endeavored to lead this House to believe that I had taken on that occasion. The hon. gentleman had better be a little more accurate in his statements in the future when he attempts to put words in the mouth of a man who knows what he is talking about. I did not forget the statement I made on that occasion, and as his father said, in giving testimony the other day, so I say, that "I never said it, because it was not true." That is the statement the hon. gentleman's father made the other day, and it is the statement I make now. I know I could not have said it, because it was not true. Now, Sir, my hon. friend has chosen to refer to the case of Robertson *vs.* the Queen, and he has chosen to bring my name into it in connection with the matter. The hon. gentleman says that the whole question of the fisheries was determined, and determined against the Dominion while I was Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That is not true. It was settled by the courts years after I left office. When, in 1867, I came into the position of Minister and organised the Department of Marine and Fisheries, I found a certain state of the law existing, under which the department issued licenses to permit fishermen to fish. I continued that condition. I always had my doubts as to the right of the Government to exercise the control which they professed to exercise as against the riparian rights of the people. But I found that condition of the law in existence, and it was continued without trouble and without contest. But in regard to the case which the hon. gentleman has quoted, Robertson *vs.* the Queen, let him look at the law. It is a case arising on my own river, and I reserved by a special clause, if my memory serves me correctly, the riparian rights to individual owners along the river. Does that show any desire to abandon the riparian rights of the people? I repeat that the House will find that I reserved the rights to the proprietors of the property to fish off their own land. The hon. gentleman will not find a single reference, not only in 1883 but in any year, where I deviated in any particular from the position I assumed and the position I occupy at this moment. What I did contend against then, I contend against now. Here is the distinction I made at that time:

"And I think it not unwise that my hon. friend from the County of St. John, on consideration, will see that between the choice of two evils, whether we shall allow unlimited fishing by these proprietors, or require of all persons desirous of fishing, having proprietary right to fish, to go to the Government and ask for a license, and that whether one horn or other of the dilemma be adopted, I think that my hon. friend will say that, in the interest of the protection of the fisheries, it is better to trust to the Government of the day, whoever they may be, than to allow the unlimited fishing which proprietors will naturally exercise if no restriction be placed upon them."

That is the contention I made at that time. It is the contention I make now, not that the Government have the right to deprive the owners of the rights to fish—they have no right to do that, but they have the right to say that they shall fish under certain restrictions and in a certain way. That was my contention at that time, and I have not varied

it in any particular, notwithstanding the attempt of the hon. gentleman to misrepresent what I have said here to-day. I feel in this matter that it is due to the people of my constituency that I should say a word or two in reply to the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns). The hon. gentleman says he is in favor of the terms of the Bill. I am not surprised at the hon. gentleman being in favor of the conditions of the Bill, because there are very few riparian-right fishermen on his river, as the tidal flow of the River Nipisiguit is very short, while on my river there is a tidal flow from its mouth of 40 to 50 miles and above that there is 100 miles of river, probably 70 of which is settled more or less, where the people own the land on its banks and have from time immemorial set nets. What was contended during the administration from 1867 to 1873, and what was carried out by everyone of the Ministers from that day to this, was this: That those people should fish under restrictions and regulations laid down by the department, under authority given by Parliament, and that they should only set nets out of tidal waters, one-third the distance across the river. That has been the law from time immemorial, it is a law which has been carried out to the satisfaction of the people. The hon. gentleman has spoken about spawning beds. Much he knows about spawning beds in rivers! The fish do not spawn in the main branch of the Miramichi within many miles of the head of the tide; and are the people for 50 miles to be deprived of fishing in the river, because the fish go past their lands to spawn? The hon. gentleman was speaking on a subject of which he knows very little, and he should study up the details of his department before he endeavors to make statements against and criticise speeches of hon. gentlemen who know much more than he does. The Bill should not pass into law. A still further reason why it should not pass is contained in the fifth section, which reads:

"5. The use of nets or other apparatus for the capture of salmon shall be confined to tidal waters, and any fishery officer may determine the length and place of each net or other apparatus used in any of the waters of Canada; provided that no one shall fish for or catch salmon with swing nets in any of the waters of Canada."

I object to that clause of the Bill. The law from time immemorial has provided that from the mouth of the Miramichi up to the head of tidal water the people shall have the liberty to set nets; and the several distances were fixed by metes and bounds. That right was established 100 years ago and has been exercised ever since with entire satisfaction; and yet it is now proposed to take these privileges out of the hands of the people, supersede the law, and place them in the hands of a fishery officer. This Act will undoubtedly lead to enormous difficulty with the fishermen. It will be an act of injustice and of unfairness to place such power in the hands of men who are not always too fit to exercise it, and in the hands of men who may be animated by spleen, or animosity, or political antagonism, because that comes in as a strong element in the matter in a way that should not be allowed. If this Bill passes into law the hon. gentleman is throwing into the fishing districts of the country an amount of trouble which will not be easily allayed.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not think by loud talking and using language, which I am very glad to say is used by hardly any other hon. gentleman in the House across the floor, that the hon. gentleman will be able to escape from the very pitiable position in which I have been able to place him to-day. I am glad to see the hon. gentleman endeavoring to crawl out of the position in which he found himself, and where he was pinned by that very speech from which I quoted, and from which the hon. gentleman dare not quote at as great length as I have done.

Mr. MITCHELL. Read any part of it.

Mr. TUPPER. I quoted much of the hon. gentleman's statement in 1883, more than the hon. gentleman dare quote. Before the hon. gentleman undertakes to charge any hon. gentleman with misleading the House by references from *Hansard*, he should be able to get a better case under his hand than this, and he ought to be able to show the House from that speech wherein I misrepresent him.

Mr. MITCHELL. I say you did not prove anything from my speech.

Mr. TUPPER. If I wish to convict the hon. gentleman of trifling, or attempting to trifle with the intelligence of this House, I would occupy more time in reading from that speech.

Mr. MITCHELL. I defy you; you dare not.

Mr. TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman is not attempting to bully some one in this House he is endeavoring to trifle with their patience every day in the Session, but I am not now going to trifle with the patience of the House by reading any more of his speech from *Hansard*.

Mr. MITCHELL. Go on; read the speech.

Mr. TUPPER. We have enough of the hon. gentleman's speeches in the *Hansard* and in this House. We have had them *ad nauseam*, but I have the satisfaction of knowing that he cannot refer to one sentence of this speech of his to sustain the position which he has taken to-day and which is absolutely inconsistent with the position he took before. I defy the hon. gentleman to contradict me in saying that he supported a Bill containing provisions of this character and that he supported, in that speech of 1883 which is there for any one that cares to read it, the arguments which I have made to-day in favor of this Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not support what you say; I dare you to read the speech.

Mr. TUPPER. I am very glad to say, that any hon. gentleman who cares to follow up this very interesting enquiry, has the proof at hand. I wanted to show to the House, the lamentable ignorance of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mitchell) who is attempting to instruct us on the fishery question. He thinks, because that he was a party to the establishment of the navy, during his occupancy of the office of Minister of Marine, that he alone ought be an authority upon fishery questions. If the hon. gentleman seeks to keep the reputation he made years ago, when, as he says, he found it his duty to support the Government of the day, he had better say very little on fishery questions, if he has nothing further to instruct the House on than the points he endeavored to make in this debate. Take the lease of Robinson, signed and sealed by the hon. gentleman, and it shows how inconsistent his position is to-day. He is the great defender—is he?—of those enjoying riparian rights. But did he, in that lease, protect them in what he calls the enjoyment of their rights, and insert a provision, allowing them to fish for salmon in the non-tidal portions of the river? No. The hon. gentleman took the position then, that we take to-day, in this Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman allow me one word?

Several hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TUPPER. I will quote the provisions in the hon. gentleman's lease. I know the hon. gentleman feels uneasy, for I have the record here, and it is not a question of my word or his, but it is a question of record. It is a question of *Hansard* in one case, and of the lease in the other, signed by that hon. gentleman himself when he was Minister of Fisheries. That provision of the lease says:

"Provided always, that actual settlers shall enjoy the privilege of fishing with a rod and line in manner known as fly surface fisheries in front of their own properties."

And yet after this the hon. gentleman tells the House that the Minister is ignorant, that fish do not go there to spawn, and that this is an invasion of riparian rights. I have shown the ridiculous position in which the hon. gentleman stands in two matters. Let me continue it. I will show the House how much we can depend on that hon. gentleman's great knowledge and great experience, when it comes to a question of temper. The hon. gentleman says that this outrageous Bill contains another more objectionable clause than the one which has been under discussion, and he says it is a terrible thing that any fishery officer may determine the length and place of each net or other apparatus used in the waters of Canada. That was the law in the hon. gentleman's own time.

Mr. MITCHELL. No, Sir.

Mr. TUPPER. That is the law on the Statute-book. That is the law of the Revised Statutes, and the hon. gentleman, if he wishes, can easily see that this is the law that he, himself, administered, or was bound to administer.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is not the law.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says it is not the law, and I do not wish to take up the time of the House by further contradictions. I appeal this time, in proof of what I say, not to the *Hansard*, not to the lease of the hon. gentleman, but I appeal to the statutes themselves, and he will find that, in that respect, there is no alteration, proposed, or suggested, in the present law of this country. The hon. gentleman is very fond of having the adjournment of the House moved, in order to display his wonderful erudition, and to show, if he can, the ignorance of any hon. gentleman who dares to differ from him. I think the next time he ventures to make an explanation of this kind, he should take more time, and exercise more patience, in a careful and calm deliberation of the question.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to one explanation.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have a right to speak when I am misrepresented. The hon. gentleman quotes the lease in which I expressly reserved the riparian right of fly-fishing. The right of net fishing is regulated by the statute and requires no regulation. I stated that I had this reservation in the lease, although I only spoke from memory of a transaction that took place years ago. With reference to this provision which he says I objected to, about giving the fishery officer power to regulate the length of the nets, I may tell him that by statute that has existed for over 70 years. The net fishing from the mouth of the river upward is limited by metes and bounds which cannot be got over.

House divided:

YEAS:
Messieurs

Armstrong,	Edwards,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Eisenhauer,	Meigs,
Barron,	Ellis,	Mills (Bothwell),
Beausoleil,	Fiset,	Mitchell,
Béchard,	Flynn,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Gauthier,	Neveux,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Guay,	Perry,
Bowman,	Hale,	Platt,
Brien,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burdett,	Innes,	Robertson,
Campbell,	Jones (Halifax),	Rowand,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd)	Kirk,	Ste. Marie,
Casey,	Landerkin,	Scriver,
Casgrain,	Lang,	Semple,
Charlton,	Langelier (Quebec),	Somerville,
Choquette,	Laurier,	Sutherland,
Colter,	Lavergne,	Trow,
Cook,	Lister,	Turcot,
Couture,	Lovitt,	Watson,
Davies,	Macdonald (Huron),	Weldon (St. John),
De St. Georges,	Mackenzie,	Welsh,
Dessaint,	McIntyre,	Wilson (Elgin),
Edgar,	McMillan (Huron),	Yeo.—72.

142

NAYS:
Messieurs

Amyot,	Doyon,	Masson,
Archibald,	Dupont,	Mills (Annapolis),
Audet,	Foster,	Moffat,
Bain (Soulanges),	Freeman,	Moncrieff,
Baird,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Barnard,	Girouard,	O'Brien,
Bergeron,	Godbout,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergin,	Gordon,	Perley,
Boisvert,	Grandbois,	Porter,
Bowell,	Guillet,	Prior,
Brown,	Haggart,	Putnam,
Burns,	Hall,	Riopel,
Cameron,	Hesson,	Roome,
Cargill,	Hickey,	Ross,
Carling,	Ives,	Rykert,
Carpenter,	Joncas,	Scarth,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jones (Digby),	Shanly,
Chouinard,	Kenny,	Skinner,
Cimon,	Kirkpatrick,	Small,
Cochrane,	Labelle,	Smith (Ontario),
Cockburn,	Landry,	Stevenson,
Colby,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Taylor,
Costigan,	La Rivière,	Thérien,
Coughlin,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Thompson (Sir John),
Coulombe,	Macdowall,	Tupper,
Curran,	McCulla,	Tyrwhitt,
Daly,	McDonald (Victoria),	Wallace,
Daoust,	McDougald (Pictou),	Ward,
Davin,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Weldon (Albert),
Davis,	McKay,	White (Cardwell),
Dawson,	McKeen,	White (Renfrew),
Denison,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilmot,
Desaulniers,	McNeill,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Desjardins,	Madill,	Wilson (Lennox),
Dickey,	Mara,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dickinson,	Marshall,	Wright.—108.

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

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT AMENDMENT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 4) further to amend the Revised Statutes, chapter 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Sir John Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will ask the Committee to return to section 2, and to concur in an amendment to the section which I laid on the Table, and which was debated when the Bill was last in Committee. At the request of hon. gentlemen opposite, we agreed that the revising officer should be restricted, as to the information on which he could make up his list, to official records and to statutory declarations. I think the Committee will agree with me that declarations of that kind, made *ex parte*, should not be acted upon for the purpose of striking a name off the roll. I have, therefore, redrafted the section, for the purpose of enabling the revising officer to avail himself of those declarations for the purpose of making additions to the roll, but omitting the provision that he can use them for striking names off the roll. The Committee will remember the various provisions of the Act providing that the party whose name it is proposed to strike off the roll should be given notice, and the leaning is generally in favor of retaining a name on the list. If the revising officer availed himself of the statutory declaration for the purpose of striking off, the burden of proof would be reversed, without any notice being given to the person affected.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it is to be regretted that solemn declarations, based on information or belief, should be admitted. A father may testify as to the qualifi-

cations of a son, and an employer as to the qualifications of a wage-earner, but to permit other persons, upon mere hearsay, which is not recognised in any other court as evidence, to take declarations on information and belief, would be a great misfortune. That would be putting a great number of names, in many cases, upon the lists which ought not to be there, and the expense and difficulty of getting them off would be very great indeed. I think the case my hon. friend from Kent gave, which happened in his own county, is a good illustration of what might take place where declarations of this sort are allowed to be made. I think the hon. gentleman should not admit those declarations as to information and belief, but if he persists in admitting them, he should also provide that, in every case, the person upon whose declaration, based on information and belief, names have been put on the list, should appear at the final revision for the purpose of being cross-examined as to the sources of the information and belief. And in case he should fail to appear, other evidence should be necessary to maintain those names upon the list.

Mr. BURDETT. I would suggest that the hon. Minister should have some mode of preserving the declarations, in order that they may be obtainable by persons who require to use them. These declarations should be filed with the clerk or the revising officer, who would, when necessary, give certified copies. In this way persons who made frivolous declarations could be held up to public ridicule. The declarations should also be drawn up in the same form as affidavits, based on absolute knowledge, which are sworn to, and used in legal proceedings, and an indictment should lie against the party making the declaration in case he did so without reasonable grounds for such knowledge and belief, so that dishonest men on either side should not be in a position to have at will names entered on the list which the opposite party would be put to considerable trouble and expense in getting struck off.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I thought that, having discussed the question of information and belief the other day, we would hardly renew it, at any rate, until the third reading of the Bill, and that by that time my hon. friends opposite, having carefully considered the question, would have withdrawn their objections. We have provided that the revising officer shall be obliged to exhibit those declarations, and shall be obliged to furnish any person with copies who desires the same. As regards the appearing at final revision, the hon. gentleman's amendment would require every person who made a declaration to come and substantiate it, even though the application was not contested.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Only in cases where names were entered on information or belief, and not from personal knowledge.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Even as to those, in many cases there would be no contest at all; and where there is a contest the provisions of the law as to notice to appear and result of non-appearance and subpœna are sufficient.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). When I find cases such as those stated by the hon. member for Kent and the hon. member for South Victoria, I think every precaution should be taken, and it would be better not to accept names on information and belief.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It would be utterly impossible to frame an Act which would prevent wrong decisions, and that appears to have been the case in Kent. I promised to make provision for copies of these lists being sent to postmasters, and, in Prince Edward Island, to secretaries of school districts. I, therefore, propose that sub-section 2 should be amended in that way.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. PLATT. Is there any provision for the distribution of the ten copies for the unsuccessful candidate in case he is dead?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have received a letter to-day which I will read, and the hon. gentleman will see from that how this provision in regard to obtaining information has worked. The writer says:

"I regret to see that one of the proposed amendments to the Franchise Act permits the revising officer to add names to the voters' list on the declarations of information and belief of the declarant. Now, anyone who knows anything of the methods of the Government supporters and unscrupulous revising officers must see the wide door here opened to fraud. Why, in this way John Mason was enabled to add scores of names to the Kent lists in 1886, that, at the expense of several hundred dollars and the time of Mr. Christie and myself for months, we were unable to get off, although they had no legal right to be on. We urged before Judge Woods the utter absurdity of putting on names in that way; we pointed out that Mason, who was then a comparative stranger in Chatham, could not possibly have any acquaintence with the persons whose names he sought by his declaration to put on the list. We offered to call Mr. Mason himself, who was then in court, to prove on his own testimony that he did not even know the persons who he declared, to the best of his information and belief, were entitled to be put on. Mr O'Neill, who was acting for Mr. Smith, objected, and for fear we might be permitted to call him, Mason got up and left the court. The revising officers who desired to act honestly and fairly with both parties refused to receive such evidence. Under the amendment proposed, this method that was rejected as unfair, and in point of information, worthless, by many and the best revising officers, is now given a statutory effect. I trust this provision may not become law."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is one other point to which I agreed to call the attention of the Committee, and that was to make provision for the correction of clerical errors. Two suggestions were made in reference to that. One was that there should be a correction of errors after the list is revised and before it is transmitted to the Queen's Printer, and the other was that the correction should be made after the list is printed. I think the only correction that is feasible is one to be made before the list is transmitted to the Queen's Printer. When the list is transmitted to him, it has been signed and is the electoral list. Any errors which may creep in while it is being printed might be corrected otherwise, but the revising officer has no longer any control over the list after it has been transmitted. I move that these words shall be inserted in the 21st section, that is in section 5 of the present Bill, line 46:

"After giving reasonable notice of delay, so as to enable errors to be corrected."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) I believe one of the suggestions to which the Minister alludes was made by me. I do not pretend to be able to frame an Act, but I see a considerable difficulty, and I think the Minister does also, in this. If the list comes to the printer as finally revised by the revising officer, and some errors should occur in the printing office, if some names should drop out, there should be some machinery by which they can be restored; and the same in regard to names which are not correctly spelled or any errors which may occur in the list finally printed. There should be some machinery by which such errors could be rectified. I observe in the newspapers that, in the lists used in the late contests in regard to the Scott Act, some well-known residents in this neighborhood, some property holders who had an undoubted right to vote, found their names were not on the list, and they could not vote. If we are to have a list made in that way, it should be taken in such a way for elections that there should be no possibility of mistake or error in the printing office. This seems to me to be one of the most important points to guard, and I would like the Minister to say definitely that there cannot be a mistake made in that way. Does he propose that the list which the revising officer certifies to and sends to the printing office shall be the list to be used, notwithstanding any errors in the printed copy?

Mr. CASEY. I understood the Minister to propose to insert words giving "proper delay and reasonable time for correcting errors." It seems to me that that almost amounts to a reopening of the revision. I do not think that is what my hon. friends were asking for. What they wanted was to make sure that the list which came from the printing office should be the same as that which the revising officer sent. The Minister says that as soon as the revising officer has signed this list and sent it down, his duties are performed. In a sense they are; but I do not think they are fully performed until he has ascertained and certified that the copy which leaves the printing office is identical with the copy he sent down. A slight mistake in the spelling of a name, or in the number of a lot, might throw a man out of his vote, a mistake purely unintentional. I think it is the duty of the revising officer to read the proof carefully and revise it along with his original copy, and finally to certify on one or more copies of the list as finally printed, to certify that they are in accordance with the list that he made up.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course, every effort must be made to prevent the mistakes which are possible in printing great numbers of names, and every effort will be made, by the transmission of proofs to the revising officer and by plans of that kind. The principle of the Bill is that the list, when finally revised and transmitted to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, is the authentic list of voters in that electoral district. The list, after being finally revised, corrected and certified, is to be transmitted to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, who shall insert a notice in the *Gazette*, and on and after the publication of that notice the persons whose names are entered on that list as voters, subject only to correction or appeal, shall be held to be duly registered voters in and for that electoral district; so that the list which is finally revised and certified to the printer, is the authentic list.

Mr. CASEY. I speak of mistakes arising in the printing office.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose that the revising officer shall correct them before the list is printed; and if any mistakes have occurred in printing after that, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall correct them. That is all plain when we keep in mind the fact that the roll sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, which is the manuscript to be printed from, is the authentic list.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E I.) I think it should be the duty of the revising officer to verify the printed list, the list which the printer prints from the certified list; and I would suggest that the word "before" should be inserted instead of the word "after," so that it shall be read that "after verification" by the revising officer, he shall transmit the list to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Then the revising officer would have to verify the correctness of the printed list by comparing it with the certified list. I think that sub-section 6 had this very thing in view. Even as it is, it will be the duty of the revising officer to verify the printed list by comparing it with the certified list after it is printed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object of that sub-section 6 is to correct the printed list which is sent to him for distribution. But what I want to avoid is that the revising officer should have any power after the list has been certified and transmitted to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and after it has become authenticated as the voters' list of the electoral district, I want to prevent any further revision.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What we want to get it at, so far as I can understand members on both sides of the House, is that the printed list shall be a correct transcript of the certified list. The draughtsman of the Bill must have had that object in view, when he put in these words: "Shall cause them to be printed, and, after verification by the revising officer, shall transmit a sufficient number of each to the revising officers and to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery;" the object therefore being, that the printed list shall be a correct copy of the certified list. My impression is that, as it stands now, he will have to compare the printed list with a certified copy, to verify its correctness.

Mr. PLATT. Why should the revising officer's duties end before the lists are printed? Why should he certify the lists until he has read the proof, and seen that the printed lists are correct? We contend that it should be placed under the revising officer's eye, until it is handed in to the returning officer at the election. I can see no reason why this list should not be sent to the printer before it is certified by the revising officer.

Mr. CHARLTON. We can hardly say the printing is done before the proofs are corrected. The printing is not complete until the proofs are correct. It strikes me that the proper person to correct the proofs is the revising barrister who made the list. I do not see how we can ensure a correct list unless we have a revised list, and revised by the officer who makes the list. In listening to this discussion I am struck with the truth of the old adage:

> "What a tangled web we weave,
> When once we practice to deceive.'

At this moment I call to mind an anecdote told the other night by the right hon. gentleman about the Jew and pork, about the clap of thunder that saluted him as he came out of the restaurant where he had been partaking of the forbidden meat, and his exclamation: "Good heavens, what a fuss about a little pork!" On this question we may say what a fuss we have about this absurd Bill, and how long it is drawn out. I sympathise with the Minister of Justice in his attempt to make workable an unworkable scheme, and in so far as printing the lists at Ottawa for the whole Dominion is concerned, I think it is impossible to do the work correctly and satisfactory, and that the attempt is a total mistake. The entire Bill is clumsy, ridiculous and absurd, and we should drop the whole matter and go back to provincial lists, which will cost us nothing instead of a great deal of money, the expenditure of which will be involved in working this Bill. There is too much cost altogether for the amount of pork.

Mr. COLTER. I wish to submit this point to the Committee. Supposing an election is coming on and these lists are sent out to the deputy returning officers and they prove to be different from the certified lists, how is that difficulty to be remedied? Supposing the printed list sent out by the Government Printing Bureau differ materially from the certified list, and supposing some names are omitted, how are those names to be placed on these copies?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think there is any practical difficulty, for this reason: that the list is to be made in triplicate, one copy of which is to be sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. It is to be printed, and after being printed, it is to be distributed all over the riding, and everybody preparing for the election will know exactly what it is to be. If there are any mistakes, we may rest assured they will be discovered and rectified.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When the mistake is discovered, how will it be rectified?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The lists distributed are not the authentic list. They are nothing unless they are certified copies of the list held by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and he is to issue the copies, and is responsible for seeing that they are true copies; and if they are not true copies, he is to make them true copies.

Mr. CASEY. It is all very well to say that, in theory, no mistake can occur because the original list will be in the

office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and another in that of the revising officer. But there is no authority for anyone to interfere with these lists after they are printed, or to put a name on or off the list. Of course, it would not do to give such authority after the list was printed and the elections coming on. The only true way to proceed is that, so soon as the printed list is printed, the proof should be sent to the revising officer to be revised, and the corrected proof returned to the printing office and afterwards copies of the corrected list should be sent out and distributed. It would never do to leave power with respect to names in the hands of any official, for additional names might be inserted on the list and no one be the wiser. If the official were compelled, before distributing the lists, to see that the copies were authentic, the whole trouble would be obviated. In some quarters of the country extraordinary names are found, including French and German, and it could not be expected that the proof-reader would be thoroughly accurate in regard to these, especially as the handwriting of some of the revising officers would not be perfectly legible, and, I repeat, the only remedy is to send the proofs back to the revising officer for final revision before he certifies to the printed list.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am willing to adopt the suggestion, that before copies are distributed they should be verified.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is a question as to whether we have more confidence in the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, or in the revising officer. I would sooner trust the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery than the revising officer, as regards the county which I represent.

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

After Recess.

Mr. COLTER. When the House rose at six o'clock, I was about to direct the attention of the Committee to the propriety of sending, under this sub-section 6 of the Act, the lists, not only to the revising officer, but also to the member for the riding, and to the defeated candidate, as well. I believe that the Minister of Justice has consented to accept this suggestion. I would also suggest that when the lists are finally printed, they shall be numbered consecutively from first to the last, in each polling sub-division. This, I believe, would reduce the chances of typographical errors occurring, because the total number for each polling sub-division could be very easily ascertained, if this rule were followed out, whereas mistakes might occur if they were not numbered consecutively.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to add a sub-section:

"7. A copy of the list so printed shall be sent to each member of the House of Commons for the electoral district, and one copy to each of the defeated candidates for such electoral district."

Amendment agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was spoken to by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette), who had a notice on the paper, as to errors in notices, and I have arranged with him an amendment which may be added as sub-section 3 to section 20 of the Act, relating to what shall be done at the final revision. I propose this sub section to meet his views:

"No application to add or remove a name shall be dismissed on account of error in the name or surname, or designation, mentioned therein, provided such error is corrected on or before the final revision, and provided that the revising officer is satisfied that the application was reasonably certain, and that the person intended to be named was not misled by such error."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CASEY,

Mr. DAWSON. The reason for this amendment, which I now suggest, is that the Indians live a great deal in common, and having a claim on the same location, consider they all have a right to vote on it. This will simplify the law by making them get location tickets, and save the revising officers a great deal of trouble in deciding what Indians shall vote on the land.

Mr. EDGAR. This does not disfranchise any Indians?

Mr. DAWSON. No, it does not alter the law; it only saves dispute.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who grants the location ticket?

Mr. DAWSON. The agent gives them location tickets when they apply for them, and when the Indians decide among themselves who are entitled to the location tickets. The Indian Act of 1880 provides for that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As I understand it, the franchise is now conferred upon Indians who hold separate portions in the reserve, and the hon. gentleman requires that they shall hold location tickets for their separate holdings.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do they get these location tickets as a matter of course, every year?

Mr. DAWSON. They do when they apply for them with the sanction of the band. The band sets aside a location, and then the tribe decides which Indian shall hold the location ticket.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The location ticket is given by the consent of the band, and that is an estate for life. At present, under the law, the Indians have to prove it. Instead of all that trouble, he is given his location ticket in his deed. It is a lease for life, with the consent of the band. He holds that in severalty as long as he lives. It is for the purpose of establishing beyond a doubt, that the Indian has a right to vote when he produces his title.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is the agent who grants the location ticket, or the Superintendent General on the recommendation of the agent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, but it must be by a solemn vote of the council.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The evidence that an Indian has been in possession of the lands for a long series of years is no evidence that he is entitled to vote?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, because it has to be held in severalty. By permission, an Indian may live eight or ten years or more on his lot, but that is permissive. The council can move him and put another upon his land. The lands are held in common.

Mr. EDGAR. This matter, after all, is in the hands of the Superintendent General, because section 16 of the Indian Act provides that:

"No Indian shall be deemed to be lawfully in possession of any land in a reserve, unless he has been or is located for the same by the band, or council of the band, with the approval of the Superintendent General."

And the next section says that:

"When the Superintendent General approves of any location as aforesaid, he shall issue, in triplicate, a ticket granting a location title to such Indian."

So that, after all, the privilege of voting, if this amendment is made, will be granted only upon the issuing of the location ticket by the Superintendent General.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman knows that everything that is done until the Indians are enfranchised is done in their council, recommended by the local agent and approved by the Superintendent General, because they are under the guardianship of the law; but

the ticket cannot be issued without a vote of the council, and then it is issued as a matter of course by the Superintendent General.

Mr. LISTER. There may be some difficulties in that. Many of the bands which have councils have not always apportioned the lands with fairness. Supposing an agent refused to recommend the issue of a ticket to a man who had occupied the land for a number of years, the Superintendent General would be powerless. We must not assume that these councils will act fairly in all cases towards all the Indians. They are actuated by certain considerations in the same way as white men are. No doubt there will be cases in which they will refuse to grant the location, and then the Superintendent General has no power to come in, because his power is only confirmatory.

Mr. ROOME. I would propose that these declarations might be made before any reeve, deputy reeve, or municipal councillor, where there is no other person authorised to take them.

Mr. COLTER. Would the persons making such declaration be liable to the penalties for perjury if they made a false declaration?

Mr. EDGAR. I think the Act in reference to extra-judicial oaths would have to be amended in order to make a false declaration of that kind perjury.

Mr. IVES. Why should not the mayor and the aldermen be included?

Mr. EDGAR. It is impossible to give a fair consideration to such an important change in the law as that proposed by the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Roome), in two minutes. I do not think it is fair to the House that an important change like that should be proposed without notice. I see many advantages in the proposal of the hon. gentleman, but we must have those declarations made in proper form, and I would suggest that the amendment should stand over, as it is impossible to look into the law now.

Mr. MULOCK. The only question is whether the declarant would be liable in such case as he would be if he made his declaration before a notary or a commissioner. I think the suggestion is a very good one, but the question is whether those declarations would be affidavits within the meaning of the Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it would be enough to say that these persons shall be justices of the peace for that purpose.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is proposing to incorporate in the Act a matter of dispute. The Local Governments have been appointing magistrates for 22 years, and the Government here have acquiesced in that construction of the British North America Act. I do not say that the Government here might not appoint a magistrate for certain purposes, but it does seem to me that in declaring there shall be a justice of the peace for that purpose is simply to incorporate in the Act a contested point; and if the courts were to decide, contrary to the hon. gentleman, that we have jurisdiction here, that the Crown, as represented by the Governor in Council, may appoint a magistrate, the result would be that this would go for nothing. But if the hon. gentleman were to provide that parties taking an affidavit or a solemn declaration before a reeve or deputy reeve, shall be held amenable to the law relating to perjury, if they swear falsely, then he would accomplish what he proposes to accomplish in this way without the possibility of going wrong.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman forgets when he says that we are incorporating a contested point here. The point in contest is whether the provincial authorities can, under any circumstances, appoint a justice of the peace, but the power of the federal authority to appoint has never been questioned in any way. It is expressly conferred by Her Majesty on His Excellency.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The British North America Act provides for the appointment of a certain class with judicial authorities, amongst which magistrates are not included.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to bring forward the motion of which I gave notice the other day, that I hope the Government will accept. It places the franchise in Prince Edward Island upon an equitable footing. I explained the other day that in the Act of 1886 the hon. gentleman conferred upon all those who were of age on the 20th day of July, 1885, and were entitled to vote under the local franchise, the right to vote; and I propose that that principle shall be made continuous. I, therefore, move:

That section 10 of said Act is hereby repealed, and the following substituted:—

"In the Provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island respectively, besides the persons entitled to be registered as voters, and to vote under this Act, every person who, on the first day of June, in each year, is of the age of 21 years, and is not by this Act, or by any law of the Dominion of Canada, disqualified or prevented from voting, and is a British subject by birth or naturalisation, and resident in the said Provinces, and is entitled to vote in said Provinces respectively, by the laws which are severally enforced in the same, shall have the right to be registered as a voter, and to vote, as long as he continues to be qualified to vote, under the provisions of said last-mentioned laws respectively, and no longer."

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BRIEN. Before the Committee rises, I would like to offer a suggestion or two. I think the intention of the Act as avowed by its supporters, is to extend the franchise to every industrious citizen. That has not been done. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who moved the address in reply to His Excellency's speech a few months ago, in speaking about the franchise, said:

"It confers the franchise on all citizens who are not confirmed paupers, or have no stake in the country."

Well, if this be the case, if that is the intention of the Act, then I think that a large number of men are excluded. The average rate of wages in the agricultural parts of the Dominion is from $1 to $1.25 per day. There are only 313 days in which a man can work, and if he only earns $1 a day, his wages per year only amounts to $313 at the most. But, as it is impossible for all men to work full time, we find that the average number of days that men work is only 250; therefore, they cannot possibly come up to the standard required by this Act, consequently, a large number of industrious citizens are disfranchised. For the information of the Committee, I would read the average wages earned by farm laborers in the Province of Ontario. In the Lake Erie district, it is $241; Lake Huron district, $255; Georgian Bay, $254; West Midland, $251; Lake Ontario, $253; St. Lawrence and Ottawa, $249; East Midland, $256; northern districts, $262; so that in the entire Province of Ontario the average rate is $250. Out of 3,354 wage-earners in eighteen different towns, only 563 worked 300 days and over; the average number of days is only 263 in towns and cities. In cities and towns where they work in factories and shops and can work in stormy days, the average might be a little greater, but still this Bill would exclude these important classes in both town and country. We have extended the franchise to Indians, but still we propose to refuse it to our white laborers who are not less qualified to vote. I have experienced a great deal of difficulty in so far as I have had anything to do with the revision of the list. We found that but a few applicants could attain to the $300 qualification. Besides, the present Act entails a great deal of difficulty and hardship upon many wage-earners

by compelling them to give an account of every cent earned. For these reasons I move that:

Sub-section 6 of section 3 of the Franchise Act be amended by striking out the words "three hundred and fifty dollars" and substituting therefor the words "two hundred and forty dollars."

Also, that sub-section 6 of section 4 of the same Act be amended by striking out the words "three hundred dollars" and substituting the words "two hundred and forty dollars."

In the last Ontario Act the franchise was extended to all wage-earners who had an income of $250, but even in that case, I think there is a considerable number of laborers who are excluded, and I believe that it was the intention of the Act to extend the franchise to every industrious citizen.

Amendment negatived, and Bill reported.

INTEREST ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 132) to amend the Revised Statutes respecting interest (from the Senate). He said: The object of this Bill is to fix the rate of interest which judgments shall bear. The question has arisen lately in the North-West Territories, inasmuch as the Interest Act provides the rate of interest which contracts shall bear when no other rate is provided, but judgments not being strictly of the nature of contracts, it had been held that there is no provision as to judgments bearing interest. Provisions of doubtful validity have been made with respect to this subject by Provincial Legislatures.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Under the third section a change would be effected and judgments would bear interest at 6 per cent., which formerly only bore interest at 5 per cent. I do not think, however, that a man has a right to allow a judgment to remain and bear interest at a high rate.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is only proposed to take the second reading to-night and to go into Committee at a future day.

Mr. IVES. Judgment with interest will be calculated from the date of the serving of the process.

Mr. DAVIN. This Bill will meet a want greatly felt in the North-West Territories, because we cannot collect overdue taxes with interest at more than 4 per cent.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 126) to amend the Summary Convictions Act, chapter 78 of the Revised Statutes, and the Act amending the same (from the Senate).—(Sir John Thompson.)

REGISTRATION AND POSTAGE OF LETTERS.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider proposed resolutions (p. 469) providing for the rate of registration and postage of letters.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. HAGGART. The object of the first part of the resolution is to enable the postmaster to charge a registration fee on any valuable matter which may be sent through the post office. I propose to change the second part of the resolution to the effect that the postage of local or drop letters shall be 2 cents per ounce in cities and towns where there is delivery by carriers. That leaves the Act the same as it is now, except in cities and towns where there is delivery by letter carriers. It assimilates our law to that of the United States where the rate is 2 cents on similar letters, and to that of the United Kingdom where the rate is one penny. I propose to change the second part to read so as to affect only periodicals issued less frequently than at intervals of one month. This allows monthly periodicals to pass as free as newspapers do, and to make specimen newspapers entitled to be sent at one cent per pound. It provides that no periodical may be carried free of postage under the 26th section of the Post Office Act, if it is published at intervals of more than one month. It leaves the law the same on certain printed matter, and on packages of seeds and matters of cognate description, namely, one cent for each four ounces. Printed manuscripts, proofs, lithographs, photographs and documents partly written and partly printed, not being deeds, policies of insurance, and miscellaneous, may be sent at one cent for each two ounces. This makes the postage on this class of matter the same as it is in the United States and Great Britain.

Mr. JONES (Halifax.) This resolution increasing the postage on drop letters will bear hard on cities, and it appears to me to be unnecessary. I do not see upon what principle the hon. gentleman is called upon to double the rate on the postage of drop letters. It is true that in some instances the letters are distributed by the carriers, but in most cases merchants and citizens have private boxes in the post office and the carriers are not called upon to distribute the letters. Business men now send their circulars through the post office at one cent, and this class of matter does not involve any increase of expense on the post office. I think that the Postmaster General should consider this, for he will see that the reason he gives for increasing the rate in places where there are letter carriers would not apply where persons have private boxes in the post office. I know that this increase of rate in drop letters is very unpopular in the cities of the Dominion, because it is looked upon as unnecessary. It is very unfavorably received by the business community generally.

Mr. DAVIN. I consider that the Postmaster General has taken from this clause everything that was objectionable in it. I am very glad indeed that this impost on the monthly periodicals, and therefore upon literature, has been removed. In regard to the objections of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones), I wish to point out to the Committee that if this objection has any force it will regulate itself. If, for instance, the Postmaster General finds that the rate of 2 cents is too much upon drop letters where letters are sent round by the letter carriers, the merchants will not avail of this means of communication and the revenue from this source will so decrease as to cause the Postmaster General to return to the old rate. On the other hand, if the merchants continue to use those sealed circulars at the 2 cent rate it will prove that it is a fair rate, and that anyone who is familiar with the present condition of our postage system and the amount that it costs the country will be very glad if there is an adjustment in this respect between the expenditure and the service rendered. I do not think that there is anything whatever in the objections of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones).

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I confess that I do not quite understand the first part of this resolution, which has reference to registered matter. It would seem to imply that the postal officials might be at liberty to register anything that came into the office, and to charge for registration if it were supposed to contain valuable matter. I should like to enquire whether this is a change in the law, and whether the opinion I have in reference to it, that postmasters may register, if they choose, anything that goes into the post office and charge for it, is correct?

Mr. HAGGART. It is a new feature. In most countries it is compulsory that all valuable matter shall be registered. In some countries, if it is not registered, the matter is forfeited, in addition to a heavy fine being imposed. Where it appears evident to the postmaster that a letter contains

something valuable, he can fix a penalty to the amount of the registration fee, which is collected at the place of delivery. This also prevents the temptation to postal clerks of abstracting letters which are not registered, and which are supposed to contain valuable matter.

Mr. CASEY. Unless power is given to the postmaster to open letters, how is he to ascertain whether the matter is valuable or not?

Mr. HAGGART. That is a rather difficult matter; but it is where it appears evident to the postmaster that the letter contains valuable matter.

Mr. CASEY. Still it depends on the postmaster to say whether it appears evident that the letter contains valuables. It may be a piece of pasteboard or a piece of stiff paper that feels like a bank note, and the postmaster is given power to fix a penalty, not on the man who posted the letter, but on the man to whom it is addressed, and the enclosure may not be worth the cost of registration. I think the old plan is the best, for the man who sends the letter to take the risk of its being stolen in transit. I think this Bill would put indefinite and improper power in the hands of postmasters, and would enable them to tax the wrong party. I almost fancy that, on reconsideration, the matter would appear in the same way to the Postmaster General himself.

Mr. LISTER. I fancy, so far as this registration is concerned, that no one is likely to be seriously injured by it. But I have a matter to bring before the Postmaster General, which I think was brought to his notice by others, that is, the postage on examination papers. As he knows, throughout our Province the examination papers of the schools are sent to the inspector, and hitherto the postage has been exceedingly high. I believe the postage on these papers should be greatly reduced, say one cent for four ounces. I have been written to on the subject by one of the public school inspectors, and I cannot do better than read his letter:

"It is the usual practice in the public schools to have written examinations for promotion from one class to another, and after the examination is over the papers of the pupils who pass the examination are sent to the inspector for review and confirmation. According to the present postal regulations the postage on these examination papers is very high, and unless the hon the Postmaster General can be induced to give the rate, of, say one cent for four ounces, in many counties, perhaps all, these examinations will have to cease, or else be conducted on a different basis, from that which obtains at present. Mr. McIntosh, Public School Inspector for Hastings, has, I believe, had some communication or correspondence with the Hon. Mr. Bowell, who, I believe, has promised to give all the assistance he could in the matter."

I think this matter is worthy of the consideration of the Postmaster General, and if he thinks the rate on this matter should be reduced, it can be added to the articles which are charged one cent for four ounces.

Mr. HAGGART. I received a good many communications from inspectors in the direction of the hon. gentleman's suggestion. If the document is partly printed and partly written, it would pass at the rate of one cent for two ounces. If it is wholly written, it has to pay full letter postage, as you will see the difficulty of distinguishing it from other correspondence.

Mr. CASEY. Does not the law provide that printers' manuscript——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will excuse me, perhaps it would be more convenient, if the discussion is to be on the details of the Bill, that the resolution should be adopted and concurred in, and then the Bill will be brought up for a second reading at once, and taken up clause by clause, and every question can be raised on one or other of the clauses.

Mr. CASEY. But I think this is the place to discuss the resolutions, and I do not suppose it will take any more time to do so now than it would under the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Only the discussion will be had twice over.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think it need be repeated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, very well.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to ask the Postmaster General on what principle he doubles the rate of postage on what are called drop letters, which are dropped into the post office to be delivered in the city or town? It appears to me that it is unnecessarily taxing the commercial community.

Mr. HAGGART. It is on this principle, that it has been found that where a letter has been dropped into the post office in a city, and delivered by a letter carrier, it does not pay to deliver it for one cent, which is just half the rate charged in any other country in the world; and this provision is to assimilate the rate to that prevailing in other countries.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It will be a serious tax to individuals in large cities. There are two classes of people in those cities, one to whom letters are delivered by carriers, and the other, who have boxes in the post office for which they have to pay a rental, and this increase is an additional tax upon them. I seems hard that a letter can be sent all over this Dominion for 3 cents, and that you have to pay 2 cents for a letter that is dropped into the post office, and put into a box in the same office. In the United States, the postage for drop letters is the same as for other letters?

Mr. HAGGART. Drop letters delivered by carriers are charged the same rate as other letters in the United States; and in England the charge is a penny, even if the letter is delivered next door.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). But in the United States all letters are carried for 2 cents, while here you charge 3 cents. I think it is going to be a pretty heavy tax in cities.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I cannot see anything more reasonable than that the cost of the letter carriers should be charged to the people in cities who receive the benefit of them. The country should not be taxed for the benefit of the people living in the cities.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I was expecting that some representatives of other large cities would have spoken on this matter, because I feel sure that if the mercantile community in Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, and other large cities knew what was proposed here to-night, there would be a strong remonstrance against it. It is manifestly unfair to the mercantile community of those cities. The Postmaster General says it is intended that the rate he is proposing is to pay for the expense of delivery. If you pay a man a dollar a day, he would only have to deliver fifty letters to earn his pay. In the majority of cases, they deliver a great many more than that. Therefore, I think that the Postmaster General is trying to make money out of the cities in order to supply the deficiency in postal revenue. I know as a business man what the inconvenience of this would be. In the cities a large amount of circulars go through the post, and I suppose the hon. gentleman never lived in the city during election times or had to run an election in a city, or he would have found that from 5,000 to 6,000 notices have to go through the post at a very critical time, the expense of which will be doubled. I remember a short time ago seeing in a Toronto paper a remonstrance against this proposal, and subsequently the statement that the Postmaster General had consented to drop it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Drop the letters.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). And I had hoped, when he introduced the resolution to-night, that he was going to intro-

duce a change of policy in this matter. I hope he will yet take the matter into consideration.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The revenue will be diminished rather than increased by this proposal. A large amount of matter goes through the post office at one cent, which will not be mailed if the charge is raised to 2 cents.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Before this resolution passes, I wish to enter my protest against that part which provides for compulsory registration. It seems to me that the department would be acting in an arbitrary manner in compelling a person to register a letter he sends through the post office, whether he likes it or not. If the sender of the matter chooses to take the risk of sending it without registering it, that is his business, and the department ought not to say that when he puts a letter in the post office, the postmaster should be the arbiter to decide whether that letter should be registered or not. The sender is the person who ought to decide whether the matter he sends is valuable or not, and whether, even if valuable, he should take the risk of sending it unregistered or not. It is assuming most arbitrary power on the part of the department to say that when I post a letter, which may perhaps not contain valuable matter, but which may feel from the outside as if it did, that letter should be registered and a postage rate of 5 cents additional—for I believe the rate of registration is to be raised to that amount—imposed.

Mr. HAGGART. This is taken from the regulation that exists in Great Britain, and a similar regulation exists all over Europe.

Mr. CASEY. The Postmaster General must not think he is settling the question by quoting regulations, either of England, or of anywhere else. We think here that we can make some slight improvements on the way they do things in Europe. The hon. gentleman, himself, was one of the first to combat the idea that any English precedent should rule here, especially in trade questions, and we can bring that home to him in discussing post office matters. If it does not rule here in regard to tariffs, I do not see why it should rule in regard to post office tariffs. We should look at the thing from a common sense view, as the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) looks at it. This view certainly does not prevail, when we are going to give postmasters the right to say what mail matter shall be registered and what shall not, and propose to tax the receiver and not the sender. It is well understood that when a man sends valuable goods in an unregistered letter, the sender is responsible and not the Post Office Department, nor the receiver, and, therefore, no loss can possibly accrue to the receiver should the letter not reach its destination, provided the sender is a responsible person. Should the sender choose to take the risk, it is arbitrary legislation on our part to try and force him to take precautions. I know the hon. the Minister wishes to make this a popular Bill. Being a new Minister he would not like to do an unpopular thing, but I assure him he will find this little provision one of the most unpopular things he could put in the Bill.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). They have not in England the cheap method of transporting valuables by Express which we have here.

Mr. HAGGART. The United States have it.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). The rule in England has been to send nearly all valuables by post; but in this country valuables are largely sent by Express; so that in England provision had to be made that is not so much required here, and I think a regulation that applies to England does not apply to this country. With regard to the 2 cent postage, when my hon. friend from St John (Mr. Weldon) or my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) drops a letter through the post office, a man is hired by the Government to carry that letter to its destination; but when a letter is dropped to my address at Niagara Falls, I have to send my own man to get it.

Mr. DAVIN. If the proposition of the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) were correct, it would follow that the officers of the department, knowing that a letter unregistered contained valuables, should not apply to it more care than to one that does not.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Why should they? The department is not responsible.

Mr. DAVIN. There is a moral obligation.

Mr. CASEY. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIN. Certainly, there is. With regard to the argument of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) that we should not copy from England or from the States, of course we should not unless there is reason for it. Then the hon. gentleman used the absurd argument that because my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) does not favor free trade, he should therefore not take any hint from what goes on in England. But the conditions in every civilised country for the distribution of letters, the main conditions on which to found a postal system, are always the same, viz., highways, railways and population. Whereas when you come to questions of protection or free trade in Canada you have a new community, in England you have a highly organised and advanced community, and there is no analogy between the two. With regard to what my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. White) has said—and I have always a great respect for what he says, because it is generally to the point—I say, if a post office clerk sees that any letter contains valuable matter, there is a moral obligation on him to have a watchful eye over that, and for that obligation the persons interested should pay.

Mr. McKAY. I was in hopes that the suggestion offered by the right hon. the First Minister would be carried out, and that this Bill would pass its second reading and be discussed in Committee clause by clause. The Bill is intended to make up some of the loss of the Post Office Department, but I do not think it is just to the mercantile community in the cities that they should be called upon to make up that deficiency. I believe the letter carrying system in the cities pays for itself. I think that the loss, if any, should be distributed over the country where letters are carried for long distances. We have had a very strong protest from the Board of Trade in Hamilton in relation to this proposal. It will be a great tax on the mercantile community, and I believe that instead of increasing the revenue from the drop letter delivery it will lessen the revenue. There are now many agencies which deliver letters and circulars at low rates; and I am satisfied that, if the rate is increased to 2 cents, these agencies would increase, and the revenue from drop letters would decrease. There are also a great many business people who have private boxes in the post office, who do not avail themselves of the letter carrier system, and who therefore ought not to be taxed for its maintenance. I desire to place on record my view that the Bill is not in the interest of the mercantile communities in the cities.

Mr. HESSON. There are other people interested besides those in commercial centres like Halifax, St. John and Hamilton, and I am satified that this Bill will meet with the general approbation of the people of Canada. If the Minister had found it possible to give us a 2 cent rate for the entire Dominion, I would have been prepared to support him, but he has done the next best thing, which is to give us the one ounce for the 3 cents. That will be a very great advantage, and hon. gentlemen who have discussed the changes which are proposed have not referred to that very important point. The hon. members from Halifax,

St. John and Hamilton have stated that the 2 cent rate on drop letters will be a heavy burden on the mercantile community. Those gentlemen in those cities have deliveries five and six and some imes seven times a day. When we remember that the letter carriers are employed for their convenience in these cities at the expense of the whole people of Canada, I think no one in this House will say that they are paying a fair rate for drop letters when they pay only one cent. I had occasion to enquire into this matter in regard to the city of Ottawa. I saw that a large staff of letter carriers were employed in this city, and I saw that a large revenue was apparently derived from the city of Ottawa post office, but when I investigated the matter, I found that the amount of expenditure which was necessary was so large in this city, which is one of great importance as a business centre, and as the capital of the Dominion, and the headquarters of Canada, when that was deducted from the receipts, the city of Stratford gave a larger revenue to the Dominion than the city of Ottawa did. If you investigate the expenses of maintaining the letter carriers in these mercantile centres, you will find, that the expenditure on that account, in cities of the size of Ottawa and Hamilton, forms a very large item in the post office expenditure. I think, that those who have the advantage of five or six deliveries a day, without any trouble being caused to themselves or their families to go for the mail matter, should not object to the payment of 2 cents on drop letters. There are a large number of post offices in the country where the postmasters are getting from $14 to $20 a year, and I think it is most unfair that in cities, where they have all the advantages I have pointed out, they should not in some way be made to pay a fairer proportion of the burden on the country. This Bill provides that they shall, and I am confident that there is not a gentleman who represents a rural constituency, a town or a county, who will not endorse what the Postmaster General is proposing in this respect. I am only sorry to see that the hon. gentlemen who represent cities are not more liberal in this matter when they consider the greater advantages which they possess.

Mr. SCRIVER. Having had some little experience as a postmaster myself, I am prepared to say unhesitatingly that I approve of the feature of the hon. gentleman's Bill, which proposes to give to the postmasters the right to enregister documents which are apparently of value when they are put in the post office; because, when those documents are lost, although the department is not obliged legally or perhaps even morally to trace them out, it endeavors to do so, and the labor which is entailed is very great, both on the department and on the postmasters. That labor and that expense will be very much lessened by the adoption of such a regulation as this Bill proposes.

Mr. CASEY. No doubt what my hon. friend has said has great weight, but it still leaves the point unsettled as to how the postmaster is going to decide what is valuable and what is not. If he could enregister only what is valuable, it would be all right; but I do not see how the Postmaster General is going to give the postmasters the supernatural power of looking through an envelope and seeing what is inside. However, I only rose to call the attention of the Postmaster General to a matter which I have personally mentioned to him, and to ask him whether he has considered the question of introducing insurance of letters, according to the English system.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Surely you are not appealing to the English system, are you?

Mr. CASEY. When the English system is reasonable, I am willing to adopt its provisions. In England, it is possible to register a letter in such a manner that the department is responsible for its safe transit up to a certain amount. The loss by registered letters here is so small that, if the Minister is in search of revenue, I believe this is probably the best way in which he could get it. People would be willing to pay a much larger amount than the ordinary registration fee to obtain this insurance, and the department would lose so few letters of that kind that they would make almost a clear profit of the extra amount of postage. I am not aware of how that is worked in England, but I have never seen any suggestion in the English newspapers that it has worked badly, and I think it would be a great boon for the people here to be able to ensure the money or valuables which they send through the post office. The charge might be graduated according to the value. I desire to ask the hon. gentleman if he has considered that point, and whether it is not possible to insert some such provision in the Bill?

Mr. HAGGART. The practice in England is for the registration fee to ensure the delivery of all valuables under the value of £2 10s., and a small insurance fee as high, I think, as £10 or £12. I considered the proposition, but I did not think it advisable to introduce it into the Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. I understood the Postmaster General sometime ago to indicate his willingness to grant a 3 cent per ounce rate.

Mr. HAGGART. It is that. The delivery in cities is increased from one cent per half ounce to two cents per ounce, and the letters are increased from half an ounce to one ounce.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the decision with regard to monthly periodicals?

Mr. HAGGART. The definition of a newspaper periodical is changed to cover those published not less frequently than once a month.

Resolution reported, and concurred in.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. HAGGART moved second reading of Bill (No. 93) to amend the Post Office Act, chapter 35 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. HAGGART. Sub-section (*i*) is amended to cover decoy letters, and to render any person stealing them guilty of the same offence as of stealing an ordinary letter. (*k*) is amended so as to include baskets. (*l*) is amended so as to include post office mail cars.

Mr. CHARLTON. Who is to decide as to who is authorised to receive letters? That ought to be a little more clearly defined. A postmaster may consider somebody authorised to receive a letter, who is not authorised.

Mr. HAGGART. That is a copy of the old Act.

On section 3,

Mr. HAGGART. That alters the old Act by adding obscene prints or photographs, and to cover persons who send through the mails improper forms of duns on postal cards, for the purpose of making the matter public. A similar provision is incorporated in the American law.

Mr. CASEY. There are two or three matters, which, although they may be contained in the old Act, require to be investigated. Any one probably can decide what an obscene picture is, but every postmaster might exercise his own taste as to what was an immoral publication. We know that certain literary works of such standing as to be considered fit to be in every library have been stopped by the Customs authorities on the ground that they were immoral,

because they advocated doctrines that appear to most of us to be atheistic or freethinking. For example, Tom Paine's works have been stopped by the Customs on the ground of immorality. An hon. friend beside me truly says that Bob Ingersoll's speeches should much rather be stopped on the same ground. I hold that this is leaving too much discretion in the hands of postmasters, and we should also be careful not to leave too much temptation to tamper with mail matter. I understand that one of the new provisions prohibits duns expressed in improper language in post cards. That is a proper proviso. Then, again, as to the question respecting illegal lotteries and gift enterprises, I do not know how the postmaster is to guess whether a certain circular is an improper one or not, and whether the circulars passing through the mails have reference to an illegal lottery. He may obtain an idea from the large number of circulars passing through the post office that they are connected with a lottery, but, I submit, although the postmaster may have the best intentions in the world, he may cast discredit on circulars sent by a highly respectable firm. It is at all events a dangerous power to place in the hands of postmasters. Again, as to the question whether circulars are intended to deceive the public or to obtain money under false pretences, how can the postmaster know whether any scheme to which the circulars refer is intended to deceive the public? He cannot do anything of the kind, and it is very dangerous to allow postmasters to attach a mark to letters stating that they are intended to deceive the public. Circulars relating to a meeting connected with the Orange Order might be stopped in this way, and other circulars looking to the raising of money for the building of a Roman Catholic church might be marked suspected to be fraudulent, and great injury might thus be done to either party. The Postmaster General is going too far in conferring improper power on his subordinates. If the matter were left in his own hands, I would have greater confidence in his exercising impartially the powers, but they should not be entrusted to postmasters throughout the Dominion. I ask the hon. gentleman most seriously if he is not giving too much of the spirit of bureaucracy to the postal service. The postmaster could not tell whether a circular were illegal and improper unless the envelope bore on the outside printed matter showing that the undertaking was of an illegal nature. We find that circulars respecting what are called "green goods" pass through the post offices without being disturbed, and in this respect the postmaster's powers are useless, while in other cases if there is a circular not exactly to the taste of the individual postmaster, it might be stopped and marked fraudulent and damage might thus be done to most respectable concerns.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has no objection to giving the Postmaster General power to stop a saucy dun, but he objects to the Postmaster General having power to stop obscene literature.

Mr. CASEY. I did not say so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will look at the clause of the Bill he will see it gives power to the Post Office Department to make regulations declaring what shall and what shall not be deemed desirable under this Act, and it makes provision for restrictions within reasonable limits and regulations also for prohibiting the circulation of dangerous and improper articles. It is simply giving power to the department to make regulations within reasonable limit. That power has been exercised by the Post Office Department without any objection in the past, and it is exercised by the post office authorities in England and the United States, and wherever there is a postal system.

Mr. CASEY. Of course these regulations are made by the department, but they are interpreted and carried out by the postmasters. I would have no objection to the stoppage of obscene and immoral publications. As to a saucy dun, that is shown on the face of the post card. I say in regard to these clauses that the powers given to the postmasters are very dangerous, while under the preceding clause the postmaster had a right to open letters on suspicion of their containing immoral works.

Mr. AMYOT. I call the attention of the Minister to the propriety of informing parties to whom pictures or letters are sent, which are seized by some officer whom we do not know, also to the parties by whom the packages were attached. It would prove a check. As it is a letter may arrive and be seized, and we do not know by whom or where, or the reason. If the party to whom it was addressed were notified of the fact that would be a check; and if the officer, whether he was a good one or a bad one—and if he had been appointed by the opponents of the Government he might be a bad one in that sense, or *vice versa*—knew he had to communicate with the party interested, that he had detained such a paper or package, that fact would be a protection to the public. I hope the Postmaster General will take this into his serious consideration.

Mr. HAGGART. I think there is something in the suggestion the hon. gentleman has made. Hitherto the Postmaster was not obliged to send notice to the party whether he detained an immoral publication or not. I think that, under the new regulation, if he detains a publication of that kind, or of any kind mentioned here, he ought to send notice.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). In this provision it is proposed that the department may make regulations fixing the charge of registration upon letters. If I rightly understood the Postmaster General when this Bill was introduced he stated that it was his intention to increase the rate of registration on letters posted to be registered. I think I understood him to say that he would increase it to the same rate as is charged in the United States.

Mr. HAGGART. No; to half the rate, 5 cents.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I think this proposed increase from 2 cents to 5 cents would be a heavy imposition on the farming class and upon the small merchants, provided, as I understand the hon. gentleman to say, that no additional security is to be given under the system of registration to be adopted by the department, than is given at present. I understood the Postmaster General to say that he did not propose to guarantee any amount in a letter that was registered at any post office. I thought that he said at first that it was the intention of the department to guarantee moneys or valuables enclosed in registered letters up to a certain amount and if that course is not adopted now I think it would be a very great hardship on those to whom I refer if the rate of registration is increased. I must again protest against the power which is assumed in this Bill, to register matter whether the sender wishes to have it registered or not. I would say in reply to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that there is an obligation on the department to deliver every letter that is received for delivery, and there is no greater obligation to deliver a letter supposed to contain valuable matter than one which may not be supposed to contain such matter. A letter may not contain valuables, but it may be very important to the sender that it should reach its destination. I say that it is a duty imposed upon the Post Office Department to deliver every letter at the place to which it is directed. Again I contend that it is in the discretion of the person sending the letter to say whether it should be registered or not. Let me point out a circumstance which I think will illustrate what I mean in regard to this matter. Letters containing bank bills or money of that description are usually registered, but if I post a letter containing a cheque, which is just as valuable as money if

I have funds to my credit, and if that cheque is made payable to the order of the person to whom I am sending it I do not consider it necessary to register the letter, and so it is with regard to drafts or notes. I think it is a most arbitrary measure on the part of the department to insist upon exacting from the person who receives a letter supposed by the postmaster to contain valuables, a registration fee in addition to the postage. It is the sender who ought to decide whether he wishes to have the security whatever security it may be, that is afforded by the registration of that letter.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There are, of course, two views to be taken of this matter; the one that is presented by the Government in the Bill and the other that has been presented by the member for Renfrew (Mr. White). If a postmaster is at liberty to decide whether a letter upon which is placed the ordinary postage contains valuables or not it necessitates close inspection of the letter, and that close inspection may lead to the letters being purloined instead of their being registered. I do not know that it would add anything to the safety of the transmission of letters to induce every postmaster in the country to inspect the letter closely with a view of ascertaining what its contents are. I think that this is a very serious objection and it is one that must necessitate the habit of close inspection in every post office in the country whether the party in charge is a person of integrity or whether he is not. I do not think that the habit of prying into the contents of letters passing through the post office is a good habit to cultivate or to encourage, and, taking everything into consideration it seems to me that the party who posts the letter ought to decide whether he will register the letter or not. I believe that the old practice in this respect is better than the one the Government propose to substitute.

Mr. DAVIN. If the reasoning of my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. White) were correct, nobody need ever register, because he says there is the same obligation precisely on the part of the Post Office Department to deliver any unregistered letter as to deliver a registered letter.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). So there is.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, if there be this same obligation there is the same security, and why then should people register?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). There is a distinction there. The man who wishes additional security registers.

Mr. DAVIN. Yet the hon. gentleman says that the obligation on the part of the Post Office Department is absolute.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). So it is.

Mr. DAVIN. Then there can be no additional security. The reason for registration is that there is additional security, and we have the registered letter watched from hand to hand until its delivery to the sendee is secured. There is a very important reason why the Government of the country should not desire to have valuable matter sent by post in an unregistered letter. There is the constant temptation to purloin on the part of their servants, and the constant danger of the demoralisation of the service. There is also the additional security given to the delivery of valuable matter. Those are two good reasons why the change proposed by the hon. the Postmaster General should be carried out. A moment ago we had a discussion about the habit prevailing in Europe and England, and in a matter of this sort, where the circumstances are precisely the same, the practice of a community so old, and so successful, and so admirable, undoubtedly forms a very good precedent for our guidance.

Mr. DALY. I certainly agree with the remarks of the member for Renfrew (Mr. White) with regard to registration. In our country we have not the same number of banks or of post offices to issue post office orders as in the old Provinces, and there a great deal of money is transmitted by registered letters. Therefore, I hope sincerely that the Postmaster General will not increase the rate. In reference to the other proposition contained in the resolution, I agree also with the hon. member for Renfrew, and reserve any remarks I have to make on that question until it is before the House.

Mr. HAGGART. The object of the regulation regarding letters unquestionably containing money, was to reach what might be transparent on the outside, such as jewellery or watches, as in other countries; but if hon. gentlemen think that the regulation might cover other things, and wish to send letters at their own risk, I have no objection to striking out the latter part of the clause.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I would ask my hon. friend to consider the question of not increasing the registration fee.

Mr. HAGGART. Registration in this country is lower than in any other country in the world. The registration fee in England is 5 cents, in this country 2 cents, and in the United States 10 cents It would be impossible to introduce the amendments which I propose to introduce for the efficient transmission of registered matter unless I get more fees. I intended to perfect the system, in fact introducing into this country the American system, which would enable us to trace a registered letter to any part of the country. That system consists in the delivery to a certain clerk of a certain parcel properly secured with a peculiar kind of lock, which will show if it has been tampered with; that parcel is delivered at the end of the journey to another clerk, who transmits it, and so on. That system can be applied to only a few cities in the country, but there is a further improvement which would enable you to put registered matter in a peculiarly shaped bag with a peculiar lock which would show tampering, and along with it there would be a system of registration and checks which would lessen the duties of the mail clerks, and ensure the certain tracing of the matter to any section of the country. That would entail a great deal of expense. The rate I propose to charge is as low as that charged in any country in the world. Our present system is very complex. I intend to include patterns, samples, parcels of merchandise, newspapers, books, circulars and miscellaneous matter, so that if a person wishes to send them by parcel post he can do so, and register them for 5 cents.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman positively assures the House that he cannot perfect a good registration system in any other way than by increasing the charge, he will have to take the responsibility. I have not heard any great complaints yet of the failure of registered letters to reach their destination, and I do not think the hon. gentleman can tell us that the proportion of registered letters lost in Canada is greater than it is under the so-called perfect system in the United States. In fact, I think it is the other way; in the United States they lose a larger proportion of registered letters than we do in Canada. But the point I wish to get at more particularly is that the hon. Minister should put his registration charges in this clause, just as he has put the postal charges in the other clause. This is a clause to give the Governor in Council the power of taxation, which is a thing utterly unconstitutional.

Mr. HAGGART. I will insert in the clause the words "not exceeding 5 cents."

Mr. CASEY. Is that to be the uniform charge on everything that can be registered?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. I regret very much that the Postmaster General has deemed it necessary to increase the registra-

tion fee on letters from 2 cents to 5 cents. This is a matter which would affect Manitoba to a very considerable extent. Manitoba has not the facilities of banks and money order offices which other Provinces enjoy, and the result is that a great number of the letters have to be registered, not only money letters or letters containing valuables, but, under our municipal law, tax notices as well. I can assure you, Sir, if this increase from 2 cents to 5 cents becomes law, it will be a great hardship on the municipalities of Manitoba. I am glad to see that the Postmaster General has seen fit to drop the compulsory registration, and I think if he could see his way to allow the registration fee to remain at 2 cents, he would meet with the unanimous approval of the House. In increasing the rate to 5 cents, the Government may find that letters hitherto registered will not be registered, and that the revenue will not materially increase. If the hon. gentleman does not see fit to drop this provision to extend the registration rate to 5 cents, I shall deem it my duty to test the feeling of the House on the question when the Bill comes up for the third reading.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When the Postmaster General is increasing the registration fee from 2 cents to 5 cents, he should give the public a guarantee that the registered letters will reach their destination. If he does not give the public greater security than we now have, I do not see why he should raise the fee. I believe it is possible to minimise the loss of registered and other letters by looking more sharply after the officials. The Postmaster General will never be able to perfect our system until he does so. If we had good honest officials, that would be the highest guarantee that every letter sent would reach its destination. I was looking over the Postmaster General's report, and I find the loss of registered letters much greater than it should be. The loss, I think, could be very materially reduced. In nearly every case where the letters have gone astray, I believe it has been owing to the dishonest conduct of those entrusted with the mails. If the Postmaster General would make an example of those who are tampering with the letters, that would have a more salutory influence on the service and bring about a change better than by increasing the registration fee. There are many people who do not register letters containing money because they say it is safer not to do so. In so many instances registered letters have gone astray, that many people believe those not registered are more apt to reach their destination, owing to the fact that post office officials are not aware that they contain money. If the Postmaster General will see whenever a misdemeanor is committed by any of those engaged in the postal service that they are dismissed and punished, he will do more good than by adding to the taxes of the people, without giving any additional security for the safe delivery of the mail matter.

Mr. WATSON. Could not the hon. gentleman make an exception in favor of tax notices?

Mr. HAGGART. We have the power of making regulations, and the suggestion of the hon. gentleman may be worthy of consideration.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am opposed to fixing one rate of registration upon one class of mail matter, and another upon another. If you are going to make a 5 cent rate, let it apply to all classes of letters registered, but at the same time I think my hon. friend had better consider, before the third reading of the Bill, whether he ought not to leave the rate at 2 cents. There is a good deal of force in the argument respecting additional burdens being imposed upon people who are least able to bear them, without any guarantee that the additional rate will reduce the probability of loss.

Mr. WATSON. In a great number of instances the letters registered by municipalities are drop letters, as municipalities are obliged by law to register their notices of assessments, and these certainly should not be rated as high as letters containing money or other valuables which go a long distance.

On section 5,

Mr. HAGGART. I propose to amend this section by providing that, in section 21 of the Act, the rate on local or drop letters shall be one cent per ounce weight except in cases where there is a delivery by letter carriers, in which case the rate shall be 2 cents per ounce prepaid.

Mr. ELLIS. Where a man owns a box in the post office, does the Postmaster General make any distinction between the letters delivered there and those delivered by carriers.

Mr. HAGGART. We make no distinction where there are letter carriers in the city.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I shall not detain the Committee further now, but at the next stage I shall divide the House upon this question.

Mr. WELDON (St John). I am convinced that this will entail a loss of revenue. If a merchant desires to send out 1,000 bills or circulars, the cost at this rate would be $20. You can get a man to deliver them for $10 at the outside. The post office will lose the whole revenue on those bills or circulars in that way. I believe that, when the people come to consider that they have to pay 2 cents for a drop letter, they will hesitate to put it in the box. It is true that one cent is a tax which amounts to something in the course of a year, but still the people do not think so much of that; but, when it comes to 2 cents, I feel sure that there will be a diminution in the revenue. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) said that we should take our inspiration from England, and I would ask whether in England they have ever increased the postage rate?

Mr. DAVIN. I never said so.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I understood my hon. friend to say that we should follow the example of England. But this is a retrograde movement. The tendency in other countries is to reduce the postage rate, and here we are increasing it, and this will bear particularly on the poor people in larger cities. It will not be so heavy on the rich merchants because, as I have pointed out, they can send their clerks or can hire people to deliver their circulars or bills, but the poor people will have to pay this tax.

Mr. HESSON. In the city of St. John a large commercial business is done, and the gross revenue is very large, but if the expenses of that office are considered, there are many small places in Canada, where they have not the advan age of this city delivery, from which the revenue is larger than it is from St. John. The gross revenue from the St. John post office is something over $37,000, and the expenses for clerks and carriers amounts to over $30,000, leaving some $6,000 balance, while Stratford is yielding a revenue to the Government of over $7,000, without having any letter delivery. The same is true in regard to the city of Ottawa. The revenue is $46,892, and the expenses amount to $45,000, mainly incurred for city delivery, leaving a net revenue of $1,800. There are 27 letter carriers employed, and about the same number of clerks. I regret to say this, because I do not know whether there will be any saving in this provision or not, but I think the Minister is fully justified in trying to obtain a little more revenue for the work done in these offices. I again protest, on behalf of the country constituencies, that the hon. gentleman should not unduly press his opposition to this change.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Will the hon. gentleman say that Ottawa is to be taken as a sample of any other cities?

If he went down to the post office here, he would see that the franks sent through this office exceed all the franks sent through all the other offices in Canada.

Mr. HESSON. I referred also to your own city of St. John.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I do not know what the revenue is in St. John, but I am certain that putting a rate of 2 cents on drop letters will reduce the revenue, because people will not send their letters in that way.

Mr. McKAY. I believe, with the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) that the introduction of this sytem into cities will reduce the revenue instead of increasing it, because people who have a large number of circulars and bills to distribute will take advantage of the distributing agencies. The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) has mentioned two or three cities for the purpose of comparison. I will take Hamilton, with which I am best acquainted. I find that in Hamilton there is a weekly delivery of drop letters of 15,700, which, at one cent each, makes an annual amount of $8,164, which more than half pays the cost of letter carrier service in that city. By adding the other cent to these drop letters, you make the drop letters of that city pay the whole cost of the letter carrying; that is, the mercantile community of that city pays the whole cost of that system, which I think is not justice to the business people of Hamilton or any other city.

On section 8,

Mr. BURDETT. On this section I wish to call the attention of the Postmaster General to a matter that has already been laid before him in respect to answers to examination questions in the Deaf and Dumb Institute, and by pupils in schools. I think the question regarding the examination papers and answers of pupils in our schools, has been laid before him by the school inspector. The superintendent of the Deaf and Dumb Institute, at Belleville, writes me that for a number of years it has been the practice to permit the answers of pupils to questions submitted to test their efficiency at the close of the examination year, to pass through the post office at the rate of one cent per four ounces, and I notice by the regulations formerly enforced that the words "wholly or partly written or printed" such as deeds, &c., are used. Now, in the case of pupils in the Deaf and Dumb Institute, their parents in many cases have no way to become informed of the progress their children are making. It is even very difficult in some cases to get parents to send their children to the institute at all, and still more difficult in many cases to get the children to go. At the close of each year in May, when the pupils are examined, printed examination papers are laid before them. To these they have to give written answers, they have no other way of communication. He desires to have those answers done up and sent to the parents in order that the parents of each child may see what progress their child is making. There is no other way to communicate this information to the parent, and no other way for the pupil to communicate it to any other person. I submit that it is an exceptional case, and I think the Postmaster General would be justified in permitting these answers of the deaf and dumb pupils to be sent in the way I indicate. It was done previously, under former regulations, but it seems a ruling was made a year or two ago that prohibited the sending of them without paying letter postage. It simply means that if letter postage is demanded to the full extent, they will not be sent, and it will be a great detriment to the children of that school. We all feel a deep interest, I know the Postmaster General, as well as every other person, feels a deep interest in the educational advantages that are given to these young people. Very marked progress is made in many cases, and useful and well informed men and women come out of these institutions. If there was any other way by which parents could know the progress their children are making, I would not urge this so earnestly as I do. I, therefore, trust that the hon. the Postmaster General will consider this a special case, and if he will permit them to go in that way, I think he would be doing a service to the country, as well as a just act.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman spoke to me before upon this subject, and I assured him that I would do all that I possibly could for the purpose of carrying out the wish he conveyed to me. But the difficulty arises that if you once let an institution of that kind have free postage, there are always other institutions calling themselves charitable institutions, educational and religious institutions, that will be coming in and asking for similar privileges. The difficulty arose in the definition of newspapers. A government might be pressed for the purpose of allowing an agricultural, a religious monthly or some such periodical as these to pass free, and it has been found impossible to draw the line which should and which should not pass. Accordingly all postal authorities have made the distinction on the ground of the frequency of publication. The same principle applies to institutions of this kind, and it is impossible, once you admit a precedent, to refuse the same privileges to others.

On section 10,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). With regard to a letter insufficiently paid, I think it should be forwarded on double postage being collected. If a letter is put in with the stamp dropped off, or if the stamp is insufficient, I think the letter ought to be forwarded on payment of the double amount. Why should not letters without stamps, and it must be remembered that the stamps sometimes come off, not be forwarded to their destination as non-prepaid letters are on double postage being charged?

Mr. HAGGART. The system referred to by the hon. gentleman exists in some countries. The objection to it is that some parties sending letters will not prepay them and this is found to be a nuisance.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I can understand how this may properly apply to letters sent from foreign countries, but with regard to letters within Canada I think the letter should be forwarded and double postage collected.

Mr. HAGGART. In the United States they detain the letter, and send a circular to the party stating that on receipt of sufficient postage the letter will be forwarded. The arrangement here is simply to prevent the nuisance of parties sending letters without postage.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). As the regulations stand now I understand that if upon an envelope there is printed the words: If within so many days the letter is not delivered it shall be returned to the parties whose names are given,—it will be returned. The present clause in the proposed Act might be read to indicate a change in that system. Does the Postmaster General wish to stop that system?

Mr. HAGGART. We intend to continue it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is there any material change in this clause, which is proposed to repeal section 45?

Mr. BOWELL. The principal change is to make every post office official a customs official for this purpose, and it is to make the Act workable, particularly since the parcel post system has been introduced.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If some arrangement could be entered into between the Customs and Post Office Departments whereby parcels would be delivered by the postmaster and whereby he would be empowered to collect the duties thereon, it would be a great benefit to outlying districts.

Mr. WATSON. I am very glad, because in a new country where there are few customs officers great difficulties may occur. I know that English people who receive boxes at Christmas, containing perhaps some contraband goods, suffer great inconvenience, and if an arrangement between the Customs Department and the Post Office authorities could be arrived at whereby the postmaster would collect the duties payable, it would be of great benefit.

Bill reported.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BOWELL moved second reading of Bill No (117) to further amend the Customs Act, chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to inform the House that since this Bill was introduced I have found in the practical working of the Customs Act difficulties, which I desire to avoid in future by amending some of the clauses. I would call the attention of the House to those changes and then we can discuss them when we are in Committee, and if we should succeed in getting through Committee to-night we can allow the third reading to remain over for a day or two in order that those who take a greater interest in this matter can better understand it. I desire to change the 68th section of this Act, which defines what shall be understood to be an importation sent through a foreign country in transit to Canada. At present there is a duty of 10 per cent. on tea purchased in the United States, while tea which is purchased and imported directly to Canada from the country of growth and production is free. We have hitherto treated all teas imported *vid* Boston or New York or any other American port and sent direct in transit to Canada as a direct importation. In order to evade the provisions of the law merchants in New York have been in the habit of importing cargoes of tea, and instead of sending it direct to Canada, as their papers would indicate it should be sent, they have allowed it to remain not in bond at the warehouse nor have they made any entry. The fact that tea is not dutiable in the United States prevents them from bonding. They are obliged under the law to make the entry and if they make the entry it becomes United States property, hence they cannot send it afterwards as a direct importation from the country of growth to Canada. In order to evade that provision of the American law they have allowed the tea to remain in warehouse as unclaimed goods until such time as they can obtain a market for it. It is the best possible evidence that could be given that it was not originally intended for Canada, for if they can find a market in the United States they would sell it there and not send it to Canada. A case which came under my observations within the past few days is one in which the tea remained as unclaimed goods in a warehouse in the city of New York since last October. I decided, and was sustained in the opinion by the Justice Department, that that was not a direct importation and the importer had to pay the duty. I desire to place the following addition to the 68th clause of the Act which has reference to the bringing of goods from the United States to Canada in bond:

"Goods that have been entered for consumption or for warehouse or that have been permitted to remain unclaimed or that have been permitted to remain for any purpose in any country intermediate between the country of export and Canada, shall not be considered as in transit through such intermediate country and shall be treated as goods imported from such intermediate country and be valued at the rate of duty accordingly."

That, I think, will avoid any difficulty in the future. I desire also to amend the 12th section of the Act, which provides for the confiscation of goods which are enclosed in a package and not mentioned in the invoice. Lawyers have discovered what they think a defect in the clause as it now stands; that is, that if goods are not found while they are passing through the Custom house that they cannot reach them afterwards though you may find the invoices in the possession of the merchant who has received them in the manner that I have indicated. I do not think, however, that in reference to that clause of the Customs Act that this contention could be sustained, but in order to avoid difficulties and lawsuits I propose to amend the clause as follows:—

"If any goods are enclosed in any package which are not mentioned in the invoice or entry of such package, such goods if found shall be seised and forfeited. If such goods are not found but the value thereof has been ascertained the importer or other person who has made the entry or caused to be made entry of such package and who neglects on receipt of such package to immediately make report and entry of such enclosure shall forfeit the value thereof."

The practice in the past has been, and I think it can be sustained by the law, to confiscate a sum equal to the value of the goods when the goods so imported could not be found. This places the matter beyond a doubt. Merchants who understand the working of this clause will see that it gives the merchants a privilege, in case the goods have been passed through without being discovered, to make entry of the goods so soon as received.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The change proposed in this section is a very important one. When the Customs law was enacted in 1879, I think that for the first time this principle of charging duty upon the inland transport charges was adopted. Representations were made at that time by those interested in importing, if not by the Montreal Board of Trade and others, that it would work unfairly, and that it was not in the public interest that we should adopt that principle. The Minister at that time compromised the matter by exempting goods imported from Great Britain and Ireland, and now he proposes to wipe out that exemption. The Minister told us the other day that he found that through treaty arrangements between Germany and England he was unable to charge the inland transport charges on German goods, and in order to remedy that he proposes that Great Britain and Ireland should no longer be exempt from this provision any more than any other country. Now, it seems to me that we have arrived at a time when it would be wise for us as a Committee to consider this whole question of charging duties on these inland transport charges. For my own part, I think it would be wise if, instead of striking out the exemption of Great Britain and Ireland, the Minister should take the other tack, and exempt goods coming from all countries from this charge; in other words, that he should wipe out this section of the Customs law altogether. Its phraseology is copied from the American Customs law; and, as I pointed out the other day—I spoke with some hesitancy at the time, but I am convinced now—that provision in the American law was repealed in March, 1883. If the Minister thought it was wise to adopt the phraseology and follow the line of the American Customs law at that time, perhaps it would be worth his while to consider whether, seeing that the Americans have learned by experience that it was wise to repeal that provision, it would not be wisdom for us to do so too. At any rate, it will strike this Committee as somewhat strange that while the American Government, who have as complex a system of tariff rates as we have, should find it in the public interest to repeal this provision, we should find it in the public interest, not only not to repeal it, but

to enact more stringent regulations in reference to it. I think it is not very defensible to add these inland transport charges at all. If the object be to secure a revenue, I think the Minister of Customs should take the bold course of increasing his tariff rates of duty, instead of endeavoring to secure revenue by such a roundabout way. I believe representations have been made to him by business men adverse to this provision. In its operation it has caused hardship in the past, loss to merchants, trouble to importers, and loss to carriers, and now it is proposed to add very greatly to the burdens of importers by the extensive change the Minister proposes. I think such a course would tend greatly to diminish the profits of our own railways and our own steamship lines; and I think the interests of all concerned will be served by repealing the clause altogether. It is represented by those who are engaged in the carrying trade—I think in a memorial from the Montreal Board of Trade—that the Canadian route labors under greater difficulties every year. The port of New York has its line of steamers sailing direct, not only to all ports to which our own Canadian steamers sail, but to the different ports of the European countries, and will be able, if we adopt this plan, of charging upon inland transport charges, and especially the transhipping charges, to take the trade from our own lines. No wonder, then, that the merchants of Montreal, the shipping interests as well as the importers, are protesting against this amendment. A parcel of goods is, for instance, bought by a merchant on the continent, and our steamship lines will have to compete for the carriage of the goods with the lines sailing from New York, and, in order to compete, will perhaps be compelled to offer as low a rate as those ships which sail direct from Hamburg or some of the other ports. In order to secure that freight, our Canadian lines sailing from Liverpool, or the other ports where they touch, will have to offer as low rates as American lines sailing direct from the ports where the goods were purchasad, and you can see the disadvantage they thus labor under. But the hon the Minister of Customs proposes by this amendment to put our steamers under this additional disadvantage, that a merchant buying goods at an European port will have them sent direct from that port to New York, and thence to Canada, in order to escape paying duty upon the transport charges which will be required if they are taken on our own vessels. Either the importer will have to bear the loss, or it will have to be borne by our own carrying lines, and the Committee cannot fail to see how injuriously this would affect our trade. Why should not the enterprising merchant be at liberty to go to any market he chooses—the cheapest market in which he can buy his goods—without being compelled to pay duty on the inland transport charges? It is manifestly unwise to maintain this practice of charging duties upon inland transport, as well as upon the value of the article itself. How does it work with reference to different classes of goods? Take high price goods. Take, for instance, the valuable, costly cutlery from Sheffield. You have a package of that in which there may be thousands of dollars worth of goods. The merchants would have to pay duty on the inland transport from Sheffield to the port of Liverpool, or whatever port he is shipping from. That would be comparatively light, you would say, in comparison with the value of the goods; but take an article like crockery, and bring that from the potteries in Staffordshire to the port of shipment, and you have not only to pay the excessive duty on the goods, but also a duty on the package; and if there is a certain percentage of breakage you have to pay duty even upon the broken crockery. Besides paying the heavy price at the original point of purchase for the packages and freights, you have to pay a heavy freight from Staffordshire to the port of shipment, and, in addition, if you add the duty on the inland charges from the Staffordshire potteries to the port of shipment, a serious item is added to the cost of these articles: I do not want to detain the House, but wish simply to point out clearly to the Committee the position in which we will be placed if this amendment be adopted I would like to hear the views of the Hon. Minister of Customs in reference to this point before discussing this amendment further. My idea would be, instead of amending section 61 of the Customs Act in the manner he proposes, to expunge it from the Statute-book altogether. If the Minister must have some additional revenue, let him take the bold course of adding it on to the article, and not take this roundabout way. The American Customs have abandoned what the hon. gentleman proposes to perpetuate and intensify. We, who have copied the very phraseology of their language for the first time in this Act, might do well to consider whether we should not follow their example and wipe out all these charges for duty on inland transport, and revert to that which, I think, is the correct principle, that the price for duty shall be the price paid for the article where it is purchased.

Mr. CURRAN. With reference to this amendment which my hon. friend now suggests, I may say that, in a very great measure, the remarks of the last speaker are the views of the mercantile community in the city which I have the honor to represent. There have been a great many very erroneous notions in connection with the effect of this amendment, if we can call it an amendment. The merchants who are interested in the imports to this country are far from regarding it as an amendment at all. Not to repeat what has been said by my hon. friend, I may say, in the first place, that the merchants contend that it will be a most difficult matter to levy this duty upon goods, on account of the peculiar charges in connection with this transportation,—not merely the railway charges but the charges for cartage, and other expenses, which were enumerated to me the other day at a meeting of the Council of the Board of Trade, held at Montreal on Saturday last. They say that the system in England differs entirely from that which prevails on the continent. There the goods are sold at a certain price free on board, while in England nothing of the kind takes place; and all these extra charges, some of a trivial nature—1s. 6d., and other small amounts of that kind—will have to be computed on a bale of goods containing a variety of imports, and perhaps calling for a different duty from the others; and it will be almost impossible to reach the duty to be levied for these additional expenses of transportation without a most complicated system arising out of it. Now, my hon. friend has spoken about the disadvantages that our Canadian lines of steamers would suffer from as regards American lines plying between English ports and ports in the United States, New York more particularly. But there is also another disadvantage as between the Canadian lines themselves. For instance, goods bought in London and shipped on board at London by a line of steamers sailing from that port, would have nothing to pay for inland transportation, whereas, if goods of the same kind were bought in London and shipped to one of our ports *vid* Liverpool, the cost of transportation from London to Liverpool would be added. There would thus be an actual discrimination between two lines of Canadian steamers simply because one would sail from one port in England and another would sail fron another port. The merchants are of the opinion that it would be far better, if the present duty be not sufficient, to increase the duty upon the goods rather than introduce the amount which is now proposed by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs. They say that they do not particularly object to any reasonable increase of the duty, but they do object to this system which is now suggested, which they contend will affect our trade most injuriously, which will affect the various interests which have been referred to,

and will cause a vast amount of annoyance. The gentlemen representing the Boards of Trade of Montreal and Toronto, are to wait upon the Minister of Customs tomorrow and to lay their views before him upon this point, and I know that their contention is that it would be far better to wipe out that portion of the clause altogether, and, if necessary, to add to the duty already levied upon goods imported rather than to adopt a system such as that which is now suggested by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs.

Mr. BOWELL. I explained fully, when I introduced the resolutions and the Bill, the reasons which had induced the Government to suggest this change in the law. I do not know that it is necessary or advisable that I should detain the Committee with any further remarks upon that point. My hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) has fallen into the same error, though not to the same extent, as a great many others have done who have written in the newspapers and have written to the department, and even I regret to say from Boards of Trade and Chambers of Commerce. My hon. friend pointed out the disadvantages which would accrue to Canadian ships bringing goods purchased in the European market and taken to Liverpool, over the American ships running direct from the port of shipment. That is not the fact. The value for duty is not the price of the goods purchased in the foreign market with the charges added to Liverpool. If a Canadian vessel entered into an arrangment with merchants in Germany or Belgium or any other foreign country for the carriage of goods from Liverpool to Canada, after the arrival of these goods there, there would be no more duty or charges added to the value of those goods than if they had been shipped directly from a port in that foreign country. I hope I have made myself sufficiently clear on that point.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but this is a matter of some importance. Suppose, for example, that goods were shipped from Antwerp to Montreal. As I understand him, a considerably less duty would be collected on those goods than on the same class of goods shipped from Liverpool, supposing the goods were manufactured in the interior of Belgium or Germany and were shipped to Liverpool for exportation to Canada. I unders and that from Antwerp to Canada they would pay less duty than they would pay if they were shipped from Liverpool to Canada though both classes of goods came from the same point in the centre of Germany.

Mr. BOWELL. No; that is the error which I was endeavoring to correct, and into which other gentlemen have fallen. If you go to Antwerp and purchase £100 worth of goods and they are shipped directly to Montreal, the duty would be levied on that £100; but if you shipped them to Liverpool the £100 value at the port of shipment at Antwerp would be the value for duty. The only point is, that, if a merchant goes into the interior of Belgium, for example, and purchases goods worth, say, £75 and it costs £5 to send them to Antwerp, then the value for duty would be £80.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Supposing it cost £10 to send them to Liverpool?

Mr. BOWELL. That would not be added.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be the same thing.

Mr. BOWELL. No; the wording of the clause shows that it is not, it reads:

"In determining the value for duty of goods, there shall be added to the fair market value, at the time of exportation, of the quantity so exported and imported in the principal markets of the country from whence the same have been imported into Canada, the cost of inland transportation, shipment and transhipment——"

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What does that mean?

Mr. BOWELL. Let me get through and I will explain.

Mr. CURRAN.

"—with all the expenses included, from the place of growth, production or manufacture, whether by land or water, to the vessel in which shipment is made, either *in transitû* or direct to Canada."

So you see, from the wording of the clause, that the costs of the inland transportation are added only until you reach the ship which brings the goods to this country.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). That is the ship that leaves Antwerp?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; the ship that leaves Antwerp. At present, if you purchase goods in Manchester and send them to Liverpool, the transportation charges are not added; but, under the proposed amendment, that will be charged. My hon. friend says that the merchants in Montreal take very strong objections to this clause because they say it will add to the trouble and annoyance of making their entries. I have never found the slightest complaint in Montreal or any other port when it was necessary for the merchants to take their invoices and deduct these charges. If there is no trouble in deducting these inland transportation charges, and other things which appear on the face of the invoice, I do not see how the trouble is to be increased by taking the invoice as it is presented to the Customs, and taking all the charges for duty. When there is no trouble in making deductions, how can it be any great trouble to them to allow the invoice to remain precisely as it is sent to them, with the charges added to it? My hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) has correctly pointed out that when this principle was adopted in the Canadian law it was taken from the American Customs Act as it then existed. It is quite true that that law was lately repealed. I find that the provision in the United States Customs law being section 2907 of the Revised Statutes, making dutiable inland transportation charges, which came into force on the 28th July, 1866, was repealed by section 87 of the Act of the 3rd March, 1883. See also synopsis of decisions of the Treasury Department, 1886, covering the United States Attorney General's opinion in reference to the dutiable value under the law as it stood after the repeal of section 2907 above referred to, which virtually fixes the dutiable value, and these are the words he uses, at the actual market value or wholesale price thereof at the period of the exportation to the United States, in the principal markets of the country from which the same has been exported. Now, if you go to Antwerp, by way of illustration, and purchase goods which have arrived in that city from the interior, the freight has been added to them, and consequently they are just exactly in the same position for duty when they reach the United States, as they would be if they had been purchased in the interior, and the inland charges added to them at Antwerp. The difficulty, then presented itself in carrying out the law as it now stands, and which I fear would be the case if we adopted the suggestion of the hon. member for Brant and repealed that provision altogether—the difficulty might be the great number of invoices that would be presented representing goods to have been purchased in the interior of the country when in fact they were purchased in the principal markets of the country. Now, the United States law provides for the value of goods for duty in the principal markets of the country in which they are purchased, and if that be carried out literally, it would include all the inland transportation. I do not think there can be a doubt upon that point; and the fact that there have been so many disputes and so much trouble arising from the wording of the law as it exists at present, induced the collector of Customs at New York, I am quite sure, when he was giving his evidence before the Commission, to state that he believed and was convinced that it had been a great mistake to repeal that provision of the law. There is another reason given by those who were instrumental in having that clause repealed in the United States, which was that they were desirous of reducing the

revenue, and that they could do it by that means without interfering to any appreciable extent with their protective system. It is quite true that it would add to the value of the goods for duty, and by that means increase the revenue to that extent; and I need not say that whenever any proposition is made for laying additional burdens upon the merchants, they, as a rule, object to it. I must say this, however, that the Montreal merchants have stated very frankly and clearly that rather than have this provision adopted they would prefer to see two or three more per cent. placed upon the dutiable value of the goods. But to my mind, and from the experience I have had in carrying out the Customs law, I cannot see that any more trouble would arise to the merchant, nor do I know of any difficulties that would present themselves in carrying out the provision of the law as it now stands. If we were to repeal that provision, as suggested by the hon. member for Brant, it would mean a loss of about a quarter a million of revenue upon continental goods alone. Of course it would not cause a loss upon those from England, because duty is not now charged in that country upon inland transportation. In the despatch to which I referred, when speaking upon this subject before, from the German ambassador in England, he points out that the difference in respect to German goods, amounts to 65 per cent. I should not have calculated the sum as high as that, but I know that in many classes of goods, and particularly those to which the member for Brant called attention, that is crockery, when purchased in the interior of Germany, it does add to the value of the duty of those goods 40 to 50, and in many cases 60 per cent. or higher. In Great Britain it could not have that effect, because the distance they are carried is not so great. The strongest reasons advanced against the proposition, to my mind, was by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), that is, that it might have the effect of causing merchants who purchase goods in London to send them by a vessel sailing from London to New York, rather than to send them to Liverpool and have the inland charges added to the value of the invoice for duty. That is the only objection I think that can be brought that has the slightest force in it against the proposition which is now before the Committee. I hope I have made myself sufficiently plain in reference to the intention of this clause. I have pointed out the misapprehension which has existed and still exists in the minds of many of those who have written upon the subject, and many of the boards of trade who have sent resolutions in connection with the matter. It is only to-day that I received a resolution passed by the French Chamber of Commerce in Montreal, in which they object to the adoption of this principle because, as they say, it will add the ocean freight to the value of goods for duty.

Mr. CURRAN. The Montreal Board of Trade does not take that view at all.

Mr. HOLTON. How much additional revenue does the hon. gentleman expect that the imposition of this duty will give him?

Mr. BOWELL. I have not made that calculation, but I think the increase may be nearly as much as the sum we would loose if we were to repeal it.

Mr. HOLTON. How much?

Mr. BOWELL. About a quarter of a million.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister of Customs has given a very explicit statement with regard to this clause, which I think the Committee fully understand. Divested of all explanation it simply amounts to this, that he is going to ask us to give him a quarter of a million more revenue.

Mr. BOWELL. It may be that, or less. I think it will be less.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The reason it was taken off in the United States was the reason assigned by the Minister of Customs, that they wished to reduce their revenue, and, therefore, they could afford to do it, whereas we, under the present circumstances, have to resort to every means of taxation to get every cent we can out of the consumers of this country. Now, I admit that if they were going to take a quarter of a million out of the taxpayers of this country it would be better to come down and advance the duty directly. That would be a more plain and intelligible way; it is one that the people understand, and it would do away with a great deal of trouble which the present position involves. On that point I think the House will agree that it is a very reprehensible Act; the House will agree that the present industries have sufficient protection without this quarter of a million which the Minister asks the House to give them in addition. If it had been understood from the commencement that this measure was going to involve so large an amount of taxation as the Minister now mentions he would have found generally among consumers, not among manufacturers, of course, a much greater outcry than has yet come up against the Bill. The working of the Bill is simple enough, I admit, there is no trouble about that. If the Minister proposes to add to the cost of an article the expense of the inland transportation, that is an intelligible proposition. But the difficulty of working it seems to be such as is indicated by the member for Montreal Centre (Mr Curran), where goods come from different parts of England. For instance, up to a certain time a very large portion of the shipments coming by the large lines to Montreal has come by way of Liverpool. Of course the hon. gentleman is now legislating in favor of one line that comes from London direct. After this time the advantages will be so great that no London goods can come by way of Liverpool, and I know the hon. gentleman had no such object in view; but that is practically what the measure amounts to. It is an interference with trade which will be found to be very objectionable to the proprietors of the large steamers directly interested. The hon. gentleman explains that on goods going to London, for instance, from Antwerp, the ocean freight up to that point would not be included, and it would form no part of the inland freight, because it would be collected in full at the time of shipment. I cannot see very much difference between ocean freight going to the port of shipment at London to be shipped to Canada, from that of inland freight of similar goods coming from a manufacturing district in England to London to be transhipped to Canada. I cannot see on principle what the difference can be. It is part of the expense of getting them to the point of departure for this country, and if they happen to be water borne part of the way to London it should make no difference over the fact that they were land carried from the interior of the country to London, the port of shipment. In that respect the hon. gentleman's reasoning is rather faulty and does not harmonise. The main fact is that we are asked to vote a quarter of a million more of taxes, and that is a very serious thing. I think at this late period of the Session the Government should hesitate before they ask the House to commit themselves to such an important measure as this is, and I repeat that if it had become known that this is what the Bill involved we would have heard much more about it than we do at present. I can understand Boards of Trade taking these Bills as they are presented and not always understanding them, for they have not always the benefit of the explanation given by the Minister; but, in my opinion, they understand the bearing of the Bill and they will understand more than ever that the object of this Bill is to obtain more money.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Then let the hon. gentleman lower the duty on those articles so as to harmonise the

amount collected, and then I should not see so much objection to the Bill.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister always speaks with a good deal of complaisancy about the errors into which people fall, and he sets us right in a very dignified way.

Mr. BOWELL. I hope I did not do it offensively, I did not mean to do so.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The trouble is the Minister is an autocrat, with power not only of introducing a Bill into Parliament but of interpreting a Bill afterwards. He brings in a Bill, and we read over a clause in it, and interpret it according to the general meaning of the English language, but the Minister rises and says that the hon gentleman has fallen into the same error that a great many people have already fallen into, and I will tell you the meaning of it. I hold that in this Committee we are dealing with the Bill as introduced, and I hold that the explanation of the Minister does not bear out his contention. His ruling may be so and so, but if he rules that way he rules contrary to the wording of the Bill, which I will read:

"In determining the value for duty of goods, there shall be added to the fair market value, at the time of exportation, of the quantity so exported and imported in the principal markets of the country from whence the same have been imported into Canada, the cost of inland transportation, shipment and transhipment, with all the expenses included, from the place of growth, production or manufacture, whether by land or water, to the vessel in which shipment is made, either *in transitu* or direct to Canada."

The wording of the resolution is as plain as it can possibly be made. Goods shipped at Hamburg for Liverpool to be sent to Canada are under the Bill subject to dutiable charges by the water route just the same as by the inland route, and the same applies to interior points of Germany. The language is this: "Either *in transitu* or direct to Canada." The meaning of the section is this: that if goods are purchased in any European country, the cost of transportation, in Germany, for example, is added to the price at Liverpool, and the cost of transportation from Germany to Liverpool is also added. If so, all the expenses of transportation, whether by land or water to the vessel in which the goods are to be shipped, are included. That is the meaning of the section. The Minister says that is not the meaning of it. If not, he should alter its wording. We cannot afford to place an Act on the Statute-book which is susceptible of other interpretation than that according to the ordinary rules of interpretation.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The Minister when introducing this Bill stated that it arose in consequence of representations made by the ambassador of Germany with respect to inland transportation charges on German goods, while such are not made against British goods. I fail to understand how a treaty between England and Germany could affect any matter between England and her colonies. I could understand very well how such a point might be raised respecting the construction of the most favored nation clause as between England and Germany or England and the United States, but I cannot understand it as between England and her colonies. I have no doubt that the effect of this measure will be to cast additional burdens upon the importers of the country to a very large extent. As I said before, I must confess I cannot understand how between the mother country and her colonies our fiscal regulations should be interfered with by a treaty between Great Britain and another power. Then, with regard to what my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) said, I must say that, although I listened very attentively to the explanation of the Minister of Customs, I am not at all clear as to the construction of this clause.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Did I not make it clear?

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Not any more clear than the Minister of Customs. I must say that the words "either *in transitu* or direct to Canada" puzzle me as to their meaning, and, taking the whole thing together, I should be inclined rather to agree with the interpretation of my hon. friend from Brant. The words:

"The cost of inland transportation, shipment and transhipment, with all the expenses included from the place of growth, production or manufacture, whether by land or water, to the vessel in which shipment is made—"

—mean, I think, that if the goods come from the interior of Germany, they would be taken by land and water, and it would be inland transportation to the vessel. I may say that I am very much puzzled as to the construction of that clause, and I believe that the strict interpretation of it would lead me to the conclusion of my hon. friend from Brant, that it would include the transhipment from Antwerp to Liverpool. I have talked with my hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, about this inland transhipment with regard to goods from the United States, and I think it is more against the Maritime Provinces than it is against the upper Provinces, because if goods are carried by rail they pay no duty, but if carried to New York and shipped to St. John or Halifax, then the inland transportation is added. In that respect I think that we are in an unfair position.

Mr. BOWELL. When I introduced the resolution, I endeavored to explain the reasons for this change. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) says that he does not understand why a treaty between Germany and England can interest the colonies so far as it relates to the imposition of duties or what might be termed our internal regulations respecting our tariff. The treaty was entered into, between Great Britain and Germany, in 1865, before Confederation, and it contains what is known as "the most favored nation clause." The provision in that treaty also binds the colonies, and hence the colonies of Great Britain at that time were made a party to the treaty. That being the case, Germany says: "You have provided in the wording of that treaty that you shall have no advantages in trade matters that are not enjoyed by ourselves, nor will you give any advantages to a country which is a party to that treaty that are not given to us." That includes the colonies as well as Great Britain, and hence the advantage given to Great Britain by adding the inland transportation for value of goods for duty is an advantage which is given to Great Britain and Ireland by Canada and which is not given to Germany. I hope I have made myself clear. I approach this point with a good deal of diffidence, because it appears that I am unfortunate in not being able to make clear to some hon. members what I conceive to be a misunderstanding of the law on the part of my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson). He seems to be a little touchy on that point. If he can suggest to me any language that cannot by any possibility imply offence I will use it. I think, however, that I used a moderate term. If you take that clause you will see that it is not an arbitrary interpretation on the part of the Customs Department. Arbitrary, dictatorial or whatever the hon. gentleman may think proper to call me in the position I occupy.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I did not call you names.

Mr. BOWELL. Well, that has nothing to do with the matter. I may be a potentate, or absolute, or anything you please, but here is my friend alongside me (Mr. Cockburn) and I might refer it to him without any fear of the result, to let him tell the House what the grammatical interpretation of this clause is. Whatever interpretation my hon. friend from Brant may put on this clause, I may state that it has been on the Statute-book ever since I have been in the Government. There is no change in the law so far as this is concerned, and the interpretation which he has

given it and as to the effects that would follow therefrom have never been experienced either by myself or by any member of the Government.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is simply because you did not put it into operation. You did not carry out the law.

Mr. BOWELL. That is a matter of opinion. If I were to call you dictatorial in the manner in which you give answers, it might be offensive, but I will not, because I know you do not mean it. I have never gone to the Council to ask for an interpretation of this law, for to my mind it is so clear that a child might understand it. It says:

"In determining the value for duty of goods, there shall be added to the fair market value, at the time of exportation, of the quantity so exported and imported in the principal markets of the country from whence the same have been imported into Canada, the cost of inland transportation, shipment and transhipment, with all the expenses included, from the place of growth, production or manufacture, whether by land or water, to the vessel in which shipment is made, either *in transitu* or direct to Canada."

Now can the ocean between Antwerp and Liverpool, or from Antwerp to any other port, be by any possibility construed into being "inland transport?"

Mr. WELDON (St. John). That is the old Act.

Mr. BOWELL. The clause is precisely the same as to wording as the old Act. There is no change so far as this is concerned. It is the land or water charges, by which it is conveyed to the ship in which it is placed for shipment to this country, that are added to the value of the goods for duty. It applies exclusively to the "inland transportation" and nothing more. Then the words, "*in transitu*" were used for the very purpose of avoiding that interpretation which has been put upon the clause by the hon. member for Brant. If those words were not there, there might be some reason for that interpretation. If you send the goods from a foreign port *via* England, they are *in transitu via* England, just as the hon. member for Brant says that they are *in transitu* when sent from Yokohama *via* New York. If his argument amounts to anything, the duty should be added to all the charges from Yokohama to New York. If the clause will bear that interpretation in one way, it must in the other. That has been the interpretation placed upon it by a number of newspapers, misled, I think, by the meagre resolutions which were placed upon the Notice Paper when it was introduced. I would ask my hon. friend to sleep over this—to take it and apply the rules of grammar to it, and then take the words "inland transportation" as governing the whole of the charges which are to be added, and consider in addition the privilege that merchants have to send the goods through a foreign country, and he cannot come to any other conclusion than the one I have come to.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). While I sleep on that, I will give the Minister of Customs this to sleep on: I happen to have here an opinion which was given by an able counsel with reference to the working of this clause on the Statute-book, and I will read what he says:

"The point at which the transportation ceases, the cost of which is to be added to the value for duty, seems to be the point at which the last shipment by water is made, by means of which the goods are expected to reach Canada."

Just what I said, and Liverpool is the last point at which the last shipment by water is made. He goes on to say:

"In this instance, again, the language of the clause is singularly ambiguous, but it seems to be intended that the point of shipment in a vessel in a port of the country *ex quo* is the point at which the cost of inland transportation, to be computed in the dutiable value, is to cease. And two modes are evidently pointed at by which the goods can afterwards reach this country, viz, directly from the port of shipment and indirectly *via* a foreign port on this side of the Atlantic, reaching Canada from thence by land, and the *transitus* spoken of in the clause must therefore mean the carriage of the goods across the ocean."

That is the opinion of a counsel who was asked to give his opinion, and if the Minister wants to know who the counsel is, it is the Hon. J. J. C. Abbott, one of his colleagues in the Government, and, therefore, he will admit its value. He goes on to point out:

"It is scarcely necessary to point out that, although the meaning thus stated is probably the meaning intended to be conveyed by the words, '*in transitu*,' used in the resolution, they really possess no such distinctive signification, as they apply equally to a shipment direct to Canada, and to a shipment to Canada *viâ* a foreign port."

That is, that the words "*in transitu*" apply equally to a vessel coming to Montreal or to one coming to New York, and the charges to be added were all the charges for transportation from whatever country the goods came to the place where the last shipment is made. Now, when you consider that so much money or revenue is involved, it is worth while for the Minister to give the matter a little consideration, and to see whether, if the clause is to go on, it cannot be amended. But I submit that if it means the imposition of another quarter of a million upon the people of this country plus the annoyance to the importer, plus the loss to the Canadian steamships and the Canadian railways, this Committee ought to take into consideration the advisability of repealing it altogether. Follow the example of the United States in repealing this provision, as you followed their example in copying the exact phraseology of it from them. The Minister on another occasion said that this law was on the Statute-book before the National Policy. I think he was altogether wrong. The law that existed before was this:

"The value for duty of goods on which an *ad valorem* duty of Customs is imposed, imported into Canada by sea, shall be the actual value of such goods at the last place at which they are purchased; and the value of such goods for duty, if imported from the United States by land or inland navigation, shall be the actual value of such goods at the last place at which they are purchased for importation into Canada, and whence they are directly conveyed, without change of package, to Canada; and whatever be the country from which the goods are imported or in which they are purchased, such value shall be ascertained by adding to the value of such goods at the place of growth, production or manufacture, the cost of transportation, whether by land or water, and the shipment and transhipment, with all expenses included, from the place of growth, production or manufacture, to the place where the goods are purchased, and if they are purchased in the United States, thence to the place whence they are directly conveyed to Canada as aforesaid."

That was the old Act, but it is entirely changed in this Bill. The system that prevailed then was this: An invoice of goods are purchased in London; they are foreign made goods; the law prescribed that if they were produced in Germany, the Minister, in estimating their value, would take the cost of the goods in Germany, and add the cost of transporting them from Germany to London, if that was the last place where the purchase was made. That was simply put in for the purpose of enabling the Customs Department to ascertain the value if it was disputed. Then there is this anomaly in this clause: The Minister gives us an illustration of the way in which he will work his law, that in the case of goods purchased in London, the inland transport charges to Liverpool would be added; but in case those goods were not purchased in London,—if they were produced in Germany, for instance, and taken to London, and the importer purchased them in London, would he add the inland transportation charges from London to Liverpool on those goods?

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) Under what authority?

Mr. BOWELL. Because that is the place where they are purchased.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) This clause does not provide that it shall be from the place where purchased. It says from the place of growth, production and manufacture. Therefore, goods bought in London, purchased, manufactured or grown outside of London, could not be affected by the duties under this clause. The whole clause is wrong, and will have to be re-drafted, if not abandoned, or it will

have to be left wholly to the discretion of the Minister of Customs to put whatever interpretation he pleases upon it, without reference to the wording of the Statute at all.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Under the protection the Minister of Customs gives there could be no difficulty; but his successor might adopt a different view, and the more you look into the clause, the more complicated it appears. I cannot understand about the treaty. The treaty was made in 1866, before Confederation, between England and Germany. We are bound to this extent by the favored nation clause, that a colony could not make a different duty against goods imported from Germany as compared with those imported from the United States. But, *quoad* Great Britain, we are one country, so that the duties we charge on English goods can in no way come under that clause.

Mr. BOWELL. The clause provides specially that no import or export duties shall be charged between Great Britain and her colonies which would favor either as compared with Germany. I propose to add the word "including" before the words "shipping and transhipment," and to strike out the word "included" in the next line and to add the words "connected therewith." This will make that part of the clause read: "The cost of inland transportation, including shipment and transhipment with all the expenses included therewith."

Mr. BOYLE. I am going to ask the Minister of Customs if this clause not only discriminates between British and foreign ports, but also between different ports in the United Kingdom? For instance, in the dry goods trade, the three principal ports are London, Manchester and Glasgow. The prices of the goods in those three markets are much the same, but the effect of this change might possibly be to drive the purchasers of goods to London, Liverpool and Glasgow, and to leave out Manchester, in order to save this duty on inland charges by shipping direct from London, Liverpool and Glasgow.

On section 6,

Mr. BOWELL. The amendment I propose is simply to prevent people bringing out machines from a foreign country, ostensibly for their own use, without paying duty upon the royalty, as all other persons do. It is so amended as to make it clear that the value of the duty shall include the value of any royalty.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I should judge the hon. the Minister would have great difficulty in managing that royalty business. There are continually new lines upon which these royalties may be used. I had a case myself in which I bought the right to use a patent right for fifteen years, and the value was added on, but there was a clause in the agreement that I might be free to give up at any time using the royalty. But, when I came to pass the hon. gentleman's officers, I was met with the claim that there would be 15 years' value added to the article, and I might abandon the use of it at the end of three months. The perplexing part was that, if I gave up the use of it, there was no provision for my getting it back. There was, in fact, a special regulation passed in regard to it, but the whole question of royalties is a very difficult one to manage.

Mr. BOWELL. It is a very difficult one.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think, unless the officers are very vigilant, as I believe most of them are, one person might be paying for the use of an article while another was not.

Mr. MASSON. I would ask the Minister whether it is the intention to charge for what is generally known as a royalty under such circumstances as this: Suppose the inventor and the manufacturer of an article lives in the United States, and has a patent there and also a patent in Canada. Under his Canadian patent he charges for the use or the right to vend the article in Canada a certain sum, which is commonly called a royalty. Is it the intention under this section to add the fee to the price or value which the manufacturer in a foreign country obtains, because the article being used in Canada, gains by virtue of the Canadian patent?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is the article made in Canada or in the States?

Mr. MASSON. Say it is made in the States, but imported into Canada, and used or sold in Canada, and for the right to use or sell in Canada, the patentee, who lives in the United States, but has obtained under our law a patent in Canada, by virtue of his Canadian patent, charges a certain fee for that privilege. It does not seem to me that that is a subject for duty at all.

Mr. BOWELL. If a man has a patent in the United States and manufactures there an article which costs him a dollar, and he charges a royalty of another dollar, that amounts to two dollars, and would be the value for duty. If he obtains a patent in Canada he has to manufacture in Canada within a year, or lose his rights under the patent. I think what my hon. friend desires to learn is in regard to a case where a man has a patent in Canada and sells the right to another to manufacture and then sends over to Canada a portion of the machinery required to complete the article, whether the whole value of the article should be charged on the portions which are imported.

Mr. MASSON. That covers a part of it.

Mr. BOWELL. If the article is made here, we have nothing to do with it. If an American manufacturer sells to a Canadian manufacturer the right to make the article, it is not our business what he sells it for, but, if he imports a portion of the article, he would have to pay duty upon it. The question has been before the department, and it has been decided that, where they send ordinary castings of an article patented in the United States and patented in this country, it was dutiable under the tariff. At first, I thought it came within the clause of the law which provides for the imposition of a duty on parts of an article, and that the value of the parts for duty should be in proportion to the value of the whole.

Mr. MASSON. The explanation of the Minister meets in part the question which I asked, but I do not confine it to parts. By way of example, I may put a case to show the drift of my question. A person in the United States has a patent in the United States, and he patents the same invention in Canada. He sells to a party in Canada the right to make and vend in Canada, for which he receives a fee for each article sold. The person in Canada is manufacturing, but he has not a sufficient supply on hand. As he is manufacturing, the question of the patent lapsing at the end of a year would not apply; but he is not manufacturing in sufficient quantities to meet the demand, and the article is sent in by the patentee in the United States.

Mr. BOWELL. Then it would be dutiable beyond a doubt.

Mr. MASSON. What I ask is, would what is called a royalty on each machine be added to the value for duty?

Mr. BOWELL. Not if it were manufactured here, but if it were imported it would be.

Mr. MASSON. He is paying the fee not to import the article, but to sell it here by virtue of a Canadian patent, and not in reference to the price in the United States. It has its price there by virtue of the American patent, but why should the additional price be put on here after the man has paid the amount in the United States, and has paid for the enhanced value there? Why should you add an additional

enhanced value by way of the royalty which is paid here? It seems to me that the importer is at a disadvantage in that.

Mr. BOWELL. I desire to move the following additional clause:—

That section sixty-eight of the Act be amended by adding the following thereto:

"Goods that have been entered for consumption or for warehouse or that have been permitted to remain unclaimed, or that have been permitted to remain for any purpose in any country intermediate between the country of export and Canada, shall not be considered as *in transitu* through such intermediate country, but shall be treated as goods imported from such intermediate country and be valued and rated for duty accordingly."

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Do you mention any time?

Mr. BOWELL. No; I have not. What I wanted to prevent is a repetition of the trouble which arose in reference to the tea.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The object is all right, but, unless you limit it to some time, you will have to decide on each entry.

Mr. BOWELL. That would be difficult. I think it would be better to leave that discretionary with the department. Cars might be ready to make the transhipment from the vessel, or they might not be there, some cause might exist by which it could not be done, and a necessary delay of 24 hours or 48 hours might occur, as very often does. When only such delays take place, the importation has not been treated in any other way than a direct importation.

On section 11, sub-section 3,

Mr. BOWELL. If goods are seized now, they are condemned, and the law provides what shall be done in order to complete the confiscation. It gives the right to the party from whom they are seized to object to go into court, but there is no provision governing a case where a merchant says: "I do not desire you to interfere with my case, there is the money." The money is deposited.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What have you been doing with the money previous to this?

Mr. BOWELL. We have put it in the bank.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The summary seizure of a vessel sometimes works injustice on the owner. I know the Minister will say that if they do not retain this power people will transfer their vessels and put them out of their hands. But I have known cases where there has been no collusion of that kind. It seems the Government have no right to come down and seize a vessel that has been rendered liable for violation of the Customs Act, a year or two before. I think that is an extreme interpretation of the law.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman does not mean to say that the Government has no right under the law to do that. Equitably considered there is a good deal of reason in the position taken by the hon. gentleman; but under all revenue laws the right to seize a vessel that has violated the law exists. When discussing this matter before I referred to the English decisions. You will find by consulting them that where a vessel has contravened the Merchants' Shipping Act, the vessel became absolutely forfeited, although she had been sold no less than three times, still she was seized and condemned.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That might have been by collusion.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no evidence of that in the trial, and I read all the evidence. But one can easily understand that if a vessel was to be held harmless for smuggling, the very moment there was a probability of her being caught for smuggling, the owner would transfer her to some one else. Cases have come up where people have a heavy mortgage upon a vessel, and where she had been caught in a flagrant case of smuggling; and the same argument has been used: "I invested my money in this security, and am I to be robbed of it by the Government taking the vessel?" You might just as well repeal the law with respect to smuggling if you adopt the principle of the hon. gentleman.

Bill reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1:05 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 10th April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OTTAWA, MORRISBURG AND NEW YORK RAILWAY.

Mr. HICKEY moved:

That as it appears from the Minutes of the proceedings of the Senate on the 28th of March, 1889, that the Select Committee on Railways, Telegraphs and Harbors reported that they had decided by a majority not to pass Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway Company, which report said Minutes show was concurred in by the Senate on the 2nd April inst.;

Resolved, That the Accountant of this House be authorised to refund the fees paid on the said Bill, less cost of printing and translation.

He said: I had intended to make some extended remarks in support of this resolution or in explanation of it, but feeling that I cannot treat, as they merit, the two or three individuals who have unfairly attacked me elsewhere, I shall have to bury my indignation with the Bill, which for the second time has been rejected.

Motion agreed to.

DUTY ON FLOUR.

Mr. MULOCK asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to take any steps, and if so, what steps, towards meeting the demands of the millers for increased duty on flour, with the view of putting an end to the unjust discrimination complained of by the milling industry?

Mr. FOSTER. The question, I think, is a little improper, having a statement of what is put forward as a fact. The Government does not admit that there has been any unjust discrimination. With reference to this question, my hon. friend will see that it is of such a nature that it would not be wise for me to give an answer at the present time.

COLLECTOR JULES QUESNEL.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked, 1. Was complaint ever brought by a person named Henderson Black, or a person named John Black, or any other person whatsoever, belonging to St. Johns, P.Q., between 1878 and 1888, against Jules Quesnel, collector on the Chambly Canal, at St. Johns? 2. If so, what was the character of the complaint? 3. What was the kind of security given by the said Jules Quesnel? 4. What are the duties of his office?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is no record on the books of the department of any complaint by Mr. Black, or any other person, against J. Quesnel. The security given by Mr. Quesnel, as collector of canal tolls and of hydraulic rents, was a bond, dated 18th March, 1879, for $2,000, by the Citizens' Insurance Company. Afterwards, on the 17th

April, 1882, he gave the personal bond of Charles Arpin, for $1,000, and of George C. Futvoye, for $1,000. These were replaced on 1st May, 1885, by a bond of J. O'Cain, for $1,000, and of Joseph Simard, for $1,000, the latter being still in force.

PILOTS BELOW QUEBEC.

Mr. AMYOT asked, How much did each of the pilots for and below the harbor of Quebec receive for each season of navigation, from 1880 to 1888, both inclusive?

Mr. TUPPER. The pilots for and below the harbor of Quebec have received on an average from 1880 to 1888, inclusive, as follows: 1880, $680; 1881, $504; 1882, $602.60; 1883, $651.47; 1884, $549; 1885, $576; 1886, $581.50; 1887, $618.13; 1888, $520.23.

ST. CATHARINES MILLING AND LUMBERING COMPANY—COSTS AND CLAIMS.

Mr. LISTER asked, What amount has been paid by the Government, up to this date, on account of the costs incurred in the case of the "St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Company" *vs.* "The Queen"? What will the total costs incurred by the company, in connection with this suit, amount to?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The amount paid so far for the costs of the company is $11,152.67; the amount paid to the London agents is $5,000. In regard to sums in connection with the case before the Privy Council, I am not aware what the total amount is, the bills not having been presented.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Is it the intention of the Government to pay the costs incurred by the Government of Ontario, on behalf of the Province, in the case of the "St. Catharines Milling Company" *vs.* "The Queen?" Has the "St Catharines Milling Company" made any demand upon the Government for indemnity, on account of losses incurred through the failure of the federal authorities to maintain them in possession of the limits upon which the said company were licensed to cut timber, or on any other account? If so, what is the amount of such claim?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is not the intention of the Government to pay the costs incurred by the Government of Ontario on behalf of the Province, except those which were awarded by the court. Information has been given to me by Mr. Ferguson, the solicitor of the St. Catharines Milling Company, that a claim will be made, but no official demand has been made on the Government.

FORTIFICATIONS AT ESQUIMALT.

Mr. PRIOR asked, Have the Government ever applied to the Imperial authorities for a copy of Colonel O'Brien's report on the fortifications necessary at Esquimalt, British Columbia? Have the Government ever received such report?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the absence of my hon. colleague, I beg to say that no application to the Imperial authorities for a copy of Colonel O'Brien's report for the fortifications necessary at Esquimalt, British Columbia, has emanated from the Department of Militia and Defence. The Department of Militia and Defence has never received such report.

BUOYS AND LIGHTS AT LAKE ST. JOHN.

Mr. COUTURE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to provide buoys and lights, for the protection of steamers navigating Lake St. John?

Mr. COSTIGAN.

Mr. TUPPER. Some time ago the Government were waited upon by two influential deputations from the district concerned, and this subject was pressed upon the attention of the Government. Since then the subject has received, and is now receiving, the careful consideration of the department.

BUOYS AND LIGHTS ON SAGUENAY RIVER.

Mr. COUTURE asked, What amount has been paid to Mr. Ainsworth Sturton, as keeper of buoys and lights on the River Saguenay, for the year 1888-89, and whether other sums have been paid to him, in the form of repairs to buoys, or otherwise, and to what amount?

Mr. TUPPER. $250 were paid on 19th February last to A. Sturton for maintaining buoys, receiving stores and delivering supplies to lighthouses during the year on the River Saguenay, that being the amount of his contract. No money was paid him for repairs to buoys or for other services.

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OF LAKE ST. JOHN.

Mr. COUTURE (translation) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make a hydrographical survey of Lake St. John, and also a marine chart, with the purpose of facilitating the navigation of the lake—which will have for a result the colonisation of the north shore of the said Lake St. John? If so, will the operations be begun this summer, as being the most favorable season for this purpose?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. gentleman, I may state that it is not the intention of the Government to have that survey made at present.

TIGNISH BREAKWATER.

Mr. PERRY asked. Has the Department of Public Works given instructions to repair the Tignish breakwater, Prince Edward Island? If so, is the work to be let by tender? If not, under whose management are the repairs to be made?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Instructions have been given to repair the Tignish breakwater, Prince Edward Island, by day work. The work has not yet been commenced, but at the proper time a clerk of works will be appointed.

MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER.

Mr. PERRY asked. Have instructions been given to repair the breakwater at Miminegash, Prince Edward Island? If so, who is the person acting as superintendent over said work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No instructions have been given to that effect.

DUTY ON PORK.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin) asked, Is it the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to increase the duty on pork?

Mr. FOSTER. That question is of the same nature as the one asked by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), and it is of such a kind as to be inadvisable to answer it.

MENNONITE IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. CARLING moved that the House resolve itself into Committee, to-morrow, to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the amount due on certain loans, amounting in the aggregate to $96,400, made to Mennonite immigrants on the security of members of that community resident in the Province of Ontario, under the authority of the Act 38 Victoria, chapter 3, should be computed as though the interest stipulated in the agreements relating to such loans had been four per cent. simple interest, instead of six per cent. compound interest, and that payment in full may be accepted on the basis of such computation.

Motion agreed to.

ENQUIRIES.

Mr. DAVIN. I should like the Minister of the Interior to state when we may expect the Bills dealing with the North-West—the North-West Territories Bill, and the Bill to amend the Dominion Lands Act. It is now almost *in fœci sessionis*.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I hope to be able to bring them down in the course of a day or two.

Mr. McMULLEN. When may we expect that the Government will lay on the Table the original cheques connected with the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will enquire into the matter.

SUPPLY—LOAN OF 1888.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, my duty on the present occasion is of a somewhat disagreeable character. I would myself have very greatly preferred that the view expressed by the Minister of Finance in his budget speech as to the character of the late 3 per cent. loan should have proved the correct one, and I make that statement not entirely from the regard I entertain for the hon. gentleman and the Government, but because I feel that the transaction, if I understand it correctly, is not one which will redound to the honor and credit of the people of Canada. So far as I can understand, a very great blunder has been committed, and a perfectly needless risk has been incurred as to which no sort of adequate explanation has been offered, or, I believe, can be offered. It is but just to the Minister of Finance to say that he is only in the slightest degree, if at all, responsible for the original inception and management of this loan. I think, Sir, that he was appointed Minister of Finance on the 28th day of May last, and that the prospectus of this loan was issued in London on the 9th of June, and apparently Sir Charles Tupper, while still Minister of Finance, had left this country with full power to negotiate this loan; therefore, although it is true that the hon. gentleman, being Minister of Finance at the time, is legally and technically responsible, I must say that I do not consider he is morally responsible for this loan at all. It was carried through by our High Commissioner, who took all the credit, and on whose shoulders, therefore, the chief responsibility must rest. Under these circumstances, and when the particulars of this transaction were brought to the notice of our present Minister of Finance a few days ago, apparently for the first time, I think he would have been well advised to have admitted frankly that a grave error had been committed, and to promise that he would do his best to remedy it, if indeed it can be remedied. But the hon. gentleman took another course; he has preferred to defend and to justify this loan, and he has even endorsed it a second time, having endorsed it already in his budget speech. Under these circumstances it becomes our duty to investigate the whole matter connected with this loan in some detail. In the first place, I would, however, like to call the attention of the House, to two points First of all, I may warn them that the term "prospectus," in itself, is apt to be rather misleading. We are accustomed to associate the word "prospectus" with a sort of manifesto rather remarkable for picturesqueness, than for strict accuracy of detail, such as is often put out by commercial companies who desire to attract subscribers. I believe, Sir, that of late, the courts, and notably the English courts, have treated prospectuses with much more severity than heretofore, but, be that as it may, there can be no doubt whatever of this fact, that a loan prospectus, issued by a Government, in order to obtain subscribers to a loan, is a document of a very formal and binding character. It is, in fact, a statement on the part of the Government, of the terms and conditions upon which it proposes to borrow money, and according to all the customs of the Stock Exchange, and, I believe, according to the law of England as well, every statement made in the prospectus is of a stringent and binding character, and must be strictly interpreted. The other point to which I would call the attention of the House is this: I do not believe that this is a case in which we can place much dependence on any opinion that may be expressed based on the experience of other loans, and for this simple reason, that I believe, that in this loan we are engaging in a totally novel experiment, the like of which, so far as I know, has never been had recourse to by any other Government under the sun, for the purpose of floating a loan, and I strongly suspect that, when this experiment is played out, that it never will be had recourse to again by any other Government.

Mr. EDGAR. Or by this Government, either.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Now, the main question which the House has got to decide is a very simple one, and it is a question which requires no special financial experience to deal with. The question is one which any business man in this House, or any man of business outside of this House, can answer for himself, without one moment's hesitation, and it is this: Was it, or was it not, a wise and prudent transaction on the part of the Government, for the purpose of floating a 3 per cent. loan, having fifty years to run, to pledge itself to purchase back that loan within the space of ten years, by nearly equal instalments, and, presumably, at a high premium. That is one question, and it is the main question which I shall submit for your consideration to-day. There are other questions of a more intricate character connected herewith; there are the questions of what the ultimate, or probable loss may be, and how far, and under what possible circumstances the Government of Canada is justified in attempting to repudiate an obligation which it has entered into. These questions, I say, involve considerations of a much more complicated character, and with respect to them, there is, no doubt, room for a considerable difference of opinion, but as to the main facts, there is, happily, no material difference. I have here the official statement of the hon. Minister, made in his budget speech, with regard to the terms of the loan, in which he informs the House that about the 10th or 12th of June last, he effected a loan in London, at the rate of 3 per cent., having fifty years to run, without any sinking fund attached to it, and that for that loan he obtained on the average a rate of £95 1s. sterling. Sir, had the fact been as the hon. gentleman stated, had he been correct really as he was technically in saying that there was no sinking fund attached to it, I admitted then, and I repeat the admission now, that the loan would have been a very excellent transaction, and would have justified all the eulogiums that the hon. gentleman passed upon it. Unfortunately, although it is quite true that there was no special sinking fund attached to it, I discovered, on examining the prospectus, that although there was no particular and special sinking fund mentioned, there was the equivalent of twenty sinking funds attached to it under a very remarkable clause in the prospectus, to which I will call your attention. In the prospec-

tus issued by Messrs. Baring and Glyn, under the express authority of the High Commissioner, and of the Minister of Finance, they stated:

"With a view of rendering the sinking funds of the various loans more effective than heretofore, the Canadian Government intend to apply the sums annually required for the reduction of the National Debt in purchases of the stock now offered. The amount at present annually applied to the redemption of the debt is about £350,000 sterling, and as the sinking funds are accumulative the amounts yearly increase."

Now, I have examined this prospectus carefully, I have looked over the bond attached to it, and neither in the one nor in the other can I discover the slightest words of limitation; the slightest thing in either the prospectus or the bond which in any way modifies or relieves us from the obligation which that clause imposes upon us. The House will probably understand how important that provision is when I tell them that if they will take the trouble to examine the various prospectuses and the various bonds which have been issued for all the various loans made by Canada since 1867, it will be found that in all cases (excepting these loans guaranteed by the Imperial Government, who took care of their own sinking funds) it will be found that in all other cases words of limitation are most carefully inserted. They will find that in the loans of 1874, 1875, 1876, 1878, 1879 and 1885—in the case of every one of these there is inserted in the prospectus, and, I believe, also in the bond attached, the following clause:—

"A cumulative sinking fund of not less than one-half per cent. per annum will be employed in the purchase of the bonds or stock of the loan at or below par, the Government reserving the right to invest the sinking fund in other securities if the price of the loan should be above par."

Now, the House and the Government will note—because this is a matter of first-rate importance—that in all other cases in which we have had a sinking fund established—although that sinking fund is infinitesimal as compared with the huge amount devoted to the repurchase of this loan—words of limitation are most carefully introduced into the propectus, and, I believe, are afterwards, in all cases, incorporated in the bond. Under these circumstances, my contention is that the Government of Canada has bound itself, by the phrases used in this unhappy clause in the prospectus of the loan of 1888, to such an extent that whereas we thought we had borrowed at 3 per cent., repayable in fifty years, what we have really done is this: we have made a loan nominally for fifty years, but that loan, by express provision in our own prospectus, we have bound ourselves to repurchase probably in ten nearly equal annual instalments, thereby, in all likelihood, compelling ourselves to repurchase our own loan at a high premium, and practically converting it from a fifty years' loan to a five years' loan. That is my contention. In reply, what has the Minister of Finance to say? In order to give the hon. gentleman all possible opportunity to consider this question, so that he might not be taken unawares, I addressed to him, about a week ago, a question as to what the intentions of the Government were in the event of this loan going above par; and to that question the hon. gentleman replied as follows:—

"The Government considers that the language used in the prospectus of the 3 per cent. loan recently negotiated in London, whereby it is declared that 'The Canadian Government intend to apply the sums annually required for the redemption of the national debt in purchases of the stock now offered,' requires them to use the sinking funds therein referred to in the purchase of the said 3 per cent. loan, in case the said securities should be held at a premium at the time of purchase, unless such premium is considered unreasonable and produced by unfair competition."

Upon that, as the House will remember, I felt it my duty to make a statement in my place, embodying substantially the contention which I have just explained. The hon. Finance Minister, having taken time to consider, about three days afterwards replied as follows—I will give all the essential parts of his reply, in order that I may not by any chance misrepresent him:—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

"Having stated so much as regards the considerations which make it necessary for us to buy a large amount for our sinking fund, a practice we have pursued heretofore, the intention expressed by the Government, and which was simply an expression of intention, does not bind the Government, in any case, if it be seen there is an unreasonable appreciation. I think it is sufficient to state this fact, which is stronger than any fancies we may indulge in with reference to the future. We have been buying out of that stock from the 1st of July of the current year. We have bought over $1,000,000 of that stock, and so far from there being any undue appreciation of the price or any evidence at all of putting up the price, we have bought at a lower price than we received for the loan, £95. We bought, for instance, on the 1st of July, 1888, at 94 5/16, 94 1/4 and 9 5/8 On the 1st of October, we bought at 92 3/4; that is net, taking into account accrued interest. On November 1st, we bought at 93 3/4, and on the 1st of December at 92 3/4. That, I think, shows that there is not very much to be apprehended in the way of undue appreciation of these stocks. * * * I think this is sufficient to make as a statement at present, and I may, in conclusion, state my own opinion, and the opinion of the officers of my department, who are careful, and, I think, thorough men, that, taking all things into consideration, there is no ground for the alarm which was rather foreshadowed by my hon. friend, and no ground for the possible conclusion which was also foreshadowed by my hon. friend, that this may prove an unremunerative and costly loan. Taking it all in all, I believe it can be fairly maintained that it is the best loan we have yet put upon the British market."

Now, Sir, with respect to that, I beg to state, that that is an explanation which really explains nothing. The hon. gentleman does not deny the facts which I have adduced, nor could he deny them. What he has done, has been to introduce a new element of complication into this matter, as to which I shall have one or two words to say presently. Reduced to its simplest expression, what the hon. gentleman tells us is this: First, that he hopes and prays, and apparently his department hope and pray, that no harm will come from this transaction; next, that he proceeds to argue, on very unsound premises, as it appears to me, that no harm can come of it; and, lastly, that he is prepared to repudiate our own obligation if harm does come. Sir, I proceed to analyse the hon. gentleman's arguments in detail. As to the first, it is not easy for me to say much. I also hope, against hope I fear, that no harm will come of this transaction. Possibly, Sir, the chapter of accidents, or Providence, may interfere to save us; but I will remind the hon. gentleman, that the age of miracles is past, and that it is not usual for Providence to interfere to save either men or Governments from the consequences of their own gross negligence or folly. However, we will let that pass. I come to the second plea, that, in the opinion of the hon. gentleman, no harm is likely to come, or, indeed, can come, and the reason he gives is somewhat remarkable. He tells us that no harm is likely to come in the future because he has succeeded in purchasing a considerable quantity of this stock at or below the price we obtained for the loan in open market. Sir, I am afraid that the hon. Finance Minister—it is no discredit to him, because he is as yet a young Finance Minister—has not fully comprehended the ordinary course of business on the stock exchange or the London market. It takes some time for a loan of £4,000,000 sterling to find its way into the hands of permanent holders or investors. While that process is going on, there is generally a considerable amount of the loan lying loose in the hands of the middlemen, who, being sometimes compelled to sell, are often willing to part with the loan for one or two per cent. less than they gave for it. That is a thing of constant occurrence. I remember very well, in floating the first 4 per cent. loan in 1874, that that state of things lasted, to the best of my recollection, for eighteen months or nearly two years. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman will permit me to tell him that the fact that in the first six or nine months he has succeeded in picking up a couple of hundred thousand pounds of this loan at reduced prices, affords no criterion whatever as to the position in which he will find himself a little later on. The hon. gentleman I suppose is aware that we have two descriptions of stocks and securities. We have inscribed stocks, and we have also bonds. He knows also, no doubt, that that portion which is inscribed is almost invariably

strongly held by permanent investors. It does not follow that the amount which remains outstanding in bonds is not strongly held by permanent investors, for it often happens that they prefer to keep these stocks in the shape of bonds rather than inscribe them. But my point is this, and the hon. gentleman will do well to attend to it. The hon. gentleman may lay it down as a certain fact, as a foregone conclusion, that the stock which is inscribed has gone mainly into the hands of permanent investors. If the hon. gentleman will look at Wettenhall's list, which is the best authority on the subject, he will find the list shows that already, in the space of nine months, £1,200,000 stg., or very nearly one-third of the loan, has been put on the inscribed list and has been converted from bonds into inscribed stock. He may, therefore, consider most of that withdrawn from the open market and gone into the hands of men who propose to hold it for permanent investment. Let him consider what his position in two years hence will be. By that time, at least one-half, and probably more than one half of the stock, will be in the hands of permanent investors who will not be at all disposed to part with it without great inducement. Under the arrangement we have made, we will be the proprietors, in two years from date, of nearly one-third of the stock, and there will remain practically available to trade on between £700,000 and £800,000 sterling in the ordinary open market. It does not require to be a financier of experience to see that if he is compelled under those circumstances to purchase, or if the trustees of the sinking fund are compelled to order purchases to the extent of £100,000, when there are only £800,000 practically available to be purchased, the remainder being in the hands of permanent investors or of the Government itself for sinking fund account, such an order would inevitably raise the price of the stock in the market probably by many points. Therefore, I think we may dismiss the argument that no harm can happen to us in the future, because in the first few months we have succeeded in purchasing this stock at or below the price paid to us for it. As for the opinion of the officers of the Finance Department, no doubt it is entitled to all due respect, but I beg to remind the House that this is a case to which their experience will afford no parallel. Never before has the experiment been tried, never I hope again will it be tried, of floating a loan with a 10 per cent. sinking fund attachment to it. But there is a more important question than this to be discussed. The hon. gentleman, in the few words that he proposes to add to the prospectus, has raised a question of the most delicate and difficult character. He has opened up, I must say, a vista of complications. The hon. gentleman tells us that the Government is not bound to purchase if it be seen that there is an unreasonable appreciation, and he further tells us there will be no difficulty in deciding what is an unreasonable appreciation. Well, I take issue with the hon. gentleman on both points. The hon. gentleman ought to remember that there are two parties in every bargain. He ought to remember that there is on the one side the men who have purchased and who now hold this stock, backed by the Stock Exchange, the most powerful financial corporation in the world, and on the other, there is the Canadian Government. But the Canadian Government have not got the sinking fund under their own exclusive control. They appoint one trustee, but there is another trustee whom they do not appoint. And these two gentlemen are bound to administer the sinking fund, not in accordance with the dictates of the Finance Minister of Canada, but in accordance with the terms of their trust, in accordance with the law, and, to some extent, in accordance with custom; and the hon. gentleman will find that, so far from being an easy matter, it is going to be a very difficult matter, indeed, to repudiate this obligation, even supposing that he was justified in his contention that the Government could repudiate an obligation of this kind because it proved inconvenient to discharge it. Allowing that, for the sake of argument, the hon. gentleman will find that it is an exceedingly difficult matter to decide what is an unreasonable premium. Let me give an illustration in point. In 1876 we floated a 4 per cent. loan at 91. Five years later, in the early part of 1882, that loan was rated from 104 to 106, through the natural operation of the market, aided, perhaps, by the very minute sinking fund attached to it. Therefore, in those five years, that stock had risen 14 or 15 points, and, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman himself, in eleven years that stock was re-purchased at 114, having risen 23 points. Now, will the hon. gentleman, before this debate closes, tell the House what he would consider an unreasonable appreciation? Will he tell the House how he means to decide, whether this stock has reached an unfair and unreasonable position in the market, or not? It is of the first importance that he should do so, and I invite his special and particular attention to that point. I may also point out that it is not sufficient for him or for anybody else to presume that money, which has been falling for some years back, will now, to suit his convenience, cease to fall. We have seen, in a very few months, some very remarkable transactions. We know that the United States 4 per cents., payable in 1907, having barely eighteen years to run, are to-day quoted on the London Stock Exchange at 131. He will thus see that those bonds scarcely average 2½ per cent. to-day. I noticed the other day in the *Monetary Times* the statement, which I confess surprised me, that the State of Massachusetts, one of the states of the Union, had floated a loan of a little less than a million dollars—a 3 per cent. loan having thirteen years to run—at 108 50. In other words, the State of Massachusetts had floated it at a rate of interest which only affords the holders two nine sixteenths per cent., or a very small fraction over two one-half per cent. The hon. gentleman must also know that, under the recent operations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the 3 per cent. consols are to be converted into ½ per cents., which will probably become, in the future, the standard of value in the English market. There is another important consideration that must not be lost sight of. The hon. gentleman, by his own action, is largely estopped from taking up the position he desires to take. The fact is, that by virtue of this extraordinary clause in the prospectus, we have received a considerably larger sum for the loan than we had really the right to expect to obtain. I do not believe that our 3 per cent. loan would have obtained as high a price as it did by several points, were it not for this clause. Under those circumstances, with what show of justice are we going to back out of the agreement which our agents and High Commissioner deliberately made? The hon. gentleman may reply that monstrous cases may arise. That is most true. Very monstrous cases may arise. I will not say that cases may not arise in which, however reluctantly, however it may go against the grain of honorable men, we might not be obliged to repudiate, to a certain extent, that agreement. I will not take that position; but I call the hon. gentleman's attention to this: It is most true, under that clause, that monstrous cases may arise; and, therefore, that probability should have been guarded against in the strongest possible manner. Have I not called the attention of the House to the fact that, even in the case of the trifling, insignificant sinking fund of half of one per cent., where only 1-200th part was to be redeemed, words of limitation have always been inserted in order to guard against just such evils as this. There are two ways in which that might have been done. The hon. gentleman, or rather his agents, could have provided that the loan should be redeemed by drawings—that is, as I suppose the hon. gentleman is aware, by a sort of lottery, by which, when the bonds come to par, they are drawn for, and those which are selected are paid off—or, he might have provided by introducing words of limitation such as those which have been introduced in every other

loan which we have made since 1867, having a sinking fund attached, and not being guaranteed by the Imperial Government. The House must remember that we put this loan on the market at 92½ per cent., and that we got in many cases 3 per cent. more than our minimum. We got on the average £2 11s. more than the minimum which was fixed. The hon. gentleman knows that the custom is to fix the minimum at a rate only a few shillings under the amount you expect to obtain. It is quite clear that this loan was largely appreciated owing to the existence of this most remarkable clause. It is quite clear that the twelve millions tendered for this loan were put in largely by reason of this clause. Now, the Stock Exchange, when the hon. gentleman desires to introduce these words of limitation, will say to him—and I do not see how he, or any Canadian Minister, is going to answer them—You, for your own purposes, chose to take this means of floating your loan for more than it was worth; you took your profit; now take your risk. Now, what is the answer to all this? Let the hon. gentleman remember that this prospectus of ours has been scattered broadcast all over the United Kingdom. I have here, furnished by the hon gentleman himself, a list of some fifty newspapers of very wide circulation, in every one of which this prospectus has been inserted; and the hon. gentleman must remember that the words of a prospectus cannot be trifled with, that the prospectus is a very stringent and binding proposal, and that the prospectus must be lived up to. More than that, I say it is far better that we should sustain a heavy loss than that Canada should lightly or heedlessly repudiate her engagements. There might be a point at which the line would have to be drawn, but how is the hon. gentleman going to say what premiums are unfair? He cannot be sure that the premiums are raised through a combination. He would have to establish the existence of the combination. The price may go up, and naturally will go up. It is the natural result of our own act, and how can we, how can he, how can any man expect to escape penalty for the act which we deliberately committed, and from which we have in the first instance profited? Now, I return to my original contention, and I say that the terms of this clause bind us to purchase the four millions in ten annual instalments of £100,000 apiece. So far as the Dominion of Canada is concerned, you have practically converted your fifty year loan into a five year loan, and I say also that, although the effect may not be apparent at this instant, the price is certain te be raised, and to be raised soon. Let the hon. gentleman wait until that loan has had time to crystalise, that is, to get into the hands of permanent investors, and then, if he has not been able to take any effective precautions before, he will find that these results, which I have pointed out to him, must necessarily and inevitably follow. It appears to me, under these circumstances, that the best that could happen would be this: We may be able to buy back this loan, if we are lucky, at an average of par. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to this. If we have to repurchase that loan in ten instalments, that is practically equivalent to a rate of interest of 4¾ per cent., nearly 5 per cent. And I make it out in this way. We have been obliged to pay nearly 2 per cent. in the way of commissions, brokerage and incidental expenses, I think 1¾ per cent. is the actual amount. So on the hypothesis of buying back at par, we will lose 6¾ per cent. on the whole transaction, and, as it has only five years to run, you may add something like 1½ per cent. per annum to the 3¼ per cent. which we have to pay as ordinary interest, making the cost of the loan until the whole is re-purchased 4¾ per cent., and that at a time when ordinary Canadian municipalities can and do borrow money freely at 4 and 3½ per cent. Sir, there is one chance, and, as far as I see, one chance only, such as it is. Instead of the rate of interest falling, it may, peradventure, rise. It is possible that a great European war may break out at any time within ten years, and, in that case, if interest were to rise, although we would lose just as much in reality, the result would not be so apparent. The consequence of this enormous sinking fund would be to buoy up our loan, not to send it to a high premium, which would be the result of a fall in interest. What would be the result to us in that case? The result would be that our other securities would fall, and thus the hon. gentleman or the trustees of the sinking fund might have to buy in a 3 per cent. loan at par when they could purchase our 4 per cent securities at the same rate. That is a point which the hon. gentleman, if he bases any expectations on the fall of interest, should bear in mind. The risks we have run are self-evident, and are two-fold. First, when the prospectus was put out, there was the utmost temptation offered to speculators on the Stock Exchange to form a syndicate to get control of a large portion of the stock, and then to hold us to the prospectus. Perhaps that was attempted to be done at or about the time the loan was issued. I have some reason to believe that the attempt was made and failed. When I first saw the hon. gentleman's prospectus, when I first became acquainted with the existence of this remarkable clause, I at once communicated with a friend of mine in London whom I knew to be versed in the mysteries of the Stock Exchange. Within the last day or so, I have received from him a communication in which he tells me that such an attempt was actually made, that a syndicate was formed at the time of the issue of that prospectus with the design of getting control of a large amount of the loan; but, fortunately for us, though no thanks for that to our High Commissioner, the design was baffled by the accident that these gentlemen had not anticipated that the loan would go to so high a premium, and they lost their chances by bidding a few shillings too low. I am inclined, therefore, to think that that particular peril may have passed away for the time, though the hon. Minister will do well to bear in mind there is no warranty that gentlemen now holding the stock may not have combined already, or may not choose hereafter to combine for the express purpose of using this clause and getting the advantage of the premium to which our sinking fund operations will inevitably force the loan. But, Sir, that is not the most serious side of the question. I told the hon. gentleman that his real trouble would come when the bulk of this loan fell into the hands of permanent investors. Now, that the hon. gentleman may understand that I am not speaking at random when I tell him that there is great probability that within a few years the bulk of this loan will be held by permanent investors, I would call his attention, and the attention of the House, to the following facts: We issued a five million loan at 3½ per cent. in 1884, I think, or 1885. I find that of this five millions £4,468,000 are now held in inscribed stock, and, presumably, by permanent investors. I find that of our four million loan, issued a short time ago, about three millions are likewise held by permanent investors; I find that of our other loans a large proportion are held in inscribed stocks, which are well understood to be held, for the most part, by permanent investors. Now, the hon. gentleman and the House are perfectly aware of this fact: When moneys are taken by trustees and placed in particular stocks, or when they are taken and held for purposes of permanent investment, such persons, as a rule, are very difficult to disturb, such investments will not put their stock on the markets lightly. They require to be tempted by a high premium, and they demand a considerable additional price for the disturbance and the inconvenience of looking out for new investments. Therefore, it is a very serious consideration indeed that a large proportion of our other stocks have gone, and presumably a large percentage of this stock will go, and is going, into the hands of men who hold them

permanently. Of course a sufficiently large premium will tempt them out, but they are not going to put their stock on the markets to suit our convenience, and the operations of our sinking fund investment will tend every month, every quarter, to strip the market bare as bare can be of the ordinary loose stock which, under ordinary circumstances, will seek for purchasers there. Sir, I find it difficult to understand how so utterly absurd a transaction should have been concurred in by the gentlemen whose names I see appended to that prospectus. Here we have a sinking fund of 10 per cent. per annum attached to a loan which has fifty years to run. Why, Sir, it is enough to buy the whole loan half-a-dozen times over. An ordinary sinking fund is so proportioned that at the very outside, in thirty or fifty years it may have to run, it will barely amount to the sum total of the original loan. But here we have a sinking fund twenty-fold as large as an ordinary sinking fund, and while the ordinary percentage attached to all our other loans is one-half of 1 per cent., we have a sinking fund of 10. An ordinary sinking fund attached to such a transaction as this, would be £20,000 and no more. We have a sinking fund begining at £350,000, going up in these 10 years to £472,000, averaging more than twenty times the sinking fund ordinarily attached. Sir, I am not going to spend any time over the silly pretext that it was necessary to do this to make our sinking fund more effective. Why, Sir, we were perfectly at liberty to use our sinking fund in buying this stock without giving any pledge at all, and so there was no necessity for doing this. Suppose you did want, for reasons of finance, to appreciate the 3 per cent. loan; we had full power in our own hands to use the whole of this £350,000 for it. It was the greatest absurdity and the greatest folly to go and tie ourselves up and bind ourselves to do it. I say that the negligence is little short of criminal; I say that the Minister of Finance owes it to himself, owes it to this House, to demand explanations about this matter, and in particular to demand, although it be an unusual thing, that under these circumstances the agents should give to him, and he should lay before the House, the names of every man who originally applied for this stock, the names of every man who received an allotment of this stock, the names of every man, so far as he can find, who now holds this stock, and the amounts they respectively applied for, subscribed to, or held. That I demand of him, and I think the common sense of this House and of the country will sustain my demand. Now, Sir, it is clear we will probably lose the sum of £200,000; that is to say, on the assumption that we get this stock at or about par. Be that as it may, the stock will soon become exceptionally scarce in any case, and I know transactions in Canadian stocks usually are few, as the hon. gentleman can see by examining the *bonâ fide* transactions recorded in the Stock Exchange list. Here we are practically placed at the mercy of parties who can make their own terms with us, which terms we cannot refuse to accept without repudiation, without denying the obligations we ourselves entered into. I regret exceedingly that agents of the character of Barings and Glyn should be mixed up with this transaction. I would be glad if they could afford any explanation; I would be glad to find that they have remonstrated with our High Commissioner; I would be glad to find, though the hon. gentleman did not say so, that they had communicated, as I think they ought to have communicated, specially with himself about this matter. I cannot, as at present advised, hold our financial agents in London altogether blameless. They receive from us the sum, I think, of £15,000 a year for managing our sinking funds and other investments. They made £40,000 sterling out of this identical loan, and I think they ought not to have allowed such a clause as that to be inserted Still, having regard for their high character, having regard to the fact that up to the present time, at any rate, there has been no ground to suspect our agents of permitting anything to be done detrimental to the interests of Canada, I will await, for my part, such explanations as they may have to offer. But I say that the youngest tyro in finance, the youngest bank clerk, the youngest clerk in the hon. gentleman's department, I say that any ordinary municipal officer, if it were only the treasurer of a township, would have known better than to allow such a clause as that to be inserted in a prospectus, to which his name was appended, applying for a loan. More, Sir, I say that the position, so far as Canada is concerned, involves loss and disgrace. Ruinous demands may possibly be made upon us, and what is our excuse for repudiating those demands? Our only valid excuse would be that the excessive folly or misconduct of our agents had involved us in an obligation which it was morally impossible that we could fulfil. Now, Sir, I put a possible case, a case which is not only possible, but which, if my information is correct, was within an ace of occurring. While we were enjoying a fool's paradise over here, while we were congratulating ourselves on the high position of Canadian credit, while we were declaring from one end of the country to the other that no such loan had ever been negotiated before, let the hon. gentleman consider what his position would have been if a syndicate had been formed in London which had got control of, say, two millions of that stock. Why, Sir, under this arrangement, in four years from this present moment, we would have been obliged to buy in all the remainder of the stock, and we would have been confronted with a determined and powerful body of creditors controlling every penny, every pound, of the remaining stock. The hon. gentleman says that it would be a very easy matter under such circumstances to prove a fraud. I doubt that exceedingly; I think the hon. gentleman would find, if such men had played their part with any ordinary prudence, the mere natural operation of this great sinking fund requiring to be invested from year to year would force the stock to an abnormally high figure, and it would be the hardest thing in the world for him or anybody else to prove conspiracy. Now let us see what our position would be in such a case. Recollect that every 5 per cent. that this stock rises, will cost us about a million dollars. If the stock gets to par and we repurchase it at that figure, we lose one million; if it gets to 105, we lose two millions; if it gets to 110, we lose three; if it gets to 115, and, as I have shown, our 4 per cent. stock rose to 114 from purely natural causes, we would lose four millions in repurchasing it. The hon. gentleman may ask, do I say that we should pay such prices? Well, Sir, I reserve my opinion. This loan is not of my making, this had no sanction of mine, nor ever would it have had. The question has got to be answered by the Minister himself; it is for him to say what is to be done in such a case. And remember, although it has not occurred, although as I believe by lucky accident it was prevented from occurring, it is a case which may occur at any time and the hon. gentleman may find himself called upon to deal with it. That is what we are exposed to under this clause, if I read it aright; and I ask, if so, what do these parties deserve? The thing is so obvious, the neglect of the plainest precautions is so glaring, the consequences which may flow are so grave, that the Minister of Finance for the first time in Canadian history has had to rise in his place and to threaten that if he found it inconvenient he would repudiate our formal obligation.

An hon. MEMBER. Never.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope not. But, at the same time, I cannot but see that circumstances may arise in which it may be difficult for the strongest purist to say that the Minister of Finance was called upon to carry out to the letter the terms of his prospectus. But, as regards the Minister of Finance, I admit that he was originally free from blame in this matter; he was hardly Minister of Finance for one hour, I may say, before this transaction was

entered upon. All he deserves to be censured for is this: I think, bearing in mind his own position in this matter, that when he received the prospectus of the loan, he, as a man of intelligence and common sense, should have seen the possible consequences involved in it, and should have at once taken the earliest opportunity of protesting against it and of demanding explanations from our agents and from the High Commissioner; and had he done so, had he taken prompt action, it is possible a remedy might have been found. Now the position is very different. All the hon. gentleman has done is to introduce this new element of complication by declaring that the Government of Canada will not fulfil their obligation if the loan is unreasonably appreciated, a course which, as I have pointed out, may involve us in no end of difficulty and entanglement. It must be admitted that the real culprit with which this House has to deal is mainly the High Commissioner, and perhaps, in a secondary sense, our financial agents.

Mr. MITCHELL. He can stand it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps he can. What I believe has happened is this: I can fancy Sir Charles Tupper, in his usual reckless fashion, was determined to make this loan a wonderful success at any hazard, and he has done it. He did achieve a wonderful success for the time. This transaction has one merit. There is no doubt this transaction is perfectly unique; there is no similar case to this to be found in the whole annals of finance. Very strange expedients may have been had recourse to on the London Exchange to float a loan, but I will venture to say that not even Mexico, or Honduras, or the South American Republics, or Spain, or Greece, or Turkey, ever thought of the expedient which presented itself to our hon. High Commissioner. It was a stroke of genius, and, like all strokes of genius, it was wonderfully simple, too. I make the hon. Minister of Finance a present of the hon. gentleman's recipe for floating a 3 per cent. loan having fifty years to run. Nothing can be simpler. Promise to buy the loan back in ten annual instalments at a much higher premium than you get for it, and I will promise you will make the loan a success—for the time being. It is an instance of thoughtful economy entirely without parallel. Turning that affair over in my mind, I can think of but one illustration which would fairly meet the case. I remember some years ago hearing a story of an Irish butler who was urged by his master to be particularly careful with respect to a cask of very excellent small beer, and with thoughtful economy, only paralleled by this clause of ours, the butler put a hogshead of strong ale in the cellar on tap beside the cask of small beer, and he did succeed in prolonging the natural duration of the cask of small beer. I do not know whether Sir Charles Tupper has an Irish strain in his pedigree. I see that Her Majesty was lately persuaded to make him a baronet of the United Kingdon. I think Her Majesty, and I say it with all due respect, should have made him a baronet of the Green Isle pure and simple, more especially as the honor was conferred strictly "more Hibernico," because the hon. gentleman had failed to accomplish the negotiation he had engaged in. As to the amount of the loss: it is utterly impossible to say, unless the chapter of accidents come in to deliver the hon. gentleman, what the possible loss may be. If we are very lucky, I think we may escape with the loss of one million, that is, that we may repurchase our loan at par. But it is quite possible that the loss may reach two millions, three millions or four millions; and yet the hon. gentleman might find it a matter of exceeding difficulty to obtain any reasonable pretext for carrying out his threat of repudiation. As to the policy of repudiation, I hold it to be dubious to the last degree. I, for my part, would rather bear, and advise the hon. gentleman to bear, a very heavy loss, than allow it to be said that the Canadian Government, when they made a foolish bargain, would attempt to repudiate it. I doubt very much whether the hon. gentleman can repudiate it unless it goes to an exceedingly exorbitant and extortionate premium. But I entertain no doubt whatever that, unless some extraordinary circumstance occurs, the inevitable result of the operation which is prescribed for us by this prospectus, must be, and will be, to force our loan to a price far in excess of that which it would otherwise have obtained. And now I have a word to say to hon. gentlemen opposite. This is not a party question, and I appeal to hon. gentlemen whether, as sound business men, and as men having regard to the interests of the country, they will allow this transaction to be passed over in silence, unless some much better explanation be offered for it than has yet been submitted; and, when I say a better explanation, I may say that I would not be content, for my part, to accept an explanation resting on any *ipse dixit* either of our financial agent, or of the Finance Minister, or of the Finance Department. The explanation ought to show clearly and distinctly how, and on what ground, the hon. gentleman is prepared to establish that a particular premium is unreasonable, and how, and on what ground, he could defend the conduct of the Canadian Government in attempting to introduce into a clause like this, words of limitation, which, most undoubtedly, ought to have been there from the first, but which, for whatever reason, have, contrary to all precedent, contrary to all ordinary precaution, been omitted therefrom; and, in order that the House and the country may have an opportunity of passing judgment on this matter, I now beg to submit, for the consideration of the House, the following motion:—

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:

"Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be Resolved, That it appears, from the Public Accounts, and from statements made in the House by the Minister of Finance, and from the prospectus of the loan, that the Government of Canada placed a loan of £4,000,000 sterling on the London market, in the month of June, 1888.

"2. That the said loan bears interest at the rate of 3 per cent. per annum, and is made repayable at the end of fifty years.

"3. That the said loan was sold at an average price of £95 1s.

"4. That while the said loan had no special sinking fund attached thereto, it is provided in the prospectus issued in connection therewith by Messrs. Barings and Glyn, the financial agents of the Government of Canada, that,

"'With a view of rendering the sinking funds of the various loans more effective than heretofore, the Canadian Government intends to apply the sums annually required for the reduction of the national debt in purchase of the stock now offered.

"'The amount at present annually applied to the reduction of the national debt is £350,000 sterling, and, as the sinking fund is accumulative, the amount yearly increases.'

"5. That the effect of the said clause is that the Canadian Government will be obliged, in order to comply with the obligation therein entered into on their behalf, to repurchase the entire loan of £4,000,000 sterling above mentioned in ten or more annual instalments, averaging £400,000 each.

"6. That the said loan will be thereby (as far as the Dominion of Canada is concerned) converted from a loan having (nominally) fifty years to run, into a loan having a little over five years to run.

"7. That all former unguaranteed loans, having sinking funds attached, contain a provision, inserted in the bond or prospectus (and usually in both), setting forth that the Government of Canada shall not be obliged to purchase said stocks on account of investment for sinking fund, if said stocks should raise above par.

"8. That neither the prospectus, nor the bond issued in connection with the three per cent loan of £4,000,000, contain any such provision.

"9. That the natural tendency of the existence of the obligation to apply a sinking fund of this magnitude to the purchase of a loan of £4,000,000 will be to raise the price of the said stock abnormally, and may result in the loss of a large sum to this country.

"10. That in any case the cost of the commission, brokerage and other charges incurred in negotiating the said loan, spread over a period of about five years, will add greatly to the rate of interest payable on the said loan.

"11. That, even if the said loan can be repurchased at an average of par, it will involve the payment of a rate in excess of the price obtained for the said loan which will make the annual charge for the said loan (till the same be repurchased), equal to a rate of interest of nearly five per cent. per annum, and will at best make the transaction unduly onerous to this country.

"12. That the said transaction is improvident and evidences negligence on the part of those charged with the interests of Canada in this matter."

Mr. FOSTER. I was disposed at first to sympathise with my hon. friend in the disagreeable duty which he has stated he had to perform in the House this afternoon, but as I did not notice any very great evidence of sadness or any feeling akin to that as the hon. gentleman proceeded, I withdrew my anticipated sympathy, although I must say that I have nothing to complain of my hon. friend in the tone and manner in which he has criticised this loan. He has very generously given me the opportunity to wash my hands clear of the larger measure of the responsibility incurred in the floating and management of the loan. I may say to him that I do not propose to take advantage of his generosity in that respect. The loan was made under this Government and when I was a member of this Government, it was made when I was Minister of Finance, the position I hold to-day, and the Government, as do I myself, as one of the members of the Government, hold themselves responsible for the loan, such as it has been put on the market. There is one thing, I think, that hon. gentlemen will have noticed during the address of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and that is, the predominance in his address of that quality which he deprecated in advance with reference to what might be the possible nature of the reply that I should make to his criticism. He said that he would not be satisfied with any *ipse dixit* of the Minister of Finance, or with the *ipse dixit* of any person, but that he wanted something more than statement, he wanted actual proof. Now, if there was one thing which was prominent in the criticism of my hon. friend from the time that he commenced his speech until he sat down, it was the vein of supposition which ran through it all. His remarks were based upon what might be, and almost every argument that he adduced to this House was an argument founded on a probability in the hon. gentleman's own mind and not an argument founded on what he could state was the fact at present or would be fact in the future. I hold that what he requires in an explanation must be more strongly required in the charge, and he ought not to charge, and to base his arguments for this charge, on the mere possibility of what may happen and what just as possibly may not happen. In the first place, then, in reference to the manner of floating the loan, he blamed the financial agents to a certain extent. Well, Sir, the financial agents who were interested in the floating of this loan, were the very same financial agents who have been interested in the floating of loans for Canada for a number of years past, and, I believe, were the same who were interested in the floating of the loans of 1874, 1875 and 1876; and if my hon. friend will go back and refresh his memory a little as to what took place in 1876, in some rather memorable debates which took place in this House, he will find that when he supposed that members then in Opposition made an attack upon those agents or insinuated something in reference to their dealings, he rose in his place and indignantly repudiated on their behalf anything but honorable and fair and square dealing. They were the agents of Canada, he said, trusted by us, it was to their interest to perform that trust, and they were honorable men who would not advise what they did not consider to be for the best interests of Canada. Is it possible that those men have deteriorated since that time? I think not. I am willing to believe that they were honest agents then, and I am willing to believe that they were honest and reliable agents during the year 1888, and that the prospectus to which they appended their names, and the advice which they may have given in reference to that prospectus, were given honestly and honorably, and in the best interest of Canada. In reference to my friend's case, it depends wholly on the existence of an unqualified and absolute obligation; it falls to the ground, and falls to the ground utterly, unless it be a fact that we have entered into such obligation, and that we are bound to carry out that obligation. I think that my hon. friend will admit, and that hon. members on both sides of the House will admit, that unless that is established, his whole criticism falls to the ground, and that we are in the same position with regard to the loan of 1888 that we are in with regard to the other loans. Let us see what took place. My hon. friend referred to certain loans which were made before, and he named them to the House. I need not repeat them, but in all of those loans in which there was a sinking fund attached, two things took place. There was the issue of a prospectus, which expressed a general intention, and certain general conditions; but after the issue of the prospectus, which is not a legal obligation——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is an obligation.

Mr. FOSTER. There came an obligation, in the form of the bond, which went to the financial world on the same page, and in the same advertisement, as the prospectus; and two things took place with reference to my hon. friend's loan, and every loan to which there was a sinking fund attached. For instance, here is the prospectus of the hon. gentleman's loan of 1875, one of the clauses of which is this:

"For the £1,000,000 Dominion 4 per cent. loan, a cumulative sinking fund of not less than one-half per cent. will be employed in the purchase of bonds or stocks of the loan at or below par, the Government reserving the right to invest the sinking fund in other securities, if the price of the loan should be above par."

Hon. gentlemen will see that that was an expression of intention. It is far more strong as an expression of fact than the clause in the prospectus of the loan of 1888, for it stated that the sinking fund would be so employed without a peradventure. But my hon. friend did not think that bound him; he did not think that was enough; and on the very same page of the prospectus, where there is always put the blank form of the bond, which every man looks at as well as at the prospectus, and which is the instrument which completed the bargain between himself and the Government, what did my hon. friend put? He put this:

"The principal and interest of the above sum are chargeable upon the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, under authority of the above Act, and a sum equal to one-half per cent. per annum of the principal sum of such portion of the aforesaid loan as may be issued, will be set apart and invested for the redemption thereof in the bonds or stock of this loan, if the price is at or below par, the Government of Canada reserving the right to invest the amount in other securities when the price of the loan is above par."

These are the two actions which took place with reference to the hon. gentlemen's loan, and with reference to all loans which have had a sinking fund. There was first the general expression of intention, more strong in the prospectus which I have read than in the prospectus of 1888; but that does not bind; that is not an obligation or stipulation; the obligation and stipulation are found in the bond, which is the instrument the man holds.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not by any means. That is wholly wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. And I may here ask, and I put it to my hon. friend, if it was not necessary to insert that in the bond, why did he put it in the bond? Why not put it simply in the prospectus? But he himself and his agents knew, and every man who floats a loan knows, that he must put it in the bond in order to make it an absolute obligation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I distinctly deny the statement.

Mr. FOSTER. What statement do you deny?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That it was necessary to insert in the bond the stipulation contained in the prospectus.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, why did you put it in the bond in the case of every loan to which a sinking fund was attached?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will tell you, if you wish.

Mr. FOSTER. Now let me call my hon. friend's attention to the prospectus of the loan of 3 per cent. sterling bonds for £4,000,000, the minimum price of issue being 92½ per cent., which is the prospectus we are discussing with reference to the loan of 1888. This is the clause in it:

"With a view of rendering the sinking funds of the various loans more effective than heretofore, the Canadian Government intend to apply the sums annually required in the redemption of the national debt in purchases of the stock now offered. The amount at present annually applied to the redemption of the debt is about £350,000, and, as the sinking funds are accumulative, the amount yearly increases."

This is an expression of the intention of the Government; and I may state that that expression of intention followed in the very course of the practice of the Government for years, namely, that we have purchased exclusively out of our own bonds for sinking fund purposes; that we have purchased out of our low-priced bonds for a very evident reason, not because it was necessarily more profitable to purchase a bond below par for a sinking fund, as compared with a bond above par, but the great element of consideration which caused that course to be taken was this, that where you have a stock running below par, it is to the interest of the country to have that stock appreciated. If you issue a 3½ per cent. stock, as was the £5,000,000 loan of 1884, and if you place it at 91 or 92, it is to the interest of this country, looking to future loans which have to be put on the British market, looking to the best interests of Canada, to buy out of that stock for the sinking fund, because the steady purchase from the stock for the sinking fund helps to appreciate the value of that stock; and when you bring that up to par, and go again to float a loan on the British market, you go in on more favorable conditions, with a lower stock at par, and with the probability of getting a little above par when you put on a stock at the same rate per cent. It was following in the line of that practice, and it is a good practice on the part of this Government, that the prospectus stated that we should purchase out of this below par stock. We had no other below par stocks. The 3½ per cents. issued in 1884, below par, had gone above par, and our 4 per cents. were, of course, above par; and following the line of my hon. friend and the line of all Finance Ministers heretofore, it was stated that we would buy for sinking fund purposes out of this stock which was below par; and that expression of intention simply carried out the practice of the Government from Confederation to the present time. But alongside of that prospectus, and on the very same page in the advertisement, as is usual, was the form of the bond of the Canada 3 per cent. stock, and in that the simple clause which refers to this is not a clause which has any reference to sinking fund, not a clause which stipulates anything on the part of this Government with regard to sinking fund purchase, but is simply this: "The principal and interest on the above are chargeable upon the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada under the authority of the above Act." The obligation to buy for the sinking funds is not in the bond. There is no stipulation, and I stand here upon the ground, which is fair, honest and legal, that that statement of intention with reference to the matter in the prospectus—along side the form of the bond, which omitted all mention of it, and which can alone interpret the obligation and the stipulation—places us under no legal obligation, that we have entered into no stipulation to buy out these stocks for the sinking fund, no matter to what price they may go, and no matter what combinations may exist. If that ground is well taken, and I believe it is—I do not believe any honest, fair-minded man or any legal authority will say anything else—then the basis on which my hon. friend has founded his whole criticism has fallen to the ground, and his criticism falls with it. Let me put another case to my hon. friend. He dwells a great deal on the fact, that if we buy for the sinking fund out of these stocks, and if we buy up to the value of £350,000 or £400,000 per annum, whatever it happens to be, in ten years time we shall have exhausted the stock, and therefore the loan which was to have run fifty years will simply run barely ten years. This is the second great point of my hon. friend. Therefore, he said, where you thought you had bonds which were to run fifty years, you find at the end of ten years you have bought them all up. I put this case to my hon. friend. He would have found no fault, I suppose, if we had put on the market a 3 per cent. loan at 92½, and if it had been floated as successfully as this one or nearly so; and if, having to pay two million dollars each year for our sinking fund, instead of buying 4 per cents. at 110 or 112, and 3½ per cents. at 106 or 108, we had bought all the sinking fund securities out of this 3 per cent. stock. Would my hon. friend have found fault with that? Would any hon. gentleman who is listening to me have found fault with that? If he would, then he would have found fault with the practice followed by the financiers of Canada from 1868 to this time. Supposing that to be the case, and that there had been nothing mentioned in the prospectus at all with reference to the intention of the Government; supposing that the loan had been put on the market below par, and had remained a stock not above par for ten years, at the end of ten years buying on this principle, which is well approved, we would have exhausted the whole loan; and a loan which was to have run for fifty years, we would equally in this case have bought back in ten years. Therefore my hon. friend's criticism falls to the ground, unless he can show that we are obliged to pay an unreasonable amount for the stocks which we buy of these 3 per cents. Let us see what does happen when we have bought, for sinking fund purposes, at the rate of two million dollars per year, out of that stock, and at the end of ten years—leaving out the fact that this intention of the Government is not shown in the prospectus at all—have exhausted the stock for sinking fund purposes, and brought it to par. Has Canada lost anything? My hon. friend must recollect that when we give a bond of £100 for £95, we must pay £100 at the end of the time limit, and if we pay it before that limit is reached, we do not, therefore, lose the whole difference between the under par price at which we sold and the face of the bond, but only what that difference would be worth to us for the unexpired time of the loan. That is an element which must be taken into account as well. Suppose we have exhausted the loan at the end of ten years and have appreciated that stock to par, is that bound to be a loss to Canada? Not at all, because Canada will go upon the market for another loan, and not upon a market where she will have to take £95 for every £100, but where her stock has been appreciated up to par, partly through her own purchases, and when she puts on another loan at 3 per cent., instead of getting £95, she will get £100 or more. That is the compensation which comes to the country from the appreciation of the stock which is put upon the market below par and at a low rate of interest.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Aye, if the appreciation be a natural one, but not if it is caused by your having to buy the stock yourself.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend asks, how are you going to tell when there has been an undue appreciation or how prove conspiracy. I do not think that is a difficult matter. I say so with all deference, because my hon. friend has told the House that I am but young in the business, and he is a man experienced in these matters for a long period of years. But, I say, when my hon. friend quotes to me the prices or the variations upon the British market of the United States 4 per cents, when he tells me that Massachusetts has put on lately a 3 per cent. loan—

state or municipal, I do not know—at a price above par, and then argues from these variations that it is impossible for us to tell when a particular stock of our country is unduly appreciated or not, I do not think my hon. friend is arguing on a right basis, but has taken the wrong ground of comparing things which are dissimilar. There may be differences between the United States and Canada which may affect the bonds of each in different ways. There may be differences between different states of the United States which may affect their bonds as compared with each other, but I hold, with regard to one country, with different issues of stock of that country running upon the market, it is not difficult to tell, comparing the one with the other, whether one has been unduly appreciated or not. My hon friend's argument is that we cannot tell whether it has or has not been unduly appreciated, but that it will be raised because of this prospectus clause, which he calls an obligation. I say, that it is an easy matter to tell whether there has been an undue appreciation or not. Take our 4 per cent. stocks, our 3½ per cent. stocks, and our 3 per cent. stocks; and I hold, that by comparing one of these three classes of stocks with the others, you can tell at once, whether in that particular stock there has or not been an undue appreciation. That is a proposition no man will pretend to deny. It will, therefore, be an easy matter to tell whether this stock has unreasonably appreciated, or whether or not it would be a profitable stock for us to buy. I do not think it is necessary for me to give a much more lengthy reply to my hon. friend. The whole thing rests upon his contention, that we entered into an obligation in the prospectus which is binding, and that it would be a repudiation if we did not carry it out. I say, there is no such obligation, but that we are required by the intention expressed in the prospectus to buy out of this low rate stock as has been our usual practice, and as is the best and most profitable for the country, and to continue this practice of buying out of stocks of our own, in order to appreciate those stocks, so long as they are unreasonably appreciated And we are not further bound by the expression in the prospectus to which there is no parallel in the bond. There being in the bond no stipulation whatever, and it being the bond which makes th e obligation, I say we are not bound to pay unreasonable prices for this, we are not bound to follow it if it unreasonably appreciates, by means of combination or the like of that. My hon. friend says this was a most absurd transaction, and he had a little facetious pleasantry—all to himself, I must say—in reference to the High Commissioner. The House did not seem to appreciate his jokes, I suppose because a financial subject is so dull and heavy a one that it seems out of place to joke about it. He said it was an absurd piece of business, almost a criminal piece of business on the part of the High Commissioner, the agents or the Government, and that it had no parallel. My hon. friend is not, it seems to me, in a position the most favorable to criticise what takes place with reference to loans and with reference to financial matters. My hon. friend has a financial history of his own. From 1874 to 1878, my hon. friend occupied this position upon the Treasury benches. He had to do with the British money market, and he put, I think, three several loans on that market; and he stands alone amongst Finance Ministers of this Dominion from 1868 to the present time, and I am sure he will occupy that unenviable notoriety of standing alone amongst Finance Ministers for all future time, in the method which he adopted in putting his loans on the British market. Let me call the attention of the House to those loans. There we e two loans made in 1868 and 1869, before my hon. friend came into the position of Finance Minister. When he came in as Finance Minister, he laid down this doctrine—I do not give the *ipssima verba*, but I give the sense of the hon. gentleman's doctrine—which was that there are only two cases in which we may venture to issue a loan by tender: first, if we have an Imperial guarantee, and second, if time or immediate success in the negotiation is a matter of indifference. My hon. friend was then trying to justify a departure which he made in the manner of floating a loan on the British market, and he laid down the doctrine that there are only two conditions under which you can afford to ask tenders for a loan—one, if you have an Imperial guarantee, and the other, if you do not care how much time is consumed or do not care particularly about the success of the negotiation. He stands alone in that view. When Sir John Rose made a loan in 1868, he asked for tenders and took the highest.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It was a guaranteed loan.

Mr. FOSTER. It being a guaranteed loan. When Sir Leonard Tilley, in 1883, asked for tenders for a loan, he did the same.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was guaranteed.

Mr. FOSTER. Partly. My hon. friend came in 1874, and put a loan upon the market, and he fixed the price of that loan at 90, if I mistake not. He did not leave it open to tender. He made a departure entirely from what had been done before, and has been done thereafter. The hon. gentleman talks about losses. Let me remind him that, in that loan of his in 1874, which he refused to allow to go to a free tender on the market, there was a discount of £9 19s. 3d. on every bond he issued. That is, for every £100 which this country had to pay, my hon friend got into his hands £100 less £9 19s. 3d. My hon. friend will say that that was a special case, that it was when he wanted to put on the market a purely Canadian loan at 4 per cent and he had to break through old custom; that he had to put on an unguaranteed Canadian loan, and that, therefore, the discount would be higher. But let us come to two years later. Let us come to 1876, and my hon. friend did not then have to break the ice. He was going over to the British market, which was in a peculiarly favorable condition for the floating of a loan, with money in the banks to repletion, with the markets glutted, and with the condition of affairs so in other parts of the world that a stated and peaceable credit such as Canada had could command the attention of the people in the English market. At that time, when our 4 per cent. bonds were quoted on the market at from 92½ to 94, instead of asking for tenders, he made a fixed price of 91, which was less by 1, or 2, or 3 per cent. less than our 4 per cent bonds were quoted at on the market. What was the result? Taking even the times which he gave, which were exorbitant, giving for the last payment no less than 267 days after interest commenced to run upon it, he came out of the market with a discount of £10 or more upon every bond for which we had to pay £100 afterwards. Yet my hon. friend criticises this loan, and criticises the manner in which it was put on the market, and the cost of it to the country. I think my hon. friend scarcely stands in the most favorable position possible when he attempts to criticise loans in regard to their cost to this country. These two discounts to which I have referred, one of £9 19s. 3d., and the other of £10 or a little more, are the largest discounts which have ever been taken from a loan in the history of the Dominion of Canada, and I feel sure that they are the largest that ever will be so taken. When Finance Ministers came into office afterwards, did they act upon the hon. gentleman's doctrine? Not at all. They acted upon the well received doctrine which had been acted upon in Canada always before, and asked for tenders, fixing perhaps a minimum price and taking the highest tenders. When Sir Leonard Tilley negotiated a loan in 1878, which was partially guaranteed, the discount amounted to only £3 8s. 9d. In 1879, on a purely Canadian loan, the discount was £1 18s. 1½d., which was less than half the discount on the second 4 per cent. loan floated by

my hon. friend in 1876. I state this as a comment upon the hon. gentleman's criticism of the High Commissioner of this country. I think I have met the main points made by my hon. friend in his criticism, but I will say this in addition. My hon. friend has made, or has attempted to make a great deal out of this guarantee. He has attempted to accuse us of repudiation, or, if we do not repudiate, he says we will be mulcted in extraordinary payments for the purchase of the sinking fund. He has made these statements, he has pressed them on the House, he has called the attention of the country to them, and, as far as he has been able, after having for a good many years tried to depreciate the credit of the country, but unsuccessfully, my hon. friend has now ended by endeavoring, seeing that its credit is good, and that it stands in a condition unsurpassed in the previous history of the country, to lead the hounds of speculation to fasten themselves, if they possibly can, upon the good credit of Canada. Neither the first nor the second of these attempts will succeed. As our credit is good, so we will maintain it, and the Government of this country is in a position to protect, and will be found able to protect, the finances of this country from any combinations of speculators that may be found in the old country or in this.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We have witnessed to day what we have often witnessed in this House, that when a charge is preferred against the Government, and they find themselves unable to make a reply that they know would be at all satisfactory to the country, they attempt to divert attention from it; and they also resort to the argument, and they have been forced to do it in this case—though I rather wonder how they could do it—of trying to represent the one who feels it his duty to bring a grave matter before the House, as crying down his country, as endeavoring to injure Canada. We do not propose to be led away from the discussion of this question by any of these side issues, as to the loans that were put upon the market by the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment that is now in your hands. These have been matters of discussion in this House time and again. If the hon. gentleman has erred, I think those who have heard him to-day will admit that he is quite able to defend, not to say justify, his course, and to prove that he acted in the best interests of Canada. But that is not the course that we are adopting at the present time. We do not wish to be led off into a discussion of questions that have been thrashed out time and again, not apparently to the entire satisfaction of hon. gentlemen opposite. We are dealing with a transaction that has been entered into by this Government, and we expected the Finance Minister to give some explanations, to give some reasons, to give some defence of the conduct he has pursued. Now, it has been pointed out by the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment, that we have had an entirely new departure in the mode of placing this loan upon the money market. When the Finance Minister attempts to say that they have only followed in the steps that have been taken by others, as he said in his reply the other day, he did admit this much, that they had bound themselves a little more explicitly in this transaction than had been done under previous management. He has been very bold in his assertions, but what are the facts? I do not wish to reiterate what has been said, but the whole subject is so simple that, as the hon. member who moved the amendment, said, the merest tyro in finance, the youngest bank clerk, if he will allow himself to think upon the subject for one moment, cannot come to any other conclusion than that a most foolish—to use no stronger term—arrangement has been entered into. Why, Sir, what was the case with reference to the previous loan, and the sinking fund attached. It was, that there should be one-half of 1 per cent. of a sinking fund attached, and we were bound to use that sinking fund in the repurchase of that particular loan; but, even in that case, with only one-half of 1 per cent. binding us, we had a proviso in it, that we should not be bound to purchase that stock if it went above par. And that is quoted as a precedent for placing a loan upon the market in which we bind ourselves to pay what is equivalent to 10 per cent. of a sinking fund toward the repurchase of this, and without any provision whatever to guard ourselves against having to pay whatever price that stock may attain in the market. Now, Sir, this is a comparison of the two cases, nor can any amount of reasoning, any amount of referring to the loans of 1874, 1875, and 1876, that have been discussed so often, any amount of talk as to pointing out in the Canadian House of Parliament to the English investors, how they may make a good thing out of this stock, break the force of the charge made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Just as if the moneyed men on the London Stock Exchange did not know what might be done in that way just as well as the Finance Minister of Canada; as if the shrewd business men who handle the finances of the nations of the world, would be unable to comprehend what was contained in this, if the hon. member for South Oxford had not pointed it out. That gentleman has been guilty of a great many misdemeanors, but now he has crowned the sum of his iniquity by pointing out to these men how they may take advantage of us in this transaction. Sir, is it not childish to hear arguments of that kind in a Canadian House of Parliament? Does he think gentlemen will be deterred from doing their duty in this House by the presentation of any such pretence of argument as that? Now, Sir, what is the defence that they have made? I am sorry to say they have attempted no defence, pointed out no way of escape from the probable loss—would I not be justified, after listening to the calm presentation of the facts of the case and all connected with it by the hon. member for South Oxford, in saying the almost inevitable consequence of what we have done in reference to this matter? The Finance Minister treats it lightly. He says it may depreciate, it may go up to par, it may go above par. It is true it may get into the hands of permanent investors—I suppose there are investors in England that could buy up all that was in the market in a short time—he says it may go up, but if we think it has gone beyond a price that suits ourselves, then we will not consider ourselves bound to buy at that figure. Why, Sir, is not that repudiation broached in the Canadian Parliament by a Canadian Minister of Finance, by that gentleman who was not blamed by the member for South Oxford—but the Minister of Finance heroically rushes in and assumes all the blame, if blame there is, attached to this loan. Sir, I cannot see the necessity for his doing that, although it may be considered as a heroic act. It cannot be that his object was this, to come in and assume the responsibility attached to that act in order to show its character with more force, possibly, than before, and giving them to understand that it is the sentiment of the Canadian Government, uttered through a Canadian Finance Minister, that if it suits the purposes of this Government to repudiate their obligations, this Government are prepared to do it, and they are not afraid to announce it to the world. Sir, I think the House would be very sorry indeed if we have been driven to that position. I think the House will regret very much that statements such as these should have been uttered by the hon. gentleman, He tells us that there is no obligation. Well, if there is no obligation, I cannot understand what an obligation is. I confess, as the hon. gentleman himself does, to the fact that I am not as well versed in these matters as some other gentlemen; but I take it that in an ordinary business transaction, when you issue a prospectus of a loan, and you state without any guard, without any reservation whatever, that you are putting twenty millions of dollars, in round numbers, on

the market, and that you have a fund in hand that is equal to about two millions, and that, at the present time, you expect to have two millions every year, and that every year you will buy two million dollars' worth of that stock. I say, Sir, that the people who buy that stock, buy it on the understanding—and it is an understanding, it is an engagement on our part, if I understand it, certainly in honor, if not of binding legal force, certainly there is moral obligation—that you shall implement the engagement you entered into, and carry out what the Government of Canada had placed before the investing British public in good faith. I do not know that I need to discuss this matter further. It is impossible to put the thing plainer than it was put in the calm and dispassionate speech of the hon. gentleman who felt it to be his duty to point out the circumstances that surround this loan, and the probable consequences that might issue from it. I can only view it, as a member of this House, in the same light, and when I am asked to pronounce upon an engagement of this kind, I can only say that I consider it was a most ill-advised arrangement, and that when a proposition comes before the House declaring that it was an ill-advised arrangement, I will be bound to give my assent to it. I cannot imagine how it was possible, scarcely, what motive could have induced any one to place a loan upon the market under such terms, with such conditions, with no reserve, or guard, or hedge in any way, as was the case with this loan placed upon the market in London. The hon. gentleman, in his attempted defence, says, when these bonds matured you would have had to buy them back at par anyway, losing sight of the fact that these were not to be bought back for fifty years. He also lost sight of the fact, when he referred to these loans, when he referred to that investment, to the repurchase by the one-half per cent. sinking fund attached to other loans, he lost sight not only of the fact that they were not to be bought if they went above par, but that there was authority given, and it was expresely so declared, that the sinking fund, if they went above par, should not be used in the purchase of that particular security, but could be used for the purchase of others. Has he in this prospectus made any other provision for the use of the sinking fund if he does not by the 3 per cent.? He has made no provision, but he has deliberately bound himself to use the sinking fund for the repurchase of this particular stock, no matter at what price it may be held by the permanent investors in whose hands it will be. He is not able to deny that; but he is forced to this position, that the Government are not bound, and will not feel themselves bound, if the parties should hold the stock at a higher figure than he thinks is right, to implement and carry out their engagement. He is bolder to-day than he was the other day. If I remember his words, he admitted that the Government were bound morally, if not legally, to use the sinking fund in the repurchase of this last loan put upon the London market. The answer he gave was as follows:—

"The Government considers that the language used in the prospectus of the 3 per cent. loan recently negotiated in London, whereby it is declared that 'The Canadian Government intend to apply the sums annually required for the redemption of the national debt in purchases of the stock now offered,' requires them to use the sinking funds therein referred to in the purchase of the said 3 per cent. loan, in case the said securities should be held at a premium at the time of purchase, unless such premium is considered unreasonable and produced by unfair competition."

He admits that was the engagement, that we were bound to do this. The sinking fund was to be used for that purpose, no other provision was made in the prospectus to provide for the use of the sinking fund in any other way, even supposing the stock went to an unreasonable price. If he had intended to have availed himself of the position, if he had wanted to avoid repurchasing it at an unreasonable price, he would have left himself at liberty to have invested the sinking fund in some other direction; but he left himself wholly without any other recourse than to repurchase again what is equivalent to one-tenth of the stock year by year until the whole was repurchased. And we find, just as it was summed up and clearly placed before the House by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that this Government acted as I have indicated. And it cannot be said that we were disposed to be unfair towards them in regard to this loan, for the hon. member for South Oxford was generous enough, when he made his speech in reply to the financial statement, to admit honestly and candidly, in the light of the information he then possessed, that the loan was a good one, and he congratulated the Government on having effected it. Yet charges of base, sinister, petty malice are made against the hon. gentleman to-day because now, with the full light thrown upon it, he has felt it to be his duty to condemn it. When these facts that have not been and cannot be contradicted or denied, that have not been and cannot be controverted, have come to light, it is plain that this loan nominally of 3 per cent., running for fifty years, is in all probability likely to cost 4½ per cent. or 4¾ per cent. for a loan not longer than five years on the average, and we must admit that it is a financial operation of the most extraordinary nature ever heard of, not only in the Dominion of Canada, but in any civilised nation on the earth.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I was in the hope that the Finance Minister would not be left alone in his defence of this loan, although, when I consider that the leading organ of the Government has to-day condemned this prospectus on almost the same grounds as have hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, I am not surprised at the silence prevailing on the other side. I have not much to say on this occasion, because my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, has covered all the grounds that I thought were left open by way of reply. But I must say, after listening very attentively to the Minister of Finance, that if I was to pass any judgment upon his speech to-day, I would say that, unfortunate as the prospectus was which Sir Charles Tupper issued, the speech of the Minister of Finance was still more unfortunate. We, as a Dominion, have prided ourselves heretofore upon the fact that we have honestly and strictly implemented every obligation we have undertaken. We in this country know that there is nothing in the world so sensitive as capital, and we know that the official declaration by the Finance Minister of Canada, a country which is constantly going upon the Stock Exchange of London for large amounts, that he does not consider the statement of facts and promises made and intentionally expressed in the prospectus issued to enable him to obtain the loan to be binding on Canada, will have the most depressing effect upon our existing securities and a very serious effect when we go to borrow money hereafter. The hon. gentleman has expressed a legal opinion that a promise made in a prospectus, that if anyone will accept some bonds he offers, this country will do so and so, is not a legal obligation. I should like to know where he got his law. I have not had an opportunity of looking up decisions with respect to prospectuses, because the ground taken by the Finance Minister the other day, as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) has shown, was entirely different; but my recollection of the opinions expressed by the highest judicial authorities of Great Britain is entirely at variance with the conclusion which the hon. gentleman has drawn. I am very much inclined to think that he will find, if he should ever come to test this matter, that a statement of positive intention made on the part of a borrower, that if you purchase his bonds, he will do so and so, and the capitalist purchases on the faith of that statement, the court of equity will compel the borrower to carry it out. But, assuming for one moment there was a mole of

escape from the strict legal obligation, what position do we occupy to-day? Is there an hon. gentleman here to-day, or is there a man in this country, who doubts that when the Canadian Government, through their legally authorised financial agents, supported by the High Commissioner of Canada, deliberately, in a printed prospectus, declare that it is the intention of the Dominion Government to apply the whole sinking fund to the purchase of this particular loan, and that loan is placed on the London market after the prospectus had been published in all the London newspapers, and is taken up on the strength of that statement, can it for a moment be contended, or will it be contended that, even if there is not an obligation which can be enforced in a court of law, there is not a moral obligation which it would be dangerous and ruinous for this country to repudiate. We have for the first time in Canadian history, a Finance Minister standing upon the floor of this House, declaring that he, for one, does not consider there is either a legal or a moral obligation on our part to implement our solemn promise, and that he will repudiate the promise if occasion serves. If the Government's necessities should compel the Finance Minister to go to the London Stock Exchange to borrow four or five millions, and if he made the statement that he intended to have a sinking fund, or adopt some other method, the brokers would read his promises made in the circular or prospectus, and compare them with the official declaration he has just made, that he does not consider the country can be compelled to implement such promises. And what will be the result? The result will be to largely impair our credit. He has told us that the hon. gentleman on this side of the House who made the motion has suggested some kind of scheme to money-lenders in England whereby they may combine to the injury of Canada, but as was pointed out by my hon. friend, it is incredible to assume that the results, which must flow from this promise, were not known to the financiers of England when that prospectus was read by them. The hon. gentleman knows well, as was pointed out by the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that many of those who made the purchase, made it on the faith of that promise, and because that promise largely appreciated the value of the stock. The other day we examined some of the English papers published at the time that this prospectus was issued, to see how it was treated by those who deal with financial matters in England, and we found that the matter had been commented upon in the financial articles published in the *Standard*, one of the most reputable and respectable English papers. I hold in my hand the *Standard*, a paper generally recognised, all over the world, as having a very high financial standing, so far as its monetary articles are concerned, and I find that on the 14th June last, in an article intituled "The Money Market," it reviews the prospectus which the hon. gentleman now defends, and the reviewer was struck with astonishment at this new departure, and called attention to it. This omission in the prospectus could not have been a mistake, because the attention of the promoters of this loan was called to it before the loan issued. The article in the *Standard* reads as follows:—

"The paragraph in the prospectus of the Canadian 3 per cent. loan which says that the sinking funds of the Canadian debt generally will be used to buy up the bonds of this new loan in the market, has led many people to conclude that purchases would be effected regardless of price. It is impossible to conclude that the Government of the Dominion can contemplate doing anything so extravagant. A limit must have been fixed beyond which the sinking fund purchases would cease; and it is a pity that a limit was not stated."

Why, Sir, the financial critic of that paper would not believe it was possible that men with heads on their shoulders and having the good of their country at heart could go on the money market with such an insane proposal, and he said there must be some mistake, and that "some limit must have been fixed." We have the facts before us to-day that there was no limit fixed by the Government, and the astonishment which this financial critic experienced, and the doubt which he expressed that the Dominion Government could contemplate doing anything so extravagant has been realised. We find that there has not been inserted either in the bond or the prospectus or in any other notice given by the Government any limitation whatever upon the promise they made, and, according to the *Standard*, the impression would be that unless the limit was fixed the Government would be bound to effect the repurchase of these bonds regardless of price. I am very much inclined to think that the Minister of Finance will not find the legal gentlemen on his side of the House endorsing the legal position he has taken in this matter, but whether they endorse it or not the moral obligation on the part of the Dominion is as binding on us, and the consequences of that moral obligation will be as serious as if we had entered into a legal obligation capable of being enforced in a court of law. We find that in all former prospectuses we carefully guarded ourselves against any compulsion in the purchase of the stocks when they became appreciated beyond par, and if we omitted to mention any limitation in this prospectus there is no tribunal which would allow us to repudiate our express stipulation and the pledge we had solemnly given. I cannot conceive that any court or any judge would allow us to repudiate our express stipulation in this prospectus. The hon. gentleman says he is going into court, but what is he going to plead? He says: "I made a foolish bargain and I want to escape from the consequences of my folly." I have heard that plea very often in courts of justice, I have heard men say this bargain is very foolish, and I ought not be called upon to implement it, but I did not find the courts generally allow them to escape on that plea. The hon. gentleman may have been foolish in making this loan on the terms he did, but he is more foolish in defending it as he did to-day. He may have been foolish, but he can depend upon it, that he will be compelled to implement the promise he has made. There is no doubt that the issue of the loan in this way appreciated the price we obtained from the purchasers, and having obtained the advantages from the omission of those words of limitation, can we honorably go into court and ask to be relieved from the obligation we have deliberately entered into? I do not see how we can ask to be allowed now to interpolate words, the omission of which we have had the advantage of in the sale of our stock. To my mind, if we did this, we would not be listened to by a judge in a court of equity, and I am quite sure, that there is not a stock exchange in the world where, if such a plea was put forward, it would not be repudiated on the moment, and the man who put it forward, be kicked out of the stock exchange. I regret exceedingly, from a national standpoint, that the Minister of Finance has seen fit to make the declarations he has made to-day, and which, I contend, are practically immoral declarations; declarations telling the world that Canada, a country which has hitherto kept all its obligations, is ready to break these obligations with persons who put confidence in us. We have made a foolish bargain and we can punish the men who made it, but we must carry out our obligations no matter what the cost is. If we do not carry out our obligations how can we dare to go on this money market again and ask to borrow money from these people? Every one who knows the Dominion of Canada, knows the condition of the country at present, they know the obligations which we are entering into every day, they know the new obligations which the Government has undertaken and which will be submitted to the House in a few days, they know that we must in consequence of these obligations borrow more money in the English market and how can we, if we have disgraced ourselves and adopted a policy of repudiation which has been more than foreshadowed by the hon. the Minister of Finance in his speech to-day, how can we face those people and ask

them to place confidence in us in future? It would be more creditable to the Minister of Finance if he adopted the line of policy to-day which he adopted the other day, and in which he admitted that we were required, as part of our obligations, to purchase these bonds even though they went beyond par, and the only limitation he then put upon our obligations was, "unless they are unduly appreciated." That portion of the question has been so thoroughly threshed out by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that I shall not go into it again. It does not require a man to be a financier to see how foolish that argument is on the part of the Finance Minister of Canada. Suppose in four or five years' time the holder of £100,000 of this stock went to the trustees of the sinking fund, and tendered it at 20 per cent. premium, and the commissioners of the sinking fund would not purchase; supposing that an attempt was made to make the commissioners purchase, in a court of law, how would the commissioners be able to convince the courts that 20 per cent. premium was an "undue appreciation." The commissioners could not buy any of the other stock, and the holders might say: "We bought this stock in the first instance because we knew you would be compelled to redeem it within a certain time, from the terms of that very bargain; you cannot go anywhere else, you cannot get it anywhere else, and you have to pay that price." If you refused to pay it, you would be laughed out of court, and you would only expose your own folly in making the bargain. Sir, there is no defence that can be made for this unfortunate prospectus. The people of Canada will have to bear the burden, and I trust that from both sides of the House there will come the strongest denunciation of the policy the Finance Minister has foreshadowed, of repudiating the legal and moral obligations which this country has entered into.

Mr. EDGAR. When the Finance Minister's attention was first drawn to this matter by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), he naturally did not know the terrible financial entanglements which were likely to arise from the prospectus he had issued in 1888 for that loan, because when he answered the question which was put on the paper, and deliberately set himself as Finance Minister to answer it with regard to the effect of that prospectus, he did to a very large extent admit the binding character of the prospectus, for he said that the words contained in the prospectus required the Government to use the sinking fund therein referred to in the purchase of the said 3 per cent. loan. When the question came up again on the 5th of April, he still was not prepared to adopt the policy of repudiation which he has chosen to-day, because he did admit that the prospectus perhaps carried with it a pledge a little more explicit than the clauses of the preceding prospectuses. To-day he has announced a new policy, a policy of repudiation, because he distinctly told the House that he did not consider himself bound by the language of the prospectus, but only by the terms of the bond itself. Well, that is certainly new law to me, and new law, I venture to say, to every legal gentleman in this House. If the Minister of Justice or the First Minister were in their seats, I would appeal to them to say whether the position taken by the Finance Minister to-day is law. I do not want to impugn his financial experience and ability, but I will question his responsibility in standing up in this House and stating that by the law of this country or the law of England the prospectus does not form part of the contract made after the prospectus has been issued. Surely the obligations of the Government of Canada are to be held as sacred as the obligations of the promoters of a private company would be. I cannot find a case, I admit, of a Government ever before repudiating a prospectus, but I can show the hon. gentleman what the courts in England think of the promoters of companies who have attempted to repudiate prospectuses. Now, remember that the hon. gentleman to-day repudiates the whole prospectus. The other day he accepted part of the responsibility of it, but told us that, in addition to what he said in that prospectus, he meant that it should have been qualified; and while it would require them to purchase the loan back out of the sinking fund, even if it went above par, still there was this qualification in his mind, unless such premium were considered unreasonable and produced by unfair combination. Why did he not include that condition in his prospectus? The other day he did not repudiate the prospectus, although he does to-day. I say that, in the first place, the prospectus cannot be repudiated, and, in the second place, all omissions of material conditions in the prospectus must be condemned, and the parties affected are not bound by those omissions. In a case quoted in Buckley on Joint Stock Companies, in a decision by Vice Chancellor Kindersley, these words were used:

"Those who issue prospectus holding out to the public the great advantages which will accrue to persons who will take shares in a proposed undertaking, and inviting them to take shares on the faith of the representations therein contained, are bound to state everything with strict and scrupulous accuracy, and not only to abstain from stating as fact that which is not so, but to omit no one fact within their knowledge, the existence of which might in any degree affect the nature or extent or quality of the privileges and advantages which the prospectus holds out as inducements to take shares."

Instead of saying shares we will say bonds, and the words exactly apply to the omission from that prospectus of what the Finance Minister now proposes to insert as a condition, that if the premium is considered unreasonable, he will not redeem. Then Lord Chelmsford said in another case:

"The objection to the prospectus is, not that it does not state the truth as far as it goes, but that it conceals most material facts which the public ought to have been made acquainted, the very concealment of which gives to the truth which is told the character of falsehood."

If these observations would apply to a private company, they would apply with all the greater force to a Government, and I venture to predict that the hon. gentleman will find, when he next goes on the London market to float a Canadian loan, that he will have to publicly swallow and repudiate and take back the language which he has used to-day on the floor of the House, and will have to announce that he did not mean to say, and that he does not believe, that the Government were not to be bound by the prospectuses which they or their agents issued for floating loans. There is no class in the world more sensitive than the money lenders in London, and they have the power also to bring the hon. Minister of Finance to his bearings; because he cannot carry on the business of the country for twelve months without taking his hat off and going to the stock exchange in London to ask for quotations for Canadian securities, and they never will allow Canadian securities to hold a position on their market unless they understand that the announcements which are solemnly made by the Finance Minister and his financial agents shall be binding upon the Dominion.

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

After Recess.

MANITOBA AND SOUTH-EASTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 61) to incorporate the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company, be concurred in.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman cannot ask that these amendments be concurred in now. They are very numerous and important. Under the circumstances, the proper course to follow would be to

refer the Bill back to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, and I move in, amendment, that this be done.

Motion agreed to.

LAKE MANITOBA RAILWAY AND CANAL COMPANY.

Mr. McDOWALL moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Manitoba Railway and Canal Company, be concurred in.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. I understand this Bill is in the same position as the one I have on the Orders, and, therefore, should be referred back to the Railway Committee.

Mr. McDOWALL. This Bill has been amended by the Senate Committee, and the promoters do not object to the amendments.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry to differ from my hon. friend. The promoters of the Bill may not object, but as these amendments change the Bill considerably, striking out about one-fourth of the Bill, and adding a new clause, I think they are too important to be concurred in now. I do not think there is another member other than the hon. gentleman who has had time to look into the Bill. This will not prevent it passing. I think it should go to the Railway Committee, as well as the other, and I move that it be referred back to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines with the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

DIVORCE—W. G. LOWRY.

Mr. SMALL moved second reading of Bill (No. 119) for the relief of William Gordon Lowry.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is the Bill to which I called the attention of the House a few evenings ago. At that time I did not make a motion to defer the Bill because, as I stated, I felt it my duty simply to call the attention of the House to the Bill, as I had received a strong impression from reading the evidence that it ought not to pass, and I said I would content myself with making that statement and asking the House to divide upon the second reading. A number of hon. members who discussed the Bill then were of opinion that it should go to the Committee on Private Bills, and they urged that view and supported it with various arguments, some of which did not seem to me to have sufficient weight to carry the House. For instance, one was that because the Bill had received the approbation of the Senate, it should receive the approbation of this House. That is a proposition in which I cannot concur, because, while I have the greatest respect for the Senate, and allow full weight to the investigations made by their Committee, I still consider that every member of this House is bound to take his own responsibility in considering and voting on a Bill of this character. It seemed to me that, even with what every member might have known apart from the evidence—and I am excused in making this reference, because some of the advocates of the Bill here indicated that they knew there was no collusion between the parties—there could be no difficulty afterwards in an Act being passed, founded on the evidence which the husband and wife may make for the purpose of the divorce which both desire. I also stated that it was evident that both parties desired a divorce and were interested in obtaining a divorce. I heard with great respect the observations founded on the reading of the evidence which were made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) and the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), and I have given some consideration to the Bill since then, and have also given further consideration to the evidence. I do not hesitate to say—I feel bound to say—

that the most careful consideration which I have been able to give to the evidence since that time convinces me more firmly than ever that this Bill is one which ought not to pass, and that, if it should pass, it will be a most dangerous precedent in regard to legislation of this kind. After the division on the second reading when I was not in the House—for if I had been in the House I might have made some remonstrance on the subject—the Bill was restored to the Paper, I believe without objection. Considering that some hon. members in the previous discussion desired that this Bill should go to the Private Bills Committee, and considering also that the House has deemed it advisable to restore this Bill to the Order Paper, I shall not make a renewed remonstrance to the Bill passing this stage and going to the Committee on Private Bills; but I say now, in justice to those who are promoting and supporting the Bill, that, unless a different case is presented to the House when the Bill comes back from the Committee, I shall feel bound again to test the sense of the House upon it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, on a division.

Mr. EDGAR. I hope that, when this Bill goes before the Committee on Private Bills, it will not be merely as a matter of form, as I am afraid it has been on several occasions. I quite agree with the Minister of Justice in feeling that, with all due respect for the other House, we should not be entirely bound by their proceedings, and that, when Bills of this character go before a Committee of this House, whenever the members of that Committee, or a majority of them, think it is a proper case for investigation, they will have the parties before them in order to form an independent opinion upon the question and present that opinion to this House. As to what the Minister of Justice has said in regard to both parties desiring a divorce, I cannot see any harm in that, so long as they are not collusive parties in the sense of making evidence to go before the House.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I rise to repudiate the insinuation of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) that the consideration of such Bills before the Private Bills Committee is a matter of form. I have for years had the honor of being a member of that Committee, and, whenever a question of this kind or any question comes before that Committee, they consider it fully and thoroughly, and they vote there as they are prepared to do here. The measure is considered on its merits, the evidence is examined by the members of the Committee, and each member expresses his views fearlessly; so that the assertion of the hon. gentleman is entirely uncalled for, and it is not true.

SUPPLY—LOAN OF 1888.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It is not only the importance of the subject which is before the House, but also what I may call the statement of the legal proposition by the Minister of Justice which induces me to occupy the time of the House briefly on the subject which we have been discussing this afternoon. It is a matter of very great importance to this country, and to the good faith which should be kept with our creditors. Before discussing this loan, I will consider the proposition which has been laid down by the Minister of Finance, that the prospectus is not of a binding nature, because the statement contained in the prospectus is not included in the bond issued. If we were to treat this as a legal question, I do not think the Minister of Finance would find any gentleman of the legal profession who would agree with him in that. If there is any point in regard to which the English courts are more sensitive than another, it is in regard to prospectuses issued by public companies, either to induce parties to embark in the enterprise or to lend their money on the faith of the securities. In either case, the statements made in the prospectus are in

the nature of a contract, and are held to be either a misrepresentation or a concealment—it is immaterial which—of the facts if they are not carried out. Every tribunal throughout the mother country—and the cases have not been by any means few—up to the highest courts of the land have always held that it requires a matter to be of *uberrimæ fidei*, of the greatest possible faith, when put forward in the prospectus. My hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Edgar) quoted from the opinion of an eminent judge, and I find that very same principle, and the words of that judge, adopted by the House of Lords in a case which was before them. Before I proceed with a discussion of the position in which we stand now, I will take the proposition as a legal proposition, as if it was binding upon the country. Whether the object was to induce the public to take shares in a company for the purpose of borrowing money to carry out an enterprise, or whether the purpose was to induce the public to loan their money, in either case the same principle is applicable. The Lord Chancellor, in speaking upon this point, says:

"But although, in its introduction to the public, some high coloring, and even exaggeration, in the description of the advantages which are likely to be enjoyed by the subscribers to an undertaking, may be expected, yet no misstatement or concealment of any material facts or circumstances ought to be permitted. In my opinion the public, who are invited by prospectus to join any new adventure, ought to have the same opportunity of judging of everything which has a material bearing on its true character, as the promoters themselves possess. It cannot be too frequently or too strongly impressed upon those who, having projected any undertaking, are desirous of obtaining the co-operation of persons who have no other information on the subject than that which they choose to convey, that the utmost candor and honesty ought to characterise their published statements. As was said by the Vice Chancellor Kindersley, in the case of the New Brunswick and Canada Railway Co. *vs.* Muggeridge, those who issue a prospectus holding out to the public the great advantages which will accrue to persons who will take shares in a proposed undertaking, and inviting them to take shares on the faith of the representations therein contained, are bound to state everything with strict and scrupulous accuracy, and not only to abstain from stating as fact that which is not so, but to omit no one fact within their knowledge the existence of which might in any degree affect the nature, or extent, or quality of the privileges and advantages which the prospectus holds out as inducements to take shares."

Such, Mr. Speaker, is the position which is taken by the highest tribunal in the mother country. If, then, so far as public companies are concerned, they are obliged to observe the strictest fidelity, how much more must the Government of a country be obliged to avoid any appearance of deception in the prospectus that they put forward. They are morally bound by honor, by that honor which enables them to place their loan in the money market, to abide by their engagements, and if this principle is applicable to public companies, in a far greater degree must it be applicable to those prospectuses which are scattered throughout the country to invite persons to invest their money in loans. We find that this prospectus was circulated throughout the whole country; as the hon. member for South Oxford stated, it was published in a number of papers, it was put forward as the means by which this loan would be paid, and under these conditions the people of Great Britain were asked to put their money into this particular loan. It was put forward as a loan by a colony in a country like England in which, so far as she and her colonies are concerned, the word repudiation is unknown. Heretofore the mother country and her colonies have kept full faith and credit with the people with whom they have dealt. Now, we have to look to see what is the nature of the prospectus put forward. We find here a most unusual clause. We find in the loans of 1874, 1876, 1878, 1879, 1884, a particular clause of limitation, setting forth distinctly the mode in which the sinking fund was to be provided for, as the means of gradually extinguishing the debt. We find, for instance, in the loan of December, 1878, it was stated:

"For the £1,500,000 4 per cent loan a cumulative sinking fund of not less than one-half per cent. will be employed in the purchase of the Dominion 4 per cent. bonds at or below par, the Government reserving the right to invest the sinking fund in other securities should the price be above par."

Such was the clause, or a similar clause, put in all the previous loans up to this present loan, but in this present loan a change is made in the terms. We find in it a clause of an unusual character, at least a clause which has not been put in the conditions of the previous loans which were offered by Canada. That in itself would attract attention. It would show at once that some departure was made from the ordinary course by which we expected to enhance the price of this loan. It would naturally show that greater advantage was to be obtained by it than would be obtained in the ordinary course. Now, what is the obvious meaning of this clause? We find that the hon. member for South Oxford put a question the other day to the Minister of Finance. The Minister took some time to consider that question, and then he made this answer:

"The Government considers that the language used in the prospectus of the 3 per cent. loan recently negotiated in London, whereby it is declared that 'The Canadian Government intend to apply the sums annually required for the redemption of the national debt in purchases of the stock now offered,' requires them to use the sinking funds therein referred to in the purchase of the said 3 per cent. loan, in case the said securities should be held at a premium at the time of purchase, unless such premium is considered unreasonable and produced by unfair competition."

Here we have stated in distinct language the obligation of the Government to carry out the proposition put forward in the prospectus, with the qualification, which does not appear upon the face of the prospectus, that the premium should not be unreasonable and produced by unfair competition. Such was the answer made by the Finance Minister, admitting an obligation in accordance with the plain and obvious meaning of the clause put into the prospectus. Eliminating the last part, the qualification that is found there was a distinct acknowledgment of the undertaking put forward in that prospectus, and that that loan would be so understood. What is the position now taken by the Finance Minister? He comes forward and says practically that he is not strictly bound by the prospectus, because the conditions are not put in the bond. But the prospectus is what is presented to the public to induce them to take the stock, and it is the pledge of the Canadian Government that the sinking fund will be appropriated in a certain manner, and this is a solemn obligation which we cannot repudiate no matter what the result may be. In that pledge the honor of Canada is involved. What will be the effect of that loan? The effect will be that every year we shall have to pay £100,000 towards the reduction of the debt, and instead of it being a fifty-year loan we shall be bound to pay it off at the utmost before the expiration of ten years. Surely that is entirely different from the statement put forward with respect to this loan when it was first referred to by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when he frankly and fairly gave credit to the Finance Minister for the manner in which the loan had been effected, and said it was one of the best loans ever made. For what reason was the clause inserted? Why was the change made from the ordinary course taken with respect to these loans, not only when my hon. friend was Finance Minister, but when the present Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick held that position? It was done with a view to advance the loan. It apparently had its effect, for we find that parties purchased it at a high price and far above the limit. If, then, on the faith of the statements published in the prospectus, and if they were inserted there for the purpose of advancing the price of the loan, surely after we have obtained that price by reason of those statements, we have no right to turn round and repudiate them. Surely after we have got the benefit we have a right to bear the burden, and no matter what the cost we shall be obliged to meet it. What will be the effect? It will be that as the stock rises in price we shall be

obliged to pay par or a premium, and instead of getting the loan at the rate asserted, we shall be paying a very much higher rate. The Minister of Finance said that even if we have to pay £100, it is only paying the amount we agreed to pay. It is true; but time is the essence of the contract in this case, and there is a great difference between paying off this loan at the end of 50 years or next year, because if we pay it next year we are paying a high rate of interest. If we were to pay off the loan to-morrow we would be paying 8 per cent. instead of 3 per cent. Such seems to be the conclusion deducible from the position in which we are placed, and surely under these circumstances to represent that this loan as a fifty years loan, when it is really a ten years loan at the very outside, indicates a great degree of recklessness in placing the loan on the market. I should like an explanation as to why such a departure from the ordinary course was made on this occasion. There must have been some sinister object in view, or it was done for the purpose of obtaining a higher price than otherwise could have been obtained and with a view afterwards to get rid of it. I fail to see how we are going to get rid of it. If parties who buy the stock choose to hold it at a certain figure, what right have we to say that it is held at that figure by a fictitious combination. It must also be remembered that the trustees are bound not only to maintain the credit of Canada, but they are bound in their position as fiduciaries, parties standing between the Government and the bondholders, to see that the Government's pledge is carried out in its integrity. When these bonds advance to a premium of 20, 30 or 40, how can the Finance Minister show that this has been done by a combination, or that it is unreasonable? If it should go far beyond a fair market value it might be open to suspicion that such had been done, but before it reaches such a position we would be called upon to pay a large sum to relieve ourselves from this position. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) quoted the opinion of the London *Standard* on the subject, as stated in an article in which it brought the matter to the notice of the London money market at the time. It has been urged that it is very unfair for the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to come forward and explain this matter, and let other people know how they have been taken advantage of. Surely the people in London who manage monetary affairs are quite as astute, and perhaps even more astute, in such affairs than perhaps any member in this House, and, therefore, while I consider no charge can be made against the speech of my hon. friend, I claim he is not only doing what is right for the interests of the country, but simply his duty as an hon. member in bringing forward this matter in the manner in which he has brought it forward. The subject has already been called to the attention of the London money market, as is shown by the article which has been read. I will not extend my remarks, because the matter is in a narrow compass. The language in the prospectus is plain, the meaning of it is easy to be ascertained. What is the fair, obvious and natural meaning of these words? The Minister of Finance has admitted to an extent what we say is their meaning. That, I say, is the true meaning of the words and the meaning that would be placed upon them. But I will go further, and say that if there might be an ambiguity about them, the construction should be favorable towards the bondholders, and under no subterfuge of words or ambiguity of wording should this country endeavor to escape from its proper obligations. I find in the organ of the Government in Montreal to-day an article on this subject, which seems to bear out fully the proposition of my hon. friend from South Oxford. After referring to previous loans this article quotes the language of the prospectus. It says:

"With a view of rendering the Sinking Funds of the various loans more effective than heretofore, the Canadian Government intends to apply the sums annually required for the reduction of the national debt in purchases of the stock now offered."

"The amount at present annually applied to the reduction of the national debt is £350,000 sterling, and as the Sinking Fund is accumulative, the amount yearly increases."

How can any person, whether a legal gentleman or otherwise, read this statement and come to any other conclusion, by taking a fair and reasonable construction of the clause, than that as far as Canada is concerned this pledge must be carried out to the letter. More particularly is that the case when we notice the change of base from the conditions attached to previous loans when there was an express limitation. Then the article in the *Gazette* proceeds:

"The point raised by Sir Richard Cartwright is whether, under the clause the Government holds itself bound to devote the whole of the sinking funds to the purchase of the three per cents, no matter what price the holders of this stock may demand. If the clause in question were taken as imposing a rigid and inexorable obligation, the consequences to the Treasury might be most serious. One result would be the extinction of the loan in ten years, because the total sum applicable to the sinking funds is now $2,000,000 annually, and as the whole amount of the three per cent. issue was $20,000,000, the loan would be paid off in a decade, instead of having a currency of fifty years as contemplated at the time of issue, and as stated on the face of the bonds. That itself would not be a serious matter, provided the bonds could be purchased at a low price, at 95 for instance. But the danger lies in the possibility of a syndicate being formed to 'corner' the stock, that is to say to buy up all the stock placed in the market and hold it at a high price on the faith of the promise that $2,000,000 will be annually spent by the Government in its purchase for the sinking fund."

"At the same time it is to be regretted that so lax a clause was inserted in the prospectus, because it is always better to avoid having thrown upon the Government the responsibility of interpreting the terms of a loan, as set forth in the prospectus, in a modifying manner. The sinking fund obligations in all preceding issues had been explicitly stated; there could arise no controversy as to the meaning of the language, but in the prospectus of the 3 per cent. loan the intention is made to appear to employ some two millions annually in repurchasing the stock without any qualification as to the price. The reason of this new departure does not appear."

And again:

"As loans mature the price, of course, declines, which is an additional reason for holding the sinking funds free for investment in the 4 per cent. loans maturing in 1903-8, instead of in a lower rate loan which does not mature until thirty years later. Upon the whole, we cannot but regard it as unfortunate that the sweeping clause without restriction should have been inserted in the prospectus of the loan of June last."

That same "sweeping clause without restriction," as set forth by the *Gazette*, was inserted in that loan in a manner which would naturally call to it the attention of the investors, and induce them to put their money in the loan. If so the Government has got to abide by it and the trustees of the sinking fund would be bound—whether legally bound or not is a matter with which we have nothing to do at all, and I am not dealing with it as a legal question—but the trustees would be bound by that prospectus as a matter of morality and as a matter of honor to carry out their obligations to the bondholders. Further than that the Government of the day, or whatever Government may hold the reins of power, will be bound to carry that out in order to maintain the credit of Canada and to show that she is a colony of Great Britain able to meet her obligations.

Mr. WALDIE. I would like to say a few words on this matter before the vote is taken. When I first read that we had borrowed $20,000,000 at 3 per cent. for fifty years, even though we were paying a commission of 2 per cent., I thought it was a very favorable transaction, but I had no idea whatever that there would be a greater sinking fund provided for its redemption than was usual with a fifty years loan. When we were informed a few days ago that the provision for the redemption of this debt, instead of being from a half to 1 per cent., was 10 per cent. and that instead of this loan being for a period of fifty years costing us 2 per cent. commission, it was a loan for not more than five years, costing us the 2 per cent. commission for that time, I found that this entirely changed the character of the loan. I agree with the Finance Minister

that if he continues to purchase his 3 per cent. loans on the English market everything should be done to enhance the value, but this only enhances the value of this particular 3 per cent. loan and it would not enhance the value of a second 3 per cent. loan unless it had the same terms attached to it. I believe that the Finance Minister who seems to think that the prospectus of this loan is so favorable to this country, will never attach it to a second 3 per cent. loan. I do not think it is at all likely that such a bond will be attached to any other loan, or that the country will be again misled to suppose that they are borrowing money for fifty years when they can actually retain it for only ten years. I think this is unfortunate, inasmuch as we find that before a year has rolled by about 10 per cent. of the amount that was loaned to us has been paid back again. Although we may not have lost anything in the amounts actually paid for those bonds which we have redeemed, yet we have paid 2 per cent. commission upon them, and we have never used the money for the purpose for which the loan was contracted. Instead of using it for the purposes required, the money was loaned again at one and a quarter per cent, while we were paying 3 per cent. on the £100 and only able to loan the £93 that the loan netted us. When we come to consider the circumstances connected with this loan, we must agree that it is a very undesirable transaction. What will be the effect of it when we are called upon, as we will be called upon very shortly, to issue another 3 per cent. loan? The next loan will not have such a favorable prospectus, for it is impossible after this discussion that the Finance Minister will ever permit such a prospectus to issue again on the English market, and we will therefore have to make a 3 per cent. loan of a different character to this, and it will be rated at a different value on the market. We may then have one, two, or three loans at 3 per cent. not bringing the same market price as this. I do think that when the Government finds as is quite evident that there has been a very serious mistake made in the issuing of this prospectus, that they will consider it advisable that the loan should be retired as speedily as possible and that the public credit of Canada should be maintained.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I desire to say a few words upon this question, and were it not for what was stated in the last few minutes of the debate I would not have detained the House by saying anything upon the argument that has been advanced; because I feel that in dealing with a question of this kind the position which the Government ought to take, and the position which the Government take, is not dependent upon any legal theories on our contract or our representations. I do feel that in thus presenting this question to the House our hon. friends opposite have endeavored to prove too much when they have assured this House that we have entered into legal and binding obligations to invest all the payments of sinking funds in this stock, and that such is our legal and binding obligation under the loan which we have made and under the contract which we have assumed. In order to present that view to the House our hon. friends opposite have read various decisions, one of which has been read twice—the second time with a great deal of emphasis by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon)—in which one of the first judges of the United Kingdom declared that the utmost good faith was necessary in any representation made in a prospectus upon which the public were induced to invest their money. To that point I wish to address myself, and first of all let me refer to the legal effect of our obligations in this prospectus, not as I said before for the purpose of basing the defence of the Government as regards this loan, nor for the purpose of stating our future action as regards this loan, solely upon the legal doctrines which may govern it, but for the purpose of removing the impression which has been improperly cast on the judgment of the House as regards what that legal effect may be. As to the effect of these decisions, only a specimen of which was given to the House by the hon. member for St. John (because the number of these decisions is legion, and the language of scores of them is even more emphatic than that which the Lord High Chancellor of England used in the decision read to the House) I conceive that as to the legal effect of that class of decisions, first of all there can be no doubt, or difficulty, and, secondly, there can be no question whatever that they have not the slighest bearing or application to this question. Now, the position which was asserted by the Lord High Chancellor of England there, which was affirmed in the House of Lords following his judgment, and which has been followed in a multitude of cases in almost every court in the land, was this—and I use this example, because it belongs to the class of cases in which this question has come up for adjudication, and in which these decisions have been given; the questions which have arisen in these cases have been questions in regard to the obligation which the promoters of companies incur to those whom they invite to take stock in the enterprises which they are endeavoring to promote; and the doctrine which was laid down there, and which is concurrent with scores of decisions in all courts of the Empire, is simply this, that when a prospectus invites persons to take shares in an enterprise on false representations of facts or concealments of material facts, the persons who by those false representation or those concealments are induced to subscribe for stock, are not bound to take the stock for which they have subscribed if they are in a position to prove the concealment or misrepresentation. That step, Sir, has long been passed in this transaction, assuming the prospectus to be all that it is stated to be by my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House; and I will endeavor presently to present to the House the view that it is not what has been stated. But assuming it to be an undertaking as to which a material fact was misstated or a promise made, those persons have since subscribed the loan and have received their securities. They are not in the position in which the litigant in those suits would have been if, when raising the question promptly, as they are bound to do at all events, they had said that there was a material misrepresentation in the prospectus on which they had been induced to subscribe, and following the course of that decision they would not have been obliged to make the loan or receive their bonds. In this case they have received their bonds, they have loaned their money, they have made beyond and above the terms of that prospectus, a deliberate, emphatic and binding contract as regards which this phrase forms no part, no condition and no term. I admit as much as is claimed by hon. gentlemen opposite when I admit that the decisions which they have cited indicate that persons who have subscribed for shares or stock are relieved from taking that stock or shares if the representations are found to be untrue or if there has been any material concealment of facts. But the decisions are abundant that the prospectus is not to be referred to at all, is not to afford any such ground of relief, whether it contains any suppressions of facts or any material misstatement of facts if, after the prospectus, the parties have made a new and distinct contract as, for instance, articles of association. After that, the prospectus can no longer be referred to, and those who would assert a material misrepresentation of fact in the prospectus are still bound, because they have entered a new engagement altogether, of which that forms no part or condition. An illustration of that may be cited in the course taken by hon. gentleman opposite as to previous loans, when it was intended that the provision as to a sinking fund should form a condition of the transaction. Then, the representation to bind the Government, the condition

and the terms, were stated in the bond. It was stated in the bond how the sinking fund was to be provided and how applied—that it was to be applied in the purchase of Canadian stocks unless they rose above a certain figure. When these lenders of the recent loan, having subscribed the stock, let us assume, on the faith of that representation in the prospectus, took a bond having no such condition contained in it, and put their money up, they would have no legal rights under the prospectus. But as to the terms of that prospectus being carried into the bond, I repeat, I do not make this argument for the purpose of contending that we ought to stand, in dealing with a transaction of this kind, on the strict terms of the bond or the strict letter of the law, but I do it because on this question the mind of the House ought not to be prejudiced by the contention that decisions which have no reference to it ought to govern it, or that we are bound by the terms of this prospectus precisely as if they were inserted in the contract. The cases referred to relate entirely to the proposition that a person having subscribed his money on a prospectus of that kind, need not follow it up by making his investment, and I have referred to the class of cases which distinctly provide that when the investors have a contract in which that condition is not inserted, the subscribers can no longer avail themselves of the prospectus. But I will call the attention of the House further to the position hon. gentlemen opposite have assumed in submitting this resolution to the House. They have a vantage ground to a certain extent, because they profess to base their arguments on the ground that they are preserving intact and inviolate the faith of Canada. Notwithstanding my view of the legal obligation of Canada in this regard, I do not believe that there is one of my colleagues, nor would I, be willing to rest in carrying out this contract, on any legal doctrine whatever if a strict regard to honor obliged us to do otherwise. We would be perfectly willing to submit our rights and the rights of those we represent to be decided by any proper tribunal, precisely as though the words used in the prospectus were incorporated in the bond; and what are they? Are they a promise?—did anybody in subscribing that loan believe they were a promise—that the sinking fund investment from year to year would be invested in this loan? Did anyone who subscribed for it believe that although he was making a fifty years loan to Canada, he was really only making a five years loan? Did anyone believe that when he was lending money to Canada for fifty years we were bound to pay it back in five years, while he was not bound to receive it back in five years? If anyone supposes that those who made the loan believed that, the fact that it has not appreciated unduly, and that no one has endeavored to extort from Canada a price above that which the loan realised to us, would be conclusive as to any such view being in the minds of investors. But the language of the prospectus is simply an expression of the intention of the Government; and even if that were incorporated in the bond, I think we might fairly submit to any reasonable man of business, to say nothing of any question of law whatever, the question, if the conditions which were stated by the hon. Minister of Finance arose, if those securities were unduly appreciated by fraudulent means, or had attained an unreasonable premium, whether the Government would be bound by a simple declaration of intention which they had formed at the time the loan was issued, and when good faith was expected quite as much on the part of investors as on the part of the Government. What I was going to call the attention of the House to, as regards the undue advantage which our hon. friends opposite seek to derive from this motion, is that, while the motion is put forward as one in the interest of the good faith of Canada, with the view of preserving intact the credit of Canada, it is really put forward in such a form as to bind the Government and

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

the country, and goes far beyond the terms of the prospectus, and far beyond what we have any reason to believe investors themselves ever intended or expected. While the prospectus was put forward simply as an expression of the intention of the Government, and while the Minister of Finance has declared his willingness to be bound by that to every reasonable extent, as long as there is good faith and reason in the minds and in the conduct of the other party, this resolution distinctly obliges the Government, this House and the country, under all conditions, and no matter how unreasonably enhanced the price may be, and how unfair may be the means by which this enhanced price may be reached, to buy the stock. The effect of such a resolution would be:

"That the Canadian Government would be obliged, in order to comply with the obligation entered into on that behalf, to re-purchase the entire loan of £4,000,000 sterling above mentioned in ten or more annual instalments, averaging £400 sterling each; that the said loan will thereby, as far as the Dominion is concerned, converted from a loan having nominally fifty years to run, into a loan having a little over five years to run; that all former unguaranteed loans, having sinking funds attached, contain the provision inserted in the bonds of prospectus, and usually in both, setting forth that the Government of Canada shall not be obliged to purchase said stocks on account of investment of for sinking funds, if said stocks should rise above par; that in connection with the said 3 per cent. loan of £4,000,000, neither the prospectus nor the bond issued contain any such provision; that the natural tendency of the existence of the obligation to apply a sinking fund of this magnitude to the purchase of a loan of £4,000,000 sterling, will be to raise the price of the said loan abnormally, and may result in the loss of a large sum to this country."

If it were thought proper to censure the Government for having made the loan upon such terms, that would be a distinct proposition, but the proposition now is, whatever the legal or moral obligations of the country may be, to declare to the holders of these securities and to the speculators who may hereafter come into possession of them, that Canada is bound, over and above the terms of her prospectus and her bond, to pay any price they may choose by any means, however unfair, to exact.

Mr. LAURIER. It is difficult to see, after the language we have heard from the hon. the Minister of Justice, what is the intention of the Government. Their intention when they issued the prospectus was to redeem the loan in a certain manner. We made a loan of £4,000,000 sterling. At this moment, under existing loans, we are bound to invest every year the sum of £300,000 annually and the sinking fund of outstanding loans will in future years reach the amount of £400 sterling. The holders of the bond require for the sinking fund, and the trustees of the Government are directed by the prospectus of the loan to invest that amount every year in the purchase of a loan; and as to this point the intention of the Government, whatever it may be now, was clear at that time. Here is the language of the prospectus:

"The Canadian Government intend to apply the sums annually required in the redemption of the national debt in the purchase of the stock now offered."

This is an order to the trustees of the sinking fund. This is a mandate to them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the meaning, then, of those words? If this is not a mandate, what were those words put in for, and what was the intention of the Government in putting them in? I cannot conceive what the right hon. gentleman means when he says this is not a mandate. If it is not, what is it? Certainly the language is plain, and when the Canadian Government, going to the London market, say in their prospectus:

"The Canadian Government intend to apply the sums annually required in the redemption of the national debt in the purchase of the stock now offered."

The banks of London could come to no other conclusion than that henceforth the £350,000 annually, which are to be in the hands of the trustees of the sinking fund, were

to be applied annually to the purchase of that stock. Suppose now the stock can be had at or below par, what will be the consequence? I presume, from the language we have heard to-day from the Minister of Finance, that if that stock can be had at or below par, the Government would not hesitate to buy it and apply it to that loan. In fact the hon. the Minister of Finance said to-day it would be to the advantage of Canada—and he dwelt at length upon this idea—that we should invest annually in the redemption of that loan. Supposing he could have it at or below par, what would be the consequence? It would be that inside of ten years the whole of those four million of bonds would be in the hands of our trustees, and practically in the hands of the Government of Canada, and, practically, the loan would be paid. The hon. gentleman stated this afternoon that Canada would profit immensely by purchasing the stock of that loan, instead of purchasing, as he had been forced to, even last year, at a premium of 114. That may or may not be; but supposing it is so, what will be the consequence? It will be simply that we have no longer a loan of fifty years, but a loan of ten years. It will be that instead of paying a loan in fifty years, at 3 per cent., we will pay it in ten years, at an interest of not of 3 per cent. per annum, but of 5 per cent. per annum. Will the hon. gentleman say that the conditions of the loan are the same, whether it be payable in ten or in fifty years? Will he say that the conditions of the loan negotiated last summer are the same, whether the capital is to be reimbursed in ten years or in fifty years? The hon. gentleman will surely not pretend seriously that in each case the conditions are the same. I hold that the conditions are much more onerous in the case of a ten year loan, and this is exactly the point which has been made by the mover of this resolution and which has not been answered. It is practically that, though the Government have negotiated a loan for fifty years, they have effected a loan which is to be reimbursed in ten years, and, therefore, all the conditions boasted of when the loan was made, instead of being advantageous, are onerous to Canada. Taking the most favorable view which the Government can take, this is the effect of the loan. Take another consideration not less important. Suppose the loan cannot be had at par; suppose we have to buy it at a premium as we probably will; suppose the holders of our sinking fund have to pay a premium. The hon. gentleman said to-day we have been forced to purchase some of our own stock at a premium of 114. Well, if it comes to that the hon. gentleman, I suppose, will have no objection, but he will see the loss to Canada. Should it, however, go to a higher amount—let the amount be ever so high—is the hon. gentleman prepared to say that Canada will not be forced to pay any rate which is quoted in redemption of that loan, whatever the profits may be? Now, we hear the pretension that Canada is not bound legally to purchase at a high premium, and that Canada is to be the master to decide whether or not the premium is too high. This was, in fact, the substance of the hon. gentleman's answer the other day, when he stated that the terms of the loan—

"Require them to use the sinking funds therein referred to in the purchase of the said 3 per cent. loan, in case the said securities would be held at a premium at the time of purchase, unless such premium is considered unreasonable and produced by unfair competition."

Well, who is to determine that? Who is to determine whether the premium is reduced by unfair competition? Nobody can determine that but Canada. It is, therefore, Canada which will be the judge, though a party to the cause, and Canada will not be an independent tribunal that can decide between the bondholders and Canada, between those who are to receive and those who are to pay. Still, according to the hon. gentleman, it is Canada herself which is to determine whether the premium asked is too high or not. Well, even taking that view, it seems to be a most unfortunate one to take. We are told that we have no legal obligation upon us. I refuse to discuss whether we have or have not a legal obligation, but it seems to me that it would be a shame and an injury to the credit of Canada if we were ever to rely on the technical language of a bond in order to see whether we were under a legal obligation or not. It seems to me that we should disregard the idea whether we are legally bound or not to resume that stock as it is offered. If there is no legal obligation on our part, certainly there is a moral obligation. Whether we are bound in law or not, we are bound in morality. What would be the effect of this language which we have heard? If the bondholders were to come to the Minister of Finance, or to our agent in London, and were to offer some of this stock, and, if the Minister of Finance were to say: No, I will not take it back because the premium is too high, there would be a cry of indignation even in this country. I will not speak of the effect in England, where the effect on our credit would be tremendous, but in this country every citizen who has at heart the honor of the country, who has at heart a desire to uphold the credit of this country—and this country cannot maintain the position it desires unless it keeps its credit always above par—everyone, not only the capitalists and the millionaires of this country, but even the laborers would repudiate the language which has been used to-day. What is the effect of this language used in the prospectus if it does not create a moral obligation? If the Minister of Finance is at liberty, at his own option, to repudiate the language used in this prospectus, why was such language put in this prospectus? There must have been some meaning or some intention when these words were put in the prospectus; and, if the meaning is not that which has been stat d by my hon. friend who moved this resolution (Sir Richard Cartwright), what does it mean? Was that language put there as a trap, or was it intended simply to have an effect upon those with whom the Government intended to deal? There is only one construction, and that is the most charitable one, that the Government of Canada intended to apply the sinking fund, which amounts to $350,000 annually, in the purchase of the stock offered. That is the most charitable construction that can be put upon this prospectus, and, unless the Government are prepared to accept the full consequences of their language in that prospectus, there must be some sinister motive when this language was put in, which cannot be repeated on the floor of Parliament.

Mr. MULOCK. It is somewhat difficult to reconcile the attitude of the Minister of Justice and that of the Minister of Finance on this question. The view of the Minister of Finance appears to have undergone a considerable change since the matter was brought to his attention. Perhaps that of the Minister of Justice would undergo a similar change after more reflection. However the Minister of Justice has endeavored to present to the House an erroneous view of the relations to the money market of a nation like Canada. He asserts that, because the clause in the prospectus was not incorporated in the contract, therefore Canada was not legally bound, that the rights of those who tendered were one thing when they offered the tender, but that those rights became different when the contracts were entered into. I maintain that the contract entered into, prepared, as it was, by the Government, was bound to have been a contract entirely on the lines of the specification, that everything which was material to the contract or which modified it or which gave any right to the persons tendering, should have been made part of the contract. But the Minister of Justice says that, whatever may have been the rights of the tenderer, having become merged in the rights under the contract, he cannot thereafter look at the prospectus to see if he has any moral obligation under that. I do not think it

is necessary for us to consider this question in the light of strict law. I am not aware that the obligations of nations are so construed. I am not aware that when a foreign nation obtains a loan in the English market, the investor tries to see whether he will be able to issue an execution in case of default in China or in Peru or in any other foreign country. The honor of the Crown is taken as a factor in the contract. The bonds may not show that he has any claim on the honor of the Crown, but that is the only security he has. If we are to come down to the legal construction of the contracts, if the English investor has to look at the contract in order to see whether he is to get a good security, then I venture to prophesy that neither the Minister of Finance nor Canada will ever again be able to float a loan on the English market on such terms as we have in the past. I was glad to find that the Minister of Justice was able to discover some good, sound, holding ground. He found himself in a different frame of mind from the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Justice was not in favor of the Government repudiating. It is only a few days ago that he had to show that the Government must not repudiate a contract which they were pledged to in a part of the country with which he is connected. He understands what repudiation means, and he understands that the honor of the Crown cannot be tarnished. If rumor is true, Canada will have to redeem her honor in that case, and she has been taught a lesson in that way. But the Minister of Finance is a more advanced pupil in the school. A week ago he declared on the floor of Parliament that Canada was legally bound to this. In answer to my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) he stated that Canada was legally bound under an obligation to invest the whole of the sinking fund annually in the redemption of these bonds, provided that the price was not unduly appreciated. To-day he says no. That is another step in the process of repudiation. To-night he sees it differently, who knows but in a little further time he will have made a further progress in this direction.

An hon. MEMBER. A back down.

Mr. MULOCK. Now, Mr. Speaker, a worthy citizen from the east, an historian, has given great credit to the people of the eastern parts of this country for many qualities, and among others that of being great as talkers. Certainly we have good evidence of the correctness of that historian's opinion on the floor of this House. The Minister of Finance is gifted in that way, and I compliment him upon his facility in presenting every case he does to this House in the most favorable light. It is greatly to his credit that he is able to command that language with which he does succeed at times in clouding an unfortunate position, as he has endeavored to do in this case. But finances are not figures of speech. The financier is not necessarily an orator; and whilst the Minister of Finance is highly gifted in some respects, I venture to question whether he has yet attained that experience which would enable him to deal effectively with the finances of a great nation like Canada. I say that it is not to his discredit, for it is unreasonable to suppose that any person without great experience can step into the office he is endeavoring to fill, and does fill so well, yet we cannot expect that he can fill it to the extent of the requirements of the country. Now, in this particular case the Minister of Finance, with a chivalry which I appreciate, has taken upon himself the whole responsibility, perhaps he has taken upon himself more responsibility than he is bound to do; if so, it is his loyalty, and I commend him for it. But at the same time I think the act for which he assumes the responsibility, and which is the act of the whole Administration, is one that is objectionable in so many respects, no matter how you look at it, it is so full of financial mistakes, that it would have been well had he transferred some of that responsibility, had he consulted authorities upon the subject, and had he at last prepared with due care a prospectus which would not have landed Canada in the position she is now in. Now, I remember last year when this loan was before the House, when his predecessor asked Parliament to give consent to make this loan, we then pointed out to Parliament that there was no necessity for a loan of this magnitude, this being part of a larger loan. We pointed out at the time that it would involve having on hand a considerable amount of money for a considerable length of time until other liabilities of ours matured, and until this money was required for public works. The Minister of Finance of to-day took part in that discussion and defended the proposition. He knew he was shortly to succeed to the inheritance, and he at an early stage served his apprenticeship under the then Finance Minister, and I am afraid that the imagination of his predecessor has produced a rather strong impression upon him. I cannot admit that he has yet attained to that imagination that made his predecessor so famous, although he is making considerable progress toward it. A couple of years ago we remember that his predecessor announced to this House that such was the fertility of the great North-West that it was able to produce in one year 640,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat. That was a fine proposition, and the Finance Minister of to-day, following this worthy example, although at a respectable distance, told us on a recent occasion that Manitoba and the North-West produced a surplus of wheat of 20,000,000 bushels.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, I refer the Minister of Fnance to a certain speech of his that is of record, and therein he will find the statement that the North-West and Manitoba produced last year a surplus of 20,000,000 bushels of wheat over and above all that was required for that country; whereas everybody who cares to get at the facts of the case know that the surplus during that year did not exceed 20 per cent. of the amount stated by the Finance Minister. Nevertheless I am not blaming him for that small departure from facts. He had a worthy example before him, and, as I say, he has followed in the footsteps of his predecessor, but at a respectful distance. Coming back to the particulars of the loan, I think many features of it are objectionable. For example, I think the Government on that occasion borrowed too much money, they borrowed too much at a time, they borrowed at an inopportune time a large amount of money that should not have been borrowed, and with what result? That money came over to Canada and was placed in our banks here, if rumor is correct, at first without any interest at all. There were some millions thrown into our Canadian banks, bearing no interest, then after an effort you succeeded in getting 1½ per cent. at a time when you were paying 5 per cent. in England, and if this loan is paid off at the end of ten years, as a straight loan of five years, it will cost us 5 per cent. during that time, and that money you are lending out at 1½ per cent., I think over a third of it at only 1½, and some of it at no interest at all. The effect of that was largely to embarrass the financial institutions of the country. You disturbed the banking interests of Canada; you embarrassed the banks. At the very time that you were loaning this money out at 1½ per cent., and a portion of it at no per cent.. you were taking in deposits from people all through the country at 4 per cent. That is the way that the Minister of Finance is enriching this country. The Minister states that if we repaid the amount the next day after we borrowed that money at 95, and out of that we had to pay a commission amounting to nearly 2 per cent., we would not have been any poorer. Why, Sir, that 5 per cent. discount, and the commission off it as well, represents the cost of making the loan, if it were spread over a period of 50 years. But to

to allow the whole cost of placing a 50 years loan to be charged against it for one year, or for a shorter period, is certainly, in my opinion, bad financing. At the very best this cannot be considered as a straight loan for a longer period than five and a half years, and you have there for this state of affairs, that the discount and the commission that you paid for a credit for 50 years, are absorbed in the credit of five and a half years. Now, the Minister of Justice admits that we are, to a certain extent, bound to this prospectus, but not really and absolutely bound. I will put the Minister of Justice this question: If we are bound—and I understand that all the members of the Government admit that we are bound—to expend the whole of our sinking fund every year in redeeming this particular loan, provided, in their judgment, it can be got at a certain figure, they say below par.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; but too high above par.

Mr. MULOCK. I presume they will admit that they would be bound—even according to this additional term they are importing into the contract—that they would be bound to expend the whole of our sinking fund each year in the purchase of these particular securities, provided they can be got at par or under. Now, at this very moment we are under legal obligations to expend a portion of our sinking fund each year in redeeming other securities. The Minister of Finance recited certain loans made by Canada since 1874. I have looked into these, and I understand that we are under an absolute obligation—not a mere moral obligation, but a legal obligation, forming part of the contract, to expend every year a certain portion of the sinking fund in redeeming our public securities, provided they can be got not higher than par. It may happen, as a matter of accident, that to-day our public securities are above par, but it may happen to-morrow that some of our public securities can be bought below par. Does not our legal liability at once accrue, and must not the country expend a portion of the sinking fund in redeeming other securities? And it may happen at that time that we have that fund invested in two securities; we have here, under this obligation, undertaken to invest the whole sinking fund in the redemption of this particular security, although under other contingencies we may have to pay a portion to redeem other securities. Some hon. gentleman may say that that may never happon. But that is not the way to deal with legal obligations; we are not here engaged in kite flying, and we are not entering into contracts that are not to be carried out. We must not depend on mere chance as to the means necessary to relieve the country from liabilities into which it may enter. There is nothing more sensitive than the money market, as has been stated by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and should there come a great disaster such as a European war or other causes these securities would decline below par. And where would we be in such an event? We are bound to invest our sinking fund in two different securities. I have thus shown the result which will accrue from the adoption of this prospectus. The Finance Minister declared that the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in bringing this matter to the attention of the House on this occasion was engaged in decrying the country. Have there ever been words uttered in Parliament or outside Parliament more calculated to injure the country than the utterances of the Minister of Finance himself, when he asserted that under certain conditions he would repudiate the solemn promise of the people of Canada? He told us that in this House to-day, and he will, by that statement, reduce the credit of Canada as other nations have had their credit reduced; and it may happen that we may pay for it in the future and we may lose all the advantage gained by this particular transaction a hundred-fold, owing to the unfortunate position taken by the Administration in regard to this matter. For my part I think it far better for Canada to look this matter straight in the face. The Government have made a mistake; let them admit it honestly and face the difficulty, and whatever the cost may be let the Government at all events pay the money and save the honor of the country. That is what the Government is for and what the people demand, no matter what it may cost, and, lest any impression might be derived from the statement of the Minister of Finance that we are prepared to allow him to qualify the contract entered into, I for one say he has no right to qualify it, and I doubt if the people of Canada, even for the purpose of saving money, will allow him to qualify it, but public opinion will be at the back of the honor of Canada, even if it is repudiated by the Government of the day.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I do not propose to detain the House more than a few minutes in regard to the matter now under discussion. Let me say at the outset that whatever may be the legal attainments of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, he evidently does not agree in financial matters with the financial leader on that side of the House. He has taken exception in the course of his speech to-night to the manner of the loan, the amount of the loan and the time at which it was negotiated. He contended that the time at which the loan was negotiated was inopportune, and that too much money was borrowed.

Mr. MULOCK. Not all those points.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Pretty nearly all, if he recollects the statements he made. He said too much money had been borrowed and that the time was inopportune.

Mr. MULOCK. To borrow that amount.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Let me refer to what the financial leader of the Opposition, the hon. gentleman who sits beside him at present, is reported to have said on a recent occasion in regard to this particular loan. That hon. gentleman is reported to have said that:

"On the whole I am glad to bear my testimony to the fact that I think the last loan was a good loan, that it was well made and the time was well chosen."

If I understood the hon. member for South Oxford aright, he continued in that opinion until the prospectus was placed in his hands, when he discovered that something had been done in this proceeding which in his opinion imposed upon the Government conditions which up to that time he did not suppose had been imposed upon them. I confess that in speaking in regard to this question I do so with a great deal of diffidence. I have a very high respect for the financial talents of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but I think in regard to this matter he has rather overdrawn the picture. I quite agree with that hon. gentleman that if the parties who subscribed their funds to this loan were induced to do so by the prospectus which was laid before them by our agents in London, and were induced to pay a higher price than otherwise would have been paid for this loan, then I say his contention may be right. But what is this prospectus, what does it say? It says that:

"With the view of rendering the sinking funds of the various loans more effective than heretofore, the Canadian Government intend to apply the sums annually required for the reduction of the national debt in purchases of the stock now offered. The amount at present annually applied to the reduction of the debt is about £350,000, and as the sinking fund is accumulative the amount yearly increases."

In this prospectus also we find the form of debenture, the form of bond, which is the contract between the borrower and lender. This form of bond reads as follows:—

"The Government of Canada hereby acknowledge to be indebted to the bearer in the sum of pounds sterling, being part of a sum authorised to be raised in virtue of an Act of Parliament of Canada, passed in the 51st year of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, Chapter 2, which sum the said Government undertakes to pay on the 1st July 1938, at the office of Messrs. Baring Bros. & Co., and Messrs. Glyn, Mills, Currie & Co., in the City of London, in England, with in-

terest in the meantime from the 1st July, 1888, at the rate of 3 per cent. per annum."

In all the prospectuses that had been issued heretofore, the form of the bond contained the condition that a sinking fund was to be provided for the redemption of those bonds, and it was very well understood upon the market, at all events in this country in the discussions that took place in this House and in the public press in regard to this loan, that this was to be a loan without a sinking fund. Here is expressed the intention of the Government to devote a certain amount of money, which must be raised yearly and must be invested by the Government for the redemption of the former loan, and to invest it in this loan instead of investing it in other securities. The Government are bound to invest the sinking fund in securities of some kind, and if it does not appreciate beyond what the fair market value will be, then the Government will be perfectly justified, and will be acting in the interests of Canada, in investing the sinking fund, which must be invested in securities of some kind, in these securities. I think the statement made by the Minister of Finance that it would be a very easy matter to determine whether this security had unduly depreciated by comparing its price with the price of other securities of Canada is a sound one, and it seems to me that unless there was a conspiracy on the part of our agents in London to get the Government of Canada into a false position in regard to this loan, the contention of the hon. gentleman is a sound one. Of course I do not speak from a legal standpoint, because I do not understand the legal construction of this particular clause in the prospectus; but as there is great divergence of opinion among legal gentlemen as to the effect of this clause, it seems to me that it may be taken for granted that, at all events, we are not under a legal obligation to redeem these securities. Then if we are not under a legal obligation, are we under a moral obligation to purchase these securities at any price they may be put up to? I do not think that we are. Let me put a case of this kind, it is an extreme case I admit, but it is a case that might possibly arise. Suppose the owners of these bonds would refuse to sell them to the Government at any price, suppose they would say: "We have these bonds and we intend to keep them," what would the Minister of Finance do in such a case? I admit that it is an extreme case, but it is one that might possibly happen. Let me say in regard to this matter that so far as investors are concerned my experience and my information leads me to the conclusion that in the present condition of the money market and the probable future condition of the money market, a loan extending for 50 years would be more acceptable to investors than a loan that would be redeemed within ten years. It appears to me that whoever invested their money in this loan did it with the full understanding that the loan was to run for 50 years and that they were to receive their interests half yearly, and I believe that this is the reasonable conclusion which business men must arrive at in regard to this loan. I do not propose to discuss the legal aspect of the question, as I said before, because I do not pretend to understand it. I do think there can be no moral obligation on the Government to redeem those securities to the extent set forth in this prospectus, in which they declare it to be their intention to redeem them, if those securities are put beyond what is the real actual market value. Therefore, I think that the motion of the hon. gentleman ought not to carry.

Mr. COLTER. At this late stage of the debate I do not intend to occupy the time of the House for more than a moment or two, but I think that the attempt that was made to prove inconsistency on the part of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in characterising this loan as a good loan, when he was not aware of the contents of the prospectus in question, and with characterising it differently after he became aware of this prospectus, is an attempt which should be frowned down by this House and by the country.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I have made no such statement.

Mr. COLTER. The hon. member for South Oxford made the statement in one case, assuming the facts to be just as they appeared from the statement of the Finance Minister; and, subsequently, he made a statement when the true facts became known to the House.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The hon. gentleman has mistaken me. What I wished to say was that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) did not agree with the hon. member for South Oxford, inasmuch as that the member for South Oxford had said that this was a good loan and effected at an opportune time.

Mr. COLTER. That is assuming that the discovery which he subsequently made was not made. It leads up to this position: that the attempt to show the discrepancy between the member for North York and the member for South Oxford has no foundation whatever, because their statements were made on a totally different set of facts. It appears that we have had a judicial construction of a question similar to this in our own courts in the Province of Ontario, and I would call the attention of this House to the case of Hodgins *vs.* the Ontario Loan and Debenture Company, which is reported in our law reports. This was a case in which a loan was effected largely on the face of a prospectus which was issued by the Ontario Loan and Debenture Company to a man named Hodgins, who borrowed from the company $4,400, and he had executed a mortgage on the instalment plan providing for the payment of principal and interest in twenty annual instalments of $428.28. Before he made this loan he had access to a circular which was issued by the company, and that circular was treated as follows, in the judgment of Mr. Justice Patterson, who is now a judge of the Supreme Court:—

"The managers of the society had been accustomed to advertise the advantages offered by their institution by sending 'to the public,' as Mr. Bullen expressed it in his evidence, through the post office, a great number of circulars, containing amongst other inducements to deal with them the following announcement: 'The following is the rule of this institution: Loans can be paid off at any time, and a discharge of mortgage will be given. The rules of the society being when this privilege is taken advantage of, to charge three months' additional interest at the same rate at which the loan was made.' This very explicit piece of information introduced by a parade of the security which borrowers had in the publication of the loan tables, which rendered them free from every possibility of extortion, deception and fraud; and by a further statement, which is worth referring to for the contrast between its terms and the gloss which Mr. Bullen attempted on his oath to give to the circular. 'These loans' it is stated are made at a fixed and uniform rate. Borrowers sometimes desire to exchange or otherwise dispose of their property or the means of repaying a loan may occur or happen in various ways before the mortgage expires, and much inconvenience is frequently caused by not being able to obtain discharges of mortgages at any time."

Then the learned judge makes this remark in giving judgment:

"The design with which a document of this kind was circulated could not of course affect its construction, as that must follow the meaning naturally conveyed by its language to those who read it. That meaning obviously is, that a loan made at the fixed and uniform rate set down in the tables might, by a rule which distinguished the mode of dealing of this society from that of private capitalists, trustees, or executors, be payed off at a time and on a scale different from the uniform rate at which the loan was formerly made, in case a contingency happened which made the borrower desire to pay it off? One contingency expressly mentioned is that which has arisen, viz., the means of repaying the loan which are now afforded by the power to borrow money at a cheaper rate."

It appears that the borrower, in this instance, wished to redeem his mortgage before its maturity, in accordance with the terms of this circular; and the company, defendants in this case, resisted the attempt that was made by Mr.

Hodgins to compel them to take back the money and give a discharge of the mortgage. Mr. Justice Patterson says:—

"The question is, whether the plaintiff can insist upon redeeming his mortgage according to the terms put forth in the circular? I should be sorry to find so grave a defect in our administration of justice as would be apparent from a negative answer. It would reverse the boast of the circular, and make it an instrument of 'extortion, deception and fraud.'"

Now, this is the language which the learned judge in giving judgment in that case, thought fit to use with regard to those who had issued that circular and who then were attempting to evade the consequences of it:

"I agree with my brother Burton in the ground upon which he has based his judgment. I am also of opinion that the plaintiff's right to the relief he seeks may be sustained upon the strict footing of contract, either the contract evidenced by the mortgage itself or a collateral and an independent contract."

I need not quote any further from the judgment, but I may say that the judgment of the Court of Appeal in this case was unanimous in upholding the judgment previouly given by Chancellor Spragge, and this case has never been reversed in any way by appeal. It seems to me that the doctrine there laid down and which has been upheld as good law, is the same doctrine which has been contended for by the hon. member for South Oxford. If it is good law in a court possessing the high standing of the Ontario Court of Appeal, I think it ought to be received with a good deal of respect by the members of this House. I merely rose in order to call the attention of hon. members to this particular, and to show that we consider that the Government of Canada ought at least to rise to as high a standard of morality as the courts of Canada exact from a loan company.

House divided on amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Edgar,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Ellis,	Mitchell,
Barron,	Fiset,	Mulock,
Beausoleil,	Fisher,	Neveu,
Béchard,	Flynn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gauthier,	Perry,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Borden,	Godbout,	Préfontaine,
Bourassa,	Guay,	Rinfret,
Bowman,	Holton,	Robertson,
Brien,	Innes,	Rowand,
Burdett,	Jones (Halifax),	Ste. Marie,
Campbell,	Kirk,	Scriver,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Landerkin,	Semple,
Casey,	Lang,	Somerville,
Casgrain,	Langelier (Quebec),	Sutherland,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Trow,
Choquette,	Lavergne,	Turcot,
Colter,	Lister,	Waldie,
Cook,	Lovitt,	Watson,
Couture,	Macdonald (Huron),	Weldon (St. John),
Davies,	McIntyre,	Welsh,
De St. Georges,	McMillan (Huron),	Wilson (Elgin), and
Dessaint,	McMullen,	Yeo.—74.
Doyon,	Meigs,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Audet,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Mills (Annapolis),
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Renfrew),	Moffat,
Baird,	Foster,	Moncrieff,
Barnard,	Freeman,	Montplaisir,
Bell,	Gigault,	O'Brien,
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergin,	Grandbois,	Perley,
Boisvert,	Guillet,	Porter,
Bowell,	Haggart,	Putnam,
Boyle,	Hall,	Riopel,
Brown,	Hesson,	Robillard,
Bryson,	Hickey,	Roome,
Burns,	Hudspeth,	Ross,
Cameron,	Ives,	Rykert,
Cargill,	Jamieson,	Scarth,
Carling,	Jones (Digby),	Shanly,
Carpenter,	Kenny,	Skinner,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Labelle,	Small,
Cimon,	Labrosse,	Smith (Ontario),
Cochrane,	Landry,	Sproule,
Cockburn,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Stevenson,
Colby,	La Rivière,	Taylor,
Corby,	Laurie,	Temple,
Costigan,	Lépine,	Thérien,
Coughlin,	Macdonald (Sir John,)	Thompson (Sir John),
Coulombe,	Macdowall,	Tisdale,
Curran,	McCulla,	Tupper,
Daly,	McDonald (Victoria),	Tyrwhitt,
Daoust,	McDougald (Pictou),	Vanasse,
Davin,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wallace,
Davis,	McGreevy,	Ward,
Dawson,	McKay,	Weldon (Albert),
Denison,	McKeen,	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Desjardins,	McNeill,	Wilmot,
Dewdney,	Madill,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Dickey,	Mara,	Wilson (Lennox),
Dickinson,	Marshall,	Wood (Westm'l'd), and
Dupont,	Masson,	Wright.—117.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. LABELLE. The hon. member for Gaspé is in his seat, and did not vote.

Mr. JONCAS. I did not vote because I paired with the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards). If I had voted, I should have voted against the amendment.

Mr. TROW. I wish to call attention to the fact that the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy) has voted, when I understood that he was paired with the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot).

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Indians, Quebec—relief of distress $4,200

Mr. MITCHELL. Let us have some explanation about this.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The vote is the same as was granted last year. We are obliged to aid nearly every Indian in the Province of Quebec, on both sides of the St. Lawrence, with both food and clothing, and also to provide them with medical attendance.

Mr. LISTER. Who has the distribution of this money?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Indian agents of the different reserves.

Mr. MITCHELL. Where are those tribes situated?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am unable to give the information now.

Mr. MITCHELL. In voting this money we have a right to know whether it is properly distributed or not, and the vote should stand if the hon. gentleman is not prepared to give that information.

Mr. LISTER. I think we have a right to know where this money is expended. The different tribes in Quebec and Ontario have moneys and annuities of their own. I know several tribes in Ontario, and I know that none of this money goes to them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This vote has been taken for very many years. The hon. gentleman knows that some Indian bands in Ontario have funds, and some of them are rich, and they do not come here for relief. But in the Province of Quebec there is no Indian fund. Some of the Indian tribes are doing comfortably enough on their reserves, but others in portions of the country which are not so fertile are assisted every year, and this money is expended through the different Indian agents where relief is found necessary. There has never been a demand before for the details of this particular item. I think we ought to pass it as it always has passed, and as the hon. member for Northumberland desires a statement, it will be brought down.

Indian Schools—Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick..... $22,197 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe here that an increase of nearly 50 per cent. is required for the Indian schools in these four Provinces. If that money be well spent, hon. gentlemen on this side are not disposed to oppose it, but this vote requires an explanation.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The proposed expenditure is made up of a number of items. The expenditure during the year ending 30th June, 1887, for schools was $8,040, and as the Indian school fund only amounts to $5,000 it had to be supplemented, in order to pay for the schools established. There is an increase in the salary of the teacher at Oneida of $50. At the Sault Ste. Marie there is an expenditure of $2,220, most of which has been granted before. This is made up by a grant of $60 to the 37 pupils. In Fort William there is a new branch for 20 pupils, at $50 a head. There is the annual grant to the Indian boys of Manitoulin Island of $1,500. In New Brunswick there is an item for schools of $1,800. These Indians have no funds of their own.

Mr. MITCHELL. They have the Indian lands, and the timber lands out of which some funds are drawn by the Government, so they have funds of their own.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have timber lands but they have no school funds.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In Nova Scotia there are salaries for teachers in eight places at $300 apiece, making $2,400, and there is $400 to cover the cost of a schoolhouse at Shubenacadie, which is a re-vote.

Mr. LISTER. These expenditures do not appear in the Auditor General's Report. If this report is to be of any use to the House, these expenditures should appear as well as the others. Will the Minister say that they will appear next year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Certainly. I have been surprised that the Auditor General has not asked for them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do I understand that, in these schools, the salaries of the teachers have been advanced, or is this expenditure for the opening of new schools?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Some of the salaries have been advanced.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have received a communication from a teacher who is, I think, in the riding represented by my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson), and he states that he gets only $25 a month for teaching in an Indian school, where the cost of living is fully double, and in regard to many items, three times as much as it is here. I do not think I will be charged with urging extravagant expenditure, but, in regard to these Indian schools, if they are doing good work, I believe the House would be disposed to be generous. This man is living on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in view of the difference of price that is only starvation wages. Beyond that he claims that he was not fairly treated in regard to some time which he had lost, and he says he sent reports to the Superintendent General through Mr. McFall, but he feared that, as had happened to him in a previous instance, his communication had not reached the department.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What is his name?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). His name is E. W. Lys, at Waubigon. He claims that he did not receive all the salary to which he was entitled, and it seems to me that he makes out a case for consideration. I do not know what is the average salary paid to the Indian school teachers, but, if we are to have progress made, the payment should be sufficient to secure, at all events, a moderately capable man. If the teacher is able to give something by way of presents to the pupils out of his own pocket, it works very well, and to keep a man at such a place on starvation allowance would be to defeat the object we have in view in establishing these schools, in helping forward the Indian children and making them more fit to take possession of the rights of citizenship.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The department has been steadily increasing the salaries of the teachers in the Indian schools to a moderate extent. At first, a great many of them were getting only $50 a year, and their salaries have been gradually inceased to $200 and $250, and now there is an effort made to provide for a uniform salary of $300—that is, that no one shall get less than $300. Very high educational requirements are not required for an Indian teacher. If he speaks English and Indian, and teaches the children to read and write the cipher, that is about all there is required. You cannot get men of high attainments to go into those schools at all, and $300 has been found sufficient to obtain the description of teacher required for these Indian schools. There may be particular cases where persons are put to such expenses that $300 would not be a sufficient inducement.

Mr. McDOWALL. I congratulate the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) on the position he has taken, and on seeing that, in out-of-the-way districts in the North-West, the cost of living is so high that the agents of the Government should be well paid. That is contrary to the view taken by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) when the Estimates for the Department of the Interior were before the House. I congratulate the hon. member for Brant on holding that the representatives of the Government, whether they be Dominion land agents or Indian school teachers, should be paid according to their services.

Mr. DAWSON. In regard to the salaries paid to the teachers of Indian schools in the district I represent, I am very glad to hear that they are to be increased to $300 a year. The salary to which my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) referred, $25 a month, is a high one in comparison with some, which amount to only $150 a year. There are learned men working for that amount in these schools, but they have very great hardships to undergo. The Indians help them, but they have in some cases to chop their own wood, build their own houses and live as the Indians do. The schools in Algoma should be somewhat extended. The Indian population is very large in that vast district. There are 10,000 or 12,000 Indians there, and there are not enough schools. The two industrial schools now in operation are doing good service. The Indians take readily to all sorts of handiwork, and those industrial schools are admirably conducted, and are producing a very great deal of good amongst the Indians. We would be better off if we had a few more of them. On the north coast of Lake Huron the game and fish are disappearing, and there should be some industrial schools there so that the Indians could be instructed in agriculture. Within the past few years they have made a good deal of progress.

Mr. McMULLEN. In reply to the hon. gentleman opposite, I would say that he has never heard me complain of the salaries that are being paid to school teachers. Whenever I have advocated a reduction in the items, they were referring to such men as Commandant Cameron and Mr. Chipman, and men of that stamp.

Mr. McDOWALL. I merely wish to say that I did not refer to Commandant Cameron, or to the other gentleman named by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen); but I was referring to the land agents in the North-West who, I believe, have a very important work to do.

Mr. MULOCK. Are the salaries of the school teachers charged against the Indian Fund? Does this vote that we

are paying out of the Consolidated Fund of Canada, pay all the salaries, or do we have to dip into the Indian Fund?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A part is paid out of the Indian Fund. I have a list here showing what was paid to each teacher in Ontario and Quebec the last quarter; it amounts to $2,382. That is paid out of the Consolidated Revenue, and the other half is paid out of the Indian Fund.

Mr. MULOCK. When we talk about increasing salaries we have to remember that we are not merely dipping into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, but we are also affecting the Indian Fund. With regard to the qualification required for school teachers, while the remarks of the First Minister may apply generally, I think that with regard to some of the bands in Ontario he will require teachers of a higher grade.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; and they are paid much higher among the Six Nation Indians and the Indians of Brant.

Mr. MULOCK. I have visited some of these Indian schools, and I find the pupils as advanced as in some of the public schools.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Brant, although the salary is fixed at $300, that is the minimum. If the average number of pupils is over 25 the teacher is allowed $12 per annum each up to 44. Where the attendance is large the teachers get more than $300, if below 25 he only gets $300.

Payment of Annuities under the Robinson Treaty... $15,588

Mr. DAWSON. Some years ago a return was presented to the House showing the arrears due to the Indians under the Robinson Treaty, and I think it was roughly estimated at $800,000; at all events, if my memory serves me, it was over half a million. Here is an enormous sum of money due to these Indians of whom we are now speaking. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) spoke of the funds for schools being taken from the Consolidated Revenue. In these arrears there is a fund which would provide for industrial schools and help the Indians to stock their farms with cattle and implements, and all that sort of thing. When the Minister of Interior brings down the information that was promised lately, I would like him to bring down such information as would give us an idea of how much is actually due in the shape of arrears to the poor Indians under the Robinson Treaty. I know that the matter is now being arranged between the Ontario and Dominion Governments. The land has fallen to the Ontario Government, and by a recent decision of the Privy Council, I believe the principle is sustained that the Province that gets the land ought to pay all claims upon it in the shape of Indian annuities. So I suppose the matter will now be settled.

Revote of amount voted last Session, but not expended, for the removal of the residue of the Lake of Two Mountains Indians from Oka to Township of Gibson... ..... $4,977 20

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the position of that arrangement?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The chief who is in charge of these Indians who removed to Algoma, has informed me how they were progressing. He states that they are in a very contented state, and anxious that their friends who had remained at Oka should join them. Some friends of the Indians remaining at Oka are endeavoring to persuade them to remove to Algoma, and I have reason to believe that in the course of another year a great many of them will join their friends there.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Those Indians who have been removed to the Township of Gibson are, I am happy to say, in a very prosperous condition, and there is nothing in their circumstances that should dissuade the remainder of the band from removing there also. They have abundant work in the mills, if they choose to take it, they are clearing land and putting up good houses. The only complaint that I have heard is that they have not been fairly treated by the Seminary; they complain that the promises of the Seminary, made at the time of their removal, have not been carried out. I would ask the Minister of Interior to ascertain whether that complaint is well founded, because if it is not, it is unjust to the Seminary, and it increases the ill-feeling among the Indians, and also prevents the remainder from removing.

Mr. MULOCK. I have had occasion for some years to bring before the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, a certain matter which I would bring to the attention of the Minister of the Interior, in whom I think I can discover an extreme desire to do justice all round. A Mr. Grant took up 100 acres of land in the township of Gibson. He cleared several acres and expended about $300 in building a house. Shortly afterwards this township, or at all events the land around him, was set apart as an Indian reserve, and Oka Indians were removed to his neighborhood. They were all around him, and so he thought they had a right to his land as well. In consequence of this incursion he abandoned his property to the Indians and withdrew from the township; and then he applied, himself at first and afterwards through me, to the department here for compensation, and up to this moment the question has never been adjusted. I observe that the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt) has entered the Chamber and I should be glad, as he is familiar with the case, and as I have had some conversation with him on the subject, if he would add any information he possesses. I am satisfied that the party in question is entitled to fair compensation. I do not know that a legal claim could be established in the Exchequer Court; but the case is as I have stated it. The incursion of Indians took place into the whole township, and his neighbors became such, as he had never contemplated, that he had to abandon the settlement, and his improvements were taken possession of by the Indians. Under these circumstances this gentleman is entitled to compensation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think so from my recollection of the facts. The Dominion Government did not take possession of this tract or form it into a reserve. The circumstances were these: The Seminary were anxious to have the Indians removed from Oka. There was a dispute which had assumed a very irritating form. The Seminary advanced a sum of money, and the Parliament of Canada advanced a sum, and with those two amounts they purchased from the Government of Ontario these lots. They purchased them at a fair market price, $1 or 50 cents an acre.

Mr. MULOCK. Your Government negotiated with the Ontario Government and arranged the matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Seminary bought the land, and we supplemented their vote of money. Mr. Grant was there as a squatter, I suppose.

Mr. MULOCK. As a settler.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If he had a title he would have held his land. The Seminary had a right to buy the land for the Indians. They bought it for the Indians; the Indians went there like any whites or any other British subjects, and they had a right to go there and settle on those lots. Mr. Grant did not like his neighbors, and went away. There is no reason why the Indians should pay Mr. Grant.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not asking that the Indians should pay him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Nor that the Government should pay him.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the Government should pay him. The Dominion Government caused the entire change that took place. It may be that the Seminary were desirous that the change should take place, but this Government arranged with the Local Government for the whole block of land. The Seminary may have supplied funds, but this Government was the moving power. The Government were anxious to place the Indians out of the scene of the troubles which had occurred before, and thought it better to remove them from their old associations and discord; and in doing so they surrounded this man with a class of neighbors he never contemplated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The claim is against the Ontario Government if they improperly sold those lands to the injury of Mr. Grant.

Mr. MULOCK. The Ontario Government did not sell this man's land. This man's land continued his own, but the Indians whom the Dominion Government put there took possession of it. I ask the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt) if he does not feel that there is an obligation resting on the Government in this matter.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I cannot say that I am equally familiar as the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is as to the facts, but I am equally interested in the welfare of Mr. Grant, from the circumstance that I have known him my entire lifetime, for a great many years before the hon. member for North York was acquainted with the country. I am equally interested with him in Mr. Grant's welfare, and I should be only too glad to assist Mr. Grant in any way I can, provided it is in accordance with the rules of the department. I shall be only too glad to assist Mr. Grant either now or in any future time I can in accordance with the rules of the department.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I know something in regard to this matter, as I was sent on behalf of the Government to deal with the settlers, and the Government did remunerate all those who had made improvements. How Mr. Grant did not come to be remunerated I do not know. Compensation was paid to all settlers in the township of Gibson; but the purchase of the land was made by the Seminary, and I do not think this Government had anything to do with it. The bargain was between the Seminary, the Province of Ontario and the Oka Indians. The Dominion Government, as superintending Indian affairs, had something to do with it, but the money was paid by the Seminary. How Mr. Grant was not compensated I do not know, because compensation was made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The others had no title, they were squatters. Mr. Grant owned the land.

Mr. MULOCK. The First Minister may remember these facts, but my impression is they are not correct, and I think he will find he is mistaken. I will tell the House how Mr. Mr. Grant was omitted. He had built a house and cultivated a certain quantity of land and his position was exactly the same as those to whom the Government made compensation; but it happened that he had rented his house and was absent from the township at the time the Government made the settlement, and he did not learn that the Government had taken possession of his property until sometime afterwards. His tenant took to flight when the Indians took possession, and he did not inform Mr. Grant of the occurrence; and when Mr. Grant put in his claim for settlement it was found that the others had been paid and he had been left out. That is how it came about.

Mr. O'BRIEN. He ought to be paid for his improvements.

Mr. MULOCK. I will ask the First Minister to look into the matter.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will look into it.

Mr. MULOCK. And give an answer before we get through with Concurrence.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. TYRWHITT. Possibly what has brought this matter to the mind of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), is that I showed him a letter from Mr. Grant a few evenings ago. I had been to the department and had interested myself in Mr. Grant's case, which I think has been under consideration for some time. I do not think the hon. member for North York would have brought this matter up this evening had I not shown him the letter from Mr. Grant a few evenings ago.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to a matter of some importance, and it is one that will come within his department. I received a communication some time ago from a gentleman by the name of Froude, with respect to the propagation and domestication of beaver. I referred the matter to the Minister of Agriculture, who told me that it would come more properly within the province of the Minister of the Interior. He sets forth in his memorial that the business of raising beaver can be easily and successfully prosecuted at moderate expense. That fur, as the hon. gentleman knows, is becoming very scarce and I think that the suggestions contained in the memorial are worth the consideration of the Minister of the Interior, and that a small sum expended in this way would be of great advantage to the country. Of course if the feasibility of beaver culture was once established, private enterprise would take the matter in charge and prosecute it successfully, but it will probably require Government aid to have the experiment made. I know that the experiment of raising and cultivating mink was made in one of the States of the Union some years ago and proved very successful, the result being that the quantity of fur was greatly increased and the prices reduced. From what knowledge we have of the production of fur-bearing animals there seems to be no doubt that the raising of beaver could be successfully engaged in. I would ask the Minister to give his attention to that memorial which is now in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture, and to give the matter that consideration which its importance deserves.

To pay A. Dingman $220

Mr. LISTER. Would the hon. gentleman state what the salary of Mr. Dingman is?

Mr. DEWDNEY. $1,700.

Mr. LISTER. I suppose his time belongs entirely to the Government, and such being the case I would ask some explanation as to why this additional pay should be given?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think this is some old standing account that was settled by my predecessor. I presume Mr. Dingman accompanied the superintendent when he made the negotiations. I do not know the particulars of it, but there must be some special reason for it, because he was paid by Order in Council.

Mr. LISTER. He being a permanent officer of the department, I cannot understand why he should receive an additional salary, but I suppose the hon. gentleman is not able to give an explanation as it was before his time. Before we pass from the Ontario Indian items, I might remind the First Minister that a year or two ago I brought to his attention the fact that an investigation was going on on the Indian reserve at Walpole Island and on one or two other

reserves in Ontario. At the instance of several Indians who claimed that they belonged to the tribes which were only entitled to the Indian annuities, and that certain other Indians who had come into the reserve years and years ago, were not so entitled although they had married and intermarried, their children and grandchildren, and great grandchildren are now living on these reserves and have received annuity moneys for years and years and although they were received into the bands at different times by resolutions at their council meetings. Some few of the Indians had made claims that these Indians I have mentioned were foreigners and not entitled to participate in those annuities. Now, the Indians who are complained against, in every instance, form the majority of the bands. They have been admitted, properly or improperly, I do not know which, but they have intermarried with the members of the other tribes, they have located on the lands and become regular members of the bands so far as we know. In addition to this, all these Indians, with the exception of five or six in the band to which I have particular reference, have petitioned the Government that this investigation should be stopped. At this late date, after forty or fifty years, when nearly all proof as to how they were admitted into the band has disappeared, it would be manifestly unjust that these Indians should be declared by the department or by the decision of the commissioner to be no longer members of the band. I desire to point out to the Minister that this investigation, prolonged as it has been for nearly two years, is creating the greatest possible unrest on the reserves. Indians who formerly were industrious and lived at home attending to their farms, are day after day coming into town and letting their places run into a condition which I could hardly describe. The commissioner comes there once in a while and holds an investigation for a day or two, and his visit seems to resuscitate all the difficulties I have spoken of. I can assure the Government that the continuance of this investigation is doing great harm on the reserve. I know that there is evidence before the Government that this investigation is not wanted by the Indians generally, but only by the smallest minority of that tribe. On the reserve in my county the council have passed a resolution asking that this investigation should not be proceeded with, and in the interest of the Indians I would strongly urge on the Government to have this matter brought to an end. The Indians have got the idea that an act of injustice is to be perpetrated on them, and that feeling is growing worse from day to day and ought to be allayed at once.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have looked into the matter to some extent, and the information I have received from the department is as stated by the hon. gentleman. I have not considered the question sufficiently to make up my mind regarding it, but I will take an early opportunity of doing so. Of course we do not want to do any injustice to any one.

Mr. LISTER. I do not pretend to say that.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice by the Auditor General's Report that this Mr. Dingman drew a salary of over $1,600 last year and also $240 for the Dundee Commission. I think it is extremely objectionable that men employed at respectable salaries should be permitted to double their pay by charging for extra services. I see now in the estimates $220 for this person while I am quite sure that he is getting the same salary as last year. This question of clerks being allowed to draw double pay has been brought before the House on several occasions and the Minister of Finance stated, when I brought the matter up before, that the number was largely increasing. I find that we have now on the list 483 officials, who are drawing money in addition to their salary. Clerks and officials of all kinds are getting to understand that once they are installed in office any little pickings they can collect, for extra services rendered, is sure to be acknowledged by the head of the department. Now, I think this should be put a stop to. A man who is drawing a salary of $1,600 a year, if asked by the department to attend to a little matter like this Dundee Commission, should be willing to do that without charging $10 a day while his salary is going on. I notice that this practice is increasing from year to year. Last year 400 were on the list, and this year there are 484 people who have been granted extra allowances of this kind.

Indians—Prince Edward Island..... $2,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the meaning of the increases of salaries in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The whole increase is in teachers' salaries. I fancy there was a representation made that the salaries were too small. They only amount to $50 or $75 a year.

Mr. CAMERON. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the salary of the Indian agent at Inverness. I notice that he has not been paid in proportion to the salaries of other agents in eastern Nova Scotia. I hope the hon. Minister will look into the matter and see that he is put on a level with the other agents in Nova Scotia.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I propose to make that representation to my colleagues, and endeavor to get it carried out.

Indians—Manitoba and North-West Territories..... $941,146

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe a considerable decrease here. What is the cause of this, and how many Indians are at present under treaty obligations to whom we require to pay annuities?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This shows a decrease of something over $9,000. The number of Indians who are participating in annuities is 25,780 men, women and children, 95 chiefs, and 335 headmen. That makes something like 26,000 Indians.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. According to that, the Indians are costing us about $200 per family, which certainly does appear a very exorbitant sum indeed for us to expend in the maintenance of the Indian tribes. We ought to obtain all the results we possibly can for very much less than $40 per head for every man, woman and child. I do not want to go into a minute detail of these various items, but I think that plain fact will strike the people of Canada as showing that this is an exorbitant sum to pay.

Mr. MACDOWALL. As a resident of the North-West, I would say to the hon. member that if he possibly did go into the details, and if he knew the work which is being done in the North-West, the sum would not perhaps appear so exorbitant after all. The condition of the Indians is very different from what it was ten years ago. At that time they were wild men on the plains; to-day they are farmers cultivating their farms. The expenditure has been incurred in bringing them into this state of semi-civilisation; and considering the cost of transport and supplies in the North-West, I think an outlay of $38 per head is very small indeed. If the hon. member went through the industrial schools and saw the excellent work they are doing, he would find that the expenditure is being made in a very wise way indeed. The Indians have been taught to cultivate their lands and to produce what they need, and have made wonderful advances.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have, however, a very strong opinion that a very large proportion is spent to provide for hangers-on of the Government of the pattern of Mr. Webster and Mr. Smyth, and that a great deal of the money is entirely wasted, especially that which goes to Indian agents, farm instructors, and all that class of people.

I am not in the least convinced that we ought to be called upon to pay out of the pockets of the people, $200 on an average for every Indian family. Are the Indians, in the opinion of the hon. gentleman, increasing or decreasing?

Mr. DEWDNEY. On some of our reserves the Indians are increasing to a small extent, but on the majority they are decreasing, but not to a very large extent. As a whole the general health on the reserves has improved every year; they are becoming civilised and seem to live in a more cleanly manner. Although this appears to be a large amount, $138,000 is paid under treaty; there is also a certain amount of implements, seed grain, and other articles, for which we are obliged to pay under treaty. In regard to the education of the Indian children of the North-West, I feel very proud of the result. I have a return which shows that a larger amount of Indians there receive instruction than in Ontario or Quebec.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). With regard to the food supply of the Indians, it was explained some years ago that, as soon as they were on reserves and taught agriculture, they would become self-supporting; but the Government still have to provide food for these people. A large amount is also voted for industrial schools. My opinion is that the best possible school for the young Indians is to set them actually at work with the men who are farm instructors. The Indians were employed occasionally, but a very few of them were employed at all. They had an opportunity of seeing the process of farming carried on where these farms were established, and I think the result was that, at the end of three years, we had to buy the food in order that these instructors might be kept from starvation while they were drawing their wages. I do not know how far that condition of things has improved, or how far these people are able to produce their own means of subsistence for the wages which they get, but it seems to me that farm instructors sufficient in number to draw wages to the extent of $32,000, are sufficient in number to raise food for these Indians even if they were not doing anything for themselves. If these farmers were honest men and were paid according to results, they would be able to bring the Indians to the field and make them self-supporting. It seems to me that the department is a failure and must be considered a failure until these appliances that the Government have introduced can produce what food the Indians require, and more than they require for the means of subsistence.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If the hon. gentleman took the opportunity of coming to the North-West when I am there, I could take him through some of our reserves in the south or the north, and I think he would change his views in reference to this matter. We have now 29 instructors, and the other employés, who are mostly Indians, are 52 in number. If we were to put them on one piece of land and give them teams of oxen and so on, they might be able to raise plenty of food for the Indians, but that is not the purpose. These instructors are not there to raise food. We do not allow them to do that on their own places, because the Indians do the work. But for the Indian labor, we could not cultivate, as we are doing, some 8,000 acres of land. Last year we cultivated 6,783 acres. Almost every acre of that was ploughed and seeded by the Indians, and, although there are a great many Indians who are raising a great deal more than they consume themselves, we cannot take that out of their fields and give it to their next door neighbors. Because in that way we would destroy all their energy. We get all we can out of them. In the Birtle district, we have two agents, one clerk, one farming instructor, and two employés, who are half-breeds or Indians, and in that agency we have 1,165 Indians. In the Moose Mountain Agency, we have 273 Indians, and there we have an agent, a clerk, one instructor, and two other men who are Indians. On the Crooked Lake Reserve there are 647 Indians, and there we have an agent, a clerk, four instructors, and three other employés. These are continually with the Indians working with them from morning to night, but they do not raise any food for themselves. With regard to the supply farms to which the hon. gentleman referred, I may say that they were established in early days, before there was any grain in the country at all, and for the purpose of raising seed grain. They did their work comparatively well, but, when there was no further use for them, we got rid of them.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to me that the prices for implements paid in the North-West were in some cases very high. For instance, I find 142 cart wheels and axles for which $27 apiece was paid. I see also that 37 harrows were purchased at a cost of $32 apiece. I can hardly understand why we should pay such prices as that in the North-West. I see also that 53 ox-yokes were purchased at $7 apiece, and ploughs at $31 apiece, while breaking ploughs cost $25 each. I think in some of these items the price is very high, and I should like to know under what system these are obtained, whether by tender or otherwise? I suppose in Ontario you could buy a plough of the same kind as that for which $31 is paid here for $16 or $18, and I have heard it stated that these implements are sold in Manitoba at as low a price as they are in Ontario. I have heard of machines being sent there which could not find buyers, and so the shippers had to take what they could for them.

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are all bought by public tender. They are all advertised for at this time of the year, and the contracts are let a little later than this.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I think the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) must have made a mistake in reference to the agricultural implements and other things to which he refers, because I think he has usually contended that agricultural implements were very dear in the North-West, and now he says that bankrupt stocks, as I suppose, or large stocks, at any rate, are sent up to the North-West, and that implements can be bought there very cheaply. I wish there were more cheap implements for sale.

Mr. McMULLEN. The statement I made was that there had been large shipments of agricultural implements, in some cases taking lower prices than what otherwise might be got. More were sent than were needed, and under these circumstances the Government should have been able to supply themselves at a less cost than we see here. I would like to ask what provision is made for preserving these implements? Are they kept under cover, or are they outside?

Mr. MACDOWALL. I hope the Government will not buy implements in the manner described by the hon. gentleman. I believe that the only proper way is to advertise for tenders and take the lowest tender.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am pleased to see that there are more "fellows" from the North-West than one.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In the early days it was very difficult to protect the tools because it was difficult to build houses, even for our Indians or agents. But circumstances are changing, and if the hon. gentleman visited any of our reserves he would see that ample provision is made for protecting the implements brought to the agencies before they are distributed. Of course, after they get into the hands of the Indians, they are not so well cared for, but the Indians themselves are beginning to recognise the importance of storing their implements. It is the business of the farm instructor to teach them the necessity of doing so.

Mr. McMULLEN. I agree with the opinion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that the exertions that

we are making from year to year to teach these Indians to produce food for themselves, are to a large extent a failure. I was told by a party who had some experience with the Indians of the North-West, that on one reserve where the Indians had been supplied with seed potatoes, after the instructor had told them how to plant and as soon as his back was turned, they took the seed out of the ground and ate them.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is an Indian trick. We have many little faults of that kind to contend against. I have known many old women on the reserves who will watch until every man has left the field, when they will dig up the potatoes that were planted and cover up the hills, and no one knew, until sometime afterwards, why the potatoes did not grow. But the Indians are learning better. With regard to the Indians raising something for themselves, I will read a letter I received a few days ago from one of our reserves:

"We have not used an ounce of contract flour for Muscowpetung's band for the last three months. We put in a little wheat on the lower farm and had it ground for the destitute. The farming Indians in most cases will feed themselves for sometime to come."

I have several reports of a similar nature, showing that they are progressing as fast as could be expected.

Mr. WATSON. I believe that contracts, as a rule, are let for the delivery of these tools on the reserve?

Mr. DEWDNEY. To be delivered on the reserve.

Mr. WATSON. I pointed out some years ago that if contracts were let for the different supplies to be delivered at certain points on the railway, and then contracts were let for their delivery from these points to the reserves, the supplies could be got by the Government much cheaper than they are to-day. The hon. gentleman has some practical knowledge of the way freights are carried in that country, and the great inconvenience it is for people who tender for small quantities of goods down east to be delivered in the west, and he knows how hard it is for them to make arrangements for the delivery of those goods from the railway stations to the reserves. I think that if a system was adopted of advertising for tenders for goods to be delivered at certain points on the railway, and then contracts were let to freighters to deliver those goods at the reserves, it would be much more satisfactory to the general public and to those who tender for the delivery of the goods. As it is at present, only large contractors can undertake to supply these goods.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are some points on the railway where I think that might be done, but there are not many. All the supplies for the North and the North Saskatchewan, I think, would be better delivered under our present system, certainly with less inconvenience to us, and I do not think it would make much difference in the price. I know it has been the impression of a number of gentlemen here that it would be better if we had a central point at which all goods should be delivered, thence to be shipped into the interior. That course was adopted before I took charge of the Indians in the North-West, at a time very different from the present, when all the freighting was done by carts. It took me nearly two years to gather up the tools and implements scattered through that country at the time, which the contractors had failed to deliver. I think the time is coming when it will not be necessary to purchase so large a quantity of tools as we are doing now, for the reason that the Indians are learning their value and purchasing themselves. Heretofore, as hon. gentlemen know, when the Indians saw either tools or provisions, or anything of that sort in a storehouse, they liked to get them, and they will not leave the agent or the party in charge until they get something; if they cannot get an axe they will take a file. Now, however, many of them are buying tools and implements for themselves, with the money they make out of the surplus crops they have raised. So many of them are doing this that it accounts for the decrease which we have here in those articles. I can name at least five or six Indians, who, last year, bought self-binders themselves, and they are paying for them out of the grain they are raising from year to year. The fewer tools that we have to deliver at the agencies, the sooner we will be able to adopt the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, and keep a certain quantity at headquarters and then the agent can requisition for what he really needs.

Mr. MACDOWALL. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman advocates advertising for supplies for the North Saskatchewan, in local papers, so that local people can have an opportunity of tendering? We can obtain flour and beef in the country in which we advertise for those articles. Strong baker's flour, I suppose' is not expected, but good wholesome flour such as white people eat in the country.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We call for local tenders for all staples which can be supplied in the Territories. It must be good wholesome flour, or we shall be charged with feeding the Indians bad flour.

Mr. WATSON. I called the attention of the House two or three years ago to this matter, on account of statements made that while people might be able to tender for certain goods, it was impossible for them to calculate the cost of delivering them from the railway station to the reserves. I believe such a system as I have spoken of might be adopted. It would be doing away with the middlemen and large contractors, and divide the trade between the manufacturers of the east and freighters of the west. In regard to flour, no doubt the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) is making a sufficiently good flour at Prince Albert to enable him to tender for flour for the Indians. I hope the time may come when it will not be necessary to supply so many implements to the Indians. I call attention also to the fact that the Yellow Quill band on the Assiniboia are not on their reserve, and, therefore, they should not receive annuities.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We have endeavored to get them on their beautiful reserve on Swan Lake, but have not been successful. I do not think we can deprive them of their annuities.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see we have paid $60 and $70 per head for cattle last year, and there is an item of $34 for cattle driving. Might not the Indians be employed in this work as well as freighting, for which $113 was charged?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We endeavor to give the Indians all the freighting we have, but we have to pay them for doing it. Wherever we can utilise the Indians we do so, but we have to pay them. With regard to driving the cows, they no doubt had to be delivered on some distant reserve, and were driven by Indians who had to be paid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. $70 per cow seems rather a large sum, unless they were some of the Valancey Fuller's cattle or pedigree cattle.

Mr. MACDOWALL. Cows in the North-West bring $60 per head.

Mr. WATSON. $70 is a very high price. From the explanation of the Minister it appears that these cattle had to be driven some distance to a reserve. In Birtle district, two or three years ago, when supplies were required and some cattle, tenders were invited, but unfortunately for the people living there, they had no notice until two days after the tenders were received. I happened to be in the district and there was great dissatisfaction among the people; and increased prices have to be paid for articles by the Indian

Department because tenders are not invited in the locality where they are required.

Mr. MACDOWALL. $60, $65 and as high as $70 was the regular price for cows in the North Saskatchewan district. At present, I am sorry to say, they would not realise very much, because there is no sale for anything there.

Mr. WATSON. On what reserve were the cows delivered?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I know that they were tendered for and let by contract, but I cannot tell where they were delivered. I will furnish the information. I am anxious to know myself.

Mr. WATSON. I know that in Manitoba you can buy a very fair milch cow within the last two years at from $25 to $30. The price, as the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Macdowall) says, has been very low, and it appears to me that this is a very high price to pay.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think that the hon. gentlemen opposite should blame us for detaining them on these items. I can remember when hon. gentlemen took up a whole night's discussion about some old woman's cow which was killed. I find that there were 24 sheep purchased here at $24 a pair, and I would like to know if the raising of sheep has been found to be successful in the North-West?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes. Wherever we supplied the Indians with sheep they have taken very great care of them and they are now utilising the wool in some reserves. They have a spinning wheel on one reserve and they make their own socks and mits; they took the contract last year to supply one of the industrial schools with mittens. The first establishment supplied was on the Moosomin reserve and the sheep were wonderfully successful there. At one time they had a credit of four or five hundred dollars from the sale of surplus sheep.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad to hear that the raising of sheep has been successful in the North-West, because some farmers who have gone from my own district to Manitoba have sent back very poor accounts of the growth of sheep there.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I see there is a large item here for flour. How much is there in a sack?

Mr. DEWDNEY. One hundred pounds. Every bag is weighed to see that it contains that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I find that the price is about $5.40 a barrel, may I ask if it is furnished by tender?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; every sack of flour that is used is purchased from the lowest tenderer.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The price that is paid for the flour is altogether beyond the market value of flour at that time.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The price depends a great deal on where it has to be delivered.

Mr. McMULLEN. $25 per pair for blankets and 60 cents a yard for *étoffe* seems to be very high prices. I would like to know who furnishes these things?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think they are furnished by Mr. Garland, of Ottawa. They are very good blankets, and the *étoffe* is of very good quality.

Mr. McMULLEN. That appears to be a very high price for Indian clothing.

Mr. DEWDNEY. You have got to get good materials or they would be of no use.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite clear that very extravagant prices are being paid for these supplies, and I am of opinion that in view of the large number of railways there are in that country we ought to be able to supply the Indians cheaper than we do now. I hardly blame gentlemen from the North-West encouraging the Government in the expenditure of money, for they do that on all occasions. From the time they had the war up there they seem to appreciate large expenditures in that section of the country. If we get value for the money spent it is all right, but I think we should endeavor to cut down the cost of a great many of the commodities supplied. $22 for ploughs and $150 for ordinary reapers that we ought to be able to buy for $75 is too much. We ought to put a stop to that kind of thing. I hope that the hon. gentleman now installed in the office of Minister of the Interior will endeavor to get these items reduced, and that he will see, as I am sure he will, that we get value for the money we spend.

Mr. MACDOWALL. The hon. gentleman has made a remark with reference to the North-West members, which I do not think should be allowed to pass without comment. He says that their object is, and that they do everything they possibly can, to have money recklessly expended in that country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I said nothing about reckless expenditure; I said they were inclined to encourage the expenditure of money in the North-West.

Mr. MACDOWALL. With that qualification I am quite willing to accept the hon. gentleman's statement. As long as it is a wise expenditure the members for the North-West are always willing that money should be expended for the benefit of the country.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is not fair to criticise the price of these implements unless you can state the point at which they are delivered. In some cases the freight often costs as much as the implement itself. All I can tell the hon. gentleman is, that if the Government thought proper to put it in the power of any man to go and buy the implements, or anything else required by the Indians, by private contract, it could be done and money saved, but that would not satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite. Immediately the Government did that we would be told that we were acting improperly, and I think we would be. The only thing we can do is to buy by tender, and we cannot do anything but give the contract to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We are furnished here with a detailed statement of the prices of supplies, and it is not mentioned where they were purchased. We bought a large amount of bacon which cost 15 cents a lb. and for beef we paid 8 cents a lb. It seems to me simply monstrous to talk about having to pay 8 cents a lb. for beef in a country like the North-West. Then I find that teams were hired for $1.25 per day for each team. There is evidently something wrong in that, for you cannot get any team I am sure in the North-West for that price.

Mr. WATSON. The Minister cannot wonder at the Opposition criticising these items, because we find that in one instance oxen cost $87.50 each, and in another instance only $59 each. With regard to the supply of meat, it appears to me that in a country like the North-West, where cattle can be grown so easily, the Government should find some means whereby the beef for the Indians should be raised in the vicinity of the reserves. It seems strange that the Government should pay 15 cents a lb. for pork in a country where beef could be raised by the department at a cheaper rate than 8 cents a lb., and I believe the Indians would be much better pleased at having fresh beef furnished to them. I have a vivid recollection that when the Indians complained of the pork that was fed to them, I think, under the superintendence of the hon. gentleman who has now charge of this department, they actually agreed to take three-quarters of a pound of fresh beef in preference to a

pound of pork. The Indians ought to be furnished with beef at a lower rate than pork.

Mr. DEWDNEY. At one season the Indians are very anxious to get beef, and at the other to get pork; you cannot depend on them in that respect. We do supply beef whenever we can from settlers, as close to the reserve, where it is consumed, as possible. It does seem singular that in our great western cattle country we are paying 8 cents a pound for beef, while in Assiniboia, in the neighborhood of the reserves, it only costs 5 or 6 cents a pound. We have found it profitable to send beef from the Touchwood Hills to Morley. The demand for beef in the North-West is very large. Last year all the surplus steers were shipped to England, and the shippers said they made more money in that way than they would have done by the Indian contracts. I fancy that this year we shall have trouble with regard to our beef, because we shall feel the shortage which took place in calves three years ago.

Mr. WATSON. Where cattle can be raised so easily as they can in the North-West Territories, and where the Government have farm instructors, would it not be possible for the department to raise their own beef?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We are supplying one or two of our reserves with some two-year old heifers for that very purpose. Two years ago we did that on a reserve on the Qu'Appelle River north of Regina, and we got very satisfactory reports of the care the Indians took of the cattle. That is the nucleus of a herd of cattle which we propose to keep for that very purpose. We are doing the same thing at Fort Pelly this year, and part of the present vote is for that purpose. I should have asked for money this year to do the same thing on many other reserves if I had not found the vote so very large. It has only been within the last two or three years that we could trust our Indians with cattle in that way. They are beginning to understand our ways better, and are not as hungry as they used to be, and I propose every year to make some advance in that respect. On our western reserve among the Blackfeet and Bloods they will not accept cattle, which they might have accepted under the treaty, because somebody has put it into their heads that if they raise cattle their rations will be stopped.

Mr. WATSON. No doubt the ranchmen and the contractors object to the Indians in the North-West keeping cattle. It would be more important to try and raise the beef in that district for the Government than in Qu'Appelle and other places.

Mr. DALY. It may interest the hon. gentleman who has just spoken to know that nearly all the beef that was supplied the Battleford agency was purchased in his own constituency. Although the hon. gentleman may advocate the encouragement to Indians to raise cattle on their own reserves, his own constituents would not be too well pleased to see that done.

Mr. WATSON. I do not wish to see the people of this country taxed for the benefit of any other people in my district, and am quite satisfied that the people I represent will thank me for trying to reduce expenditure.

Industrial Schools..... $128,094

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are the Indian pupils supported as well as taught?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Both.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the average cost per head?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Qu'Appelle school last year cost $78 per head; Battleford, $233 per head; St. Joseph school, which is at High River, cost $231 per head.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are not those exorbitant?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not think so. They compare favorably with the expenses of similar institutions in the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many pupils are there in each school?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In the Qu'Appelle school, 70 pupils; in Battleford, 45 pupils; in St. Joseph, 27 pupils. Comparing these schools with American institutions, I find that in 13 of the States six cost, for officers, an average of $3,070 per annum; while the Qu'Appelle school cost $2,100; the Battleford, $2,040; and the St. Joseph, $2,800.

Mr. WATSON. Does the Government intend to provide any sum for the Industrial school carried on at Portage la Prairie.

Mr. DEWDNEY. On several occasions I have had applications for assistance to that school, but refused. The Indians who attended them are those hanging round the Portage, who should be on the reserve.

Mr. WATSON. These Indians have been over twelve years around the town, and this school is well worthy of some assistance from the Government. I know several of the pupils, and they can read and write fairly well. Now the agent, Mr. Ogilvie, reports favorably as to the working of the school. I think this is one of the cases where the Government should grant some assistance. They are inducing the Indians to keep their huts in better shape and to wear better clothing and to keep themselves clean, and I think they should be encouraged by the Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do we board these teachers in the industrial school, or do they board themselves?

Mr. DEWDNEY. All the officers of these establishments are boarded.

Mr. McMULLEN. I observe that we pay them $1,200 or $1,300 a year.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The principals of those large institutions were engaged at that figure when the institutions were started. Looking at what is paid in the United States, I think it is a large salary, but having engaged those gentlemen at that salary, we do not like to reduce the salaries. However, in future, we propose, in any new institution, to lower the salaries for the principals.

Mr. WATSON In the Indian school at Portage la Prairie, they feed and clothe the pupils, and they do not get any pay. I think the Presbyterian Church subscribes $200 a year, but I think that school deserves support from the Government.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will take a note of that.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is a large increase, nearly $8,000 for maintenance under this head.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The department has decided that it would only employ married men on the reserves, and consequently we have to ration the whole family. That is one reason for the increase. We have also established new agencies, one at Fort Pelly and one at Onion Lake. The increase in the price of flour is also quite an item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that, under the head of general expenses, there is an increase of nearly $17,000. I notice further that last year $84,000 is put down for salaries. I suppose the salaries might average about $1,000 a year.

Mr. DEWDNEY. From $1,000 to $1,200.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would represent about 80 agents, and that seems to be a very large number

of agents for 5,000 families of Indians who seem to be looked after.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are nineteen agents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Nineteen agents cannot consume $84,000 in salaries. The hon. gentleman will see that the amount for salaries is $84,237, and there is also an amount for travelling expenses of $30,000, and the hon. gentleman has just mentioned that the average salary is from $1,000 to $1,200. What does the $84,000 for salaries represent?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This includes the whole of Manitoba and the North-West. In the North-West alone, there are nineteen agents, fourteen clerks, twenty-five instructors and fifty-two other employés, who, however, do not come under the item. Then we have the expenses of the Regina office, out of which is paid the salary of the Indian Commissioner, the Assistant Commissioner and several clerks there, amounting altogether to $21,580. Then there is the survey branch which is included in this, and the two inspectors of reserves and two school inspectors. The amount paid out of this for the chief surveyor's salary and the inspectors is $8,420.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a large sum for two inspectors.

Mr. DEWDNEY. They get $2,400 each and travelling expenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see a separate item of $30,000 for travelling expenses. That is in last year's accounts.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not think you will find it in this year's vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not able to know how you are going to divide this year's vote, but I see that last year the amount paid for travelling expenses was $29,921, in addition to $84,237 for salaries.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I thought that I had the details of the whole, but I have only details of the increases over the last year's vote, but I will get the particulars to-morrow. In the Birtle agency there is an increase in the clerk's salary from $720 to $900; increase of the interpreter's salary from $25 to $30 per month; rations for families of employés, $120. Duck Lake, new agent's salary, $1,000; agency buildings, $1,200; Moose Mountain agency, a clerk, $600; and an increase in the salary of the interpreter, $60. Crooked Lake, increase in agent's salary, $1,200 to $1,400. That is the highest salary we pay any agent. He is Colonel McDonald, no doubt well known by hon. gentlemen here, who has been in the service since 1874. On the Assiniboine reserve the agent's salary was increased from $1,000 to $1,200. At Muscowpetung's a cattle herder has been appointed specially to look after the herd of cattle that I mentioned a short time ago. Repairs to agency buildings, $350. A mower and rake have been bought to harvest hay for this herd of cattle. At the Carlton agency, agent's salary, $1,000; clerk, $600; interpreter, $120; travelling expenses, $160; sundry expenses, $200; stationery for office, $140. At Battleford there is a slight increase for clerk's salary. On the Blackfoot Reserve a blacksmith has been employed for six months. Extra rations for families of employees, $440. On the Blood Reserve, provision for a carpenter, six months, $300; rations to employees, $200. We had to provide for the new inspector of schools, Mr. Betournay, at a salary of $1,200, with $1,000 for travelling expenses. Repairs for building at Regina, $400. Then we have to pay for removing Indians to their reserve who have wandered away from them. Prizes to the most successful teachers in the Indian schools, $200.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I see some large items here for flour under general expenses. Can the Minister tell me who has the contract for supplying this flour? I find here that we paid over $60,000 for flour, and the price I am bound to say is at least $1.40 per barrel higher than the fair market value last year.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Where?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Where is this? I want to find out. We find that wheat only costs about 80 cents a bushel; according to that a fair price for flour would be $4 per barrel.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If that is on the North Saskatchewan, it would be worth probably $8 or $10 per barrel.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to know who has the contract, or if there is any chance of anybody else getting it?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Messrs. Ogilvie had the larger share of it this year; Mr. McMillan of Qu'Appelle had a portion, also Mr. Joiner, of Fort Qu'Appelle; and the Regina mills had a portion of it. Five or six different parties supplied the flour last year. The Hudson Bay Company had also a portion of the contract.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would advise the Minister to build a mill up there and make his own flour.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I hope the Minister will not do anything of the kind. There are mills already there.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). We are told that the various articles bought in that section can be purchased as cheaply as they can in any part of Canada, or in the United States. If we go over the various items charged here, we must come to the conculsion that a greater price is paid than ought to be paid. I notice here an item for buckboard, $250. I also notice an item of $404 paid to the Indians for a celebration. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would tell me the number of Indians who attended the Brant celebration, by whose authority they were sent and the amount charged?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In regard to the item for buckboards, they are made specially for the work for which they are used and are made extra heavy for the inspectors. Buckboards can be purchased for $60 or $75, but they would not last an inspector two weeks, and when a man gets on the prairie he does not like to be left there. I have paid $125 for a buckboard These buckboards will carry 500, 600 or 700 lbs. Some Indians came down to attend the Brant celebration the year before last, including four Indians from McLeod agency and five or six Crees. They were here for some weeks and they attended the celebration, which no doubt did a great deal of good.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am satisfied that $125 for a buckboard is an extravagant sum.

Mr. WILSON. It is evident that excessive sums are paid for articles supplied in the North-West. I hope in the future we shall have a detailed statement of the cost, and tenders asked for.

Mr. DALY. Following the example of hon. gentlemen opposite I desire to ask for an explanation as to an item on page 3 E. 18, Keep-of-the-Rat, Manitoba Asylum, $64? I do this in the interests of my constituents.

Mr. DEWDNEY. He is one of our Indians, I presume.

Indians, B. C..... $74,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When will the Reserve Commission close?

Mr. DEWDNEY. If we did not look for speedy settlement of the interior it might close very soon, but if the population goes into the interior it will not be possible to do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This reserve question is a pretty serious one. When the item was under discussion

some years ago the Commission was expected to close within three years. That time and the amount voted have been very much exceeded.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The reserves are not very large, but they are very numerous and there has been great difficulty with respect to them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This has been going on for a great many years.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; since the first Commission was appointed. The whole work of two of the Commissioners has had to be gone over again.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then all that work had to be practically thrown away?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; virtually so.

Expenses of government, bridges, schools, &c., of the North-West..... $145,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I find there is an increase of $17,000 on the Estimates of last year.

Mr. DAVIN. If I remember rightly there is no increase here, but last year all the money was not all expended, and it is one of the things that the people of the North-West have at heart that the amount that is voted to the North-West should remain to its credit and should not be allowed to lapse.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are some increases here. There is an increase of $500 for the travelling expenses of the Advisory Board, of $10,000 for schools, and for roads and bridges an increase of $10,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that the Regina *Leader* figures very conspicuously in the accounts of the North-West. Is there any increase in the expenditure for the Regina *Leader*?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not see any particulars of an increase for the Regina *Leader* in the notes I have before me.

Mr. DAVIN. As the name of the Regina *Leader* has been mentioned once or twice——

Some hon. MEMBERS. The item is passed.

Mr. DAVIN. I apprehend I can speak whether it is passed or not. As the name of the Regina *Leader* has been mentioned once or twice here and as I have an interest in the company that publishes the Regina *Leader* I should like hon. gentlemen very much to go into the accounts of that company and to see the work that has been done for those items.

Mr. CURRAN. Life is too short.

Mr. DAVIN. Some hon. gentlemen seem to think that this amount is given as a lump sum to the *Leader* or to somebody connected with it. If they saw the blue-books nearly as massive as your own, Mr. Chairman, thousands of them printed to represent this amount, they would probably come to the conclusion that there was no advantage given to the Regina *Leader*.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. DAVIN. I say there is no use crying "carried" at this time or any other time if I think it is necessary for me to speak. There are not throats enough in this House to cry "carried" if I think it is my duty to this House, or to myself, or to any one of my clients to speak. That item although appearing in those blue-books, belongs to the Territories. It is a Local Government account, and no doubt it appears here because we have under our management at the present day those Territories, but the funds that we vote here we do not vote as a sort of gratuity to the Territories. They belong of right to the Territories, and as I explained here when speaking some few weeks ago, we did not get by thousands of dollars anything like the amount the Territories are entitled to. I may say here on the part of that company and on the part of that paper so often quoted, that I challenge and invite hon. gentlemen to look into the items and to look at the specimens of the work done, which they will find in the library, and if they will enquire as to the wages paid in those Territories they will discover that there is full value given for what is received.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he is personally interested in the Regina *Leader*.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to ask if the hon. gentleman has forgotten section 16 of chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. DAVIN. I am perfectly well aware of that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand that this Regina *Leader*, in which this hon. gentleman is interested, has a contract with the Government, and I wish to call the attention of the House to that section of the Act which says:

"In every contract, agreement or commission to be made, entered into or accepted by any person with the Government of Canada, or any of the departments or officers of the Government of Canada, there shall be inserted an express condition, that no member of the House of Commons shall be admitted to any share or part of such contract, agreement or commission, or to any benefit to arise therefrom; and in case any person, who has entered into or accepted, or who shall enter into or accept any such contract, agreement or commission, admits any member or members of the House of Commons to any part or share thereof, or to receive any benefit thereby, every such person shall for every such offence forfeit and pay the sum of $2,000"

I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that under the hon. gentleman's own statement, made from his place in this House, and under his own responsibility, the hon. member is receiving a benefit from this contract, and I ask that the Minister of Justice should institute proceedings.

Mr. DAVIN. If you wish to proceed yourself, you will get half of the fine.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to call the attention of the House also to the fact that in the Interpretation Act, the word "personal" means a body corporate. The hon. gentleman is contravening the 16th section of chapter 11 of the Consolidated Statutes, and is liable to a penalty of $2,000. I hope the Minister of Justice will consider this.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I shall.

To provide for the payment of Mr. Fabre's salary and the contingencies of his office..... $2,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Fabre sent us one immigrant, I am credibly informed, as the result of three years' labor. When is the second one to be sent?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think this is a perfectly shameless vote which we are asked to make every year. There have been no returns, and hon. members know that there are none, and for one I will raise my protest against it if we do not divide the House upon it on Concurrence. Nobody attempts to justify it, and hon. members know in their own conscience that it is $3,000 thrown away every year. In point of fact, you pension a man to live in Paris the year round. It is a disgraceful item.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the First Minister promised a report to the House on this matter, and if we have not the report, we ought to have some explanation from some member of the Government. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works can tell us how many French-Canadians who have gone to France have been returned through the labors of that man.

Mr. McMULLEN. We should certainly have some explanation with regard to this item. It is an outrageous thing that year after year we should have a vote of this kind to enable a man to live in state in Paris who is doing nothing for the country, simply because he is some relative of a Minister or some hanger-on of the Government. We contend that there is no work that he performs for the salary he draws. If he is really a hanger-on, or some relative of a member of the Government, and has to be kept somewhere, let us bring him home and board him here; we can do it here at much less expense than in Paris. We are entitled to some explanation, and we will not allow the item to pass until we get it.

Mr. FOSTER. This is not a new item, and explanations have been given each year. The Minister of Agriculture who is responsible for it, is not here, and the item can stand.

Commercial Agencies..... $10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are you going to do with this?

Mr. FOSTER. Last year and the year previous, out of the vote was taken the expense of sending delegates to the West Indies and South America. This year I am trying to perfect a plan by which the money will be spent more in accordance with the nature of the vote, with the view of ascertaining if there cannot be some real commercial agencies established in certain ports. I think a feasible and good plan can be arranged, and it is with that view that I ask the vote this year,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a system of consular agents?

Mr. FOSTER. I am looking into that whole subject, and when the House meets another year, I think I shall have a plan which will commend itself to the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If you are going to have a system of consuls for the Dominion of Canada, it will cost more than $10,000 before you get through with it, and we had better consider well such a scheme before we commit ourselves to it. Only about $1,300 were expended in 1888. How much does the Minister expect to expend in the current year?

Mr. FOSTER. Probably $2,000 or $3,000.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the Minister if a settlement has been made with Mr. Wood, who went to Australia?

Mr. FOSTER. So far as I know, Mr. Wood has been paid his travelling expenses, and that, I think, is due to him. I do not think there was any arrangement made for salary. He offered his services gratuitously, and we agreed to pay his expenses.

Mr. WATSON. I understood from Mr. Wood that he was to receive a fair remuneration from the Government for his services.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not my understanding.

Survey, construction of roads, bridges and other works in connection with the hot spring reservation near Banff Station, N.W.T..... $20,000

Mr. McMULLEN. We would like to get some explanation of the money spent on Banff Springs. Last year there was $40,000 spent.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am not aware of the expenses of the previous year, having had nothing to do with Banff Park except to visit it. But I find that a great deal has been done in the way of making roads and bridges. This year the expense is only $20,000, and in future we propose to keep down the expenses. I had a memorandum prepared to inform the House of the details of what had been done, but did not expect it would be required to-night.

Mr. McMULLEN. Seeing that we have expended a large amount of money there, nearly $40,000, this item should be allowed to stand until the hon. gentleman can give us the information required.

Inspector and Registrars, and Contingencies..... $15,160

Mr. McMULLEN. How many registrars are there and inspectors and what are their salaries?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is the first time this item has been voted by itself. Previous years it was included in the North-West Government item? The registry office includes the registry books, stationery, furniture, and we allow for that $3,400. At Winnipeg, Mr. Scott is the registrar and he gets $2,000. Mr. Sproat is registrar at Prince Albert, and he gets $1,200. J. A. McLean, registrar at Alberta, gets $1,200. G. Roy of North Alberta gets $1,200; and J. A. Montgomery $1,200. This makes the $6,000 in salaries. Two clerks in the Regina office get each $730. A clerk in the Alberta office gets $730, and the inspector at the registry office, Mr. Barker, gets $1,600.

Mr. McMULLEN. We employ an inspector at $1,600 to look after five registry offices. We have only one inspector for the registry offices in Ontario. Some of the officials connected with the Interior Department might do that inspecting, and save this $1,600 a year.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Barker was appointed specially to instruct the registrars in the new system. Up to this time he has been constantly employed at that work, and in the event of a registrar not being able to attend to his duties we must find somebody to put in his place, and Mr. Barker is now doing the work for a sick registrar.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1:40 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 11th April, 1889.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Fisheries for the year 1888.—(Mr. Tupper.)

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 133) for the better securing of the safety of certain fishermen (from the Senate).—(Mr. Jones, Halifax.)

CHEESE EXPORTED TO ENGLAND.

Mr. VANASSE asked, Whether the Government are aware that certain cheese dealers in the United States are in the habit of marking on cheese exported by them to England *via* Montreal, the words "Canadian Product," greatly to the detriment of the real Canadian article in the English market; and do the Government propose to adopt means to put an end to this fraud, which involves consequences greatly prejudicial to the Canadian producer?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government are aware, from general report, that certain cheese dealers in the United States are in the habit of marking on cheese exported by them to England *via* Montreal, the words "Canadian Product." The subject having thus been drawn to the attention of the Government, we shall consider means for preventing this fraudulent practice. These frauds ought to be checked, and this can only be done by enacting some legislation pointing directly to the fraud.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. COUTURE asked, Whether the Government intend to comply with the request of the large and important deputation from Chicoutimi and Saguenay and grant them the railway subsidies applied for?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have under consideration the request and the representation of the large and important deputation from Chicoutimi and Saguenay on this subject.

T. BOURGEOIS.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether the Government are aware that Mr. T. Bourgeois, Post Office Inspector for the Three Rivers division, has been sick and unable to perform the duties of his office for several months past?

Mr. HAGGART. No interruption has taken place in Mr. Bourgeois' correspondence with the department, nor has any intimation been made of his inability to attend to his duties.

WHARVES AT LAKE ST. JOHN.

Mr. COUTURE (Translation) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to build two wharves at Lake St. John, the one at Roberval and the other at Metabetchouan Post; and what sums will be granted for these works?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) The attention of the Government was drawn to the necessity of these wharves at Lake St. John, by the deputation which came here the other day from Lake St. John. The Government have, as yet, taken no action in the matter.

REPAIRS TO THE WHARF AT ST. ALPHONSE.

Mr. COUTURE (Translation) asked, Whether the Government intend to issue orders for the use, in repairing the wharf at St. Alphonse, of the timber prepared by Benjamin Simard, by order of the Government Inspector of Works, and since rejected for political considerations?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot answer the question put by the hon. member, on account of its not being drawn in a proper language.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That Government measures shall have precedence on every Monday during the remainder of the Session, after Questions put by Members.

He said: I submit this motion with a view to secure prorogation by Easter, and no doubt the proposition will be hailed with pleasure by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. That will depend a great deal on the future intentions of the Government. This motion, I apprehend, indicates that the right hon. gentleman is willing to fix an approximate day for prorogation. Still, I must call his attention to the fact that much business yet remains on the Order Paper. We have Bills relating to Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, to amend the Summary Trials Act, to amend the Revised Statutes respecting Interest, to amend the Summary Convictions Act, respecting Militia and Defence, relating to Bills of Lading, and to amend the Copyright Act. Then we have resolutions respecting Judges' salaries; also Bills respecting the inspection of timber and lumber, to authorise the granting of pensions to the members of the North-West Mounted Police, respecting expropriations of land, and resolutions respecting loans to Mennonites. Besides, it is possible that the Committee of Ways and Means may sit again, because when the Finance Minister delivered his Budget speech, he stated that while he would not propose any important modifications of the tariff, some slight modifications might be necessary at a later period. Then there are the general Estimates, the Supplementary Estimates for the current year, and the Supplementary Estimates for next year; the last named have not yet been brought down. There is also a motion standing on the paper in the name of the Minister of Justice, indicating that possibly the Government may take up the Combines Bill. I observe by the Votes and Proceedings of to-day, notice of a Bill to amend the Inland Revenue Act. Besides, the Government promised, at the opening of the Session, that a measure would be introduced respecting mail subsidies for the Atlantic and Pacific services, and only a few days ago the First Minister intimated that the House would be called upon to consider a certain arrangement for the construction of a railway from Harvey to Salisbury. It is possible that, in addition to all these measures, railway subsidies may be proposed. All these measures go to make up a full bill of fare. If we are limited to the measures already on the paper, the House might possibly prorogue by Easter; but if we are to take into consideration, not only the measures on the paper, but also measures that have yet to be proposed, I must leave it to the hon. gentleman to fix when he expects prorogation to take place.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman will see that the more Government measures there are on the paper, the greater necessity there is for the Government obtaining all possible time for their consideration. The hon. gentleman will, I think, admit that the Government have this Session advanced their business with all convenient speed, and that there has been considerable discussion on some measures. Perhaps, looking at it from the gallery, it might be said that there was a good deal more talk than was necessary. That I do not at all mean to say, but I merely make the remark *en passant*. The House has worked steadily during this Session, and the Government, I think, have pressed their measures with due promptitude. Of course, the reasonableness of the motion I propose to make to-day is to be governed more by the business which is not Government business, than by the business which is in the hands of the Government. Looking over the different public Bills and Orders, I do not think that there are very many measures that could be expected to be got through during the Session, even though it were protracted for some time, and the Government, I think, would be inclined, as far as the House would allow it, to take any measure on which there was no great difference of opinion, and have that transferred to the Government Orders, with the understanding, however, that it is not a Government measure, but placed there merely to expedite it on account of the short period to which the Session is supposed to extend. I would press that we want another day, even for the business on the paper, but we will have Supplementary Estimates, and we will have, I hope, a very moderate Bill for railway subsidies. All this can, I think, be disposed of, if you give us this one other day. It is a case of Oliver asking for more, and I think the hon. gentleman will grant it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But this is a Roland.

Mr. LAURIER. I have not at this moment any criticism, or even any comment to offer as to the way the business has been carried on. I must, however, take exception to what the right hon. gentleman stated, even though it was by way of a joke, that there has been too much talk during the present Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not at all say it came from the Opposition.

Mr. LAURIER. If it has been confined to the Government side I have nothing to say, but, before we discuss this matter further, perhaps the right hon. gentleman will consider it is quite appropriate to ask whether he proposes to have any adjournment at Easter?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In a matter of that kind I would submit to the convenience of the majority of the members of this House, but I should rather think that we had better adjourn on Thursday, the 18th inst., over Good Friday, until the Saturday before Easter Sunday, and sit again on Easter Monday.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear. As short an adjournment as possible.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I would suggest to the right hon. Premier that he would add to his motion, after questions put by members, the words "and the usual hour for private Bills," because we should have private Bills at the usual hour on Monday night.

Mr. MITCHELL. I entirely object to this motion of the right hon. gentleman. I think it is dealing very unfairly with the private members of this House, because, if he takes away Monday, we have not a single day to bring private matters under the consideration of Parliament. This is a complaint which I have made on many previous occasions, and the culmination now is, that every day is to be taken away from private members. If the hon. gentleman were making an effort to get through before Easter, I could well understand it, but he is going to have an adjournment at Easter from Thursday until Saturday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Only for Good Friday.

Mr. MITCHELL. If there is going to be an adjournment over Easter, I do not think that the only day at the disposal of private members should be taken away. I put motions on the paper as early as the 20th day of February, and I have not been able to reach them yet. There are now over thirty motions of private members on the paper, and I should like to ask this House whether it is reasonable or fair that we should be foreclosed from bringing up these questions which our duty to our constituents calls on us to place before the House. I do not think it is reasonable or right, or that it should be conceded. Of course I am a very small minority in this House and therefore unable to influence it, but if I could I would prevent this motion being carried.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A minority ought to be counted not by numbers, but by strength, and although my hon. friend is not very strong in numbers he has got the other strength. On looking over the list of motions I find that my hon. friend has only got three on the paper.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is a good many, considering that I have not been able to get one yet.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think his first motion, in reference to the Derby Branch Railway, ought to be struck off the list, because, I think, it has passed.

Mr. MITCHELL. You said you would bring down the papers, and you have not done so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events, the order is passed. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can move his other motions now, and if the House will allow them to pass, we will grant them.

Mr. COOK. I move as an amendment to the motion:

That all the words after "That" be left out and the following substituted, viz.: Mr. Cook's resolution on the subject of granting Home Rule to Ireland be made a Special Order for consideration on Monday next.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would simply say to my hon. friend that I think that the majority of the members of this House want to exercise their home rule at home in Canada rather than in Ireland.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MITCHELL. The right hon. gentleman understands that these three motions of mine on the paper are ordered by the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With the consent of the House, I have no objection.

Mr. LAURIER. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he intends to sit next Saturday?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. The hon. gentleman has been a Minister and he knows that Saturday is a very convenient day to the Government. We want next Saturday in order to help us through the following week.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to ask again if it is clearly understood that my motions have been ordered by the House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It can only be with the consent of the House that the three motions of the leader of the Third party be adopted.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Agreed to. Carried.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it my duty to acknowledge the courtesy which the right hon. gentleman has shown me on this occasion—and the whole House, too.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all letters, reports, and correspondence had between Mr. George R. Parker and the Government, or any of its officers; and also between the Government and its officers, in relation to claims for land, and damages, in connection with the Derby Branch Railway.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Copies of all papers and correspondence in connection with a claim of Messrs. A. and J. Adams for loss incurred by the wreck of their vessel *Carrier Dove*, caused by the change of lights at Crapaud Harbor, without due notice to the public.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Papers, reports, returns and correspondence in reference to the condition of the railway subsidised by the Parliament of Canada, extending from the western end of the Derby Branch Railway to a connection with the Northern and Western Railway, in the County of Northumberland, New Brunswick; also all correspondence, &c., had between the Government, or any of its officers, and the proprietors of the said railway, with the object of opening it up and running trains thereon.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

SUPPLY—CAPE BRETON RAILWAY.

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

Mr. FLYNN. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring the question of the location of the Cape Breton Railway before the House. Two years ago, when it was announced by the Government that it was their intention to build that railway by the Grand Narrows, the people of Cape Breton became very much alarmed, and their alarm took the practical shape of holding public meetings, and sending delegates to protest against the adoption of that route. The counties of Capes Breton and Richmond sent delegates in the winter of 1887, who urged, among other reasons, that it was a departure from the well expressed intentions of the Government and Parliament, of building the line through Cape Breton, as a continuation of the Inter-

colonial Railway, by the southern route *via* St. Peters. They urged many reasons—that that route was shorter, was easier of construction, and was to terminate at an open winter port. Notwithstanding all these reasons, the Government adopted the route by which they are building the road at present, but with the assurance that the Grand Narrows would not be bridged. That a steam ferry could and would be operated there. I propose, in dealing with this question, to show, in the first place, that during the many years the railway was discussed here, it was understood that it was to be a continuation of the Intercolonial Railway, *viâ* St. Peter's, to Louisburg and Sydney; in the second place, that the cost of the route by the Grand Narrows will far exceed the cost of the southern route—will, in fact, give two roads on both sides of the Island; in the third place, that the Grand Narrows route will not accommodate the majority but only a small minority of the people, and cannot aid in developing the resources of the country, as it will not pass through any great agricultural or mining district in the island; and, in the fourth place, that the building of a bridge at Grand Narrows will obstruct the navigation of the Bras D'Or, and render St. Peter's Canal, which was constructed at a cost of three-quarters of a million dollars, comparatively useless. When discussing this question on a former occasion, I was met by the senior member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) with the taunt that the electors of Cape Breton had confirmed the selection of this route in 1887. I propose to show that that statement was not accurate. At that time there were seven candidates in the field, and that is what saved the hon. gentleman and his colleague. Five of those candidates were opposed to the route; in fact, his colleague was opposed to it, and expressed his disapprobation of it in both public and private, but he said that as the Government had selected the route, he, as a good and faithful Tory, would support it. Mr. McDougall polled 1,882 votes and Mr. Murray polled 1,702 votes. If you take the vote polled by Mr. Gillies, 890 and that polled by Mr. Moseley, 539, they make together a total of 3,131, as against the 1,882 polled by the hon. gentleman and his colleague, or a majority of 1,249 against the Grand Narrows' route. The vote polled on that occasion clearly shows that a majority were against the route by the Grand Narrows; but there were other reasons. The Government, when they had made up their mind to build the road by the Grand Narrows, determined, as the leader of the Government decided at that time to dissolve the House, to keep dangling before the electors the railroad without definitely announcing what route they would adopt; but for some reason the Government were forced to show their hand, and a contract was entered into on the 28th of January; and in midwinter, on the 8th of February, ten days after the contract was signed at Ottawa, the contractors were in Sydney. The papers were immediately filled with advertisements for supplies, laborers and everything else; there was a great flourish of trumpets in reference to this railway; the contractors who were sent there especially in the interest of those two members, did everything they could for them. But, as soon as the elections were over, all this ceased, and the 95 miles of road which the contractors were to commence in midwinter, and which were to be constructed from day to day until they were completed, are not yet half completed; and what is more, the laborers on that section between the Grand Narrows and Sydney, who have given their honest toil, are yet unpaid for the work they then performed. The contract was taken for the eastern end by Sims & Slater; the Government held a deposit of $50,000 for the due performance of the work; and what did we hear the other day when the question was asked if this deposit had been given up to the sureties of Sims & Slater? It was stated by the right hon. leader of the Government that the money had been given up, but that a bond had been taken for it. Now, we have the fact that to this hour these men are unpaid. Last Session this question was put, on the 30th of April, by the hon. member for Inverness:

"Whether the Government intend to adopt means to compel the sureties of Sims & Slater, contractors on the east end of the Cape Breton Railway, to pay laborers and others who were employed by them?"

The answer which was given by the Minister of Public Works was:

"Any legal means the Government may have to get these matters settled, of course, the Government will take."

Nearly twelve months afterwards—a few days ago—the question was again put, not by the hon. member for Inverness, but by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McDonald), whether it was the intention of the Government to pay the laborers who worked on the Cape Breton Railway for Sims & Slater and their sub contractors; and what was the answer? The answer on this occasion was given by the right hon. the First Minister himself. He said:

"It is not the intention. The surety, upon receiving the deposit, gave bonds to pay any legal claims for wages."

Now, as I have stated, the hon. gentleman, who took this deposit of $50,000 for the due performance of that contract, acknowledges to this House—when these contractors failed to perform the work and the contract was taken from them before completion, and while these laborers were unpaid and were clamoring, through their representatives, for payment—that he gave up the $50,000 security, and tells the laborers of Cape Breton that it is not the intention of the Government to see that they are paid, and that they can proceed on the bond. I had the cash, he tells them, it is true, and that was the only means in my power to protect you; but I gave it up to the sureties, and now you can proceed on the bond. This bond, we may presume, is but a worthless piece of paper, and we can easily foresee what slight chance of success the laborers will have of getting their dues by proceeding on the bond which the First Minister took after he gave up the deposit. Why was the deposit given up? I remember a noteworthy occasion in this House when the Government were charged with having thown away over $200,000 of the money of the people, by giving to the Messrs. Onderdonk the contract for building a section of the Canadian Pacific Railway. They were told that Messrs. Charlebois & Macdonald were lower tenderers by over $200,000, and they were asked: Why, then, did you throw away $200,000 of the people's money in accepting a higher tender? The answer was that Messrs. Charlebois & Macdonald's deposit of $20,000 was not good, because the cheque was only marked good for two days; and, although that deposit was made good until paid, because there was a telegram from Montreal to the bank here declaring that it would be good until paid, still the only answer the Government gave was that that deposit was not good. The Government must, in that case, have set some value by the deposit; but in this case, when the contractors failed to carry out their obligations, and there is a large amount due to the laborers, they gave up the deposit, and told the laborers to proceed on the bond. The laborers are still unpaid, and when they ask for the bread they have earned for their families, the hon. gentleman turns round, calmly, and says to them: There is the bond, proceed on it. Here is a Government which shows marvellous solicitude in the interests of the labor ing community of this country. Such is the solicitude the right hon. gentleman feels for the laboring classes, that he has had a labor commission sitting for the last two years, and which has not reported yet, and which has cost the tax payers of this country over $70,000—and for what? to show the great solicitude the right hon. gentleman has for the laboring classes of this country. And yet the poor laborers of Cape Breton are still unpaid. What language

could I use sufficiently strong to denounce such a course of conduct as this? Here is a man who pretends he is so anxious for the welfare of the laboring classes of this country, that he has put the people to a large expense in connection with the Labor Commission, and who, in this instance, has given up the money he held as security for the payment of the laborers' wages, and then tells them to proceed on the bond. Let me refer to another point in the way in which he is treating the people of Cape Breton. When this work was commenced, it was naturally thought that the men of Cape Breton, many of whom had acquired experience in masonry work, and in other capacities particular to railway construction, would have had the first chance of employment. They did apply; but did they get work? No, Sir, it is a fact which the hon. gentlemen knows well, that men were sent from Quebec, Ontario, and Pictou, and different parts of Nova Scotia, as masons, timekeepers, and other capacities; and the young men of Cape Breton, who had the right to expect employment, and who were capable and experienced, were refused work, and Cape Breton was actually made a dumping ground for these other men. That cannot be denied. What is the fact to-day? On this very section that the Government have taken control of, and which the Government had let to favorites, these parties have left the laborers unpaid, and I am informed that up to this hour they are still unpaid. I hold the Government responsible for this. I now propose, in the first place, to show that it was always the intention that this Cape Breton road, when built, should be built *vid* St. Peter's, as a continuation of the Intercolonial Railway, having its open port at Louisburg or Sydney. I intend to be as brief at the nature of the question will admit, and will read an extract from the speech of Sir Charles Tupper, who was Minister of Railways in 1883. In introducing the Railway resolution, he said:

"It is proposed to give to the Great American and European Short Line Railway Company, for 80 miles, from Canso to Louisburg or Sydney, a subsidy of $3,200--not exceeding in the whole $256,000. The construction of this 80 miles will extend the great interocean system of railway communication to which we have been devoting so much time and energy for the last few years, from Port Moody, on the shores of the Pacific, to the easternmost part in the Dominion of Canada. The port of Louisburg is open all the seasons of the year, and by that port we have the shortest route to Liverpool, as the distance by way of Louisburg is 200 miles shorter than by Halifax."

Again, in the Session of 1884, Sir Charles Tupper moved the following resolution:—

"For the construction of a line of railway from Oxford station, on the Intercolonial Railway, to Sydney or Louisburg, a subsidy not exceeding $30,000 per annum for fifteen years."

We have also a memorial in 1884 signed by a large number of members of Parliament, in which they urge upon the Government:

"The extreme desirability of taking immediate measures for procuring the extension or connection of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to or with the following ports in the Maritime Provinces, to wit: St. Andrews, St. John, Halifax and Louisburg, by the shortest practical line."

We have also a memorandum signed by the five Cape Breton members, and the hon. member for Inverness was one of them who signed it. In that memorandum they say:

"'$3,200 per mile is inadequate for the construction of a line of railway from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg.' 'A railway from New Glasgow to Louisburg would prove a valuable feeder to the Intercolonial.' Again: 'A larger subsidy would be required to induce a company to undertake the Cape Breton section concurrently with other sections of the line from Montreal to Louisburg.'"

All these clearly point to Louisburg. The expressions and utterances of the hon. the Minister of Railways, and the hon. member for Inverness, on the floor of this House, only a few years ago, all point to Louisburg. Again, we have, as late as the Session of 1886, the hon. member for Inverness, on the 9th April, asking if it was the intention of the Government to provide for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway from Canso to Louisburg; and, on the 21st April, the Minister of Railways made this reply to the hon. member for Inverness:

"That negotiations were in progress looking to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway from Canso to Louisburg."

Again, during the same Session of 1886, Sir Hector Langevin moved a resolution, that it is expedient to provide that the Minister of Railways be authorised to construct a line of railway from a point in the Strait of Canso to Louisburg or Sydney. He said on that occasion:

"It was the intention of the Government to take the best line, the line that would be most feasible and most advantageous to the Island at large."

Mr. CAMERON. Hear, hear.

Mr. FLYNN. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." I shall prove that the line taken was not the most advantageous. I think I have shown from these extracts, from the utterances of Sir Charles Tupper, as Minister of Railways, and the utterances of the hon. member for Inverness, when he asked those questions, that it was always the intention to build the line from Canso to Louisburg.

Mr. CAMERON. I would like to ask my hon. friend, if in those questions I did not mention Sydney or Louisburg?

Mr. FLYNN. No; I was just going to say that in these very questions the hon. gentleman had left out Sydney, and that evidently he then never dreamt of Sydney. Simply from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg, and the answer given just before the adoption of this route was, to Louisburg. I have read those extracts, and they are sufficient to prove that the public were led to believe that, whenever the railway was extended to the Island of Cape Breton, it would be *vid* St. Peter's to either Louisburg or Sydney. There were many reasons for that. It would be a shorter and a cheaper route, and would be a continuation of the Intercolonial Railway, terminating at an open winter port. These reasons led us to believe that we would have the road constructed by that route. I propose to refer, in the second place, to the cost of this route, and, in doing so, I shall be as brief as possible. I intend to show that the cost by the present location will be 50 per cent. more than it would have been by the southern route. Mr. Hyndman, who makes the report in 1886, or Mr. Schreiber, in directing it to the Minister of Railways, says, in speaking of the southern route:

"The work on about one-fourth of the total distance may be classed as heavy, and the remainder medium to light. The bridging on this route is not of an expensive character, the largest structure being that over the Inhabitants River, consisting of one span of 180 feet, and 450 feet of pile trestle. The indications of rock are by no means formidable, and it is estimated that the construction and equipment of this road, including sufficient wharf accommodation at each terminus, to serve the present traffic, would not exceed $20,000 per mile."

After speaking of the line up to the 12th mile, he says:

"From 12th to 13¼ miles the grades are easy, the alignment good, and the work light; the line then descends until it crosses the St. Peter's road at 16½ miles. No grades over this last portion exceed 32 feet per mile; the alignment is good, and the work not heavy, though a small quantity of solid rock will likely be met with; structures unimportant."

From the 16½ to the 19th mile, the same thing. Then:

"Between 19th and 23rd mile, the grades are undulating, none exceeding 56 feet per mile; the work is not heavy, though the material in cuttings will be largely rock (solid and broken). No sharp curves are necessary.

"From the 23rd to the 26½ mile the line runs between the St. Peter's post road and the River Tillard. The grade descends at the rate of 50 feet per mile from the 23rd to 24⅝ miles, thence level to and beyond the crossing of the River Tillard at 26½ miles. The work is heavy over this portion, the material in cuttings largely rock; good stone suitable for masonry will be found in cutting west of crossing of River Tillard. The depth at low water in this river is about 3 feet, the bottom composed of boulders and gravel; the foundations will be inexpensive, one span of 100 feet will be ample.

"From the crossing of the River Tillard to St. Peter's Canal (29 miles) the grades are undulating, none exceeding 57 feet per mile. The

alignment is good. Though the work over this portion is not light, no rock is likely to be met with in the cuttings.

"From the 36th mile the grade descends for one mile at the rate of 29 feet per mile along the inlet of Loch Caileau; thence level for three-quarter mile along shore of Loch Caileau, then descending again at varying rates, none exceeding 66 feet per mile, until an elevation of 25 feet above high water is reached at 38½ miles. The work over this portion is generally light, a small quantity of solid rock may be met with along the outlet of Loch Caileau.

"From 38½ miles the line works into the valley of the Grand River (outlet of Loch Lomond), then along the west bank to the 43rd mile, where the river is crossed. Light undulating grades are used over this portion, no curve sharper than 5 degrees will be necessary. Work not heavy, and the material earth and gravel. The Grand River will require one span of 125 feet."

Then, from 46½ miles to the 50th mile:

"The work will not be heavy, the alignment good, the material generally sand or gravel, and boulders, and no important structures"

From the 50th mile to the 51th mile:

"Grades easy, alignment good, and work light."

From the 56th to the 60th mile, it is the same way, "The work not heavy, and the material earth and boulders; some 5-deg. curves will be necessary; structures unimportant." From the 60th mile to the 64th mile:

"Over this portion the work is not heavy; good ballast is found in different places; some 6-deg. curves will be necessary; no important structures."

From the 66th mile, "The work is not heavy, the material clay and gravel." From the 66th mile, he says, "The work is not heavy, and the alignment is good, though some solid rock will be met with on the 67th mile." From 68½ miles, he says:

"The grades over this portion are very light, the alignment good, the work not heavy, and the material clay and gravel."

And so on to the 79th mile, where he says:

"From the 79th mile the line descends to the head of Louisburg Harbor, with varying grades, none exceeding 53 feet per mile, thence along harbor, with easy grades, to the terminus at Slattery's Cove."

This is the description as contained in the engineer's report of the southern route *vid* St. Peter's to Louisburg. Now I propose to turn the attention of the House for a moment to the report in regard to the character of the country through which the present line of railway runs. In estimating the cost, the engineer put the cost of the southern route at $20,000 per mile, and the cost of the route by which the road is being built at $20,000, if the steam ferry could be operated at the Grand Narrows. It has been a matter of wonder to me how the engineer could have made such an estimate, because a careful reading of the reports must lead anyone to come to the conclusion that the cost by the present route would be much greater than by the southern route. It was generally believed in the Island of Cape Breton, and is believed to-day, that when the Government had made up their minds to built by the central route, that the engineers were instructed to make a report that the cost on the central route would not be greater than that on the southern route. They knew that, if the engineers were to give a true report, it would show that the cost on the central route must be much in excess of that by the southern route. I think I have here sufficient evidence to show to the House that the cost by the line which they are building now must be much greater than by the other line. Let me take the report itself, and see what is said about the present route from Hawkesbury to Grand Narrows. Mr. Schreiber says:

"West of the Grand Narrows the country is very rough, necessitating heavy work and considerable curvature. The structures are somewhat numerous, there being eight spans of 100 feet required, besides a large number of small bridges and culverts."

"From 13½ to 17½ miles the line ascends the high ground between River Inhabitants and Deny's River, by the valley of McMaster's Brook. Grades of various inclinations are used over this part, none exceeding 80 feet per mile, until an elevation of 280 feet over high water tide level is reached at summit. This is the highest level reached on this survey. The work over a part of this distance may be classed as heavy; the material, except, perhaps, a part of one cutting, will be clay and gravel. The general direction of the line, from 14½ to 17½ miles, is not good; curves of 5 and 6 degrees are necessary to keep within the limits of the narrow valley. Structures, though not very large, will occur frequently over this portion; one trestle 150 feet in length and 30 feet in height, one of 90 feet in length and 25 feet high, and one span of 40 feet."

Then he goes on until he comes to this:

"At 29½ miles the line turns abruptly to the north, then sweeping around the northern end of a high ridge it resumes its easterly direction again at the 31st mile. Two other lines were run between the 29½ mile and the 31st, with a view of improving the direction, both of which failed. From 29¾ to 31½ miles the grade descends at the rate of 66 feet per mile, then various undulating grades, none of which exceed 64 feet per mile, descending to the 36th mile, when an elevation of 44 feet above tide level is reached."

Then, Sir, going down to the 37th mile, he says:

"The arm of the basin at Deny's River, called the 'Little Narrows,' is 450 wide at the point selected for crossing, the greatest depth of water is 25 feet, shoaling gradually to the edges; no current. The bottom was found to have 3 to 5 feet of mud overlying compact sand or gravel; a structure having two spans of 100 feet each is proposed for this crossing. The work over this portion is heavy, large cuttings of gypsum occurring frequently, 6-degree curves will be necessary in the alignment. A trestle 200 feet in length and 35 feet high will be required between the 42nd and 43rd miles."

Again, at the 45th mile, he says:

"The work over this portion is heavy, the material in the cutting is chiefly clay overlying gypsum, though one large cutting of conglomerate rock occurs near the 50th mile. The curvature over this portion will be considerable, 6-degree curves being frequently required. One trestle of 300 feet in length and 47 feet high occurs between the 47th and 48th miles."

Then, again, he says:

"The direction of the line between Grand Narrows and Benecadie Point is nearly at right angles in the general direction, and the total length of the line is thereby considerably increased. Benecadie Pond, at the point selected for crossing, is about 1,100 feet wide; the greatest depth of water is three feet. The grade elevation is six feet over water level."

Again he says:

"Between the 70th and the 71st miles McIntosh's Brook is crossed; the valley of this stream is 500 feet wide. A trestle 450 feet in length and 35 feet high will be required."

And again:

"Between the 78th and 79th miles Gillis' Brook is crossed; the valley of this stream is 700 feet wide At restle 650 feet in length and 47 feet wide will be required. At the 80th mile the head of East Bay is reached, and from that point to Sydney the line keeps close to the main post road between St. Peter's and Sydney."

Now, I contend that in this report of the engineer's on the two routes there is enough evidence to show conclusively ——

Mr. McKEEN. The hon. gentleman has been speaking of a line which has been surveyed but not been adopted.

Mr. FLYNN. I do not know what line is surveyed. I moved for these papers in 1887, and I have got them here. I went to the office and was told this is the only report, and in the papers there is no mention of any other report. There is nothing official to show where the Government are building the road, but the report of engineers from which I am quoting, and I can only go by the official report. It will not do for the hon. gentleman to state in answer to me that the Government are not building by this line. These are the reports, and there are no subsequent reports. I knew I would be met by the reply that this is not the line that they are building, but still it is the line shown by the papers, by the official documents placed on the Table of the House. My intention is to show that the statement of the engineer is not correct when he says that if a steam ferry is operated, it will only cost $20,000 a mile. The report itself contains evidence that it must be largely in excess of the cost of the southern route. It is a well-known fact that bridges and heavy cuttings are what makes railway building expensive. Now, the engineer states that by the southern route there are only fifteen bridges, only one across the River

Inhabitants of an important character, whereas by the route on which the railway is now located, by the Grand Narrows, there are twenty-one bridges, necessitating large and heavy spans and trestles. How is it possible for any sane man to believe that a road where there are twenty-one bridges will be less expensive than another road with only fifteen bridges, even if the other expenses of building the two roads were the same? The idea is too preposterous, but it is in keeping with everything else in connection with this railway. The leader of the Government knew that if the engineers were told to go into Cape Breton and make a survey of the southern route, giving an honest and impartial report of the cost, according to the best of their ability, and also to go by the Grand Narrows and make a careful survey of that route, and give an honest and impartial report—he knew that the engineers would have reported that the cost would be 50 per cent. in excess of what this report states. If the Government had also stated: We are not only going to build by this line, making it longer than the other and costing more, but, eventually, we are going to obstruct navigation by erecting a bridge across the Narrows—if they had made that avowal in 1887, we know it would have been fatal to the project. I do not hesitate to say, from all the facts, that the intention was to keep the cost of the present route down to the cost of the southern route, and the engineers were instructed to report accordingly. Here we have over 3,000 feet of spans of bridges on the present route, and only 1,200 feet on the other. But, Sir, there is more to prove my contention that the cost of the present route will be greater. In 1886 some French gentlemen, representing a syndicate who were prepared to construct the railway through Cape Breton, visited that Island and went over the two routes. They read the report of the surveyors, and after they traversed the country, they at once stated that it was impossible for that road to be built as cheaply as the other. They came up here to Ottawa and told the Minister of Railways, so I am credibly informed, that the road by the Grand Narrows, where they proposed to build, would cost 50 per cent. more than the estimated cost given by the engineers, and they would have nothing to do with it. We have also the fact that the contract was taken from the contractors by the Government because they failed to perform the works as rapidly as they had agreed to do. They stated, in a memorial to the Government, that they were deceived by the estimate given by the engineers of the cost of that railway. And what is the fact now? They have an action against the Government for damages to the extent of $200,000. But supposing that the evidence I have given, the report I have read of the engineers, was not sufficient; suppose the evidence I have given of the fact that the French syndicate were prepared to build, but abandonod the project because they found that it would cost more than the estimate of the engineers—suppose all this was not sufficient, we have in further proof of the correctness of my contention, in the action of the Government, who took a vote in this House in 1886 for $1,700,000, and the other night they took a vote for $700,000 for the same purpose, these two sums together bringing the cost of that work up to over $25,000 a mile, independently of the cost of the bridge across the Narrows. Therefore, I say that I was correct in attacking the report of the engineers, and in declaring that when they stated that the cost would be the same, they were misleading the country. From the facts that have been developed since, I do not hesitate to say that if the road is built, it will cost $30,000 a mile and over——

Mr. CAMERON. Ha! ha!

Mr. FLYNN. The hon. gentleman may laugh. When I stated a year ago that it would cost over $20,000 a mile, he laughed in the same way. But there are the facts, and can he deny that, so far, it is costing $25,000, without the bridge?

Mr. CAMERON. Do you mean to say that it will cost $25,000 a mile, besides the bridge?

Mr. FLYNN. Yes, and more. The road from the Strait of Canso to the Grand Narrows will be 95 miles in length; we have now voted $2,400,000 for the construction of the road without the bridge, which brings the cost up to over $25,000 a mile. Now let me see what the cost would be by the southern route. By building *via* St. Peter's and Loch Lomond, Sydney can be reached by 80 miles of railway. By adding a branch of 10 miles you can reach North Sydney, making a distance of 90 miles, saving five miles of railway and avoiding the Grand Narrows ferry. 66 miles of this line would be common to the national line to Louisburg, which Port can be reached by a branch line of 15 miles, you have a total distance of 105 miles, accommodating the three towns of Sydney, North Sydney and Louisburg. The estimated cost of this line was $20,000 a mile, making a total cost of $2,100,000. If this line had been carried out the terminus would have been at the open winter port of Louisburg. Let me now take the Grand Narrows route, by which the line has been built. The distance from the Strait of Canso to Sydney by the present route is 95 miles, which, at $30,000 per mile, would make the cost $2,850,000. If you add the distance to Louisburg, which I have placed at $20,000 per mile, it would make $500,000, which, added to the cost of the road to Sydney, would make $3,350,000, being $1,250,000 more than the cost of a road by the southern route, independent of the cost of a bridge at the Grand Narrows. If you add half a million dollars, the amount of the contract for building the bridge—in all probability it will cost much more—it will make a total cost of $3,850,000, or $1,750,000 more than the costby the southern route. But this is not all. The statistical record states that the cost of working expenses of railroads, in 1887, was $2,363 per mile. The increased distance, if you extend to Louisburg, would add yearly about $18,000 to the cost, or a sum, if capitalised at 4 per cent., equal to $1,200,000. It has always been contended by hon. gentlemen opposite—the hon. members for Cape Breton—that the road, to be complete, must go to Louisburg. What did the junior member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKeen) state, when this question was under discussion? He said:

"That the road under construction would fail in its object if it is not continued as far as the important harbor of Louisburg. We know that it is the only open port we have on the Island of Cape Breton. Sydney is closed for some four months in the year, but Louisburg is open—free to the navigation of the world, we might say. We know that the route from Sydney to Louisburg intersects one of the richest mining localities in the Dominion, mines which represent a capital of eight or ten millions of dollars, and seven or eight collieries which have no outlet to the sea except by Louisburg. Without the extension to Louisburg, the system will be incomplete and must partially fail to accomplish the object sought to be achieved."

Why, both Mr. McKeen and Mr. McDougall, before election, stated that the road between Sydney and Louisburg would be broad gauged and equipped by the Government within two years. Mr. McDougall gave a guarantee to that effect, with a condition, that if that promise was not fulfilled within two years from then, that he would resign his seat. An Ottawa despatch to the Montreal *Gazette* furnishes a more detailed statement of the proposals which Messrs. McDougall and McKeen have made to the Dominion Government in reference to the Louisburg railway. The despatch says:

"The two Cape Breton members, Messrs. McKeen and McDougall, have had a lengthy interview with Sir John Macdonald and Sir John Thompson on the subject of the extension of the Cape Breton railway from Sydney to Louisburg. The Cape Breton members appear to be determined to secure this concession, in order that the road may be opened up to Louisburg simultaneously with the Cape Breton railway now nearing completion. When the road is extended to Louisburg, instead of being only able to ship coal during five or six months of the year, it could be shipped during the whole year, as Louisburg harbor is always

free from ice. As it is at present, the output last year was 500,000 tons. This, the deputation informed Sir John, could be doubled. It may be added, that Messrs. McKeen and McDougall have had several interviews with the Premier on this subject, but at the last, they had statistics, maps, etc., showing the location of the several mines and the close proximity of them to the proposed road. Sir John was satisfied of the feasibility of the scheme, and said that the matter would be looked into."

I have read these extracts to show that the road will be incomplete unless it is built to Louisburg, that it will fail, as the hon. gentleman says, in its object, and that we may look forward, in the near future, to see the road extended there. I have no doubt, if it is so extended, it will cost, as I have said, $1,750,000 more than if it were built by the southern route, that is, independent of the bridge at the Narrows, or an amount sufficient to give us railway accommodation on both sides of the island. Owing to the peculiar formation of the Island of Cape Breton, being divided into almost two islands by the waters of Bras d'Or Lake, two roads are necessary to develop its resources, one by the north, accommodating Inverness and Victoria, and the southern, by Richmond to Louisburg, Sydney and North Sydney. Where have they built this road, which is misnamed the Central? The road runs mostly through two peninsulas, through a narrow neck of land isolated by the Little Bras d'Or and Whycocomagh Bay on the north, and by the waters of the Great Bras d'Or and East Bay on the south. It is isolated from nine-tenths of the area of the counties through which it passes, as can easily be seen by referring to the map, connecting Cape Breton and Inverness Counties at their extreme points, and having neither mineral or agricultural resources to develop. Nor does it pass through any important agricultural district. From the head of Whycocomagh Bay to Grand Narrows, a distance of 20 miles—and I would particularly call the attention of the House to this fact—the average width of country through which the road runs is not over four miles; for about five miles from Orangedale it does not average over one mile in width, and at Little Narrows, for some distance, it is not half a mile in width, passing through a country where there are holes and plaster beds, making it difficult and expensive to build a railway. There was a bridge built there last fall, and it sunk from six to eight inches in a short time after being built. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) asked the First Minister a question in regard to those holes and quagmires, to which he got his answer. Mr. Fletcher, of the Geological Survey, stated to one of the delegates that in process of time the whole district would be submerged, that portions of the Bras d'Or Lake near there now covered with water were at one time land. It is a well-known fact that pieces of land bearing large trees have disappeared out of sight in the very neighborhood of where this railway is being built, and this is the place in which the Government are to build the railroad and they will call it justice to Cape Breton. I say, Mr. Speaker, that a greater injustice was never perpetrated on a people, or a more reckless waste of money ever proposed, than the building of that railway by that route. But the Government cannot claim now that they had no information, or that they were not warned before they undertook the construction of that road. They cannot plead ignorance of these facts, and they cannot throw the responsibility wholly on the report of their engineer. As I have stated before, the very moment that it was announced that the Cape Breton Railway was likely to be built by the Grand Narrows, the people became alarmed, they took immediate action by public meetings and by every means in their power to protest against the construction of the road by this route. The Government were warned of this in time. The delegates who came here, comprising the Honorable Senator Macdonald and Mr. McKay, leader of the opposition in the Local Legislature, representing Cape Breton County, and Reverend Father Quinnan and Doctor Chisholm, representing Richmond. They warned the Government of the injustice they would inflict on Cape Breton if the road were built by that route. The Government were also warned by a memorial signed by the Rev. J. McNeill and 4,000 others, and by a petition from seventeen or eighteen Catholic clergymen who were assembled in Sydney on some public occasion. Some of these were clergymen favorable to the Government. But they felt in the interest of the country that it was necessary to warn the Government against constructing the railway along the Grand Narrows. I do not see this petition among the papers, but there is no doubt that it was sent here. There is one memorial, signed by the Rev. J. McNeill and 4,000 others, which I will read to the House, and which will show how they protested, and how they urged on the Government in the interest of the country not to throw away money in a manner which would jeopardise the future of Cape Breton, by building this railroad by the Grand Narrows. This memorial was written in 1886, and I would call the particular attention of the Government to it. It says:

"*To His Excellency the Governor General of Canada in Council:*

"The petition of the undersigned electors of the Island of Cape Breton humbly sheweth,—

"That your petitioners felt highly gratified at the determination of your Government to construct a line of railway through Cape Breton to Louisburg or Sydney, as a continuation of the national system of railways.

"That your petitioners would regard with much apprehension, the final location of the line by the Grand Narrows and Bois-dale-Route, because, (*a*) if so located, the road will accommodate neither the fishing, the mining, nor the agricultural interests of the Island; because (*b*) the Grand Narrows is an insuperable obstacle to the national importance and commercial success of the line.

"That, in the opinion of your petitioners, the railway will satisfy four-fifths of the people of Cape Breton, if built in the shortest and most direct course by St Peters to Louisburg or Sydney, as contemplated by the Act.

"That your petitioners would refer to the mass of statistical information that has been furnished your Government, respecting the positive advantages of the route *via* St. Peters, sent by memorial, on behalf of the people of Cape Breton, and dated the 21st September last past.

"That your petitioners view with alarm, the strenuous efforts that have been made by parties who, in their endeavors to secure the location of the road *via* Grand Narrows and Bois-dale route, persistently misrepresent the interests of Cape Breton, and the desires of her people.

"That your petitioners have sufficient confidence in the good judgment of your Government to believe that they will locate the road by that route that will best serve the national interests of Canada, and the commercial interests of Cape Breton, which route has been indicated above.

"That your petitioners make the last appeal to your Government on behalf of the route *via* St. Peters, and would now implore, that all further location by the Grand Narrows and Bois-dale be forthwith discontinued.

"And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

"CAPE BRETON, November, A.D. 1886."

This is a memorial presented in 1886 protesting in language as strong as can be made use of against the adoption of that route. The memorialists refer here to "a mass of statistical information that has been furnished your Government respecting the positive advantage of the route *vid* St. Peter's, sent by memorial on behalf of the people of Cape Breton and dated 21st September last past." That is not amongst the papers, but we have the fact here that it was submitted to the Government. I have now shown to the House that the moment the people of Cape Breton became aware that the location of the road was to be by the Grand Narrows, they became alarmed, and by public meetings, by delegations sent here, by memorials, by petitions, by statistical information, by adopting every means in their power they implored the Government not to jeopardise the future of Cape Breton by building along this route. What have we on the other side in favor of this route? What have we behind the Government to show that, by building this railway along this route, any portion of Cape Breton has urged them to do so? Has there been a delegation? Has there been a memorial? Has there been a public meeting held in any part of Cape Breton to ask the Government to

build the road by the Grand Narrows? No, Sir, there is no such request. I say that these facts speak loudly in favor of my argument here to day. I say there must be something unfair behind this, and I regret to say that the great influence possessed by the Minister of Justice in the Cabinet—for to him was largely due the selection of this line—was used against the best interests of Cape Breton. I make this statement on no authority of my own, but on the authority of Dr. Chisholm, of Halifax, one of the delegates to Ottawa, who, in the pamphlet which he published afterwards, speaks of the Minister of Justice as having used his influence in favor of the Grand Narrows route. Alluding to Dr. Chisholm, I may say that he would not make a statement unless he had some grounds for it, and he must have obtained that knowledge while he was here in his official capacity as a delegate, because I know he is incapable of making any incorrect statement. I feel that it is due to Dr. Chisholm to state publicly here that he acted in this matter from the purest, most disinterested and most patriotic motives in the interest of his native island. Now, Sir, having said so much as regards that part of the subject, I propose to show that the millions of dollars which the Government are spending on this railroad does not accommodate the people of Cape Breton or will not in any way assist in the future requirements of the Island. I intend, in dealing with this matter, also, not to ask the House to rely on any statement or assertion of my own, but I intend to prove it by the public utterances of the people of Cape Breton, not in the County of Richmond, but in the County of Victoria and in the County of Inverness. In 1887, shortly after the route was adopted, a large meeting was held in the shire town of the County of Inverness, with the warden in the chair, asking for aid for a railroad running through the important centres of that county down to the Straits of Canso. Even last January, a meeting was held there for the same purpose of asking the Dominion and local representatives to do everything in their power for the purpose of getting aid to build a railroad through the important centres of Inverness County to the Straits of Canso.

Mr. CAMERON. And we will get it.

Mr. FLYNN. Yes, he may get it; but I am going to show that this road is no good to Invernes, is no good to Victoria, is no good to Richmond, no good to all the southern part of Cape Breton County, and that being the case I would ask why have the millions of public money been spent in building by the Grand Narrows. If Richmond gets no benefit, and if only a small portion of the County of Cape Breton gets the benefit of it, why is this money wasted? If no portion of Victoria gets any benefit, why is Parliament asked to spend these millions? Now, my object is simply to show that by building this road by the Grand Narrows, the money will be absolutely thrown away. On the 10th of last January a public meeting was held in Baddeck, the shire town of Victoria; the council was in session at the time, and every district of that county was represented. The hon. member for Victoria was present, and was one of a committee to prepare the resolution passed at that meeting. Now, I want to call attention to the resolution passed at that meeting:

"Whereas it is desired and required by the people of Cape Breton Island, and more especially of the Counties of Victoria and Inverness, that a railway should be built from Baddeck in Victoria County, *via* Big Baddeck, Middle River, and Lake O'Law, to Margaree and Broad Cove, in the County of Inverness, and thence *via* Mabou and Port Hood to the Strait of Canso, as one through trunk line. Therefore, resolved, that our representatives of the Dominion and Provincial Parliaments, and all and every the electorate of the counties, more especially, of Victoria and Inverness, deem it their duty and privilege to urge, advocate and further to their utmost power and ability the construction of said railway."

Here are the reasons they gave for the road—I have only selected a few of them:

"Because the north-western half of the Island of Cape Breton (for Cape Breton is naturally two islands) is altogether devoid of railway facilities"

"Baddeck is situated on a splendid harbor, in the course of all the steamers traversing the Bras D'Or Lakes, and is the natural outlet on the lakes of a magnificent agricultural, timber and mining country, extending all around for 50 miles inland."

A number of other reasons are given which I leave the hon. member for Victoria to state. One would imagine, from these meetings held in the Counties of Inverness and Victoria urging the construction of railways through these important counties, and urging their Dominion and Local representatives to use their efforts for a through trunk line to the Strait of Canso, that there was no line of railway building in Cape Breton. The facts speak loudly in corroboration of what I have stated to-day, that the railway constructed by the Grand Narrows will be of no use to an overwhelming majority of the people of Cape Breton. It may be of some use to the senior member for the County of Cape Breton; but valuable as he is to his party, I believe, and the country will believe, that it would be too dear a price to pay for his support—the millions that will be thrown away upon the construction of that road, and the sacrifice of the future interests of Cape Breton. There are many reasons to show that the whole transaction connected with this road was not a fair and square, above-board, honest transaction. There are certain features connected with it that must lead any impartial mind to that conclusion. It is true, I cannot bring clear and positive evidence to substantiate the conviction that is in the minds of many of the people of Cape Breton, and the strong conviction that is in my own mind; but I have given the House sufficient evidence to prove the position I take. I have shown that if the cost of the road had been put at its proper estimate of $30,000 a mile, and if the Government had said that they would build a bridge across the Narrows, and would ultimately extend the line to Louisburg, making it 120 miles long instead of 100 miles. If all this had been avowed, it must necessarily have been fatal to the Grand Narrows route. The building of a bridge was not then proposed, but when I brought this matter up before, I warned the Government, and they were warned by the delegates, that if they carried the road by that route, they would have to build a bridge across the Grand Narrows. When the senior member for Cape Breton replied to me on that occasion, the whole burden of his speech went to prove that a bridge was not necessary. He said that the previous winterhad been the most severe that we had had for thirty years, and that the ferrymen had crossed every day without one solitary exception. When the engineer, Mr. Hyndman, had received reports of some surveys, the hon. gentleman wrote a letter to him, stating that the information he had got was incorrect, and that there was no necessity of building a bridge there, as a steam ferry would be sufficient. Less than two years ago, it was positively asserted that it would not be necessary to build a bridge across the Narrows. What did Mr. McDougall himself say? Here is his letter:

"DEAR SIR,—You will remember that when discussing the subject of the Grand Narrows crossing with you, before leaving Cape Breton last fall, I learned from you that, acting on information received from Mr. McNeil, you reported to the Department of Railways that the ice in the Grand Narrows attained a thickness of some six feet at certain periods in the winter. I subsequently called Mr. McNeil's attention to this, and he told me that you could not have possibly understood him, as no permanent ice forming at or near the Grand Narrows scarcely ever exceeds one foot in thickness, and at the crossing points in the Narrows there is seldom any ice at all; none, however, to impede regular crossing with an open boat during any period in the winter. The only reference which Mr. McNeil, or any other person, could have made to ice forming a thickness of six feet is, that in some parts of the lake, when the ice is broken, the force of strong winds would cause such ice to be piled up, in a crumbled form, on the shore, to a height or thickness of six feet, but does not apply to the immediate points at which the crossing is made. I can only refer you for corroboration of these facts to the ferrymen of forty years' experience on both sides of the Narrows. I might further add that the mails from Port Hastings for North Sydney have been crossed over the Grand Narrows in an open row boat during the last two winters every night (except Sunday), and although the winter of 1885 was an exceptionally severe winter, the service has been

accomplished without a single interruption by ice since first established. The same may be said with regard to the mail service performed across the ferry for a period of some fifteen or twenty years in day time, previous to the establishing of the present night service in connection with the mail to and from North Sydney. And I trust you will be pleased to represent this matter to the department, in conjunction with your former report, if you have not done so already.

"I beg to remain, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"H. F. McDOUGALL.

"P. K. HYNDMAN, Esq., Civil Engineer, &c."

He did present this to the department, and it was embodied in the report. But let me point to what occurred on the floor of this House only last Friday night, when the Chief Engineer was here, and when we saw what an exhibition he made when the question was brought up regarding the millions which were voted to build the line from Oxford to New Glasgow on the pretence that it would shorten the distance by 45 miles. When the First Minister was asked as to the distance to be saved, he would not condescend to answer the gentleman who put the question to him. But, when forced to do so, when told by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones): You have your Chief Engineer within a yard of two; get the information from him,—he went to him, and replied: Twenty-six miles. When told that was not true, then he made a pitiable exhibition of himself by stating seven miles. Now, I say, when the Chief Engineer will attempt, in broad daylight, in the face of Parliament, to mislead the public, I ask, am I not warranted in saying that I have no faith in the reports of his subordinates. The fourth proposition that I intend to take up has reference to the bridging of the Narrows. The bridging of the Narrows will interfere with the utility of the St. Peter's Canal and I assert obstruct the navigation of the Bras d'Or Lake. About 35 years ago the Local Government of Nova Scotia were urged to open up the narrow isthmus that divides the waters of the Atlantic from St. Peter's, on the one hand, to Bras d'Or Lake on the other. When the Government of that Province commenced railway construction, they knew Cape Breton was contributing to the construction of that work without getting any advantage, and they agreed to open up the canal. At the time of Confederation the canal was partly constructed and fell into the hands of the Dominion Government, who completed it and put it in its present condition. It is impossible to overestimate the value of that canal to our coasters and our fishermen. The number of vessels that pass through it has been increasing daily. Not only has it been of advantage to the shipping interest, but also to the farmers in the interior by giving them facilities to send their produce to market, and it has also been a great accommodation to those going to the mines. I know the reply will be made to me that this bridge will not obstruct or interfere with navigation, but, in case such an assertion should be made on the floor of Parliament, I wish, in advance, to state that it will obstruct navigation. In making that assertion I do not base it altogether on my own knowledge of the place—and I have some knowledge of it—but when it was announced publicly that the Government were determined to bridge the Grand Narrows, a good deal of excitement was aroused among that class of people who use the canal as coasters and fishermen, and I made it my business to enquire from every man his opinion. There was but one voice, and that was that it would obstruct navigation, and that mariners would rather run the risk of an open Atlantic voyage then go through St. Peter's Canal to the Grand Narrows. It will be easily seen how the bridge will obstruct the navigation of the lake. When you go to the Grand Narrows, so far as the eye can reach, from east to west, there is nothing but the open, exposed sea. Now, with a current of four miles at least, as stated in the official report, and that increased by the velocity of the wind, when the wind is running high—and when you put a draw-bridge there, it must necessarily be increased—with no anchorage, with nothing but the open sea, what vessels would attempt to go through? You might as well fill up the canal, if you are going to put a bridge across the Narrows. Mr. Hyndman says, in his report concerning this bridge:

"Because of the great amount of shipping which passes through there, a low level bridge would be objectionable, besides its great cost; and the cost of a high level bridge would, by reason of its increased length, be very much greater."

I intend to show you the importance of the canal. I am going to give you, not any statement of my own, or knowledge contained from the people of the locality, but official information of the importance of the canal and the necessity of freedom from obstruction in navigating the Straits of Barra, where you propose to build the bridge:

"The shipping passing through the Narrows consist principally of fishing schooners which come from the east to fish in the Great Bras d'Or Lake, and coasting vessels, all of which pass on through the canal at St. Peter's. On some days as many as sixty or seventy have passed backwards and forwards. The season of navigation is from the middle of May to the end of December. There is a line of steamboats running each way every second day, between Sydney and Port Mulgrave, through the canal, besides occasional steamboats belonging to the same company which ply between ports in the two Bras d'Or Lakes The steamship *St Pierre* of the Anglo-French and American Company, makes fortnightly trips through the lakes between Halifax and Miquelon."

Here we have the official statement from Mr. Hyndman that there are as many as sixty or seventy vessels passing through the Grand Narrows every day during the navigable season. Will any hon. gentleman pretend to say, with a draw-bridge at a place like this, with an open sea east and west for miles, that there will not be detention to vessels passing through, and great risk of loss. Every man who has put his foot on the deck of a vessel, and knows anything about the Bras d'Or Lake, and the Current, and the Narrows, will tell you there is. I have also another document, and it is the last I shall read. It is the report of a meeting held in St. Peter's, County Richmond, to protest against the building of a bridge at Grand Narrows. This meeting was held on February 28th, and the following is the resolution that was passed:—

"Whereas the opening of the St. Peter's Canal has developed an extensive shipping trade through the Bras D'Or Lakes; and whereas the erection of a bridge over the Grand Narrows would cause serious detention to vessels passing through, and would make the navigation of these waters more hazardous and dangerous on account of the difficulty of mooring vessels to a pier in an open bay and with a strong current running; and whereas, said detention and risk would prevent shipowners from utilizing that otherwise safe, convenient channel; and whereas, such an obstruction to navigation would seriously damage the shipping interests of the Maritime Provinces, and practically destroy the usefulness of the St. Peter's Canal, thereby causing loss to the Government and injury to the growth and prosperity of this county: Therefore resolved, that this meeting protest against the building of a bridge over the Grand Narrows. Further resolved, that our Dominion representatives be instructed to place our grievances before the Government and Parliament at the earliest possible opportunity."

That is the resolution protesting against the building of the bridge. Again, I might say that the lighthouses erected between the Grand Narrows and the St. Peter's Canal would be of little use afterwards. The members of the Government know very little, unfortunately, about the geography of that part of the country, for if they did and had any interest in the welfare of the people, the line of road would never have been located by the Grand Narrows. But the right hon. the First Minister did us the honor of paying us a visit last year. He passed through St. Peter's Canal to the Grand Narrows, and no doubt his keen eye took in the situation. I have been informed that the importance of the canal was pointed out to him, and that it was also pointed out to him that, if the Grand Narrows were bridged, the canal would be practically destroyed. His reply was that it would never do to destroy the canal, and he was right, but if he bridges the Narrows, he will destroy the canal, which was opened out at a cost of three-quarters of a million in order to enable all those who use the Bras-

d'Or Lake to enter it freely, and now you propose to destroy the canal by another expenditure of three-quarters of a million of dollars in building the bridge across the Narrows; and it is not only the people of Cape Breton who use that canal, but people from other parts of Nova Scotia who go with coasting vessels by that route, carrying produce to the Sydney Mines and carrying coal back, and so saving the Atlantic voyage. These people will also suffer by the bridging of the Narrows. I think I have shown that this route will cost much more than the southern route. I have shown that it will not accommodate anything like the majority, but rather a very small minority, of the people of Cape Breton. You have already voted nearly $3,000,000 for the construction of a railway in Cape Breton, but the people of Inverness and the people of Victoria are still asking their representatives to use every effort to have a railway built, because this railway will be of no benefit whatever to them. I say to the Government, in the interests not only of the present but of the future of the country, abandon the idea of building a bridge at the Grand Narrows; leave the waters of the Bras D'Or Lake as you found them at Confederation and as nature left them for our use, free and unobstructed. You can, if you desire, before it is too late, retrieve, to some extent, the error you have committed. Proceed with the construction of the work from Point Tupper to River Inhabitants, thence through the important centres of Inverness and Victoria. Abandon the line between River Denys and Sydney, and save the amount this will cost, and the cost of bridging the Grand Narrows, and these amounts, put together, will not only build a line in the direction to which I have referred, but will also build one by way of St. Peter's and Loch Lomond to Louisburg and Sydney, thus carrying out the general intention of Parliament, which has been frequently expressed, of having a winter port at Louisburg. Unless you do what I have indicated, you will throw away a large amount of money to very little purpose. What are the facts to-day? Have you satisfied any county in Cape Breton? We have the gentlemen from Inverness and Victoria urged by their constituents to get a line built through those counties. We have the gentlemen from Cape Breton urging the building of a line to Louisburg, because otherwise the national highway is incomplete. The building of the Intercolonial Railway should have been a warning to the Government. They should have remembered the millions which were thrown away for political purposes in building that road, as millions would be thrown away for political purposes in building this road. If the Government were animated by a desire to economise in the expenditure of public money, and had a proper regard for the interests and future welfare of Cape Breton, this railroad would never have been built by the Grand Narrows route. I tell the Government that a strong feeling of opposition to this route exists in Cape Breton, and they know it. Sir, the people of that Island—the richest for its area of any portion of this Dominion in everything that constitutes national wealth—entertained hopes in the near future of having their vast resources developed by means of a railroad. But these hopes you have blasted by your insane policy of building by the Grand Narrows. It is a wreckless waste of public money to serve political purposes. I know that in protesting against your railway policy in Cape Breton, I voice not only the sentiments of the people of Richmond, but also of a large majority of the people of the other counties in the Island. I know the evil results that bridging the Grand Narrows will produce. I know the injury it will inflict on the fishermen and coasters, and the general commerce of the Bras d'Or Lake. Knowing these facts, I felt it my duty to submit them to the House, and, as the representative of a county in that Island, to protest against a policy fraught with disaster to her best interests. If you bridge the Grand Narrows, you will render the St. Peter's Canal—constructed at an enormous cost—comparatively, if not completely, useless. You will obstruct the navigation and interfere with the commerce of the Bras d'Or Lake. Your policy, instead of promoting and encouraging, will check and retard the development of our resources and strike a fatal blow at the progress and prosperity of Cape Breton. I beg to move that you do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved:

That the location selected by the Government for the Cap Breton Railway is inexpedient, inasmuch as the route selected is longer and more expensive than is required to effect a connection between the Atlantic ports and the railway system of this Dominion, and is in every way less calculated to serve the national and local interests which such an enterprise is designed to promote.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). I am somewhat surprised at the motion which has just been tabled by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), and I am sure that the people on whose behalf he pretends to speak on this occasion must be greatly surprised that, at this late date, he has made the charges he has now made to the House. The hon. member came here entrusted with the responsibility of presenting those statements nearly two months and a-half ago, but he has sat in solemn silence without uttering a word of protest of the character he has uttered to-day until now, nearly at the close of the Session. He came here in charge of resolutions from the municipal council of his county, from meetings in his county, and from electors in his county who sent in petitions, but he remained from the first day of the meeting of Parliament until this day, after immense sums have been voted away by Parliament for the work to which the hon. gentleman alludes, without uttering a word of protest. Under those circumstances, can any hon. gentleman on the floor of this House say that the hon. member has discharged his duty on behalf of those whom he pretends to represent in this House. Did he discharge his duty to his county, did he discharge his duty to the Dominion of Canada, when he, with his colleagues, sat in the House in silence, without uttering a word that would induce the Government to withdraw the moneys that were appropriated to building the railway by the present route? I think that this fact alone is sufficient to meet the charge made by the hon. member, and it will relieve this House of the necessity of my going into particulars, although I would have liked to do so if the hon. member had brought the matter up at an earlier period of the Session. The hon gentleman, by delaying his statements till this afternoon, has himself given the answer necessary to meet his charge. However, if the House will permit me, it may not be out of place to refer briefly to some of the points which he has raised. In the early part of this Session he presented petitions, the first sentence of which said that they represented 7,000 inhabitants—French Acadians of Cape Breton. The hon. member presented a petition on the 26th of February, which I examined and found it to contain thirty four signatures of people of French extraction and forty-four people of other nationalities. I find that on the 27th he presented a petition with sixty-one French names and forty-three other names. On the 8th of March he presented a petition containing 105 names—I believe they were nearly all French Acadians. Those were the only petitions, and the only signatures to the petitions, presented to this House during the present Session. The total number of signatures to these petitions representing 7,000 French Acadians of the Island of Cape Breton, was only 200, and eighty-seven of other nationalities. That shows the importance of these petitions, and the importance of this question in so far as it agitated the minds of the people represented by the hon. gentleman himself. Now, I will refer to some of the points which the petition raises. The petition says that the districts of the Island through which the Government are now building this

railway, are in themselves insignificant, unproductive, and so on. Now, in order to show the true state of the case, I will take the number of people living within a distance of ten miles on either side of the line of railway which is now being built. I will also take the number of people living within ten miles on each side of the line which the hon. gentleman would have this House believe the Government should have adopted. I think every hon. gentleman will agree that this is a fair and reasonable way of comparing the so-called insignificance of the adopted line with the one he proposes. I also propose to show the relative products of the country embraced within the same limits, and if I make any statement that is not correct, I want the hon. gentleman to correct me. Now, starting from the Strait of Canso, and taking 10 miles on each side of the railway, whether that includes water or land makes no difference, so long as I find the population. In the route that is now being built, which is designated as the central route, I find, starting from the Strait of Canso, that the population in the county of Richmond that is taken in by that line, is 1,341; the population in the county of Inverness is 7,807; and in the county of Victoria, 6,332; in the county of Cape Breton, 24,607, making altogether a population of 40,150 within 10 miles on each side of this road, or within a 20-mile belt from one end of the road to the other. I find, in addition to these, that there are living to the north of this line, in the counties of Inverness and Victoria, 23,982 inhabitants. Now, it must be remembered, that these people could not be benefited by any line south of the present one, that the present one must necessarily suit them better than the one the hon. gentleman is advocating. Of the 23,982 living to the north of this 10-miles limit, there are 17,844 in in the county of Inverness, and 6,138 in the county of Victoria. Adding these to the population within the 10 miles on either side of the line, and we have a population of 64,000, in round numbers. Now let us see what population we can find within 10 miles on each side of the route advocated by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn). I find that the total population in the county represented by my hon. friend, is 15,121. By adopting the line advocated by my hon. friend, and adopting the 10-mile limit on either side of the line, I find that I take in every inch of the hon. gentleman's county, and we find that there are 3,434 inhabitants in the county of Inverness who come within the 10-mile limit, and the number of people in the county of Cape Breton coming within the 10-mile limit, is 5,995, making a total of 24,550 who are within 10 miles of each side of the route advocated by my hon. friend, as against 40,150 within 10 miles on each side of the other route, and the 23,982 inhabitants living to the north of that line. Now, if that is not an answer to the charge set forth in that petition that this country through which the road is going is insignificant, I do not know what is an answer. As I said before, if my hon. friend doubts the figures that I am giving to this House, I will give him each district within this belt separately. Let me now go on to speak of the so called unproductiveness of the "peninsula" route. I claim that the principal products of these sections of the Island of Cape Breton, in fact, of the whole island, except the fisheries and mines, are farm products, and the chief among those products are grain, potatoes and hay. The following statistics show the relative productiveness, as well as the population, of the country on the respective routes:

CENTRAL ROUTE (10 MILES EACH SIDE).

	Total Pop.	Bush. Grain.	Bush. Potatoes.	Tons Hay.
Richmond	1,341	1,469	9,613	1,046
Inverness	7,807	73,175	110,613	13,634
Victoria	6,332	94,787	110,677	12,014
Cape Breton	24,670	145,592	359,624	20,050
	40,150	315,023	590,527	46,744

NORTH OF 10 MILES FROM CENTRAL LINE.

	Total Pop.	Bush. Grain.	Bush. Potatoes.	Tons Hay.
Inverness	17,844	239,790	323,920	34,182
Victoria	6,138	16,379	78,198	7,422
	23,982	256,169	402,118	41,604

SOUTHERN LINE (10 MILES EACH SIDE OF LINE).

Richmond	15,121*	28,428	149,619	13,265
Inverness	3,434	20,378	47,944	4,931
Cape Breton	5,995	30,899	94,190	6,059
	24,550	79,705	291,753	24,255

POPULATION AND PRODUCTS OF "PENINSULA," CAPE BRETON COUNTY.

Grand Narrows	1,464	17,883	38,987	2,415
Boisdale	900	10,345	22,794	743
E. Bay, N. Side	1,331	13,781	31,603	1,689
Balls Creek	2,529	22,066	50,081	3,741
North Sydney	5,484	7,951	39,353	1,876
	11,708	72,626	182,818	10,464
*Richmond	15,121	28,428	149,619	12,565

When I quote the southern route I wish hon. members to understand that there is no land south until you cross the Atlantic, that there is nothing to be expected except what is produced within the 10-mile limit; but in the case of the route adopted by the Government a large proportion of the population and of the products lies to the north. That, to my mind, is a sufficient answer with respect to the unproductiveness and unimportance of the peninsula route, as that petition sets forth. I can quite understand the feeling of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), on this question, and there are other hon. gentlemen who can very clearly understand his feeling on the matter. I may mention that my hon. friend held a seat in this House some years previous to the present Parliament. He also held a seat in the Local Legislature of the Province from which he comes. He held an important position in that legislature and occupied one of the most important offices in the Government, and during the time he held that position the Government of which he was a member adopted a policy with respect to railways in the Island of Cape Breton. The policy adopted by the hon. gentleman and his colleagues on that occasion was a policy simply of paper railways, and we have those paper railways to this day. The hon. gentleman, in 1872, was a member of the Local Government of Nova Scotia, and that was the year when, so far as my researches go, that Government adopted their first policy with a view to building railways in Cape Breton. They adopted that policy while my hon. friend occupied the position of Commissioner of Crown Lands, and, to begin with, they promised by Acts of Parliament and by the voice of that Parliament a land subsidy of 150,000 acres and half the royalty on coal produced in the island, towards building a railway from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg. In 1873 they amended that legislation, and, in addition, passed legislation with a view to building another line of railway between Sydney and East Bay, in addition to the proposed line from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg. In 1874 they amended that Act again; they gave it a turn-over in order to please the people of the island for the time being, and in order to keep them interested in these paper railways. In the year 1875 they changed their policy, and promised $4,000 per mile for a railway from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg, and $4,000 a mile for a railway from the Strait of Canso to Broad Cove, so that there should be no danger of the people uniting against the Government. In 1876 they provided for a railway to

* About 6,000 of the population of Richmond County live on an Island separated from the rest of the County by the waters of Lenox Passage.

the Strait of Canso, and, in addition to that, they provided a subsidy of $8,000 per mile and 150,000 acres of Crown lands in addition, for a railway with an extension from the Strait of Canso to a point on Bras d'Or Lake, abandoning the road to Louisburg. They would not mention the point because they thought they would catch everybody by simply naming "a point on the Lake." In 1877 they extended these Acts, and in 1878 they adopted the same course, and up to that date they did not pay a single dollar to the building of railways on the island, they simply gave the people paper railways year after year, although in my county some 40 or 50 miles of railway was built without any Government aid. The Government went to the people and were defeated at the polls, and those who took their places gave attention to the building of railways and to their completion: they perfected a scheme and brought it before the Legislature. Soon afterwards they appealed to the people, who did not, however, return them to power. On the accession to power of the party supported by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), the Government went to work and strangled this legislation lest any practical effect should follow. They again reverted to the system of giving the island paper railways. In 1886 they provided a subsidy of $3,200 per mile for a railway from the Strait of Canso to St. Peter's, to East Bay, to Sydney, to North Sydney, to Little Bras d'Or, from Baddeck to Broad Cove, in fact, they promised by this legislation that we should have railways anywhere and everywhere over Cape Breton. This is the legislation which has been adopted by the party supported by my hon. friend, and which was first inaugurated by the party while the hon. gentleman occupied a very important position in that Government. To this day they live on this paper railway policy, and they expect the people of the country to live on it also. Hon. gentlemen will understand what feelings prompt the hon. gentleman when he takes advantage of an occasion like this to present his statement to the House. He allowed the whole Session to pass without making a protest and it is only on almost the last day of the Session, the very day when the date of the question of prorogation is discussed in this House, that he brings up the question. What he would like us to do now is that the Government would withdraw the application of this money from the people of Cape Breton and let them live on paper railways for a little while longer. That would be on a par with the policy that my hon. friend (Mr. Flynn) enunciated in 1872, but that paper railway policy ceased to carry Cape Breton members to Parliament. The hon. member (Mr. Flynn) would lead the House to believe the other night that there had been no opportunity for bringing up this question now. It may be possible that when he goes back to the people who charged him with the responsibility of bringing this matter before Parliament, that he will say he had no opportunity of doing so earlier in the Session. For the information of my hon. friend, and for the information of the people who I have no doubt take a great interest in this matter, I will point out the number of opportunities that the hon. member for Richmond had to bring up this question. The hon. gentleman brought up the question to-day on a motion to go into Supply and let me point out that this House was moved into Supply, just the same as it was to-day, on the 12th February, on the 15th February, the 19th February, 22nd February, 1st March, 19th March, 22nd Mard, 28th March, 29th March, 2nd April, 5th April, 10th April, and to-day the 11th April. My hon. friend allowed every single one of those opportunities to pass without making his protest to this House. Hon. gentlemen will now see what force his remarks can have in the face of the action, or want of action, of the hon. gentleman himself. The hon. member, in order to show that this route was not properly selected by the Government used the argument

that there was an agitation in the Counties of Inverness and Victoria for the building of more railways, but he never attempted to present the argument that there was an agitation for building the line on the southern route except at the expense of the line that is now being built. He asks Parliament now to abandon this line which is being built, and some 40 or 50 miles of which is ready for the rails to be laid, and to adopt a route to the south of this, but he cannot present one argument to this House in favor of the route which the hon. gentleman himself advocates, except that it would benefit the extreme eastern point of the county which I have the honor to represent. My hon. friend has also made the statement to this House that my colleague from Cape Breton and myself were not supported by the majority of the people of the county when we appealed to them at the last election. I differ with my hon. friend on that question. It is true that in the county which I have the honor to represent there was a good deal of agitation got up, and agitation which I am prepared to explain to this House was got up under false statements and false pretences by the agitators in connection with this question. The people were led to take part in this agitation under a misapprehension of how this matter stood. It is true as the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) has said that important and leading gentlemen from my own county came on a delegation to the Government to tell them that they were making a mistake in selecting that route. But what has been the result? These gentlemen came here and told the Government that if they insisted on carrying the line through the central route, which is now adopted, the result would be they could not get a member from the island of Cape Breton elected to support them and that they could not in their appeal to the people of Cape Breton Island, expect a supporter of the Government returned, unless they adopted the route which those delegates favored. I had occasion to come here at that time, and I did not come at the request of any one in my county, but I took the responsibility on myself of coming here and telling the Government what I knew, and of telling them where those people misrepresented matters. Now, Sir, what followed? Those two popular gentlemen from my county—they were always known as popular men and they are known to-day as popular men, one of whom leads the Opposition in the Provincial Legislature of Nova Scotia and the other a Senator in this House, and we all know the popular position that that hon. gentleman occupied both in this House and in the county which he represented - those two gentlemen came here and the result goes to show that a mistake was made by these gentlemen notwithstanding that they were popular. They made all those strong statements to the Government in Ottawa and they went back to Cape Breton and undertook to bring out two independent candidates on the question of the route adopted by the Government. These candidates went from point to point in the county and used the charge against the Government that they adopted the wrong route, that they had adopted a route which was not acceptable to the majority of the people of the island or of the county; but what was the result? Those two candidates were defeated in the election and defeated so badly that they could not save their deposits of $200. Why should my hon. friend undertake to inform this House that these people had a majority of the people of the county at their back, when their candidates who ran on this issue supported by them, could not save their deposits at the election. My hon. friend (Mr. Flynn) may attempt to refute this statement, but I will refer him to the *Parliamentary Companion* and he will find there that in the last election I, who was charged with advising the Government to do what was so terribly wrong—not only to the people of the Island, but to the people of

the whole Dominion—I was returned at the head of the poll with 1,882 votes and my colleague from Cape Breton (Mr. McKeen) was next with 1,875 votes. I may inform my hon. friend if he does not know it, and I am sure he does, but I wish to inform the House that Mr. Murray, the Liberal candidate who was pitted against my colleague, would not undertake to discuss the question of routes during his candidacy. When in the north he was favorable to the northern route and when he was in the south he was favorable to the southern route, but he evaded the question as much as possible. That gentleman obtained his votes on purely personal and political principles. He got 1,702 votes as against 1,875 cast for my hon. colleague, (Mr. McKeen.) The Liberal candidate who was put up against myself was a Mr. Slattery living at the port of Louisburg and representing the voice of the people of the southern part of the county. He had the advantage of not only being a Liberal but of being a strong southern route man as well, but he only obtained 1,062 votes as against 1,882 for myself. Now I come to the candidates who were put up by the gentlemen who came as delegates to Ottawa to represent to the Government the mistake they were making. Mr. Gillies one of the independent candidates only obtained 895 votes as against the man who had committed this great wrong, according to the member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), and who had advised the Government to do what they did, and his independent colleague, who was put up against my hon. friend, got 518 votes, as against 1,875 polled for my colleague. That is my answer to my hon. friend's charge with regard to the feeling of the people in my own county on this question. On the occasion on which we discussed this question in this House two years ago, in reply to my hon. friend, I made reference to the fact that on my arrival at Ottawa at the time the delegation was here, I found that the statement was made by this delegation that the two Counties of Inverness and Victoria had no interest in the matter at all, and would be quite satified that the line should be built by the southern route; and they laid greater stress on that statement so far as the County of Victoria was concerned. Having heard that on my arrival here, I took the trouble of telegraphing to the leading men of both parties in the county of Victoria; and I will just read my message and their replies. I telegraphed to the Hon. C. J. Campbell, then representing the county in this House; to Dr. Bethune, who was an independent member in the Local Legislature; to Wm. McCurdy, who represented the county at that time as a supporter of the Liberal Government in the Province; to John A. McDonald, the present representative of the county in this House, and at that time a member of the Local House also; and C. R. Hart, a prominent merchant of the county. The question I put to them was this:

"Do people of Bad leck and Victoria County strongly favor Narrows route to preference to any southern route? Delegates here say not. Answer quickly."

This message was sent on the 7th of January, 1887, and I received the replies on the following day:

From C. J. Campbell:—"Of course people of Victoria strongly favor Central and Boisdale route as located, and will strongly protest against any change."

From J. L. Bethune:—"Victoria County unanimously prefer Narrows to southern route. Must have branch to Baddeck."

From Wm. F. McCurdy:—"I was under the impression that there is no doubt about feeling of Victoria in this matter. Baddeck and Victoria County generally have, and are, united, and will insist upon the Grand Narrows route in preference to any southern route."

From John A. McDonald:—"People of Baddeck and Victoria favor central route, southern routes are so far from us, and further, than eastern extension. Not a man in the county would vote for southern route in preference to Narrows route."

From C. R. Hart:—"Local and Dominion members, business men of the whole county, and all classes of people strongly favor central route in preference to any southern route."

These were the sentiments of the leading people of Victoria on that occasion, before the contract was let. Hon. gentlemen will understand the difference between what those people might be led to say then and what they would say to-day. They told us that they would not favor any other route, and that view has been supported by the people at the polls. There was no question at the polls as to the proper location. No one in the County of Victoria dared to open his mouth to question the route, and the hon. member who now represents the county was sent to this House, not only at that time, but on a second occasion, when the Liberal party would not bring out a candidate. In the County of Inverness there was no question of route either. The people of that county supported the route which has been adopted. They admitted that only one line could be built by the Government, especially in the meantime, and that the route which would serve the greatest number of people, and which they would support, was the route which would reach the harbor of Sydney, and if possible the harbor of Louisburg; and for that reason the people of Inverness could support no route, except that which has been adopted by the Government, and they would protest against the southern route, if the Government proposed to adopt it. More than that, three of those counties sent supporters of the Government at that election, while the one county that protested against the route which has been adopted, did not send a supporter of the Government. My hon. friend from Richmond, and the candidate against whom he ran, both protested against the route selected by the Government, and I venture to say, that if the people whose names were signed to the petition, which was presented to the House against the route, were to-day asked the question, they would say that that route is the one which serves the greater number. Now, I do not consider that it is necessary that I should delay the House any longer with regard to my hon. friend's statement, except to say this: We are urging the Government to extend that road to Louisburg, with the view to the development of our mines, and the route which my hon. friend described to this House would not touch those mines had it been adopted. He says that it should go by Loch Lomond, and that a branch should be built to Sydney, and on to Louisburg. Such a route would not touch a single mine in the county I represent, and, Sir, there is not a mine in the hon. gentleman's county. Of the $10,000,000 invested to day in the coal mining industry of Cape Breton, not one dollar is in the county represented by my hon. friend or on the route he advocates. The people who have signed the petition now before the House contend that the road must go to Louisburg; they admit also that it must go to Sydney, and they say they are quite willing that it should go to North Sydney. If that is the case, we must see what the mileage of this route would be. Road to Louisburg, 85 miles; branch to Sydney, 12 miles; Sydney to North Sydney, 18 miles; total, 115 miles; adding mileage required to connect all the mines with Louisburg, about forty miles; while we can connect all the mines with the present road with a mileage of some fifteen miles less. The House may not know that the route advocated by my hon. friend, with all those branches, is not as feasible or practicable, and not as favorably reported on by the engineers. The hon. gentleman is just as far in error in quoting the length of this route as he was in quoting about a route that was not adopted by the Government at all as an argument against the adopted route. He read from the report dealing with a route that goes by East Bay, 40 miles of which was not adopted by the Government, and over-looked the report on the Baisdale route, which has been adopted and more favorable than the one quoted from. My hon. friend pretends to know all about this road, but the display of knowledge that he gave to-day shows that he knows nothing, because he has to refer to reports in order to

obtain knowledge that he could get at his own door. I venture to say my hon. friend never traversed a mile of that road. I would like my hon. friend to say whether he has travelled over ten miles of that road between Hawksbury and the town of Sydney. Some of the bridges my hon. friend quoted as the heaviest structures on that line, apart from the Narrows, were bridges across rivers and streams over which the road, if it went by the southern route, would equally have to pass. No matter what route the Government adopted, the road would have to cross those streams over which are the heaviest structures. In the other cases of the heavy structures, they were on a road not adopted by the Government at all. My hon. friend quoted from the report of Mr. Hyndman, that there were 60 vessels passing the Grand Narrows every day, as a reason why the Government should build the Narrows bridge. I wish to inform my hon. friend there never has been a day yet, in the history of the Island of Cape Breton, when thirty vessels went through the Narrows. It is considered a great deal when 25 pass in one day. Quite a number do pass—5, 6, 10 or 15—and on a very exceptional day, 20, to which a bridge would not be any serious impediment. My hon. friend makes this statement from a report which he says himself is not a correct report, which he says is made with a view of influencing the Government to build up this road. These are the so-called incontrovertible statements quoted by my hon. friend. The remarks I have made, I believe, are sufficient to answer the charges made by the hon. gentleman, so far as the country is concerned and so far as the people of the Island are concerned; and with regard to my hon. friend's charges against the Government for their management of this work, I presume he will get his answer in that respect. It is not for me to defend the Government beyond what I know to be the facts within my own personal knowledge and the knowledge of the people I am here representing. I am very much obliged to the House for the patient attention given my remarks, and am sorry to have delayed the House at this late stage in the Session.

Mr. KIRK. Although I may be open to the charge made by the hon. member for Cape Breton against the hon. member for Richmond, of not knowing anything about this line in consequence of never having travelled over it, yet I feel it my duty to say a few words upon this question, because the work is one of very great importance, and one in which every hon. member cannot help feeling an interest in view of the amount of money required to build it. This is also a work in which I have always taken an interest, and since I have been in this House I have always had great pleasure in supporting it. So far as the location of the line is concerned, that is something I know very little about personally, but any hon. gentleman who will take the trouble to look at the map of Nova Scotia will see—even in the small scale as it is given in the report of the Minister of Railways—that the location of that line cannot be in the interest of the whole people. Cape Breton Island comprises four very important counties. This central line is on a location which any man who will look at the map must see does not and cannot accommodate the four counties, and can accommodate but a very small portion of one or two of them. When it was first proposed by the Government to locate the line on the central route, the people of Cape Breton, generally, viewed the proposition with considerable alarm. I remember at that time a public meeting was held in the town of Sydney, and that meeting condemned that route. They appointed a delegation to go to Ottawa for the purpose of laying the matter before the Government, and, if possible, to urge upon them the necessity of constructing the road by the southern route. The delegates appointed at that time were the Rev. James M. Quinan, Dr. Murdock Chisholm, Senator McDonald, and Dr. Wm. McKay. The delegates were all Con-

servatives, for the people knew well it would be useless to send a Liberal here. On that delegation were the four most influential Conservatives in the county. They presented to the Secretary of State in Ottawa the following letter:—

"The undersigned beg to enclose herewith petitions from electors of Cape Breton protesting against the adoption of central railway route, and praying for the adoption of the St. Peter's route. We are instructed to say that the warden of the County of Inverness and several electors of the said county signed said petitions."

Now, the senior member for Cape Breton has given to this House a large number of references in order to prove that the interests to serve by the central are greater than those to be served by the southern route. In answer to that I will give the hon. gentleman the letter which the delegates wrote with regard to that point:

"That by building *viâ* St Peter's and Loch Lomond, Sydney can be reached by 80 miles of railway easily constructed, and North Sydney by a branch of ten miles additional—making in all 90 miles, thereby saving 5 miles of railway, avoiding the ferry at Grand Narrows, and accommodating 50,000 of the population of the island."

Now, the largest population the hon. gentleman could get for the central route was 40,000, and I dare say he made it as large as he could. These delegates, who were not personally interested in the matter, stand in this respect in contrast with the senior member for Cape Breton, who not only owns a large portion of land near the line, but is otherwise personally interested. The delegates conclude:

"Moreover, by this route, all due encouragement would be given to agricultural, mining and fishing interests, as the statement already submitted to your honorable body sufficiently proves."

I have not that statement, but this letter is a complete answer to the hon. gentleman as regards the interest to be served. We have been told by the hon. member for Richmond, and it has not been denied, that this central route will cost $3,850,000 to complete. Now, when we consider that when this line was first spoken of in 1883, and the resolution was brought down by the Minister of Railways, asking the House to vote the sum of $3,200 per mile to build this road, or a sum total of $256,000, he led this House to believe then that that was a sufficient sum to build this road, that all he wanted was $256,000, to build the road from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg and Sydney, in Cape Breton, and when he was asked by the hon. member for West Durham if he had any assurance that the company would complete the work with this subsidy, he said:

"I have the assurance of the General Manager, Colonel Snow, that they will. Previous to his leaving here, I told him, although I knew the work was more costly in Cape Breton than in other sections, I was not prepared to recommend a subsidy of over $3,200 per mile, and I asked him before taking that step, whether he would be prepared to carry out the work, and he assured me they would."

He also said:

"I have taken great pains to ascertain the financial standing and position of this company, and I think I am in a position to state that, whatever work they engage in, they will carry through. The Government made a contract with them to extend the line from Oxford to New Glasgow, and, although they have made great progress with it and incurred large expense, they have not yet called for any portion of the subsidy, so that I have no doubt at all as to their financial ability. Dr. Norwin Green, a well known capitalist, and a gentleman connected with a great many railway corporations in New York, who is associated with parties who can command any amount of capital, is the president of this company, which, I am sure, will vigorously carry the work to completion, provided they accept the subsidy. They asked for a larger subsidy."

So the House will see that the Government were exceedingly modest in asking the House to begin the work; but, once they had begun it and had pledged the House to it, they were compelled to go on, and that road, which was to cost the country only $256,000, has now cost $3,800,000. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) has stated that the southern route would only have cost $2,100,000, so that

there is a difference of no less than $1,700,000. I maintain that, if the southern route had been adopted the difference of expense between that and the central route would have been sufficient to build another railway through the Counties of Inverness and Victoria, which the people of those Counties are asking for, and those two roads would have amply accommodated all the interests in the Island of Cape Breton, whereas this road will only accommodate one County and a portion of another of the four counties in the Island of Cape Breton. I do not desire to detain the House in regard to this subject. I have only to say that, in talking with people from Cape Breton who are perfectly familiar with all the circumstances in connection with this road and all the interests to be served by it, men, too, who are strong supporters of the Government, men whom I have never before heard say a solitary syllable against the Tory Government, they have declared to me that this was a most scandalous waste of public money, and that a Government which would expend money to build the line by the central route, ought not to be permitted to exist for any time. This is the opinion of some of the strongest Conservatives I have met, who know all about the different routes, and this is their ground, because they maintain, as I do, that this money would have built two roads on each side of the Bras d'Or.

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

After Recess.

Mr. KIRK. Had the money been appropriated and expended on the southern route, there would have been a sufficient sum left to secure the building of the road through Inverness and Victoria, for which, I understand, the municipal council of Inverness have recently voted to tax themselves $100,000. Then the people of Inverness need not have taxed themselves $1, except for the right of way, and that line would not have interfered, in the slightest degree, with the navigation of the Bras d'Or, or with the navigation at the Grand Narrows. The senior member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), in his speech this afternoon, charged the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) with having sat silent in his seat, during all this Session, and during other Sessions as well, without saying anything against this central route.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). I did not say other Sessions; I said this Session.

Mr. KIRK. It appears to me that there was no necessity for my hon. friend from Richmond to say anything against the route this Session. He had placed his opinions on record with regard to that route in other Sessions, but, that he did not speak earlier this Session on the question of the Grand Narrows bridge he is not to be blamed for. He presented three petitions from the people of Inverness, who seemed to be very much agitated on the subject of the Grand Narrows bridge, and he was prepared, if he had had an opportunity, to make a speech on this question at an earlier date, but he only got an opportunity to do so to-day.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Will the hon. member state when the House refused the hon. gentleman an opportunity?

Mr. KIRK. He had an opportunity on one occasion at 1 o'clock in the morning to go on and make his speech, but he did not think it proper to go on at that hour, and he would not have done himself justice if he had gone on at that time to make a speech of an hour and a half. He was wise not to make his speech on that occasion, but he took the first opportunity afterwards, and it is not yet too late to bring this question before the House.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). After the money is voted.

Mr. KIRK. No one heard until last fall of the intention of the Government to build a bridge across the Grand Narrows. It was always understood that they intended to operate the road with a steam ferry, and not to build a bridge there. Consequently, there was no necessity to deal with that question until now, but the Government have now decided to build a bridge across the Grand Narrows, which, many people believe, will very much interfere with the navigation there. I think, when this House appropriates large sums of money to establish a public highway, they should take very good care that in doing this they should not destroy any existing highway which is quite as important as the one they are constructing. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr Flynn) has pointed out clearly that to build a bridge across the Grand Narrows would greatly interfere with the navigation of the Narrows, and would almost utterly destroy the St. Peter's Canal which has been constructed at a cost of more than half a million of dollars. Anyone by looking at the map can see that a bridge there would be exposed on each side to the open sea. The tide, in ebbing and flowing there, has a very rapid current; and we are informed, too, that the anchorage there is very poor, and that being the case it must necessarily interfere very seriously with navigation, and for that reason the people are considerably exercised over the matter. But what is the use? They know perfectly well that it is no use to petition this Government in regard to the matter; they know the petitions would be treated just as the delegates were who were sent up against the adoption of the route. They know the Government will do this, and they know it will be supported by the members from Cape Breton; for that reason, no doubt, the people have refrained from petitioning Parliament not to destroy this highway into the Bras d'Or Lake.

Mr. CAMERON. I regret to be called upon to speak on this question at this late stage of the Session. Notwithstanding what my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Kirk) has said, the member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) had several opportunities since the commencement of the Session to air his views on this question. It is a singular fact that he deferred discussion on this question until this stage of the Session. He had opportunities to talk upon it, even before tenders were asked for the Narrows bridge, and he had several opportunities to air his views against building that bridge before the time of receiving tenders had expired. But he failed to discharge his duty to his constituents, and persistently declined to bring this matter before the attention of the House until the tenders were in, the contract signed, and the question placed beyond the power of this House. But he had an object in view, evidently; he supposed that at this late stage of the Session, the members of the House would be very anxious to get through the business, and would be so impatient that, after listening to his dissertation on this subject, they would not hear any other member. But I hope the House will forbear with me, because I have not occupied much of its time for the last two or three Sessions, while I give my views on this question. The hon. member from Guysborough tried to mislead the House to believe that the cost of the line by the central route will be great enough to enable railway companies to build all the branch lines, not only in Cape Breton but in Nova Scotia as well. This is a mere delusion on his part, and he will fail to convince the House that such would be the case. The central route is 98¾ miles in length, including the branches. The estimated cost of that road is $20,000 per mile, it may cost more. But the line defined by my hon. friend from Richmond is 108 miles long, and the estimated cost of that road also is $20,000 per mile; so it is fair to estimate that if the southern route were adopted

it would cost equally as much, because the estimated cost is the same as that of the central route. Therefore, the route asked for by my hon. friend from Richmond would cost not only as much as the central route, but would cost besides nearly as much as the Grand Narrows bridge will cost. It is, therefore, very unfair for my hon. friend to endeavor to mislead the House as he has done. He cannot mislead the people on the Island to believe that the cost of the central route would be sufficient to build not only the southern route but all the branch lines on the Island. I think it is also unfair for my hon. friends opposite to ignore the fact, that, while the people were building roads in Nova Scotia proper at the expense of the local treasury and of the Dominion treasury as well, the private enterprise of the residents of Cape Breton built not less than seventy miles of railway without any aid from either Government. This is a fact which our friends from Guysborough and Richmond ought to be candid enough to lay before the House in justification of the Government assuming the responsibility of building only ninety-eight miles at the exclusive expense of the Dominion treasury. But Cape Breton railway agitation has a history. Those of you who were in the House during the term between 1883 and 1887 may recollect that on more than one occasion I felt it my duty to air this question. I was accused more than once of tracing the history of the Island of Cape Breton from some time prior to the flood up to the present time, in endeavoring to lead the Government to undertake to subsidise partially a line through the island. It has been my policy, and I never hesitated to say so in public or in private, to induce the Dominion Government to build the main line at the exclusive expense of the Dominion treasury, and to grant the usual aid given to local railways for the purpose of building branch lines. In 1883 I advocated this course. During that term a promoter of the short line from Montreal to Sydney and Louisburg, was in the city of Ottawa pressing the claims of his company for the usual subsidy of $3,200 per mile for a branch line through the island, and also a subsidy for all the unconstructed links between the Strait of Canso and Montreal. During that Session I took a leading part in the agitation, and I was misled to believe that the Local Government of Nova Scotia would aid us in the construction of that line, because at that time the line between New Glasgow and the Strait of Canso was in the hands of a private company, and it was impossible, I might say, for the Dominion Government to undertake the construction of the Cape Breton section as an extension of the Intercolonial Railway. But, I then advocated the purchase from the company of the eastern extension and the assumption by the Dominion Parliament of the extension through the Island. My remarks on that occasion will be found in *Hansard*, 1883, page 1272. After showing the wisdom of the Government in constructing the line from Moncton to Louisburg or Sydney as part of the Intercolonial, I concluded as follows:—

"Under these circumstances, in the near future, it is just possible that the line between Truro and the Strait of Canso, instead of being a local line, will eventually become a part of the Intercolonial Railway; and the extension of this line from the Strait of Canso to Sydney or Louisburg will only be a construction of a road which is a Dominion line. It is, therefore, evident that the Dominion Government has an interest in that extension as a feeder to a road which may, in the near future, become a road owned by the Government; and whether this will be so or not it is well known that the Eastern Extension through Cape Breton to Sydney or Louisburg will be a feeder to the Intercolonial from Truro westward. On these grounds I hold that it should not be considered a local road. Although the subsidy for Cape Breton is not as large as the people of the island would possibly desire, and although I have no doubt that they would expect and suggest a larger subsidy, still I hold that this subsidy will be sufficient to ensure the extension of the road from the Strait of Canso to Sydney or Louisburg; and that, as soon as railway enterprise will take a firm footing on the island, it will no doubt ensure a network of railroads over that island, developing the resources of this important section of the Dominion."

That was my idea in 1883. At that time the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia promised us not only $3,200 per mile, but they promised a great deal more, if necessary, for the completion of the road. The promoter of the road, who was here at that time, assured me that he had a guarantee from the Local Government of $3,200 per mile, which the Company led me to believe would, in addition to the Dominion subsidy, enable it to construct the road through the island. In order that there may be no doubt about it I will quote the utterances of members of the Local Legislature during 1883; which will be conclusive on that point. They were made in a discussion in the Local Legislature in Nova Scotia, with a view to obtaining the Eastern Extension and the Pictou Branch from the company owning it and utilising the whole line for the purpose of railway extension in Cape Breton. The company while here were led to believe that the Local Government would give them the Pictou Branch and the Eastern Extension in addition to a Dominion subsidy of $3,200 per mile, and that would enable the company to complete the road through the island. During that discussion, Dr. Haley, member for Nova Scotia and a good Grit, said:

"I am willing to support the Government in maturing the transfer of the Pictou Branch and Eastern Extension by purchase from the Local Government, because I believe they are taking over a valuable asset. We believe, as I have said already, the Eastern Extension is one of the most valuable assets of the Province of Nova Scotia, and though the western counties do not receive any advantage from the taking over of this road, yet I, as a western member, am willing to vote for railway extension in the Island of Cape Breton from the proceeds of the sale of the road."

This was the opinion of one of the hon. gentlemen representing Nova Scotia. We have also the opinion of another hon. member in regard to the same question. He said:

"The road is the key by which to open railway construction in the Island of Cape Breton. I and my friend expect the Government to deal with the question so as to secure railway extension in Cape Breton."

This was the language used by the member for Victoria on 16th April, 1883, during the time the representatives of the Short Line Railway were here agitating for a Dominion subsidy. We have also the opinion of Mr. McCoy, a supporter of the Local Government on this question. He said:

"Now, I would like to ask my hon. friend and every member in this House if he would undertake to say that the Eastern Extension Railway and the Pictou Branch, even with the low rates of freight imposed by the present Government, does not pay a handsome dividend to-day. They (the Opposition) will be prepared to assist the Government in raising the funds to enable them to pay for the railway and place it in the hands of the Government, so as to enable them to carry the railway into the Island of Cape Breton, not stopping short at St. Peter's, but carrying it through to its proper termination."

The Premier said:

"It would be with great pride that I would be enabled to carry out a policy that would send the iron horse running through the gem of the ocean, the Island of Cape Breton."

This was the opinion of the leader of the Local Government in Nova Scotia at the time. In fact I might quote from every Grit supporter of the Local Government, and from every member of the Local Government as well, to prove that the object which they had in view, in the purchase of the Eastern Extension from the company at that time, was simply for the purpose of granting it as a bonus to a railway company for the purpose of extending the line through the Island. Was it, therefore, unreasonable for me to believe that they would carry out their promises? I so represented the state of things in this House and on the strength of those representations, aided by the unanimous vote of this House, the votes of the Opposition as well as those of the Government, a subsidy of $3,200 per mile was granted to the company. But, unfortunately, as soon as the Local Government of Nova Scotia secured the support of our deluded friends from Cape Breton to purchase the Eastern Extension, so soon did they repudiate the promises made at the time the question was under discussion in the Local

House. They acquired the power to purchase in the spring of 1883, as they represented for the sole purpose of giving both the Pictou Branch and the Eastern Extension as a subsidy for the construction of the road through the Island. But to our great surprise we found that the *Morning Chronicle*, the organ of the Local Government, on 13th November, 1883, editorially concluded as follows:—

"The Dominion Government have been humbugging Cape Breton long enough; they voted $12,000 a mile for a road in Ontario, while they fooled Cape Breton with an offer of $3,200 per mile which they knew would not be acted upon. They have millions of money to spare, they can give Cape Breton a railway if they want to do so. The Local Government's liberal offer has been before them for months. They ought to have accepted it long ago, let them accept it now."

This was the position of the Local Government as far as we can judge from the utterances of their organ, and we find that besides repudiating promises which were made to us by representations in the Local Legislature, by letter and otherwise, they, as soon as the Dominion Government granted a subsidy of $3,200 per mile, repudiated their promises. The result was that which we hoped to attain shortly after the vote was granted here, was as for from being accomplished as ever. In the meantime the Local Government purchased the Eastern Extension and the Pictou Branch, and, besides, they sold that line to the Dominion Government before 1884. You would suppose that after they had sold the Pictou Branch and the Eastern Extension they would at least give us the proceeds of the sale for the purpose of extending the line through the island. All their professions of friendship to Cape Breton during the time they were agitating for power to purchase the road from the company, misled us to believe that they would either give us the road itself or the proceeds of the sale for the purpose of extending the line through the Island. But they did neither one nor the other, and you will be surprised to learn that up to the present time they did not expend a dollar on railways in the Island of Cape Breton. In 1884 the company presented itself again here and held that if they secured a subsidy of $3,200 per mile additional to that given to them in 1883 by this Parliament, it would enable them to finish the road, and the prospects of securing it were so good that the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia, and particularly the Grit portion of that Legislature, determined that something would have to be done to prevent the construction of any railroad in the Island. We find that the policy of that party in Nova Scotia since 1867 has been to delude the people of Cape Breton, to believe that they were friendly to that Island, and whenever they voted subsidies for the purpose of constructing railways in Nova Scotia proper, they always held out the hope that Cape Breton would receive a proportionate amount. In 1876 there were $2,000,000 to the credit of the Nova Scotia Government in the Dominion treasury and at that time the Local Government in Nova Scotia, which was a Grit Government, sub-divided that amount for railway purposes. They granted $600,000 for branch lines in Cape Breton and the balance for other branches in Nova Scotia proper; but, as usual, they went back on their promise to Cape Breton, and while they secured the aid of its representatives for the purpose of obtaining subsidies for their own roads, as soon as they secured the subsidies they repudiated their promise to the people of Cape Breton. At that time they granted $4,000 per mile for a branch line through Inverness and $5,000 per mile for a line from the Straits of Canso to Sydney or Louisburg, but they succeeded in defeating the construction of the railways in the same manner as they always prevent the construction of any line on that island; that was by creating dissensions among the people themselves in reference to the routes. In fact on the eve of every occasion when it was probable that the people of Cape Breton would secure railway extension through that island the Local Legislature since 1867, ruled by the Grits principally, always managed to create dissension for the purpose of preventing the construction of the road. In 1884, they felt alarmed, they feared that the subsidy granted in 1883 and the subsidy in prospect in 1884, which was equivalent to $3,200 per mile and the Eastern Extension, granted by this Parliament for that purpose, would cause the line to be carried out and they found that it was necessary for them to make a movement which would be calculated to counteract that enterprise. We find that on the 10th March, 1884, Premier Fielding, the Grit Premier of the present Government, delivered himself in the House of Assembly as follows:—

"Hon. W. Fielding said: The suggestion of the Hon. Attorney General ought to meet the wishes of the hon. gentlemen opposite. The Bill was not being passed there a final stage. He did not agree with the member for Inverness (Mr. Fielding was referring to the local member for the County of Inverness) as he thought it was no harm to have more companies than one chartered for railway purposes. He had seen a telegram in a Cape Breton paper suggesting that the granting of that charter was going to embarrass the Dominion Government, but though he for one was inclined to look to the Dominion Government to assist in railway building in the Island of Cape Breton, he did not see how the passage of this Bill, and the conditions suggested by the hon. the Attorney General, could have any such effect."

It may seem singular to hon. gentlemen in this House to hear what the Premier of Nova Scotia said in 1884 in view of the fact that he and his Government misled the people of Cape Breton to believe that his whole aim in purchasing the Eastern Extension and the Pictou Branch, in 1883, from the company then holding it was for the purpose of giving the whole of that line for railway extension in Cape Breton. As soon as he secured the object he had in view, that is, the support of the Cape Breton members to his scheme, he repudiated it, subsidising another line on the 10th March, 1884. But he then found it necessary to create dissensions as usual for the purpose of preventing the construction of the road and by the language which I have quoted he aided the passage of a rival charter for a railway through the island. The Short Line Railway Company was prepared to construct the road from the Straits of Canso to Sydney or Louisburg at that time, and it had also a charter to build a branch as far north as Cape North through the County of Inverness. But the Local Government chartered a rival company for the purpose of having a rivalry of routes, and for the purpose of having a competition between the two companies for the Dominion subsidy. That company was named the Cape Breton Railway Extension Company, Limited; and as hon. gentlemen who happened to be in this House at the time know, they elected as president of that company the illustrious predecessor of the hon. member for Richmond. At that time that gentleman was the instrument that was used for the purpose of preventing the construction of any railway in Cape Breton by the Short Line Railway Company; and the Premier of Nova Scotia aided and abetted him in securing a charter for that purpose. I recollect having written to Mr. Alex. Campbell, the local member for Inverness, to whom the Premier of Nova Scotia referred at the time. My object was to ascertain whether the Local Government would aid the Dominion Government in subsidising a company to build a line through the Island; and I received a reply from Mr. Campbell, dated 25th February, 1884, in which he says:

"My Dear Doctor,—Yours of the 20th is at hand. I immediately called on the Attorney-General and asked him if he would press on the Government either of these propositions, that is, the $4,000 per mile or the increase on royalty. He told me that he was willing to do more if it was necessary, and give me the enclosed note. He has introduced a Bill last Friday to incorporate a company to build railroads in the Island of Cape Breton, which I think is the very company you allude to. I enclose the name of the body incorporated. I have prepared a Bill to revive the Acts of 1875."

Here is the assurance given in writing by the Attorney-General of Nova Scotia, dated 25th February, 1884, in his own hand:

"I am satisfied the Local Government will aid even to a greater extent than you suggest.

"A. J. WHITE."

I am sure that any hon. gentleman in this House who knows the difficulties companies have to secure money to enable them to construct railways, will admit that to obtain two or three charters over the same line, granted by any Legislature, is the way best calculated to defeat the object in view. This was the course pursued by the Local Government of Nova Scotia at the time, led by the present Premier of Nova Scotia; and he succeeded in defeating the object we had in view, namely, the construction of a railway through the Island of Cape Breton by a company. In 1886 the Dominion Parliament decided to build a main line exclusively at the expense of the Dominion treasury. My hon. friend from Richmond has referred to the public meeting held in the County of Inverness in 1886. That meeting was called for the purpose of securing the opinion of the people of the county in reference to the vexed question of railway extension through the Island. A resolution was passed at that meeting, unanimously desiring that the Dominion Government should build a main line exclusively at the expense of the Dominion treasury, and that the Local Government should be asked to subsidise local lines; the municipal councils of the Counties of Victoria, Cape Breton and Richmond passed similar resolutions; and, in 1886, an attempt was made in this House to create a discussion on rival routes. I expressed my opinion in reference to that question on the floor of this House at that time. I urged the predecessor of the hon. member for Richmond not to discuss the question of routes. I held that if a company could be got to undertake to build a line from the Strait of Canso to Sydney or Louisburg, the wisest course would be to leave the company absolutely to decide the route, and that if the Dominion Government would undertake the construction of the line, it should have the right to select the route. Although I was always favorable to the construction of the road by the central route, yet I never felt that either a company or the Government that would make accurate surveys and see the character of the country through which the different lines would pass, would ever undertake the construction of the road from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg by the southern route. I was perfectly willing, indeed anxious, to leave the selection of the route to either the company or the Government if it would undertake the construction of the road, and I so expressed myself in this House. As soon as the Local Government, led by that astute little Premier, the Hon. W. S. Fielding, found that the Dominion Government assumed the responsibility of constructing the line, as a main line through the Island, as desired unanimously by the municipal councils of Victoria, Inverness, Cape Breton and also Richmond, in January, 1886, they took immediate steps to create, if possible, dissensions on the Island with a view to counteract the political effect which the construction of the main line might have on the people of the Island; and in 1887 we find that they turned their attention particularly to Inverness. During the agitation between 1872 and 1887, the discussion on the question of rival routes in Cape Breton convinced every railway company that purposed to build through that Island, and the Dominion Government as well, that it would be madness for any company or for the Government to build any line as a main line through the Island unless by the central route. No sane company having in view local traffic would ever undertake to construct a line from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg by the southern route. Notwithstanding what my hon. friend has said, I, who know the character of the country through which that line would pass, know, without any assistance from the reports of engineers, that the southern route would cost as much as, if not more, than the central route, and that the line which he advocates would be a longer one than that which the Government have adopted. Now, what did they do in Inverness in 1887, when they found it was necessary to turn their attention to myself in particular? The Short Line Railway Company had a charter for the purpose of building a branch line to Inverness. They found this was not sufficient, notwithstanding the fact that a company had already a charter, and the Local Government of Nova Scotia, in 1887, chartered two other rival companies for the purpose of constructing a branch line through the County of Inverness. In fact, there was much excitement among capitalists to get hold of a branch through Inverness, on account of the representations made by the advocates of the southern route, representing that the enormous resources of Inverness were of such a character that no local line was as necessary as a branch line through that county. This agitation created such excitement among capitalists to get hold of the construction of a branch line, with the view of making immense profits, that no less than four companies secured charters from the Local Legislature for the purpose of building branch lines. I, who know something about the difficulties which companies have in raising capital for the purpose of constructing lines in any part of the Dominion, concluded at once that it was the same old game practiced, not to knock the heads of the people of Cape Breton against each other, but to crack the head of the member of Inverness against his own. They had only one head to deal with. They had four charters for the purpose of building branch lines through Inverness, and they sent the four companies up to the Parliament of Canada to secure a subsidy for each branch line. The Local Government of Nova Scotia, by an Act of Parliament, promised each company chartered by the Local Legislature for the purpose of building branch lines through Inverness a subsidy of $3,200 per mile and a land subsidy of 2,000 acres per mile. I have only, to prove this, to quote section 5, chapter 1, of the Acts of 1886, which is known in my county as a lobster clause of the Nova Scotia Railway Act. This clause promised to every chartered company in Nova Scotia $3,200 per mile, and a land subsidy of 2,000 acres, and no less than four applications were sent to your humble servant for the purpose of securing the Dominion subsidy of $3,200 a mile for four of them from the Dominion Parliament. This is the clause to which I refer:

"The Governor in Council may grant to any company offering to construct any line of railway in Nova Scotia, not already subsidised by the Province, a cash subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and a land subsidy not exceeding 2,000 acres per mile, provided that such subsidy shall not in any case be granted until the company offering to construct the railway shall have furnished to the Governor in Council satisfactory evidence that it has at its disposal, either from grants provided by the Parliament of Canada, or from private capital, or from both, funds sufficient, with the subsidies authorised by this part of this Act, to complete such railway, and shall have given ample security for said completion."

The Local Government chartered four railway companies for the purpose of constructing branch lines through Inverness, and the representatives of each railway company appealed to me to assist it, and secure the Dominion subsidy for itself. In order to show you that I am not exaggerating, I shall call your attention to only one of the demands made by one of those companies, because it would prolong the Session until July next before I could get through with the history of the deception practiced by the Grit Local Government of Nova Scotia on the people of Cape Breton. I shall quote the high authority of the leader of the Local Government, Premier Fielding, as to the manner in which they were always able to butt the heads of the Cape Breton people against each

other by agitation on rival routes. On 10th April, 1888, Mr. Fielding said:

"It has been the fact in times past that a skilful political leader could knock the heads of the two divisions of Cape Breton together, and prevent anything like united action on the part of Cape Breton members, by raising the question of the rival routes. In fact the question of the rival routes in Cape Breton is a more serious question than the rivalry between the mainland and Cape Breton. I have my own opinions on the subject, but I would be quite willing to grant aid to either of these routes, if the company on commercial principles was ready to build on either of them; but if we are forced to decide between the routes, as we would be by this resolution, then I see great difficulty in the way. I am quite willing to admit the strong claims of Cape Breton. If this resolution had the approval of all the members from the Island, if it could be taken as a fair indication of the interests of Cape Breton, then it might be an indication of the line of policy which this Government would adopt. But I am afraid it does not; I am afraid it brings up the question of the rival routes, an exceedingly difficult question. On behalf of the Government I have to say that, if any company be found to build a railway in Cape Breton, the Government will be ready to aid in that work to the extent of their power."

The Grit Premier of Nova Scotia knew well the manner in which he could always create dissension among the people of Cape Breton, for preventing the construction of any railway in any part of the Island, and since 1887 he has devoted his special attention to Inverness. As I stated, the Local Government chartered no less than four railway companies to build branch lines through that county, and I will only refer to the representations made by one of these companies to myself in order to show the manner in which they have been trifling with the important question of branch lines in that county. On all occasions, the Local Government of Nova Scotia managed to secure the aid of some representative from the Island to mislead the people. That Government knew full well that, if any representative or any person from the mainland attempted to practice such deception upon our people, they would not believe him, and therefore they always adopted some person who they believed would have the confidence of the people. In 1887, after they chartered two companies, two in that Session itself, knowing that there were two railway charters for that county previously, they set on my trail an old friend, who held the confidence of the people for a long time, and I have no doubt holds the confidence of a section of the people of that county now. He was to be set on my trail for the purpose of misleading the people of Cape Breton to believe that that Government were in earnest in their professions of friendship for the County of Inverness at all events, for at that time they were ignoring the other counties in the Island. I will read the following letter which I received from that gentleman:

"HALIFAX, 18th May, 1887.

"H. CAMERON, Esq., M.P.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I have not troubled you with any letters of mine this Session, but have watched that so far you have been silent on Cape Breton interests. Mr. McRam is here from New York with full powers to negotiate and enter into contract for the building of the branch lines of railway in your county. I understand that Mr. McNeil, a member of the Local Government, took some care to have the enclosed Incorporation Act passed, and views, with much favor, the lines of railway to be opened up, so that through him the co-operation of the Local Government, to the extent of $3,200 per mile and some other concessions, will be assumed. The company comprised of wealthy capitalists, require no municipal concessions or guarantees further than the right of way and exemptions from taxation, while I notice that some other incorporated company requires municipal guarantees which, at the outset, shall create doubt and distrust of their being able to successfully complete any great undertaking of this kind. My object in writing you is that you had some correspondence with Mr. McRam, and that with A. McRay, Esq., a member of the Legislative Council, we saw the Provincial Secretary here and explained to him the object of commencing soon in order to have the line completed in the time mentioned in the Act. He stated that the first move should be by the Dominion Government in procuring the subsidy either in the Estimates or by resolution, and once the contract would be entered into then that his Government would be prepared to do their part. In the absence of his council he was not prepared to give any written guarantees until further progress was made at Ottawa, but that he would view with favor these important lines, and once the company would show that they had made proper arrangements with the Dominion Government and prove to their satisfaction their ability to build this road within a reasonable time, then that the $3,200 per mile would be provided by them, making payments whenever ten miles was finished. The Local Government would be deeply interested in having a road to the Inverness coal fields, shipping during winter at Cariboo Cove and probably at Cheticamp during the opening of navigation. The object now will be to see that the Dominion subsidy would be provided for in the Estimates or by resolution in your House. I understand that another company is incorporated, but the very fact of their seeking municipal guarantee for the interest of $100,000 as being made a consideration proves that they are more adventurers who simply desire to sell their charter. You can readily understand that Mr. McNeil would not view favorably any line that would not include Port Hood and the shore which the other company would not do. Mr. McRam is here now and he is waiting for further instructions from Mr. Bell, then he may have to proceed to Ottawa. The Incorporation Act will speak for itself, and I have no doubt you will be able to see that money matters will be arranged there so that the contract may be entered into soon. The engineer and staff are ready now to come to locate the line as soon as matters are pressed forward a step or two. You may understand that I have no direct interest in this matter only as far as it tends to the general development and prosperity of our common country.

"In haste,

"Yours very sincerely,

"W. ROSS."

Every person who knows the gentleman who signed this letter must know that he is a person who has taken a very active part in the politics of Nova Scotia. You find, by his letter, that he was fresh from the office of Premier Fielding of Nova Scotia, and he was only representing one of the four companies that sent representatives to me in a similar manner asking me to secure aid for a branch line through the island. All this was done with the view of preventing the construction of the line through that county. The subsidy to which my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Kirk) referred as having been granted by the municipality of Inverness was not granted for the company in whose behalf Mr. Ross wrote to me, but to another of the rival companies, so that at the very threshold of the agitation for the construction of branch lines in Inverness, the Premier of Nova Scotia has taken this effective means for the purpose of preventing it; but, as he found that even yet there was very great danger of the company undertaking the construction of the line with the offer of a subsidy which was given by the Local Government of Nova Scotia, it was found necessary, not only to have all these rival companies chartered, but to pull wires in order to divide the company against itself. We find that the company to which my friend, Mr. Ross, referred was organised in Halifax on 12th September, 1887. It was agreed between Mr. Allen and Mr. Bell to undertake the construction of that road. The agreement between them reads as follows:—

"Whereas the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, Limited, was incorporated by the Legislature of Nova Scotia, 3rd May, 1887, and William H. Bell and Frank B. Allen have undertaken to build said road, it is agreed between them as follows:—That the sum of $400,000 in the bonds of the said road shall be set aside to be sold or hypothecated to raise the sum of $100,000 to be used in the construction of said road; that all interests beyond this amount belong to the said Bell and Allen jointly, and other and further negotiations shall be by their joint consent; and all moneys advanced by either of them shall be a credit to the party advancing the same; and no bonds or stock of said road shall be issued to either party without their mutual consent; and all stock issued shall be held by the treasurer of the road till a mutual division shall take place between the parties hereto; that the money necessary to finish the survey now under way shall be advanced by the said Allen on the condition above set forth; that should said bonds not be negotiated, such other arrangements looking to the raising of money on bonds and stocks of the company shall be by their mutual consent."

This company, then, was prepared to undertake the construction of the road under these conditions, but the Premier of Nova Scotia managed to divide the two leading heads of this organisation, one against the other. Here is a statement given to me by the president of the company, W. H. Bell, of the holders of the stock subscribed on that occasion: Frank B. Allen, 990 shares; John M. Dow, 10 shares; W. H. Bell, 1,000 shares; William Ross, 10 shares; William Dunn Allen, 10 shares. Although Mr. Ross de-

clared in the commencement of his letter that he had no connection with this road, we find he was one of the shareholders of the company; and we find that, immediately after the Local Government set to work to divide this company into two sections, he did all he could to prevent the other section from securing a subsidy from the Local or Dominion Government. Not only so, but there were other companies chartered by the Local Government, who pursued the same course. While I listened to the hon. members for Richmond and Guysborough assailing the Dominion Government for undertaking the construction of a line through the Island, I could not help remembering the deception practiced by the party with which these members had been associated in Nova Scotia, whose Government misled the people of Cape Breton to believe that they had always been friendly to the construction of roads through that Island, for the purpose of securing aid for roads in which the people of the mainland were much interested; and since 1877 they have pursued the iniquitous course of chartering several rival lines through the County of Inverness for the purpose of creating dissension, so as to prevent the construction of a branch line through that county. Every hon. gentleman in this House who knows anything about the construction of railways, must admit that it would be practically impossible for any company to build any of these rival lines as long as there are so many charters granted by the Local Government for the purpose of building branch lines through the county. I have no hesitation in saying, in answer to my hon. friend from Richmond, that, so far as the County of Inverness is concerned, the people are all but unanimous in favor of the construction of the line by the central route, and equally as unanimous in favor of the construction of the Grand Narrows Bridge. He need not attempt to mislead this House to believe that the contrary is the fact; they are all interested in building a branch line through the County of Inverness for the purpose of developing the enormous resources of that county, particularly in coal which lies dormant beneath the soil. They know full well that the construction of the Narrows Bridge is the key by which a company can be secured for the purpose of building that branch line; and he will represent to this House and to the country in vain, that the majority of the people of the Island are either against the construction of the main line, or the construction of the bridge. I felt it my duty to show the deception which has been practiced by the Grit Governments of Nova Scotia on the people of the Island from 1867 to the present time, and that deception is being practiced, not only in the Local Legislature, but by members of this House for the purpose of continuing the same policy. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) kindly asked for a grant from this Parliament last year for a branch line through Inverness. I had forgotten at the time to thank him for the manner in which he asked the House to subsidise that road to the extent of $3,200 per mile. But when I find that the Government which he supports in Nova Scotia has chartered four rival companies for the purpose of building branch lines through the Island, and that the same Government is promising $3,200 per mile to each of the rival companies, I feel that the sincerity which characterises their conduct, had to some extent characterised the conduct of my hon. friend who so kindly advocated a subsidy for that line, which is very essential, and which will, in the near future, be constructed, but never as long as the little Premier of Nova Scotia rules the destinies of that Province and of that Island.

Mr. McKEEN. The persistent hostility of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) to the Government's railway policy in Cape Breton, is to be regretted, inasmuch as the valuable time of this House has been taken up in discussing a matter which, from the circumstances, cannot do any good to the Island of Cape Breton or the country at large. During the Session of 1887 the hon. gentleman very fully discussed this question and elaborated his grievances at great length. During that discussion it was shown I think conclusively, that the policy of the Government in the location of the road through the Island of Cape Breton, had been fully endorsed by the people concerned. I think it was then shown that three at least, out of four counties of that Island, had approved of the location of that road, to which such great exception has been taken by the hon. member for Richmond. As the hon. member has chosen to mention my name in connection with the discussion which took place on that occasion, I will ask the House to listen to a few remarks I made then, which he did not quote in his speech this afternoon:

"It is a most unfortunate fact that the noble Island of Cape Breton is so nearly bisected as to make it almost two Islands, and being two islands, it is entirely impossible to locate a line of railway which will suit both the north and the south sides of the island. Much might be said in favor of both routes, and I feel a good deal of sympathy with the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), but unfortunately, his county is situated on the southern side of the island, and it does not derive the benefit from the proposed line of the road that the other side does. I think, from what I have learned from the engineers who had charge of the surveys of these routes, that the expense of building the road would be pretty nearly the same. From what I gathered from the engineers during the agitation with regard to the location of this road last autumn, I concluded there was not more than a mile difference in the length of the lines. I learned also that the gradients were about the same, and that the expense of construction, with the exception of building the bridge across the Narrows, if that should ever be found necessary, was almost the same. I think, therefore, the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), is misinformed when he says that the expense of building the central line is much greater than if the southern line were built."

"I simply take the estimates given by the engineer in charge of the line, in expressing that opinion. Personally I may say I have no great preference for either. Either line suits us, and, therefore, I did not take any decided ground. I may say, however, that I fail to see the necessity of taking up the time of the House upon this question when we know that the matter has already been decided by the Government, that the line is under contract, that the work of construction has been going on for the last four or five months, that thousands of dollars have been spent in building the road from Sydney to the Grand Narrows and that it is absurd to suppose that the route could be changed on account of any representations that could be made at this late hour."

I think I can repeat the statement I made on that occasion with much greater emphasis now. That line has been under construction for the past two years, and why this matter should be brought up now, why an agitation should have been awakened at this late date, and why the time of the House at this late stage of the Session should be monopolised by such a useless discussion is more than I can understand. At the same time some statements have been made here which I think it is my duty to notice. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Flynn) in his remarks this afternoon told us this road was in a very incomplete state, that it would not be finished for about two years.

Mr. FLYNN. No. I said it was two years since it was commenced, and it was not half finished yet.

Mr. McKEEN. That is the same thing. The hon. gentleman said further that laborers were unpaid, and that the surplus laboring population of Ontario and Pictou was dumped on the Island of Cape Breton to do work which should have belonged to our own laboring men. In regard to these contentions I am not prepared to say very much; but I think that if our laborers were unpaid, I am very sorry more of the population of Pictou and Ontario did not go down and do the work for nothing. While speaking on this matter I must say that the fact that some of our laborers have been unpaid has been brought to my notice on several occasions, and I have remonstrated with the engineers in charge, and others, in regard to the existing practice whereby contracts are let to irresponsible parties on the lowest tender, which system leads to work being given to people who are incompetent to carry it out; and

if there is any difficulty in connection with the payment of the laborers, it is on account of contractors taking work at prices which are not paying prices, and when the contractors are unable to fulfil their obligations they leave the country, and the men are left to look to the Government or to the members for remuneration, which I am sorry to say they have not always received. In regard to the cost of the road, it has been stated by the hon. gentleman that it is going to cost some three millions of dollars, irrespective of the cost of the bridge. I am ununable to understand that calculation. The road between Sydney and Hawkesbury is precisely the same length by the southern route as by the northern or present route. I myself made a careful examination of the plans in 1887, and having had some experience in surveys of this kind, I know that the distance by the two projected routes between Sydney and Hawkesbury, namely, by the southern and northern route, is almost precisely the same. Then as regards the cost, we have nothing to judge by except the estimates of the engineers. Those estimates gave the cost of construction at exactly the same figures, namely, about $20,000 per mile. Experience has taught us that this was an under estimate so far as the central line is concerned. The same argument may be applied to other routes, but as this road has never been built no one can tell what the cost would have been. We know, however, that the gradients on the southern line were said to be a little heavier than on the central route, but it was the opinion of the engineers who made the survey, whom we must presume to be honorable men, that the cost of the central road would be no more, excluding the bridge, than the cost of the other road. But supposing that the southern road could be built for $20,000 per mile and the central road for $25,000 per mile, which is the maximum amount the engineers now estimate it will cost, the difference is only $5,000 a mile, and that on ninety-three miles, I believe, is only $465,000. So, how it is possible for the hon. gentleman to make this great difference in the cost of the central as compared with the southern route is more than I can understand. As regards the inuendoes or insinuations of the hon. gentleman as to the means by which the location of the road was brought about, I have nothing to say. I am not in the secrets of the Government, I do not know by what means the location of the central route was decided. I take it for granted that it was decided on business principles; but this I know that the Government having made their decision and the contracts having been let, we came to the conclusion that it was best to accept the situation and to fall in with the Government's policy. The only difficulty we saw in the way was that of the ferry at the Grand Narrows. That ferry would have always been more or less an objection, but it was proved by the engineers and others that it could be successfully maintained. My own opinion was that the line could be operated by a ferry. The first idea of a bridge being built across those Narrows emanated from the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) himself. In his speech in 1887, to which I have already alluded, setting forth the great grievances to which the Island was subjected in adopting this line, he stated as follows:—

"If that is the case and the road is built on that route I maintain that a steam ferry cannot be used at all times, and it necessarily involves the building of a bridge. One of the surveyors states that the bridge can only be built at an enormous cost, and it has been estimated by some that it will amount to at least a million dollars."

Here is an admission by the hon. gentleman that if the road is permanently located here a bridge is certainly necessary. That was his admission, and I think the first suggestion of the construction of a bridge made on the floor of this House came from the hon. gentleman himself. It is contended that this bridge, if built, will obstruct the navigation of Bras d' Or Lake and of the Narrows, and, as I know, a great deal of opposition has arisen to that work by the people of Richmond County, represented by the hon. gentleman. But we must look at the other side of the Island. The hon. gentleman must admit there is a large commerce existing between Sydney and the lower end of the lake and Grace Bay and Cow Bay, and no opposition has come from those quarters. I, with my hon. colleague, represent a county which has a population more than double that of the County of Richmond, but we have yet to hear the first word of protest against the building of the bridge, and we in our county maintain that the principal part of the commerce of Cape Breton is conducted there. The coasters which pass through the Narrows pass through our county, and it is to our county the people come for their coal and to sell their farm products. We own a considerable number of vessels, and yet we have never had the slightest complaint from any master mariner or coal proprietor or from any of the merchants who supply the lake trade. None of those have taken any exception to the building of this bridge, and why ought the people of the smallest county on the Island be supposed to obstruct this great enterprise which I believe is hailed with delight by all the people of the eastern part of Cape Breton Island. When this road was first projected the great exception that was taken to it was that it might obstruct the Narrows, but that difficulty has been overcome and I believe, as far as I know, that this central line will accommodate the people of Sydney and of the outlying mines, as well as any other line can. I say this knowing that the line is now an established fact and knowing that, although I never gave it any support in the past I think our people are satisfied with the situation and I say it is ill-advised to raise those contentions at this late date. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Flynn) referred to the petition which he has presented to the House asking that the present line of railway from Orangedale (I think the petition states Orangedale) to North Sydney, should be abandoned, and the route turned towards the County of Inverness, and also that the line connecting North Sydney with Louisburg, going around by the coal mines, should be adopted. Now, Sir, I cannot imagine that the hon. gentleman or his constituents, in presenting that petition to this House, ever supposed or imagined that it would be for one moment entertained. What does it ask for? It asks practically for the abandonment of 56 miles of road which are now under construction and approaching completion; 56 miles of road on which have been expended the money of the people of this country to the extent of more than $850,000. A more absurd proposition was never presented to any Parliament, and what do they propose to give us in return? They propose that we should undertake to build a road from North Sydney to Hawkesbury *via* Louisburg. I have always advocated, and I hope to advocate as long as I am in this House or in public life, the connection of Louisburg with Sydney and with the entire railway system of our country. I do not intend to go back on any statements I made in this regard during the discussion on this matter in 1887; but, Sir, to abandon our present line and to deprive our harbor of North Sydney of the connection it is likely to have with Hawkesbury, and to add to the distance some 47 miles, is a proposition that the people of the eastern part of our county would not for a moment entertain. As nearly as I can remember, North Sydney and Louisburg are equi-distant from Hawkesbury, but if we were to abandon the present line, if we were to build a road to Hawkesbury *via* Louisburg it would increase the distance from North Sydney *via* the coal mines to Hawkesbury about 47 miles as compared with the present route. Let me say a word as to the position of North Sydney. It is one of the most important, energetic and growing towns that we have in the eastern part of Nova Scotia. It has a shipping tonnage every year

entering its port about equal to any port in the Dominion with the exception of Halifax, Yarmouth and Montreal. Its population including the district is about one-half the whole County of Richmond, and its revenue collections last year were some $19,000, while the whole revenue collection of the County of Richmond was under $2,000. This is the town that is to be made tributary to the County of Richmond and to other parts of the Island according to the policy of some hon. gentlemen. I say that Sydney and North Sydney are two of the most important centres in our Island. I think it is no more than right that they should receive equal railway facilities with any other part of the country. The question of a railway to Louisburg is one that has always been agitated by the people of our Island and by not only the people of our Island, but I am glad to be able to say of the entire Lower Provinces.

Mr. PURCELL. What do you call the distance from Hawkesbury to Louisburg?

Mr. McKEEN. About 85 miles, according to recent surveys.

Mr. PURCELL. I mean along the shore.

Mr. McKEEN. That is the survey line, and it is the only line I know of. With regard to the Louisburg Railway I hope that the House will bear with me while I attempt to show the necessity and the importance of continuing the present system by the collieries of our county through to Louisburg, and we hope the day is not far distant when this will be made one of the great Atlantic ports of the Dominion of Canada. I cannot do better in this connection than to read the remarks of the late Minister of Finance. In speaking in this House he said:

"I need not refer to the great volume of shipping which is now pouring into the harbor of Sydney. I do not think it will be necessary for me to detain the House at this stage of the Session, to speak longer on this question, though great and important as it is; but I will say that it would be difficult to overrate the value to Canada, of obtaining this great route, from ocean to ocean, and it would be difficult to overrate the importance from every point of view, of opening up the Island of Cape Breton. The Island of Cape Breton is cut off by the Strait of Canso, although there is no ice, and no difficulty in maintaining communication across by means of a boat—and, perhaps, at no distant day, by a bridge or a tunnel, although that is not proposed at present. It is at present cut off by the Strait of Canso from railway communication with the rest of the country and it will be impossible to overrate the importance of the development of the Island of Cape Breton, of the construction of that line of railway. Independent of enormous coal fields, independent of the valuable fisheries, it is known that Cape Breton possesses a large portion of good soil adapted to cultivation and development, and also mineral resources of various kinds that only await the facilities railroads alone can give in order to cause the island to spring forward, as I am sure it will, with unwonted rapidity."

I maintained on a previous occasion in this House that our railway system was incomplete without this connection from Louisburg to Sydney, and that with it we would have a continuous line from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean with an open winter port all the year round. I was glad to hear the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) bring this matter up the other night and speak on behalf of the claims of the port of Louisburg. I was glad to see that hon. gentleman advocating the contentions that have been made in this House in favor of the opening of the railway to that port. I only hope that, on all succeeding occasions whenever the necessity may arise, we may have the assistance of that able gentleman to help us in our contention for the claims of the harbor of Louisburg. I do not wish to trespass on the time of the House; I know it is becoming impatient, and I can assure you that I have taken up this question with a great deal of diffidence. There is not a man in the House who is more reluctant to hear me than I have been to speak; but this is a question of great importance to the people of our county, and when we see our rights and privileges assailed, it is our duty as far as we can to defend them. Now, Sir, what does the hon. gentleman propose? He opened his remarks this afternoon by telling this House that the railway to Sydney, as now being constructed, was of no use to the Island, that it was wrongly located and very expensive, and he wound up by asking in his amendment that we should be deprived of that railway altogether. His amendment reads:

"That the location selected by the Government for the Cape Breton Railway is inexpedient, inasmuch as the route selected is longer and more expensive than is required to effect the connection between the Atlantic ports and the railway system of this Dominion, and is in every way less calculated to serve the national and local interests which such an enterprise is designed to promote."

He has offered no alternative, he has offered us nothing, he simply proposes to deprive us of that railway for which we have been fighting for the last twenty-five years. I presume that this amendment must have been moved in the interests of the hon. members for Halifax and those of the western part of the Province, who are desirous of securing for the port of Halifax the communication with the Atlantic, which we consider the port of Louisburg is intended by nature to have. This amendment must meet with the opposition of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and it is on that account that I have ventured to trespass on the time of the House to-night. We were further told that this railway, as now located, would be of no benefit to the Island. I wish to say that, on the contrary, it is going to effect a commercial and social revolution in our Island. We cannot overestimate the benefits that will accrue from the opening of this road, particularly if the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches conceive it, as I believe they do, to be in the interest of the country to continue it to Louisburg. That is a proposition I have advocated ever since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, and I intend to advocate it as long as I am here, whether I succeed or not; and in advocating it I feel that I am supported by my colleague, who is equally interested in seeing this road extended to Louisburg harbor.

Mr. PURCELL. I wish to say a few words in reply to the hon. member who has just sat down. I am a practical man, and I have been through that country, and I want to say that the route which has been adopted is a very different route from what any practical party would adopt. The fact of the matter is that all the way to Louisburg is a very easy road to build. I have built the St. Peter's Canal, and the docks at Port Hood, and I have been all through that country, and I know what I am talking about; and I want to say to the hon. gentleman that he does not know exactly what he is talking about. There is no route by which that road could be constructed better than by that which is suggested by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn); and it could be built for a good deal less money by the route from Hawkesbury to Louisburg than by the present route, and there is no person who knows that part of the country better than I do.

Amendment of Mr. Flynn negatived, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Sault Ste. Marie Canal..... $1,291,400

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On this very important item, we shall expect some explanations in detail by the Minister in charge.

Mr. FOSTER. The estimated cost of the Sault Canal is $2,657,809.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that include all the approaches?

Mr. FOSTER. That includes everything. There has been voted already $1,291,400. The "A" contract has been let for the work in three different sections. The new vote this year is $300,000 and the re-vote $991,400.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Last year you mentioned $2,800,000 as the probable cost. Have you had further surveys made to lead you to reduce your estimate?

Mr. FOSTER. The surveys and the examinations which have been made have led to a nearer estimate than could have been made last year.

Mr. PURCELL. I said, you must remember, that the cost with a lock pit would be $3,000,000.

Mr. DAWSON. As this matter is up, I may be permitted to give some little information which will be very satisfactory to the House, as to the rapid increase in the traffic in that part of the navigation of the great lakes. I have just received in advance a statement of the traffic that passed through the Sault Ste. Marie last season of navigation. The total freight was 6,411,000 tons. The total passages were 7,803 vessels, and the total lockages 3,845. The number of sailing vessels was 2,009, and steamers 5,297. The total number of unregistered craft was 484. I draw attention to this as it shows the rapid increase of the traffic in that part of the country. Last year it was said that the then existing canal on the American side was quite equal to all the traffic, and that there was no necessity to build a new canal. Here is a report on that subject by the chief engineer of canals, General Poe, of the United States engineers:

"The project for obtaining a navigable channel of 16 feet in depth between Lakes Superior and Huron had been barely completed when the demands of commerce so enormously increased that the work of attaining a depth of 20 feet throughout was undertaken with the full sanction of both legislative and executive authority. A necessary part of the project is the construction of a new lock upon the site of the old state locks, to have a length of 800 feet between gates, a width of 100 feet throughout, a depth of 21 feet on the mitre-sills, and a single lift approximating 18 feet. The canal is to be deepened to correspond. The estimated cost of this enlargement of the canal system is $4,738,865, for the details of which see the annual report of the Chief Engineers for 1887. The statistics of the commerce using the canal indicate more clearly, each succeeding year, the urgency for rapid progress in the improvement."

So that the traffic has increased vastly quicker than the means to accommodate it can be provided. The traffic, in 1887, was, in June, 1,685 vessels, or an average of 45·76 per day; July, 1,665 vessels, or an average of 53·07 per day; and in August, 1,780 vessels, or an average of 57·42 per day. The average all through was 55·76 per day for 92 days. Now, the corresponding period in 1886 only shows an average of 40·66 per day for 92 days, showing a rate of increase during 1887 of 37$\frac{1}{7}$ per cent.; and during the past summer it was still greater over 1887, than 1887 was over 1886. Should the same rate of increase continue for three years more, we would reach the utmost capacity of the lock, which is 96 per day. On one day, in the month of June, 84 vessels were passed through the canal; on the 3rd June, 49 vessels passed the canal, carrying 49,258 tons of freight, or an average of a little more than 1,000 tons per vessel. Over 50,000 tons were passed on one day, but in a greater number of vessels. Thus we can see that this traffic is increasing so rapidly, that on the United States side they are not only providing a new lock, but they find the river not sufficient for the traffic, and are opening up a new channel which will shorten the distance. The total estimate of the cost of the lock now being made is $4,738,863. The cost of the present lock is $2,440,000, and the first locks cost over $1,000,000. The estimated cost of dredging the new channel is $2,659,000. So the Americans on their side are making an expenditure of $10,800,000 on this work. It has been said, and the comparison is often made, that the traffic passing at Sault Ste. Marie is equal to the traffic passing through the Suez Canal. That is not quite correct, but it is not very far from it. The traffic on the Suez Canal up to 1887, the last year for which we have returns, averaged 8,400,000 tons annually for the three previous years—the traffic of Europe and Asia for the whole twelve months, navigation being always open. The Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in the six or seven months of navigation passed through an amount of 6,411,000 tons, so it is not very far behind the Suez Canal and is fast coming up to it, the Suez Canal traffic having been practically stationary for the last three years. To show still further the traffic which is growing up on these inland lakes, I may mention that the annual traffic passing Windsor and Detroit has been estimated by the American engineer at the enormous amount of eighteen millions of tons. There is no other point in the wide world where such a large traffic passes, and I draw attention to the enormous traffic arising on the great lakes in order to show to the Government and the country that some more comprehensive system than has hitherto been followed must be adopted on these inland seas, in the way of lighting the coasts, in the way of providing harbors, and in the way of deepening channels where they are too shallow. There is a great future for that traffic when we consider the vast extent of the North-West and the enormous exports of wheat which we must expect from that territory. I believe there is no question raised this year as to the necessity of this lock, but I will submit these tables which contain a great deal of information and show the growth of the traffic from the opening of that canal to the present time:

STATEMENT of the Commerce through St. Mary's Falls Canal for each calendar year from its opening in 1855.

Year.	Sailing Vessels.	Steamers.	Unregistered Craft.	Total Passages.	Total Lockages.	Tonnage. Registered.	Tonnage. Actual Freight.	Passengers.	Coal.	Flour.	Wheat.	Grain, other than Wheat.	Manufactured and Pig Iron	Salt.	Copper	Iron Ore.	Lumber. B. M.	Silver Ore and Bullion.	Building Stone.	Date of Opening	Date of Closing.
									Tons.	Barrels.	Bushels.	Bushels.	Tons.	Barrels.	Tons.	Tons.	Feet.	Tons.	Tons.		
1855	(a)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(c)	106,296	(c)	4,270	1,414	10,289	(e)	.....	1,040	587	3,196	1,447	126,000	(d)	(e)	June 18	Nov. 23
1856	(a)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(c)	101,458	(c)	4,674	3,968	17,686	(e)	33,908	781	464	5,727	11,597	395,000	(d)	(e)	May 4	do 28
1857	(a)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(c)	180,820	(c)	6,650	5,278	16,560	(e)	22,300	1,325	1,500	5,760	26,184	572,000	(d)	(e)	do 9	do 30
1858	(a)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(c)	219,819	(c)	9,230	4,118	13,782	(e)	10,500	2,597	950	6,744	31,035	185,000	(d)	(e)	Apr. 18	do 20
1859	(a)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(c)	352,642	(c)	.....	8,884	39,458	(e)	71,738	5,504	2,737	7,247	65,769	.....	(d)	(e)	May 3	do 28
1860	(a)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(c)	403,657	(c)	.....	.....	50,250	(e)	133,437	.....	.....	9,000	120,000	.....	(d)	(e)	do 11	do 26
1861	(a)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(c)	276,639	(c)	8,816	11,507	22,743	(e)	76,830	4,194	3,014	7,645	44,836	394,000	(d)	(e)	do 3	do 14
1862	(a)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(c)	359,612	(c)	8,468	11,346	17,291	(e)	59,062	6,438	2,477	6,881	113,014	196,000	(d)	(e)	Apr. 27	do 27
1863	(a)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(c)	507,434	(c)	18,281	7,805	31,975	(e)	78,480	6,681	1,506	1,044	181,567	1,411,000	(d)	(e)	do 28	do 24
1864	1,045	366	(b)	1,411	(c)	571,438	(c)	16,985	11,282	33,937	(e)	143,560	7,643	1,776	5,331	213,753	2,001,000	(d)	(e)	May 2	Dec. 4
1865	602	395	(b)	997	(c)	409,062	(c)	19,777	.....	24,985	(e)	.....	7,346	3,175	9,935	147,459	822,000	(d)	(e)	do 1	do 3
1866	555	453	(b)	1,008	(c)	458,530	(c)	14,067	19,915	33,603	(e)	229,926	13,235	4,454	9,550	152,102	144,000	(d)	(e)	do 5	do 3
1867	839	466	(b)	1,305	(c)	556,899	(c)	15,120	22,927	28,345	(e)	249,031	20,602	5,316	10,588	222,861	390,000	(d)	(e)	do 4	do 3
1868	817	338	(b)	1,155	(c)	432,563	(c)	10,590	25,814	27,372	(e)	285,123	22,785	4,624	12,222	191,939	1,119,000	(d)	(e)	do 2	do 3
1869	939	399	(b)	1,338	(c)	524,885	(c)	17,657	27,850	32,007	(e)	323,501	23,851	5,910	18,662	239,368	1,260,000	(d)	(e)	do 4	Nov. 29
1870	1,397	431	(b)	1,828	(c)	690,826	(c)	17,153	15,952	33,548	49,700	304,077	42,959	11,089	11,301	409,850	722,000	92	2,917	Apr. 29	Dec. 1
1871	1,064	573	(b)	1,637	(c)	752,101	(c)	15,859	46,798	26,060	1,376,705	308,823	54,984	36,199	14,562	327,461	1,072,000	464	5,228	May 8	Nov. 29
1872	1,212	792	(b)	2,004	(c)	914,735	(c)	25,830	80,815	136,411	567,134	445,774	86,194	42,600	11,591	383,105	1,744,000	306	5,213	do 11	do 25
1873	1,549	968	(b)	2,517	(c)	1,204,446	(c)	30,966	96,780	172,692	2,119,997	309,645	44,920	29,335	15,927	504,121	1,162,000	580	2,218	do 5	do 18
1874	833	901	(b)	1,734	(c)	1,070,857	(c)	22,958	61,123	179,855	1,120,015	149,959	31,741	42,231	15,346	427,658	638,000	443	401	do 12	Dec. 2
1875	569	1,464	(b)	2,033	(c)	1,259,534	(c)	19,685	101,260	309,991	1,213,788	250,080	54,381	43,989	18,396	493,408	5,391,000	847	2,978	do 12	do 2
1876	684	1,733	(b)	2,417	(c)	1,541,676	(c)	30,286	124,734	315,224	1,971,549	407,772	64,091	46,666	25,756	609,752	17,761,000	985	2,102	do 8	Nov. 26
1877	1,401	1,050	(b)	2,451	(c)	1,439,216	(c)	21,800	91,575	355,117	1,349,738	343,542	39,971	63,188	16,767	568,082	4,143,000	987	2,506	do 2	do 30
1878	1,091	1,476	(b)	2,567	(c)	1,667,136	(c)	20,394	91,856	344,599	1,872,940	264,674	14,882	63,520	22,529	555,750	24,119,000	650	2,754	Apr. 8	Dec. 3
1879	1,403	1,618	100	3,121	(c)	1,677,071	(c)	18,979	110,704	451,000	2,603,666	951,496	39,218	93,245	22,309	540,075	35,598,000	324	2,226	May 2	do 3
1880	1,718	1,735	50	3,503	(c)	1,734,890	(c)	25,766	170,501	523,860	2,105,920	2,547,106	46,791	77,916	21,753	677,073	44,539,000	66	2,283	Apr. 28	Nov. 15
1881	1,706	2,117	181	4,004	2,120	2,092,757	1,567,741	24,671	295,647	605,453	3,456,965	367,836	87,830	65,897	29,488	748,131	58,877,000	.....	1,400	May 7	Dec. 5
1882	1,663	2,739	372	4,774	2,572	2,468,088	2,029,521	29,256	430,184	344,044	3,728,856	473,129	92,870	176,612	25,409	987,060	82,783,000	22	5,428	Apr. 21	do 3
1883	1,458	2,620	237	4,315	2,351	2,042,259	2,267,105	39,130	714,444	687,031	5,900,473	776,552	109,910	70,898	31,024	791,732	87,131,000	814	2,405	May 2	do 11
1884	1,709	3,609	371	5,689	3,074	2,997,837	2,874,557	54,314	706,379	1,248,243	11,985,791	517,103	72,428	144,804	36,062	1,136,071	122,389,000	9,731	6,047	Apr. 23	do 10
1885	1,689	3,354	337	5,380	2,863	3,035,937	3,256,628	36,147	894,991	1,440,093	15,274,213	422,981	60,842	136,355	31,927	1,235,132	127,984,000	3,669	8,189	May 6	do 2
1886	2,534	4,584	306	7,424	3,593	4,219,397	4,527,759	27,088	1,009,999	1,759,365	18,991,485	715,373	115,208	158,677	38,627	2,087,809	138,688,000	2,009	9,449	Apr. 25	do 4
1887	2,562	5,968	825	9,355	4,165	4,897,598	5,494,649	32,668	1,352,987	1,572,735	23,096,520	775,166	74,919	204,908	34,886	2,497,713	165,226,600	350	13,401	May 1	do 2
1888	2,009	5,297	484	7,803	3,845	5,130,659	6,411,423	25,558	2,105,041	2,190,725	18,596,351	2,022,308	63,703	210,433	28,960	2,570,517	240,372,000	8,385	33,541	do 7	do 4

(a) No record kept until 1864. (b) No record kept until 1879. (c) No record kept until June, 1881.
(d) None shipped from Lake Superior until 1867. (e) None shipped from Lake Superior until 1870.

Mr. PURCELL. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) I may say that last year I made my estimate that it would cost $3,000,000 to build that canal. I have been through that country a good deal, and I think I am a practical man. The people who know me believe what I say, and I say that we did not last year talk about the lock pit, which is going to be the most expensive thing in connection with that contract. Mr. Page would bear me out in saying that the lock pit of that canal will be more expensive than the lock will be. I give that from my practical knowledge. The hon. member is a little mistaken, and I tell him that it is not the lock or the approaches to the lock, but the lock pit, which is going to cost the money, and I tell him that the lock pit will cost all the money I stated last year, $3,000,000. We will see whether it does or not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I). I would ask the Finance Minister whether this lock pit is included in the contract?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The lock pit is included in the contract. Everything connected with the canal is supposed to be included in the sum mentioned by my hon. friend.

Lachine Canal..... $79,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there any special purpose for which this sum is required?

Mr. FOSTER. It is for the purpose of settling for the St. Gabriel basin. There is a contract with Mr. Delorimier to complete about 500 feet of rubble wall below Côte St. Paul lock, $4,250; and the amount required to settle for the St. Paul basin is $44,750. Then there is a raceway and some drains and ditches, stone fences, contingencies and superintendence, making up the amount of $79,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think, if I remember aright, there was some difficulties experienced with the lessees of water power on that canal, and I think the Government ordered enquiry to be made. What is the position of the leases there? Has any arrangement been come to? Some vessel owners have complained a good deal of the difficulty of navigating that canal, in consequence of the demands of tenants for water, and of the very considerable current that was produced thereby.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has not been anything done as yet with respect to adjusting the over-issue of waterpower, but that is now being looked into by the department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The season of navigation will be on in a very few weeks. It is a matter of considerable moment to all who use that canal, that some understanding should be come to, because I believe considerable difficulty is experienced.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not considerable difficulty. There has been a complaint that the vessels were impeded by the current caused by the excess of water used. Of course the present lessees must hold the power leased to them, although it may cause some little disturbance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Unless my memory is at fault, these various leases contain express provisions that the parties who draw water are not allowed to use it to the disturbance of navigation. If that is the case, it will remain in the hands of the Government to regulate as they see fit. It is desirable that the vessel owners should know what the Government propose to do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no provision of that kind. There is no means of doing so, except by purchase of the property, and granting compensation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Were leases given without provision?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. So I am told.

Mr. SHANLY. I do not think there has been any recent complaint of obstruction to navigation by the draught of the mills, I say not recent, because the increase in the size of the canal is so great, and the volume of water sent through is so much greater than it was, that, while the draught of the mills remain just the same, I do not think there can be any great cause for complaint by the vessel owners, because the mills are doing the same work they did before the enlargement. I do not remember to have heard any recent complaints.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does my hon. friend consider that there is not much risk, with the present size of the canal, of inconvenience? I put the question because, although I do not know myself how the matter may be, complaints have been made to me within the last 18 months certainly, perhaps within the last 12 months; they may have been exaggerated, very likely they were, but complaints have been made on the part of vessel owners that they were a good deal inconvenienced in passing through the canal.

Mr. SHANLY. I could not say without making a careful examination myself; but this I do know: that the increase in the volume of the canal is so enormous, while the draught remains the same, that there must be an immense diminution in the causes that retarded navigation, that were formerly complained of by vessel owners.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the First Minister say about what time these leases expire?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can ascertain.

Mr. SHANLY. They are perpetual.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are of long standing. But I am informed by the chief engineer that since the enlargement of the canal there is no cause of complaint; that the only thing the Government can do hereafter, should there be any trouble, which is very improbable, would be to insist upon a better description of wheel, allowing the same amount of power with a smaller waste of water.

Cornwall Canal..... $1,200,000

Mr. FOSTER. The amount is required to meet the expenditure to the 1st of July, 1890. The contracts entered into to complete the excavation, require the canal to be enlarged to a depth of 14 feet; also to complete the four remaining docks out of the six, the enlargement of two being completed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the bank been placed in a proper state of repair, and is there no fear of another break?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The engineers say that there is no danger of a break, and that the repairs have been completed. The hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) is of a different opinion, as the hon. gentleman no doubt heard the other night when he made his very instructive speech.

Williamsburg Canal..... $800,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose this is intended to secure 14 feet navigation.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There have been doubts expressed at different times, as the First Minister knows very well, as to whether we can really secure anything like that depth of water from Kingston downward. Have the engineers in the department reported specifically to the Government that they are sure of getting 14 feet without very expensive rockwork at the bottom of the river?

Perhaps the First Minister will not take offence if I ask the member for South Grenville (Mr. Shanly) his opinion on the subject, if he has had occasion to look into it lately. I heard him express the opinion once, an opinion which struck me as having a great deal of force, that, on the whole, it would be a great deal cheaper to tranship grain into bargos and take it down to Montreal rather than expend a very great sum in obtaining 14 feet navigation from Montreal to Kingston.

Mr. SHANLY. I would say, since the hon. gentleman has referred to me, that perhaps I have peculiar ideas upon that point. I never was in favor of securing the extreme depth of 14 feet between Kingston and Montreal. I was strongly in favor of securing that depth as regards the Welland Canal, but I think transhipment at some point near the foot of navigation, say Kingston, will be the rule, and that a less depth than 14 feet would answer the purpose fully. That is my own personal opinion. It is the opinion I have held for a number of years, and it is one I have never changed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the Minister of Finance give the Committee any idea as to the total sum that will be required to obtain 14 feet navigation from Kingston to Montreal? The Government engineers must by this time have arrived at some idea with regard to it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am informed by the chief engineer that the St. Lawrence between Kingston and Lachine will give us 14 feet. There are some points to be improved and there will be considerable other expenditure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the First Minister give us any idea as to what sum—I know considerable allowance has got to be made—that will be required over and above that already expended to complete the navigation, so as to give us 14 feet? I presume 14 feet at low water is meant. The St. Lawrence is subject to very considerable fluctuations, there being sometimes as much as three feet between high and low water.

Mr. SHANLY. Four feet.

Mr. FOSTER. The amount required, taking the appropriations of 1889 and 1890, will be a little over thirteen millions. The appropriations for 1889-1890 are estimated at $4,170,400. So the amount required will be $9,380,709 over and above that sum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is an estimate only.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the latest revised estimate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems a very large amount of money to pay over and above what we have already spent. Is it the Government's idea that they can bring ocean going craft down, because I would doubt that very much? Is it really worth our while going to this enormous expense for the purpose of enabling a comparatively small number of vessels to go down to Montreal? My information coincides very closely with the statement of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) that cheapness and economy would be much better promoted by the transhipment taking place at Kingston than by spending nearly nine millions or very likely twelve or fifteen millions, in order to get 14 feet of water.

Mr. FOSTER. I must correct the statement I made in this way: that the amount I mentioned includes the cost of Sault Ste. Marie Canal. This year we have voted $1,294,000 for that canal, and next year there will be required $1,341,409. These two sums I included in the $13,000,000 which will be required to finish the system. The 14 feet provided for is 14 feet taking the lowest known level of the water.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD I will read a statement prepared by the department:

"After completion of the several works embraced in the scheme of canal enlargement in progress and contemplated the position of navigation will be as follows:—

"A freight-carrying vessel loaded to the depth of 14 feet will be able to pass down from Lake Superior through the Sault Ste. Marie and the Welland Canal into the St. Lawrence; here the natural water way of the river will be utilised as far as the Cornwall Canal. Traversing the Cornwall Canal, Lake St. Francis, the Beauharnois Canal and a channel deepened through the lower part of Lake St. Louis, the Lachine Canal will be reached, and through it Montreal.

"Upward bound vessels will use the canals and river as far as the head of the Cornwall Canal, and at Farran's Point the rapids or strong current can be surmounted either by the construction of a deepened and enlarged canal, the cost of which is estimated at $500,000 or by the provision of a chain tug using the river channel, the cost of which is set down at about $100,000. Passing this point the Rapide Plat and Galops Canals, will give access into Lake Ontario, and thence upward through the Welland and Sault Ste. Marie to Lake Superior.

"NOTE.—The present Galops Canal is 7⅞ miles long, the length of the enlarged canal will be about three-quarters of a mile long."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I understand the cost of the entire system will not be nine millions but seven millions.

Mr. FOSTER. That is for the St. Lawrence system alone.

Mr. PLATT. Will the First Minister state the amount we have thus far expended on the Murray Canal?

Mr. FOSTER. Up to 1st December, 1888, $975,282. The amount now asked, $217,000, will complete the work on the canal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. gentleman able to state whether the difficulties said to have been met with, owing to the falling in of the banks, or the presence of something approaching a quicksand, have been overcome?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that has been overcome.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can you state positively that that has been overcome?

Mr. FOSTER. I am informed that there was never any trouble, as far as quicksand is concerned, in the Murray Canal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is seven years since it was commenced, and it was promised to be built in two, or, in the outside, in three years, and the reason given for the delay was that there was difficulty experienced from time to time. That canal contract was let out in 1882, and certainly the time has been exceeded by several years. I think it has got a depth of only 10 feet.

Mr. FOSTER. Ten feet navigation, at the lowest water.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So that it cannot be used for vessels of the draught you propose to send down the St. Lawrence. It would be available only for vessels of small draught.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Vessels of a smaller draught of course; vessels that would require to go by the Bay of Quinté by the County of Prince Edward into the open lake. It is calculated it would be extensively used by steamers and barges carrying ores across to the United States, which is expected to be a very large business.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But surely the hon. gentleman is not going to spend money to create a traffic with the United States, to the detriment of the Canadian producers? That is contrary to his policy announced here time and again.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman will find that we have a very wholesome and productive reciprocity there. We will send over enough ore to purchase coal enough to supply the smelting works in Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suspect you will without difficulty, or without deepening the canal.

Welland Canal—deepening to 14 feet $100,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much remains to be done to complete the deepening to 14 feet?

Mr. FOSTER. The amount of $100,000 is required to complete the deepening and to settle contracts, so that completes the entire matter.

Trent River Navigation..... $80,000

Mr. BARRON. I would like to draw the attention of the First Minister to the report of Mr. Rogers, the chief engineer of the Trent River Navigation works, who says:

"Navigation commenced on the completion of swing bridges. During the past three years new steamboats have been placed in the waters from Lakefield to Balsam Lake. There are now 13 steamboats on this stretch."

I do not suppose that he intended this report to be misleading, but it is quite misleading, because the fact is that although we spent an enormous sum of money in building a lock at Fenelon Falls, the navigation above the falls is completely stopped by reason of the obstruction of the railway bridge, and on account of the ridge at Cameron Lake, which has never been removed. The first Session I had the honor of a seat in the House I drew the attention of the First Minister to these circumstances, showing that this money was completely thrown away unless the obstructions I speak of were removed, so as to allow of navigation. From that time up to the present (two seasons of navigation) not one single thing has been done in the matter. I confess that when I drew the attention of the Government by telegram last summer, to the fact that the swing bridge at Fenelon Falls was being delayed in its construction, that they showed a reasonable promptitude to have it completed as fast as possible so as to allow of navigation over the lock itself. But I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that the railway bridge is there without any swing in it at all, and it is utterly impossible for any craft of any dimensions such as it is proposed shall navigate these waters to get through into the lake further than about 100 yards north of the lock itself. Even if that bridge is made so that craft can pass backwards and forwards, there is still a ridge at Cameron Lake, which prevents navigation especially when the water is at all shallow. It seems to me that the Government put the cart before the horse in this matter. They went to work and spent this enormous sum of money on this lock, of which of course I do not complain, but it is entirely useless without the clearing away of these obstacles. The matter is of considerable importance to the people of that district.

Mr. SHANLY. May I ask what railway is there?

Mr. BARRON. It is the Victoria Branch of the Grand Trunk Railway. The enormous output of forest produce in that part of the country is really astonishing. The waters all lead to Fenelon Falls, and I certainly can applaud the expenditure of money so far as this lock is concerned, if for no other purpose than to enable the forest produce to get to some railway station; but as I have said the whole expenditure becomes absolutely wasted, and it has been wasted, and we have lost the interest on that expenditure for two years for the simple reason that the Government will do nothing in the way of removing these obstructions. I know that great complaint was made last year that the Government did nothing; a great many people wanted to make use of the upper waters in connection with the lower waters but they were prevented from doing so. Large contracts were entered into in anticipation that these obstructions would be removed, but the contracts had to be cancelled. People entered on the construction of steamboats, and I see that the engineer, Mr. Rogers, states the fact that steamboats were built on the upper waters, but these steamboats have been rendered useless by obstructions to the navigation of these waters. I would like to draw the attention of the First Minister also to the fact that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction with this work so far as the Commission is concerned. The Government for years and years have professed to be in the possession of knowledge sufficient to enable them to ask large appropriations for the purpose of building the Trent Valley Canal. I can refer to the letter of the chief engineer of the 21st May, 1881, directed to Mr. Page, and which is as follows:—

"SIR,—By direction of the Minister I have to request that you will be pleased to take the necessary steps to obtain during the ensuing summer surveys for a system of canals, &c., whereby communication may be made between the Bay of Quinté and Georgian Bay, already in part effected through the Trent River Works, for which survey the sum of $6,000 was voted by Parliament at its last Session."

Sir Charles Tupper reported to Council as follows on 8th April, 1882:—

"The undersigned has the honor to represent that from time to time during many years past, as shown in many successive annual and other reports, the establishment of a line of water communication between Lake Ontario and the mouth of the River Trent, and Lake Huron, through the utilising of existing river and lake waters, has been under consideration."

It will be seen from these two documents that the idea was to construct the Trent Valley Canal, not simply to open communication between the inland waters. Then, we have the statement of the First Minister in a speech which he made in Peterborough in the month of June, just before the election; and of course he was desirous of creating the impression that it was the intention of the Government to go on and build the canal. He said:

"Every town of a sufficient size wanted a post office and a custom house, and every part of the country wanted some improvement in order to develop its resources, just as those he was addressing demanded the carrying out of the Trent navigation system, and they were going to get it. It was by a mere chance the Government had the opportunity of carrying out that great project of inland navigation."

Speaking of the Trent waters, the First Minister said:

"The Government kept them till the revenue had expanded sufficiently to justify them in going to Parliament as they did last Session, and getting a substantial vote which would be sufficient to add 150 miles of internal communication to their part of the country. The vote taken last Session would, however, amply guarantee that the whole work would be carried out as fast as the revenue would allow, so it could be constructed."

The impression created up to that time was that the canal, from Lake Ontario to the Georgian Bay, should be constructed, not simply that the inland waters should be connected by means of locks. Mind you, I do not condemn the Government for spending this large sum of money to connect the inland waters, because I believe it is a good expenditure; but what I do complain of is that the Government should create the impression, time and time again, that they were going on with the construction of the Trent Valley Canal, while they are not doing so. Mr. Stevenson, speaking on the night of the last election, by the authority of the Minister of Public Works, said:

"The Minister of Public Works had given him every assurance that the Trent Valley Canal contract between Peterborough and Lakefield would be let during the coming summer. This was no electioneering dodge because the elections were now all over."

Mr. Stevenson made that statement on the evening of the very day on which he was elected. Therefore the Minister of Public Works must have stated that to him before the election was held, so that when Mr. Stevenson said that it was not an election dodge, I take issue with him, because the statement was made to him before the election was held, and he used it as such. Now, I would like the Minister of Public Works to say whether he intends to ask the Government to carry out that pledge to build the works from Peterborough to Lake-

field. It appears that the Government have taken refuge in the appointment of a Commission—to ascertain what? To ascertain that which the Government have professed to know for many years past, when they assured the public from time to time that they were going on with the work. The First Minister has stated that the Commission has not reported, and very likely will not report this Session. In fact, one of the commissioners has left the country on a holiday, with the knowledge and consent of the Government, so that we cannot expect them to report for some time yet. They have ceased taking the evidence, which is necessary to enable them to report. I want to know why they do not report? The Government may think that this is a light and unimportant matter, but I can assure them that the people do not think so at all. They think that the Government are simply playing with this matter, and that they have appointed this Commission to give them an opportunity to get out of the work, because I can inform them that the Commission intend to report against going on with this canal. Whom did they appoint on the Commission? A gentleman from Toronto, who, if in favor of a canal at all, is in favor of the Huron and Ontario Ship Canal; then they appointed a gentleman from Montreal, who, I believe, is antagonistic to the canal as the people of Montreal are; and the chairman is a Peterborough gentleman, who, I believe, will be largely guided by the other commissioners. When the Commission report against the canal I suppose the Government will not go on with it, and if they do not they will be flying in the face of what they again and again have promised to the people. I want to read what the Peterborough *Review*, which is a Conservative organ, thinks of this Commission. It says:

"The statement made by the Minister of Railways and Canals that a Commission would be appointed to examine during the recess into the nature and cost of further works to open the Trent Valley navigation will not be favorably regarded in this district. The nature and cost of these works have already been fully investigated and if the Ministers insist upon their officials producing them they will find ample materials on which to form a judgment. Indeed on the information before them they some time ago found a judgment, recognised the value and feasibility of this great improvement and promised to carry it out as promptly as the finances permitted. So far they have continuously prosecuted the works, but the section now on hand is now near its completion, and for the first time since it was recommenced there will be a cessation of the work. There is no disposition to dread an investigation on account of want of confidence in the merits of this improvement. The more it is investigated the more clearly it will appear that for a comparatively small outlay a route can be opened that will be of great value to the country at large Its benefits have been plainly demonstrated and have been officially admitted. Mr. Stark's careful estimates showed that it would be far from costly for a route of such great importance, and nothing has since arisen to modify this view. If a Commission is to be appointed, we hope it will consist of men of sound judgment, and then there can be no fear of their reporting adversely to this necessary work But, as we have before remarked, we see no need of a Commission. The stage of investigation is passed. Another section, say from here to Lakefield might well be placed under contract, for the plans and estimates are ready. Many railways that have been subsidised in other parts of the Dominion are of far less public importance than this navigable route."

That is the opinion of the Conservative organ in the town of Peterborough, and I tell the Government that the people have very little confidence in this Commission; they believe it is nothing more or less than a subterfuge to enable the Government to get out of the pledges on which they carried riding after riding in the different elections. One objection made to the construction of this canal is that it will take a great deal of water. The reservoir for this canal is supposed to be Balsam Lake. There need be no apprehension with regard to the supply of water, because a considerable distance north of Balsam Lake is Hollow Lake, the waters of which are almost immediately connected with the waters which flow down towards and into Balsam Lake; and not more than half a mile will need to be canalled or trenched in order to bring a plentiful supply of water down from the far north. The only argument I have heard against the construction of this canal is the possibility of there not being sufficient water. That difficulty can be easily removed, not only with benefit to the construction of the canal, but with a large advantage to the lumbermen and mill owners all along the Trent valley waters, because by this means they will be enabled to bring down logs and other forest produce from the far north, and also with the result of retaining along the Trent waters the different centres of business which are now there. I do not approach this subject in any party spirit at all. I recognise that the First Minister secured votes from both parties, as he knows very well, in the different elections, on the strength of his promise that this work was going on. Sir Charles Tupper at great expense to the country paid a visit to the different waters up there and I have no doubt created by his presence the impression on the minds of the people that this work was one of such magnitude that it was intended to carry it through. A great many people on both sides of politics buried the political hatchet for the purpose of supporting the Government in the belief that they were going on with this work, and I warn them that they are in danger of losing the confidence of the people, who may transfer that confidence to some other gentlemen who may be more likely to carry out their pledges.

Mr. STEVENSON. As the hon. gentleman has taken upon himself to bring my name into this matter, I want to say a word or two. The hon. gentleman, who is a well known unbeliever in this scheme, who ridicules it, who has stood up over and over again in public and said that it is clap-trap, and that the Government never intends to do anything of the kind, comes now before this Committee and mixes up things in this hang yarn style. As far as I am concerned, this thing never entered into the elections hardly at all, either the last or any other election, in fact it was the hon. gentlemen from the other side who made most of this question by saying it was all clap-trap, that the Government would never build it, and would never commence to build it.

Mr. BARRON. I say that now.

Mr. STEVENSON. When the commissioners passed the route of the canal, did the hon. gentleman ever meet them? Did he send information to the Commission to enable them to come to a proper judgment?

Mr. BARRON. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. Did he give any affidavit at all? No; but he comes to this House with this story now. During the election he referred to, I never mentioned public works at all in connection with this matter. Now, bring your paper if you like. If I mentioned a Minister at all, I mentioned one for whom I had a high respect and who is now no more. I say that the Government took the proper course in this matter of appointing a Commission—I suppose an independent commission. They appointed as chairman a gentleman from Peterborough, who himself was an advocate of the scheme all his lifetime. There may be gentlemen opposed to it on the Commission, for all I know, but I have to learn that yet. I believe the Commission is a fair one which will report what it finds to be correct. The hon. gentleman knows well that during the long debate on this subject, there were two or three engineers who differed very widely on the cost of the canal, more especially from Peterborough to Lakeville. One made an estimate of $1,000,500. It was a wise move for the Government to appoint a Commission to take evidence and ascertain the probable cost of that section of the canal. There are many difficulties of course in the way, and I can understand those difficulties. I do not propose to put the Government in any position other than what is honest and square, and I am quite satisfied the people of the County of Peterborough do not want anything but what is right. There are difficulties in the way. Evidence has been sent to the Commission that the class of

vessels now in use in the grain trade are much larger, and require larger locks and greater depth of water than formerly. On local grounds the canal ought to be built. That country is full of iron which will some day find a market; I hope not across the line, but on our own side. I hope we will be in a position to manufature our ore in Canada without going across the line. What I am saying is correct, and I am quite satisfied that the hon. gentleman spoke from a bunkum point of view. He said he knew it was all trash, that the Government never intended to build the canal; but he never attended a public meeting in my county that I am aware of. But privately he always said that the thing would never be built, and that surely I was not a believer in it. I am a believer in it, I have the firm belief that the canal will be built, because the demands of the country require it. People in the sections from Peterborough to Lakeville will certainly benefit by it. and it will open up a very large additional area. The whole area from Hastings to Cameron Lake will be opened, and the canal will give immense water power to run any quantity of mills along its line. I did not intend saying anything to-night. But, as I am here, I may say that, as far as I know, the intention of the Government, is to assist in the building of the canal. The chief engineer, I am quite satisfied, has been, by many, misconstrued in saying he was opposed to it. There has never, as far as I can learn, been any wish to oppose it, but rather the reverse. The hon. gentleman now wants to ascertain the actual state of matters, and the Government are anxious to lay before the country, before they undertake a work which will inevitably involve a great amount of money, its true position, and I cannot say anything against any Government doing that. As I feel confident, from what I know of the Commission, they will report favorably on the canal. I have been at several meetings of the Commission and have heard evidence given before them, and, from what I know of that Commission, I believe the hon. gentleman will be satisfied that there is no clap-trap about it, but that it is intended to be a verity and a certainty, and that we will have that canal. When he brings his papers forward, he will find that I did not accuse the Minister of Public Works of saying anything of the kind which he has asserted.

Mr. BARRON. I do not think the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Stevenson) and I are so far apart after all. I do not know that it is proper to retail private conversations on the floor of the House, but I would be quite willing to have all my private conversations on the subject of the Trent Valley Canal retailed here. I have said, and I say again that the Government look upon this canal as so much trash, and that they do not intend to build it, and no doubt I told my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) of that fact, and no doubt I said, and I say again, that the Government have taken advantage of this Commission by way of a subterfuge to get out of building this canal. If my information is correct, the Commission will not advise the building of that canal. If the Government were sincere and honest and earnest in this matter, they would not have allowed one of the commissioners to go to the old country, especially in view of the fact that the commissioners ceased their labors many weeks since. If the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) were as anxious as he professes to be in this matter, he would have told the Government that one of the commissioners was going to England, and he would have used all his influence on the Government in order to get them to insist upon the commissioners reporting one way or the other before they went away. But one of them has gone with the knowledge of the Government, and they have not reported, and it will be some time before they can report. The hon. member for Peterborough says he did not say what I charged him with saying in reference to the Minister of Public Works. I must, of course, accept his statement. No doubt he does not remember making that statement, but I know that he has an enormous faith in the Peterborough *Review* He sticks by that paper and that paper sticks by him, and that paper does put these words into the mouth of the hon. member for West Peterborough, as being used on the night of his election:

"The Minister of Public Works had given him every assurance that the Trent Valley contract between Peterborough and Lakefield would be let during the coming summer. This was no electioneering dodge, because the election was all over."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman knows that that must be a mistake on the part of the *Review*, in referring to the Minister of Public Works instead of the Minister of Railways and Canals. The Minister of Public Works had no more to do with it than I had.

Mr. BARRON. I am not particular which member of the Government it was who made that promise, but it was stated that the promise was made by some member of the Government, and the mistake is not mine, but that of the hon. member for West Peterborough. Then the hon. gentleman said I have always laughed at this canal: That is not so. The hon. gentleman cannot mention any public occasion on which I have not spoken in favor of it. In our part of the country we are all deeply interested in it. If the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. Hudspeth) were present, he could speak of a meeting which was held in the town of Lindsay, where resolutions were unanimously passed in favor of the construction of this canal The county council of Victoria, the county council of Peterborough, and all the different councils of the counties through which the canal will run have petitioned for this canal. Now, the hon. gentleman says I did not attend a meeting of the commissioners in Lindsay. I do not remember the commissioners ever going to Lindsay. So little interest did they show in the matter that I do not think they ever went to Lindsay. I did attend a meeting in Lindsay where Mr. John Carnegie, a strong supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite was present, and gave most valuable information on the subject. When the hon. member states that I spoke against this canal, he must accept my statement to the contrary, for it is not so. If I were in the position of the hon. member for Peterborough, I think I would bring my influence to bear a little more strongly on the Government in order to make them carry out their pledges. I am not now discussing whether this is a proper work or not, but the Government have time after time, as it suited their purposes, assured the public that they were going on with this work from Lake Ontario to the Georgian Bay, but now they are backing out of it and are taking advantage of the Commission to let themselves down easily. The result, I believe, will prove the correctness of my statement that the Commission will report against the work, and that the Government will back out of their pledge.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Silence admits that this statement is true.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barron) has made a number of statements which I think unworthy of him, and for which he has no foundation. He supposes everything against the Government, and he supposes everything against the Commission. Who were the commissioners? I suppose he would not object to Judge Weller——

Mr. BARRON. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—Judge Weller, who lives at Peterborough, and he is the chairman of the Commission. Will he object to Mr. Kennedy, of Montreal, one of the first hydraulic engineers on this continent, and who is now absent in consequence of illness and has been obliged to go to Europe, which everybody regrets? The third gentleman is an

engineer of standing, Mr. Frank Turner of Toronto. Everyone knows of him. These are three honorable, upright men, and to say that they were appointed to make a sham report to enable the Government to back down is unfounded, is unworthy of the House and of the hon. gentleman, and, if I had not been called to my feet by the remark of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), I should have considered it unworthy of reply.

Mr. BARRON. I did not say it was a sham report.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I leave it to the House if that is not the case.

Mr. BARRON. I said they knew what the report would be, and they were likely to take advantage of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another side to this question. It is six or seven years since the Government asked for considerable sums of money to carry out this work. It seems to me extraordinary that after this work was undertaken, and after pledges were made by some members of the Government—certainly by Sir Charles Tupper—that the work should be proceeded with, in the sixth or seventh year afterwards the Government should find it necessary to institute a Commission to find out whether, in 1889, it was possible to do a thing which they had declared, or one of their number had declared, was to be done in 1881, 1882, or 1883—I cannot recollect the exact year, but I recollect the facts. The Government ought, before going into the expenditures which they then incurred, to have found out, through their engineers or other competent authorities, whether the thing could be done or not, and the appointment of the Commission appears to me, and I think will appear to the country, to indicate that they commenced this work on very imperfect information, and that they made representations to the inhabitants of the Trent Valley on very imperfect information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is unjust, though I do not think he is intentionally unjust, in the inferences he has drawn. The Trent Valley scheme was before the country and was a subject of discussion many years ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Fifty years ago, at least.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the hon. gentleman or I were here, the Government of the country got some light on this subject. The Trent navigation was considered to be an inland water carriage similar to the Rideau canal. The reports are to be found, the statements of the cost are to be found. When the Government took up this matter some years ago they decided it must be a work to be built by degrees, as the country could afford it. The Government have gone on and built it by degrees, and the hon. gentleman opposite admits that the work, so far as it has been built, is of great advantage to the country through which it passes, that it has opened out a large stretch of water communication, that there are steamboats plying on those waters, doing a very considerable trade. The Government have gone on steadily in the construction of the canal, bit by bit, coming every year to Parliament and explaining how much would be built in that year, and how much money was wanted. The statement has been made lately by engineers of standing that whatever might have been the grounds on which the original estimates were made by competent engineers—and that original plan was adopted by public sentiment years ago—those grounds have changed, and it would cost much more now. Well, the Government of the day would have to come to Parliament to get a vote. It was a sum exceeding by some millions the original estimate. Then two very competent gentlemen were appointed, and a third gentleman of high standing and character—and certainly any leanings he might have would be in favor of the complete construction of this work—was appointed chairman that he might, as a legal man, marshal the evidence. We are waiting for that report, and that must be submitted to Parliament, it must meet the assent of Parliament; and we would be quite unjustified in going on, having been informed again and again of late years that the work would cost infinitely more than was stated by the engineers in those days. And there is no loss of time. The hon. gentleman says we have been idling. We have been carrying out steadily the object with which we have started, that is to build a water line of communication by degrees, taking a vote for enough to employ a certain number of men, and do a certain amount of work during the next year. We are doing so this year, and before this money is expended I hope that Mr. Kennedy will be back and then we will get a report of the whole matter, and it will be for Parliament to judge, when we come down with the Estimates, of the expediency of expending this money. I do not believe that hon. gentleman has any grounds for saying that he believes these gentlemen are going to report adversely. I do not think he has been taken into their confidence, I do not think he knows anything about it; and he cannot get up now in his place and state that he has any reliable information that these gentlemen have been such fools as to tell him, or to tell anyone else beforehand, what the report was going be. I challenge the hon. gentleman to substantiate that statement. It is so absurd in itself that I do not think, with at all undue respect to him, that we can place any reliance upon it unless he produces additional evidence of it. It cannot be so. These gentlemen know their duties. They are gentlemen of character, they are professional men as well, and they would not have consulted the hon. gentleman, or taken him or anybody else into their confidence. The hon. gentleman for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when he was speaking about the St. Lawrence Canal, although that is part of the policy of the Government, did not hesitate to state, and it was his duty to state, that he had heard that on the whole it would be more economical, and perhaps as well, to use a system of transhipment rather than deepen the canal to 14 feet. Well, the Government were pledged to build a water communication within a depth of 14 feet, and yet if Parliament chooses to say: We have changed our mind, or if the Government, on full evidence, think that it would be inexpedient to carry out their original intention, they are not to be charged with doing anything wrong; on the contrary they are to be praised, to be lauded, even though the hon. gentleman might call it backing down. They should be lauded if, upon a careful study of the circumstances, they think that the original intention ought to be, in the interest of the country, changed. That is the plain state of the case. The hon. gentleman says it is not a political question at all. The whole animus of the hon. gentleman was political in the most miserable party sense.

Mr. BARRON. I am not going to be drawn out by the First Minister to give the source of my information. I am willing to admit at once that I have had no conversation whatever with any of the commissioners, but I am positive that my information is most reliable that the Commission is going to report adversely to the construction of this canal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It cannot be.

Mr. BARRON. It can be. It is quite possible that some of the commissioners may have spoken to others and given their views as to what the report is going to be. I will not say whether that is so or not, but it is quite possible that in some roundabout way the information may have come to my ears. But we can only wait for the future to prove whether I am right or wrong; I am willing to rest my case with the future. The Premier said that I charged them with idling. Now, I used the word "idling" in con-

nection with the work at Fenelon Falls, and I reiterate it. I say for two years and a half they have had that money expended at Fenelon Falls, the interest upon it being lost, because there has been no use made of the works, and the reason is the obstruction to which I drew the attention of the Finance Minister two years ago; and nothing has been done from that time to the present. Now, to show that I am not altogether wrong in regard to this matter, I want to read the First Minister's statement in this House on the 11th July, 1885:

"The system is a very old one. It has been reported on by many able engineers, and at last the Government adopted the idea of making a permanent work by connecting the two great waterways."

Meaning Lake Ontario and Georgian Bay. Now, if that was his intention, then I ask why, in the name of common sense, we must appoint a Commission now to find out whether it is necessary to do that which he said was going to be done in the year 1885? He goes on:

"It may be it cannot compete in all respects with other and deeper waterways, and with a railway system, but it will be substantially a Dominion work, connecting the two waters, and at the same time a great advantage to the fine district of country through which it passes."

Now, of course the First Minister may read me a lecture. I am young in the House, and he, being so very much my senior, is at liberty to do so; but his lecture will not be accepted by the people of this country who believe that they are being deceived. But I am quite willing to rest my contention as against his with the people in the country who are interested in this great work.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to know if the delay in the report of this Commission is going to delay this work which the Premier appears to think of so much importance to this country. It is a most unfortunate thing if the illness of one of the commissioners is going to stop a work which he says is of so much benefit to the country, and which he says, the Government earnestly desire to push forward, and in which the hon. member for Peterborough seems to take such a lively interest. Is it not possible for the other two gentlemen to collect the information? This question has been before the country for fifty years; the Government have had some years experience in office, and after they had been in office for a number of years they appoint a Commission, after they have spent a good deal of money, to see if this thing is feasible at all. It appears to me singular if these two waters are to be connected that after fifty years of preparation and enquiry, after the Government had spent a large sum of money, it became necessary to appoint a Commission of investigation to find out as to its practicability. Then one of the commissioners fell ill, an estimable and reputable gentleman, and on this account this work, which is of pressing importance, is to be delayed another year. It does not look as if the promoters were really in earnest, and as if they believed the scheme was practicable. There has been a good deal of discussion in this House in regard to the proposed Ontario Ship Canal. It was advocated some years ago by Mr. Blaine, who represented one of the Yorks. He at that time was a good Liberal, but he went over to the Tories, and he has gone away, as nearly all the Tories go, to the United States. One of the difficulties that attends our Liberals when they become Tories is, that they become Annexationists and go to the United States I think the temper shown by the First Minister towards the member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) is rather out of place. That hon. gentleman was only discharging his duty to the section of country from which he comes and to the Dominion at large. I think the display of temper was scarcely called for by the mild criticisms made by that hon. gentleman. The explanation may be that the Premier has entertained an antagonism against the hon. gentleman for having voted against him on a certain occasion, some time ago, thus becoming one of the unfortunate thirteen described by the First Minister. I hope that antagonism will not be extended into canal and other matters. We have had enough of theological discussion for some time. I must say that the First Minister generally controls his temper and acts with becoming decorum, and yet when an hon. gentleman rises and makes a fair criticism in regard to works in his own county and in regard to a subject with which we have been dealing for ten years, and on which large sums have been expended, and in regard to which the Government appointed a Commission to see if those works were required and were in the interests of the country, the First Minister rises in a rage and denounces this young member as one of those who formed one of the 13 whom the First Minister designated as belonging to the de'il.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was stated by the Government in 1883 that they had full information on this subject. I find that Sir Charles Tupper stated at that time that the facts had all been collected, and that $8,000, the cost of the survey, would complete the work, so that he would be able, next Session, to report the whole scheme. The Government, according to Sir Charles Tupper, ought certainly to be in possession, before 1889, of all the facts and should have ascertained the cost.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Even if the canal were not finished, there has been substantial benefit done to that part of the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My point was this: that the hon. gentleman's colleague had many years before stated to the House that the Government would be in a position in a very short time to give complete estimates of the cost of the werk and state what they were going to do. Several years elapse, then the Government appoint a Commission. That is not business, and it is not the way a public work should be carried out. In so far as the advantages to the particular localities are concerned, all well and good; but when the Government propose through a responsible Minister to engage in works of this kind, I repeat we have a right to expect that they have made up their minds as to what they are going to do, and have obtained full estimates as to the cost of the work.

Tay Canal..... $25,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought this work was finished last year?

Mr. FOSTER. $25,000 is required to complete the basin, and carry out other works.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of these works, and is this really the last amount required?

Mr. FOSTER. The cost is $364,951.

Rideau Canal..... $28,100

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that this is a revote, and that the money has not been spent. Why was nothing done, and what is proposed to be done?

Mr. FOSTER. This vote is required to increase the supply of water to the Rideau Canal, by erecting several dams and constructing cuttings, so as to connect the several lakes forming what is known as the Devil Lake system.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And to supply Gananoque with water power.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not stated.

Repairs and expenses to Canals..... $468,855

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman estimate are the receipts from all our canals collectively? I see that on account of canal revenue there was deposited in 1888 a total of $318,000. Are we to understand

that matters have come to such a pass that while we are required to spend on these canals as nearly as may be on capital and income account, $790,000, that all our estimated expenditure of receipts is only $318,000? Is that the state of the case?

Mr. FOSTER. That is about the state of the case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a very bad showing.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as the money is concerned; but those canals are of a great benefit to the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think this is the worst showing we have had for a great many years.

Mr. FOSTER. The revenue has been very much beyond the expenditure for some years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But not to that extent. What does the hon. gentleman propose to do with the canal tolls between Montreal and other points?

Mr. FOSTER. The same regulations hold as last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is to say we are going to abolish those canal tolls?

Mr. FOSTER. No, not abolish them; they are diminished from the old rates, and the same Order in Council was passed this year as last year regulating them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to have the First Minister's attention for a moment. The hon. gentleman is aware that a question has been raised by the American Government as to the alleged discrimination which is being made against their vessels by practically throwing the whole burthen of the tolls on their vessels going through Government canals. Has there been any correspondence between this Government and the American Government on this subject, and what is the contention of the American Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no correspondence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. None since when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has been no correspondence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think they made a complaint of an unjust discrimination being exercised against their vessels?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that something of that kind was said in the discussions at Washington, but up to the present there has been no communication on that point. That is one of the points that will have to be a matter of discussion, and I think that if the point is conceded it should be considered as a concession and a corresponding concession should be made to us.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no objections to every possible concession being obtained, but I think we have been coming out rather badly in some of these cases about these very matters. Then, I understand distinctly that the American Government, so far as the hon. gentleman's memory is correct, have not made this a source of complaint?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not made any complaint.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is sure of that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no recollection of it. Of course I will have to enquire before I will be positive.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a matter of very considerable moment. I shall not press the point further because it is not necessarily involved in this item, but I would ask the hon. gentleman to make enquiry and to ascertain whether or not any complaint or any demand has been made by the American Government in respect to that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; I will.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And if there should be any correspondence, I presume if the public service permits that, the hon. gentleman will have no objection to lay it on the Table?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course not, if the public service permits.

North-West Mounted Police..... $723,426

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the exact strength of that force just now, officers and men?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You may reckon upon a force of 1,000 men, non-commissioned officers and men, including scouts. There may be a few more or less, as they are continually getting discharges for length of service, sometimes they buy their discharge, and in a very few cases they desert. There are 45 officers, 5 medical officers and two veterinary surgeons. The whole strength of the force is 1,052.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the First Minister state how many of those officers are graduates of the Military College?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are seven graduates from the Military College.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As the hon. First Minister has recently been visiting his constituents at Kingston, where he took occasion to make a profession of repentance for the lack of faith he had in the Military College, and stated that he regarded it as a very excellent institution, I would ask him if he is prepared to assign a number of commissions in the Mounted Police from time to time to the best graduates of the college if they choose to avail themselves of them. I have suggested to him on more than one occasion that if we are to keep the college efficient, in addition to the commissions which are given by the English Government, we ought to provide some half dozen commissions to be given to the best of graduates; and it appears to me that the Mounted Police would afford an excellent opportunity of attaching say a couple per annum. They need not be made assistant inspectors; they might act as sort of supernumerary cadets until such time as it should be found expedient to give them full commissions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The plan that has been adopted, as nearly as may be, is this: We take from the non-commissioned officers the most deserving, and we take occasionally the more likely officers from the active militia who have been reported by the Major General as showing superior military aptitude. I think about half of the officers have been promoted from the ranks. The hon. gentleman knows that that force is a *corps d'élite*. Admission to it is eagerly sought after by sons of gentlemen, educated men, so that when they are promoted from the ranks they are found to be in every way fit, socially as well as otherwise, for the rank of commissioned officers. We have in the force gentlemen who have held commissions in Her Majesty's service. The last promotion of an inspector was that of an officer who had been an adjutant in a regiment of the line, who had come to Canada and enlisted in the force, who rose soon to become a non-commissioned officer, in due season became a staff-sergeant, and has now been appointed an inspector. So with several others; and I think the hon. gentleman will say that those who have thus risen are the most valuable men we could have, because while they have been non-commissioned officers they have been over the

whole country, and have got acquainted with the Indians, the trails, the system of patrolling, the habits of smugglers, and being educated men in addition to having this experience, they make very valuable officers. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that we should take a certain number from the Military College. It is rather unfortunate for Canada that that college is so good, and gives so complete a military education. A large proportion of the men educated there are eagerly sought after and get commissions in Her Majesty's service. It is satisfactory to know that some of our young gentlemen get commissions, but at the same time that is not without its loss. We lose some of our best men who enter the army and never come back. Some will come back. One of the best officers we have is Superintendent Perry—a gentleman whom the hon. gentleman knows. He came from the Bay of Quinté, was educated in the college, passed with honors, was gazetted, got his commission in the Royal Engineers, but, luckily for our service, he met with an accident, breaking his leg, which laid him up so long that he had to give up his commission. He came to Canada and is now Superintendent in the force and one of the best officers we have.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman's practice of promoting a reasonable number of men from the ranks. I am inclined to think that what he says is correct, that many of the men are of a superior grade of life, well educated, and fit for promotion. All that I suggested was that, in order to prevent the evil which he deplores, of losing our best educated graduates, I would attach a couple of commissions in this force per annum to the Royal Military College.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are not two vacancies in the year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would be possible in a force like this to offer cadetships—that is a sort of supernumerary sub-lieutenantcy, from the college—who could be promoted as occasion occurred. In many foreign corps a similar practice is followed. This force is apt to be broken up in so many detachments that it often would be very convenient to the officer in charge to have a small number of additional officers at his disposal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman's suggestion is worthy of consideration.

Mr. McMULLEN. I find that we have fourteen officers to whom we pay $1,667, besides feeding and clothing them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We do not clothe our officers.

Mr. McMULLEN. If even they clothe themselves the salary is too high. A large number get $1,000 each; and, on looking over the items of Supply, I notice that very high prices are paid in the North-West—from 9 cents to 11 cents per pound for beef, 70 cents per pound for fancy tobacco for those men to smoke. The prices paid are exorbitant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to tobacco, that is bought to be repaid. The police are scattered all over an immense country, and cannot get a good supply of tobacco. Most of them, I take it, smoke, and the tobacco is bought at a reasonable price, and sold to them at cost price. As to beef, that depends on the part of the country where the beef is supplied. It may be hundreds of miles from the places of supply and railways. Every year, of course, the prices will decrease as the amount of cattle increases, and the means of transport. These things are tendered for by public tender, and the lowest tenderer, if a responsible party, always gets the contract.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). In reference to Mr. Pierson, surgeon in the service, he is employed 266 days at $1.50, and is credited with extra work, $358.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is an old commissariat officer, who works every day of the year and works at night.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How many men are there in the police?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 1,052?

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not see how a man can work day and night.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is exactly what you are doing now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see, under the head of arms and ammunition, that we have a vote of $20,000. How are the police at present armed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have got the Winchester repeating carbines, and the Enfield revolver.

Mr. BARRON. Has the First Minister had any complaints about the working of the Winchester carbine?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not that I am aware of. I believe it is not so good a weapon, from a military point of view, as might be found; but when it was adopted it was the very best arm used. It is quite sufficient for the purpose, and, having a supply, it would not do to throw them away.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not only a matter of considerable importance that these men should be supplied with a good class of arms, but also the class of arms that can stand rough wear. I was under the impression that the Winchester had not quite filled the bill in all respects.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not a fancy rifle. A great many of these new inventions are in skilled hands, and, being always kept away from bad weather and rough usage, they are of course in good condition, but the Winchester has been there for years, and has proved of service in the field. They have been used in the United States for many years. The Indians desire to have the Winchester rifle above all things, and we are very anxious to get it away from them.

Mr. BARRON. I can tell the hon. gentleman why the Indian likes the Winchester. The Indian, as a scout, likes to have the Winchester rifle, and so do all scouts, because they can carry it horizontally, but it is not serviceable for the police because they have to carry it perpendicularly, and very frequently, when the cartridges are in the magazine, they stick and will not go into the barrel. In my experience in the North-West, I found that was the case, and others found the same thing. It is possible that complaints have not been made by some of the Mounted Police, but some of them did complain that it was not a proper rifle for that purpose. The hon. gentleman will understand the fix a man will be in when he had the cartridges in the magazine and found that he was not able to get them in the barrel.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events, they have got the arms, and it would be the height of folly for us to throw those arms away and get better.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was any report made on the subject?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think so. I believe Commissioner Herchmer is perfectly satisfied with the rifle.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman make an enquiry, and let us know at another time whether, in practice, the Winchester rifle is used as a magazine rifle at all, or whether it is true that, in riding, they have been compelled to content themselves with having only one ball in the carbine, because, if that be the

case, while we suppose that we have armed the force with a repeating rifle, we may prove to have supplied them with a rifle which is only capable of using one round at a time. It is a question of moment, though I hope we shall not need to utilise the arms of the Mounted Police.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). How many recruits were added to the force last year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. About 160.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). How much is charged by the surgeon for examining a recruit?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. $2 for every man.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I find that last year we have an expenditure at Ottawa, for attendance at Medical Board, Sir James Grant, $80, H. Hall, $130. Then Mr. Powell receives $50 for compiling medical requisitions, and Sir James Grant for examining recruits gets $304. Dr. Halliday, who lives in Peterborough, received $ 8 for examining recruits, and Dr. Wright, of Port Hope, $20 for the same service. There are other charges for examining recruits in different places, amounting in all, with other medical expenses, to over $500.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We pay $2 for every examination and report, and about 50 per cent. of the men examined are rejected. There are medical boards established in the centres when it is necessary to examine men who have been injured in the service, and who have a right to compensation by gratuity or pension. In such cases, the board receives $10 a day.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). When men are injured in the North-West, do they return to Ottawa to be examined by the medical board here?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Many of them come back to their friends, and apply for their discharge and for compensation, or for pension. Then they are examined in the most convenient place. Of course, if they remain there, they are examined by the board in the North-West.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I see no charges for examination by medical boards in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD. There is no necessity for a board there, because they are examined and reported upon by the medical officers of the establishment. There are a surgeon and several assistant surgeons there, and they form the board and make their report, and they do not get anything for it.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). How many of the force are there at Qu'Appelle station?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know how many at this moment. The number of men at the different stations frequently varies. They may be of a particular strength for particular reasons, and for a particular season; and they may be detailed to go elsewhere. They are a removable body, moving over the whole of that vast country.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Is there a hospital at Qu'Appelle? Is there extra medical attendance at Qu'Appelle more than at other points?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Then I would like to have the Minister explain how we are charged $3,194.50 for drugs at Qu'Appelle.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the whole amount of the column on the preceding page brought forward.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Oh, it is Regina. Look down a little lower.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Regina is not Qu'Appelle. Regina is the headquarters of the force. The drugs are stored there and distributed to the different points when they are wanted.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Is there a large force at Fort McLeod?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A considerable force. There are nearly 200 men, and there is a hospital.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I find you have charged $926.10 for drugs. I see you charge at Calgary $15 for extracting teeth, and a little below that, $16.50 for four pairs of forceps. Now, if you have a surgeon paid for his services, and if you have paid for forceps, how is it that you have charged $15 for punishing a poor unfortunate individual who suffers with toothache?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They must have a good many teeth to be pulled.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I see large items in several places for alcohol, 30 gallons at Regina, and Bass's ale amounts to a considerable item. How do they get it there? I thought that was a prohibition country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These are medical comforts for the different hospitals.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that whereas the hon. gentleman only asked for $5,000 here, nearly $15,000 were actually expended for medicine and hospital expenses in the year 1888. Either that was an extraordinary expenditure for 1888, or else the present vote is much below the requirements of the force.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I take it that was a large purchase of stock to be kept on hand.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I am sorry the right hon. gentleman has not given a gratuity to Constable Boyd, in whose behalf the hon. gentleman will remember that I made application. He was struck down by a horse, and he was brought down here. I have seen the man; there is no doubt that he is injured for life.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This man Boyd is getting temporary relief, and I hope we will have such legislation as will enable us to treat his case as the hon. gentleman thinks it deserves. I believe it is a bad case.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would like some explanation in reference to the item of Kenneth Campbell & Co., Montreal, drugs, $1,674.79. If we are charged with the cost of drugs in the North-West, how is it that we are charged with this item at Montreal? We find at almost every station in the North-West very large items for drugs.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All these supplies of drugs are bought from three houses—Kenneth Campbell & Co., Montreal, Adams, Mason & Co., and Hooper, of Toronto, and they are entered here. All drugs are put in in the name of Kenneth Campbell & Co., or whatever firm of the three it may be which supplies these medicines.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The quantity of drugs used is enormous for the number of men. It may be they are a very sickly lot and have to be taking drugs all the time, or they are in a very unhealthy country, or their duties are irksome and almost dangerous. It does not look well to see sums of six, eight or nine thousand dollars a year for drugs with a force of a little over 1,000 men. I have no objection to the items for instruments, but the surgeons should take care of them. While I admit the force is one of great utility, its cost is excessive.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The medical stores were much depleted in 1885 at the time of the outbreak. They have been refitted since, $15,000 being the first sum and the present vote being only $5,000. This amount covers not only drugs but medicines, medical comforts, and hospital

supplies, and I do not think it a very large sum. If the hon. gentleman were a military surgeon he would find that it was not a large sum. The supplies are given on the requisition of the senior surgeon, Dr. Jukes, formerly of St. Catharines, who is a very conscientious and painstaking man.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It is true there is only $5,000 in the Estimates this year, but last year there was a much larger sum. In regard to the stores being depleted, it must be remembered that we paid large amounts during the rebellion, and made up the supplies. There is something wrong in the whole affair, and drugs may perhaps cover a multitude of sins in the North-West. I call the Minister of Finance's attention to this point, in order to see whether another article does not pass under the name of drugs.

Works at Banff Park $20,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The First Minister stated last year that the amount then voted would be sufficient for the completion of the park.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I could not have said that.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think I can show it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I recollect reading last year's debate and I do not remember seeing any such statement; but, at all events, it could hardly have been so, for there must be some provision for officials who live at the park and take charge of it. This year the superintendent made a recommendation for the sum of $40,000 which he thought it was necessary to expend this year. I cut the amount down to $20,000, although I think a good deal more could be spent there with advantage. It is proposed to spend $5,000 on a main sewer through the town, which work is reported by the superintendent to be most necessary.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How are we liable for that expense?

Mr. DEWDNEY. All the property is in our hands.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What revenue do we derive?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Up to 30th June, 1883, we received for rents $1,875; at the cave, $245; at the basin adjoining the cave, $273; hay, $321; wood, $200; lime, $137; other items, $18; total, $2,951. For six months ending 31st December of last year the revenue was $1,776; $642 rents; $242 cave; $340 basin; $363 hay; $17 wood; $257 lime; and $164 water rates.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the Canadian Pacific Railway pay any rent?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They pay for the water and so much for each bath. If there is a swimming bath they pay so much more. I think $10.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Who does the hotel belong to?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are two hotels in the park. One belongs to Doctor Brett and the other to the Canadian Pacific Railway. There are several other hotels in the town.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What property do you rent for $642?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is rent for the leased building lots.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is there likely to be many of these lots taken?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think so. There seems to be an increasing demand for them every year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). For what space of time are the leases of these lots?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I forget the conditions of the lease. The parties renting have to put up a particular class of building depending on the location. The plans of the residences have to be approved of by the superintendent. I forget for what time the lease is; I think it is for 15 or 20 years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the extent of the lots?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The town lots are 50 by 120; the building lots on the river are much larger—an acre I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have you a regular rental on these lots, or do you put them up for competition?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are regular rates, but I have not the particulars with me.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the hon. gentleman has some schedule or Order in Council defining the terms upon which these lots are leased?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Oh, yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman might bring it down, as it is a matter of interest to us to know what they are. Does the hon. gentleman remember the time of the leases?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are building lots for 21 years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At the expiration of the lease what becomes of the building?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I don't remember, I presume the lease will be for 21 years with a renewal upon a new system of rental.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the policy of renting those lots as indicated by the Minister is a very bad one and no wonder you have not more houses there.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will bring down the returns and I think the hon. gentleman will see that we charge reasonable rent for the lots.

Mr. McMULLEN. What time do you give a party to build, or is it allowable for a person to hold lots in fee to sell or transfer them?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think that most of those who apply for lots have built immediately.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose they are not bound to build if they pay their rent?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know, but if a man buys a lot he is obliged to build according to approved plans as the buildings are intended to be ornamental. If he does not build the land remains a portion of the park and he pays the rent for it, and if he assigns it the assignee is subject to the original terms of the lease.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I remember aright an anthracite mine was supposed to exist in the centre of the park. Is it leased, or worked, or does it remain idle?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is being worked rather extensively now I believe. That was purchased by Mr. Stewart before the park was established.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the whole of the mine, whatever it may be, in the hands of Mr. Stewart?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No. The area that he purchased was only about 800 acres. There is seven or eight miles of the park through which the coal runs and which belongs to the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I presume it is not the intention of the Government to part with that at present?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The First Minister conveyed the idea that a man who leases a lot is not compelled to build on it. If people are permitted to hold a lot without building they are retarding the progress of that property in which we all are interested and desirous of being developed as rapidly as possible. I could not gather from the First Minister what the exact time of those leases were.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt they are for 21 years.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Suppose they are for 21 years and if a man can purchase choice lots there, and he has the right to transfer them, it might lead to speculation and the person holding them might transfer them at a higher rent. We take a great pride in that park, and we certainly ought to have more information than we have been given, so that we may see whether the Government have been carrying it on on business principles and have been taking good care of the property.

Mr. ELLIS. I take no pride whatever in that park. I think it is a mistake to impose the burden of this institution on the people of the country who are not able to bear it. What difference does it make to the people in the east, or the people here, whether this park is maintained or not?

Mr. HESSON. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. I do not suppose he has ever put his foot in that country, and does not understand what it is to have such an institution for people of travel and people of money. I think the Government are doing an excellent work there. I have been there on one or two occasions, and I am satisfied that it is in the best interest of the country. The hon. gentleman would not object if it were at St. John, N.B.; but I think we have a right to look to the interests of the west as well as the east. I do not think the hon. gentleman should find fault with what has been approved of by gentlemen on that side of the House as well as on this.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has visited the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. HESSON. I have.

Mr. ELLIS. Do you think the people down there should pay for this institution?

Mr. HESSON. We pay for a great deal down there.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I quite agree with the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis). I took exception to this expenditure two years ago, and I think if we have any money to expend we can expend it in different ways more for the benefit of the country. We spend $2,000 a year on Major's Hill Park for the benefit of the people of Ottawa, and now we are spending about $20,000 a year, I will not say for the benefit of the people of the North-West, but for the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. If they want to have a park there, they should bear the expense of it, and not the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. BARRON. The remarks of the hon. member for Perth I think were very characteristic of him. He said that this park should be maintained to give pleasure to people of leisure and people of means. There are other people in this Dominion besides people of leisure and people of means. I am aware that the hon. gentleman bows with great respect to people of leisure and money, but that is no reason why the ordinary tax-payer of the country should bow with such respect to them as to put his hands in his pockets to keep up this establishment for them If the hon. gentleman thinks an institution of this kind should be kept up for people of leisure and means, let him contribute himself in some other way, so that he will not put the expense on the ordinary taxpayer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. HESSON. I do not think the ordinary taxpayer objects.

Mr. BARRON. As an ordinary taxpayer I do object to this expenditure, and I think the people of the country would decidedly object to it.

Mr. HESSON. I do not think they would object; it is only small, narrow-minded fellows like you.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the entire cost of this park up to the present time?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The cost in 1886 was $4,500; in 1887, $36,170.97; in 1888, $39,612.48; and for the six months ending 31st December, $16,128; making a total of $96,411.

Mr. McMULLEN. I must concur in the remarks that have dropped from hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I cannot see that it is necessary in the interest of this country to spend about $100,000 a year on this park. I notice that we have some expensive officials up there. Geo. A. Stewart receives $2,700 a year. What are his duties?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He is the superintendent of the park. He is an engineer by profession; he has superintended the laying out of the park and the construction of the roads; he has also planned and built the bridges in the park; and he keeps the accounts.

Mr. McMULLEN. So it appears that while we receive only $2,951 in rents we pay the man in charge $2,700, so that for all the money we expend we get practically nothing in return. I have visited the park, and I found considerable complaints of people who had leases and did not build. I spoke to one man who had built far away out in the bush, and asked him why he had built there.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There has been a wonderful change since then. Many fine buildings have been put up.

Mr. McMULLEN. There cannot have been a very great change, judging by the amount we receive. It is a mistake, in my opinion, to lease property to a man without a condition that he must erect a house within some reasonable time, because if you permit people to lease property in that way, from year to year as people build round them they keep back the progress of the place, and in the end sell out to somebody else at a profit. The only way we can make anything out of this park is by leasing the property and getting rents for it, but if we grant these leases without any building condition there will be no inducement to people to improve the place and make it attractive.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). May we expect to receive the terms of the lease and other agreements entered into between the Government and the leaseholders?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will get that. The Annual Report of the Department of the Interior appears to me to give a better showing than what was given to me by my officers to-day. The revenue from the lots south of Bow River alone amounts to $5,452, representing an interest at 6 per cent. on $90,740, or at 4 per cent. on $136,111. The Canadian Pacific Railway are paying $20 an acre for the five acres on which their hotel is situated. The sanitarium pays $20 an acre on five acres. Four lots of hot springs pay $10 an acre. Four lots Transfer Company pay $30 an acre. Lots in town sites pay $2,168. Sundries amount to $2,400. The maintenance and repairs cost $4,000, protection of game and fur, $800, and salaries $500. My idea is that a few rough trails built through the mountains for excursion parties to visit points of interest would be preferable to these expensive roads.

Mr. BARRON. Do you intend to retain Mr. Stewart, after his duties are over, as an engineer?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Somebody will have to be retained or the park will soon deteriorate.

Mr. BARRON. $2,700 is a big price to pay.

Mr. WATSON. It seems to me that quantities of land are held by people there for speculative purposes. There are four acres, for instance, given for a livery stable. That is too great a quantity for that purpose. Have these people the right to sub-let a portion of their land?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They cannot sub-let.

Mr. WATSON. It would be better for the Government to lease those lots to persons who would build on them, and if they do not build within a certain time their lots will be cancelled.

Customs—Salaries and Contingencies in the Province of Nova Scotia..... $112,550 00

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I placed on the paper a notice of motion for correspondence between the department and the Mayor of Halifax, relating to the admission of a steam fire engine free of duty. I had communication from the mayor to say there was no correspondence, but he had several interviews with the Minister on the subject, and I believe there was some correspondence in another way. The Government property in Halifax is protected by our fire department, and there is a good deal of Dominion property in Halifax. I think the Government should have admitted that engine free of duty under the circumstances. In Ottawa this Government made a large expenditure putting up a fire department on the ground that as we had the benefit of the protection of the fire department in Ottawa we should reciprocate in some way. In view of this precedent, I think Halifax is entitled to some consideration.

Mr. BOWELL. This is a matter over which the Minister, individually or departmentally, has no control. The hon. gentleman knows that the officers of the Customs Department have to carry out the law, and the law imposes a duty upon engines brought into the country; and it is only when applications of that kind are made and carried before the Treasury Board, which can act under the Audit Act, that a remission of the duty can be made under certain circumstances. The only correspondence which has taken place has been between Mr. T. E. Kenny, on behalf of what is termed the board of works, for the admission free of duty of the fire engine. This question was fully considered by the Treasury Board, and they decided that, under all the circumstances, it would not be advisable to admit fire engines free, for the reason that, if they were admitted to Halifax free, they would necessarily have to be admitted free in all sections of the country.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Not all.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know why not. Halifax is not exceptional in that regard. There is Government property in St. John and in Charlottetown and in nearly all the large cities, and, as all the other cities had paid duty on these fire engines, it was not deemed advisable to open the door and make fire engines free in Halifax. The matter was fully considered, and that was the opinion of the Treasury Board with which the Council agreed.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says that similar applications would be made all over the country.

Mr. BOWELL. I say that applications were made.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I say that, if applications were made from places where the Government property had the protection of the fire brigade, the Government should have admitted those fire engines duty free. The hon. gentleman has entirely ignored the fact that here in Ottawa the Government have made considerable concessions on that ground. They purchased a large property here, and last year there was a considerable grant made to the city of Ottawa on the ground that the Government had the benefit of the fire brigade. There is a large amount of Government property in Halifax. They have their large building in the city, they have their deep water terminus and their railway terminus, and all these are protected by the fire brigade, and they pay no taxes except for the water and light which they require; and I think it is a very small two-penny half-penny affair for the Government not to deal with these matters in a broad general spirit, not only in regard to Halifax but in regard to every city where they require an engine for the purpose of protecting Government property. In all those cases, I think they should admit those engines duty free.

Mr. BOWELL. In Nova Scotia, the principal increase is in Halifax, amounting to $2,500. This arises from the necessity of putting on extra men in the winter, when the harbor is visited by a much larger number of steamers than it is in the summer, and, in addition, we have put on a small yacht to visit the ships when they enter the harbor. An extra expense has also been necessary in all the larger ports in connection with the postal service. Some apparent increases are accounted for by the transfer of outports to ports, and a decrease is shown on the other hand by the abolition or reduction of these ports. The total increase in that Province is $7,190, and the reduction $3,945, leaving a total increase of $3,245.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Has the Minister appointed a surveyor in the port of Halifax yet?

Mr. BOWELL. I have not. Mr. Garrison is still acting.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman think it proper to keep an office of that kind open for so long a time? I understand that Mr. Garrison has been twice up for his examination, and has failed to pass.

Mr. BOWELL. No; he failed only once. He is a good officer, and performs his duty efficiently, but he did not get enough marks to pass the examination, and he remains at the clerk's salary, without any increase, though he is performing the duties of a surveyor. I told the collector, and I told Mr. Garrison himself, that, if he passed at the next examination, I would confirm his appointment, and then he would get the salary of a surveyor, $1,500, instead of $1,200, which he is now receiving.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I said at the time that I thought it was an unsuitable appointment, and I think the result has justified my remarks. I think it is very unfortunate to keep so important a position open for two years in order to suit one individual under very peculiar and exceptional circumstances.

Mr. KENNY. As far as I can learn, Mr. Garrison is a very competent officer. I recognise the propriety of his conforming to the regulations of the Civil Service, and I understand from the Minister of Customs that, as soon as he qualifies for the position of surveyor, he will be appointed to it. When this was mentioned the last time, I had no personal acquaintance with Mr. Garrison, but since that time I have made it my business to inform myself as to his qualifications for the office, and I am very reliably informed that he is a competent officer.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Referring to the vote for Prince Edward Island, I would ask the Minister of Customs what is the reason for the dismissal of Mr. Hesson, the landing waiter in the port of Georgetown, Prince Edward Island?

Mr. BOWELL. The reason is that for five or ten years he was reported as an officer whose principal duty was to go once a month and sign the pay roll, that there was nothing for him to do, that he lived on his farm and simply went to his office when the pay day came and took his money.

That was the only reason for his dismissal, and I think the House will justify his removal from office. It is true that the gentleman applied for superannuation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. What is his politics?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know. I should judge however, having been put there by the hon. gentleman's friends, that he must belong to his politics. But for keeping him there I am responsible to a great extent, and for his having drawn money without giving a return. Since I have had charge of the office I have reduced the staff in Georgetown by two or three officers. Mr. Hesson was the last one removed, he has not been replaced. Another one, a Mr. Stewart, who was not required was also removed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Where did the hon. gentleman get his information with regard to the small duties Mr. Hesson was performing?

Mr. BOWELL. I got it from the inspector. I instructed Inspector MacLaren to make an investigation of all the outports in the Island, and I made the removals upon that report. I will read the report concerning Georgetown:

"I next visited Georgetown, distant from Montague six miles. The officers of this port are sub-collector Charles Owen, salary $700 per annum; landing waiter Thomas G. Hesson, salary $400; locker Dalziel, salary $300. The amounts collected at that port last year was $1,401, and the salaries are $1,400, with expenses of $18. During my visit I learned that Thomas G. Hesson, who is in receipt of a salary of $400 per annum, during the summer months devotes only a small portion of his time to the Customs, being entirely engaged on his farm, and from my questioning him I found that he had scarcely reported himself to the office since the first of May."

This report is dated late in the fall—

"This I told him would not do. It has also been his habit for years during the summer months to work on his farm, only calling at the office for his monthly pay, and leaving the Customs work to be performed by locker Dalziel, who is a first-class reliable man. I would, therefore, strongly recommend that officer Hesson's services be dispensed with, there being no need of this officer. The collector and officer Dalziel are fully equal to the wants of the port. I further consider that Hesson has been an imposition on the department for years, and his continuance in office would be in no wise advantageous to the department."

These are the reasons which induced me to remove him.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Those are strong reasons, but I have information of a contrary nature. I know the people in the locality, and they inform me that Mr. Hesson was doing a great part of the work. The Port of Georgetown is frequented by a great number of American fishing vessels and consequently a good deal of work falls upon the Collector of Customs, especially in the autumn season of the year. Mr. Hesson was an old appointment, made by the Local Government before Confederation, and I have never heard found any fault with him. From the information I have received from people in that section of the country, it appears he was one of the best of officers, and was attending to his duties faithfully. He had to attend at night time as well as in the day. When the *Northern Light* was running and used to call at this port, Mr. Hesson had to be on duty whenever she came into port. He has been a long time in the service, and I think it was rather hard to dismiss him without superannuation, and the people in that locality think so, too. He subscribed to the superannuation fund.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then, why did he not get superannuation?

Mr. BOWELL. Because he had been drawing his pay for years and doing nothing.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Dalziel was appointed a good many years after Mr. Hesson, and was doing the work before Dalziel did any work at all.

Mr. BOWELL. There were four officers at this port when I assumed office, and there was no more work to be done then there is now. When I visited the port I did not consider that it required four officers to do the work, which two are doing now. Owen and Dalziel are quite sufficient to do all the work. The hon. gentleman says that Hesson has performed his work well. No doubt he has; he attended to his farm, and signed his receipt for his check regularly, like a little man, every month. I have not a word to say against Mr. Hesson as a man. I do not know him. But I do say that, in many ports, I have found altogether too many men to do the little work there is to do; and in every case where a vacancy took place, and where the services of the officer could be dispensed with, I have not filled the vacancy. That is the way the estimates for the Customs have been kept as low as they are. I think the country will justify the removal of a great many more men than I have removed, that is my honest conviction. The hon. gentleman knows that upon that report I have removed from the Island of Prince Edward some ten or a dozen officers during the last summer, and I have not heard a single complaint except through the friends of those who have been deprived of the privilege of taking public money which they did not earn. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) intimates, although he did not say so directly, that this man was removed on account of his politics. I may remark that I have received a great many more complaints from those who support the Government for the action I have taken in removing their friends who were not performing any duty, than I have from friends of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If I may judge from the statement of the hon. member on my right (Mr. Robertson), which is admitted by the Minister of Customs, I look upon this as a very high-handed, arbitrary act, indeed, utterly unwarranted. He has admitted that this man had been a long time in that position; he has admitted that his services were dispensed with because they were no longer required at the port. The hon. gentleman admitted that during the long time he had occupied that office he had contributed towards the superannuation fund. He has admitted that whenever there was any work to be done this officer did it.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Then the hon. gentleman must go to the head of the office, for he is the person who is responsible in respect to officials doing their work. I look upon this as a most arbitrary and unconstitutional act, and the hon. gentleman need not pose as one who looks with scrupulous regard to the rights of officials under the Superannuation Act. We have only to look at the recent superannuation of a judge—one who is most active in politics as well as in judicial life, and who has been superannuated—I mean Judge Clarke, and we find that he is drawing $1,700 a year from this country and at the same time is receiving $10,000 from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Was there ever a greater outrage in the world than superannuation under those circumstances? He was a most active judge and one whose services as judge of the county court could not be retained and who voluntarily relinquished that position, the Government being a party to it, and giving him $1,700 a year superannuation allowance, and he has accepted a position under that great corporation, the Canadian Pacific Railway, at $10,000 a year. It is an outrage on common sense that the Minister should pose as an apostle of economy with respect to superannuation, for he takes a poor man who for 25 years has been drawing $400 a year and regularly contributing to the superannuation fund, and because he has no one to stand up for him, his services are dispensed with and he is not superannuated. It is an exhibition that does no credit to the Minister, or to the Government, or to the country that would permit it. He was entitled, if his services were no longer required, to come under the Superannuation Act, and if he did not do his duty during his term of service it

was the fault of the head of the office. The explanation of the Minister of Customs is not an acceptable one, and it shows how unequally and unfairly Government patronage is distributed. When it suits the Government to superannuate a man for political purposes it can be done and that man can obtain $10,000 for his services, and yet he receives $1,700 a year from this country for life. I think the Minister can hardly justify his action in either one case or the other. He could justify the superannuation of this man because he was entitled to it; with respect to the other case he may be called upon to justify it by a vote of this House.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No one will find fault with the Minister of Customs in reducing the staff if it was more numerous than necessary, but I submit it should be done according to the rules adopted by business men. If there was necessity for a reduction, and the evidence shows that there was, why did not the Minister relieve from duty the officer last appointed? One officer I am informed has been employed only a few years. The Minister employed him himself.

Mr. BOWELL. I have already told the Committee that I had made no appointments at Georgetown.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The gentleman feels persuaded he was appointed by this Government.

Mr. BOWELL. I say he was not appointed by the present Government.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When was he appointed?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know when he was appointed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman will be prepared to take the statement of a gentleman who says he does know. He held office years before the other officer was appointed. There is no charge of incapacity or refusing to perform his duty. It was in the public interest, no doubt, that a reduction should be made, but fairness and justice demand that in making a reduction, the last appointed should be the first to go. Then there was added the fact that against this man no charges of incapacity or insubordination have been made, but the simple statement that there was not enough work to do. He was not granted any superannuation although he had contributed to the superannuation fund during twenty-five years. The action of the Minister in this case is not justifiable on the face of it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I commend the Minister for endeavoring to curtail the expenses of officials, and no doubt he will find many cases were dismissal could properly take place But it has been hinted that this man has a farm and lives a long distance from the town and did not attend to his work. He has a small farm within five minutes walking distance of the wharf. From what I gather from the inhabitants, he was very punctual in his attendance and was ready to do day work or night work, when work was to be done.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to allow the hon. gentleman, even though he may know much of the locality, to put words into my mouth which I did not utter. I said nothing about the distance of his farm from the town. What I said was that during the whole summer he had devoted his time to his farm, and during that time he has been drawing a salary, for which he has given no return, and under these circumstances I did not think he was entitled to be placed on the superannuation list.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Was that report communicated to him?

Mr. BOWELL. It was the reason given him when he was removed, and the Order in Council states the reason why he was removed. In regard to his removal, I took the report of the inspector, and I retained the officer who had attended to his duty. However severe the comments of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) may be upon this question, I am quite prepared to defend myself before this House and the people in regard to making these reductions. The great difficulty is this: that it is more difficult to make a reduction in any part of the staff in any part of the country, and the Minister receives more condemnation for it, more particularly from those who are constantly complaining of the expenditure by the department and by the Government generally, than to add thousands of dollars to the expenditure.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman had no right to violate the law.

Mr. BOWELL. I have not violated the law in the manner in which it has been done. It is optional for the Government if a man has been receiving pay for years and has done nothing for it, whether he should be superannuated; and this man should be very well satisfied that he received money for doing nothing, without being placed on the superannuation list for the rest of his life.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Whose fault was it?

Mr. BOWELL. I assume the responsibility of not having removed a dozen or twenty of them years ago. If there is any condemnation at all, I should have been condemned for not having removed such officers before.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would ask the hon. gentleman if he thinks he should dismiss the last appointed?

Mr. BOWELL. That depends altogether on circumstances. I find that the last appointee, to whom you refer, was appointed on the 7th November, 1873, about the time the Island came into Confederation.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the hon. gentleman give us a similar case where a man who has been in the employ of the Government for a number of years, and who paid into the superannuation fund and was dismissed without a charge against him, received no annuity or gratuity?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know that there is a case analogous to this. I am delighted to hear the hon. gentleman arguing in favor of the superannuation.

Mr. McMULLEN. No; I did not.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; you did, or something like it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will not allow him to put words in my mouth.

Mr. BOWELL. Will the hon. gentleman sit down till I get through.

Mr. McMULLEN. Don't put words in my mouth.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not put words in your mouth.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes; you did.

Mr. BOWELL. No; I did not.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes; you did.

Mr. BOWELL. No; I did not.

Mr. McMULLEN. You said I argued in favor of superannuation and I said nothing of the kind. I asked the hon. gentleman to give us a case were he removed an officer from the service who paid into the superannuation fund and who was dismissed without any charge, and in which you gave him no gratuity? You put words in my mouth that I did not say. Give us any similar case?

Mr. BOWELL. I tell you I do not know of any other case; is that sufficient? You blame me for not giving this man superannuation, that looks like as if you argued in favor of superannuation. I would have no objection that this report and the action taken upon it should have been printed and sent all over the country.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The inspector could not remain in that town very long and he evidently got his information from some other party, probably the collector. The collector gave the information that this man had a small farm and of course as he had only a small salary, he should have some other means to make a living for himself and his children. Let me inform the hon. Minister that the collector has himself a farm and that he spends a little time on it, and I would not be surprised if this man spent as much time in the office as the collector did.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Would there be any saving if the collector were dismissed instead of this man?

Mr. ROBERTSON. There would be a considerable saving.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That makes the case worse.

Mr. COLTER. There is something strange in this matter. When a man pays into the superannuation fund it seems that he pays that he may be entitled to share in the superannuation allowance. What would be thought of the morality of an insurance company that receives premiums year after year from a man and when the amount insured should be paid that the company would repudiate it? The Government in this case puts itself in a similar position to the company that would repudiate its debts. For what purpose was this superannuation allowance received from this man who has been dismissed if not to supply him with a gratuity when his services would be dispensed with? This seems to me as very little short of a fraud on this man and it seems to me that the Government of Canada, representing the resources of this country, should be able to at least do justice. I do not think that we have a right to say that the superannuation should be extended, but when contributions have been received year after year from this official that they may be applied for his benefit when his services are dispensed with, to refuse him that benefit is to set the law at defiance. I think, when the occasion arises, that we will be able to show that the Minister of Customs who is so very economical in this respect has made some appointments that are wholly uncalled for.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would recommend the Minister to come a little nearer home if he is bound to dismiss officers. I notice that the receipts in Colborne are $2,426.26, and that the expenses of the office $2,869.26. How many officers have you there?

Mr. BOWELL. Where did you get that? What Colborne do you mean?

Mr. McMULLEN. Colborne, Ontario.

Mr. BOWELL. The salaries in Colborne are: Mr. Macfarlane, collector, $300; Mr. Schofield, landing waiter, $300; Mr. Hann, preventive officer, $250; contingencies, $7.87; total $857.87, and the total receipts were $2,518.32.

Mr. McMULLEN. It may be Cobourg.

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps it may be somewhere else. In Cobourg the total expenses were $2,869.26 and the revenue $19,385.73.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are there no points at which the revenue is less than what you pay for officers' salaries?

Mr. BOWELL. Oh, yes; a good many places. I took the trouble to make an investigation into this matter to satisfy myself after seeing an attack made on the department in one of the city papers here. I found that in the ports to which he refers that the expenditure to-day did not exceed the income as largely as it did in 1878 when I assumed office. The hon. gentleman will understand how that occurred. There are many places where it is necessary to place preventive officers and where there is no revenue at all. As an illustration, I have in the interest of the fishermen principally at Grand Manan placed three officers along the coast to prevent smuggling and to facilitate the fishing vessels in making their entries. There is little revenue collected there, but smuggling is prevented.

Mr. McMULLEN. I admit that it is necessary that we should have Customs officers and Customs houses to prevent goods being imported without paying duty. But I believe there are some offices in Ontario where there was very little collected and where the salaries exceed the amount.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not aware of any of those.

Mr. COLTER. I presume Hagersville is an outport of Hamilton.

Mr. BOWELL. I think it is.

Mr. COLTER. I would direct the attention of the Committee to the fact that there is no necessity whatever for the appointment which has been made at Hagersville. That place is thoroughly guarded from all all quarters by officers now in existence, and the revenue which is collected at that point is utterly insignificant. There may be a few carloads of coal, but they are about the only imports that come there, and the only reason why this appointment was made was to enable the gentleman who formerly sat for the county I represent to say that he had succeeded in getting so much for the county. Goods could not come there unless through other ports which are well guarded. On the line of railway on which it is situated, we have Hamilton at one end and Port Dover at the other, at which ports the duties are collected on goods coming from Lake Erie or from Lake Ontario, and if goods from Buffalo or Suspension Bridge, or from Detroit, there are officers at other ports to guard the revenue. As the Minister is so economical in Prince Edward Island, there is no reason for throwing away money in Ontario. I say this appointment was not in the public interest at all, but was made for political purposes.

Mr. BOWELL. That is a matter which will have my serious attention, particularly as the member who represents the county says there is no necessity for the office. I find that Mr. Thos. Geo. Hesson was appointed on the 19th January, 1874, and that Mr. Wm. Dalziel was appointed on the 7th November, 1873, so that all the indignation as to the seniority of this gentleman was lost.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I want to inform the hon. gentleman that Mr. Hesson was appointed by the Local Government before Confederation, and that Mr. Hesson's appointment is in my desk, if the hon. gentleman wishes to see it. He was re-appointed by the Dominion Government when Confederation was formed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am glad to see the hon. Minister must feel, if he has dismissed the elder and retained the younger man, he has done wrong, judging by the joy he showed when he thought it was the other way.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Has the hon. the Minister of Customs received any petitions asking him to make Aylmer, Elgin County, an outport of entry? It is a town of considerable size, over 3,000 population, and it would not cost a great deal to make it an outport of entry. At Port Bruce there is nothing hardly being done.

Mr. BOWELL. Is that an outport of London?

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). No; an outport of St. Thomas. It would be a great convenience if someone were appointed at Aylmer, and it were made an outport of entry.

Mr. BOWELL. There was a petition sent sometime ago from Aylmer. There is scarcely a small town in the country that does not petition to be made an outport of entry. I send all such petitions to the inspector, Mr. Newburn, and if he reports favorably I generally carry out

his recommendation. My impression is that the report was against Aylmer.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is the hon. gentleman going to re-instate the official whom he has improperly discharged from Prince Edward Island?

Mr. BOWELL. I have his commission. It is dated in 1874; I have also another paper signed by Mr. Morrison, Assistant Colonial Secretary, appointing Mr. Hesson on the 15th December, 1870. He was appointed by the Local Government in 1870, and got his commission from this Government in 1874, and the other man was appointed by this Government in 1873.

Mr. LAURIER. The other man might have been in the employ of the Local Government too.

Mr. JONES (Halifax.) The hon. gentleman should admit that Mr. Hesson was improperly dismissed.

Mr. BOWELL. He was properly dismissed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why is there the increase in British Columbia?

Mr. BOWELL. There is a deduction at New Westminster of $1,504, and an increase at Vancouver of $1,200. I am afraid that will not be sufficient, during the present year, to perform all the work that will have to be done there, on account of the increase in trade at that port. At Vancouver there is an increase of $1,200 in the Customs, owing to the extra work at that point. I am asking $3,000 to provide for a probable preventive service along the frontier. We find large quantities of goods brought over the Northern Pacific, landed at Sand Point, and taken across the country to the river, and by that means taken into the interior.

Board of Customs and Outside Detective Service... $17,000

Mr. BOWELL. The special agent is Mr. Wolff, who resides in Montreal. Mr. McMichael attends to a good deal of that work in connection with his duties as financial inspector, and Mr. O'Keefe, with two or three on his staff, at New Brunswick looks after the work there. That branch extends over Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island as well as New Brunswick, while Mr. Wolff has charge of the staff all over the Dominion. I think I know what the objections are to this staff, and I have no doubt, from what I learn, that, before the House rises, there will be a discussion on this question, and if the hon. gentleman likes to defer the discussion to that time, I think I shall be able to justify the action of the department in keeping the staff still in existence by showing the result which follows from it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). And by showing the amount of money which each one makes himself?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, the amount each one makes through the work he performs. From what has been said, one would suppose that the money was taken out of the general revenue to pay them. All they get out of the general revenue is their ordinary salaries. Whatever they make in addition to that is made by seizures, and that is paid by those who violate the law. Whether the system is a correct one or not is open to discussion, and it would take longer than I think we desire to remain to discuss it now, but I shall be ready, when the discussion comes on, to justify the action of the department in this matter.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I agree with the hon. gentleman that this opens too large a question to discuss to-night, and, as the Minister intimates that it will form the subject of debate under some other resolution, I will not enter into it now; but I may tell him that there will be a great difference of opinion on that point, and that, though he may be sustained by hon. gentlemen who usually sustain the Government, there is a very strong opinion in mercantile circles that the present system is a very injudicious and a very improper one, clothing, as it does, some not very responsible persons with such large powers.

Administration of the Chinese Immigration Act, including remuneration to Customs Officers..... .....$2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There should be some discussion upon that, but, if the hon. gentleman will agree that we can take that up on Concurrence, we will allow it to pass now.

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2:10 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 12th April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DIVORCE—W. G. LOWRY.

Mr. SPROULE presented the sixth report of the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills. He moved:

That the evidence taken before the Committee this morning on the Bill for the relief of Wm. Gordon Lowry, be printed and distributed.

He said: I do this because I understand that if the matter were referred to the Committee on Printing, it might take a longer time to get it before the members of the House.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 134) to amend chapter 148 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, respecting the improper use of fire-arms and other weapons (from the Senate.)—(Mr. Brown.)

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FOSTER (for Mr. COSTIGAN) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee, on Monday next, to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Inland Revenue Act and to make better provision for ascertaining the duty to be charged on malt under the said Act; to provide that a duty of excise of fifteen cents per gallon shall be imposed on spirits used in a bonded manufactory in the production of ether and other chemical compositions, as from the 22nd May, 1888; for the remission of the duty on malt used in the manufacture of vinegar under certain restrictions, and for the better supervision of bonded manufactories; and to make provision that from the 1st July next the excise duty on cigarettes, weighing not more than three pounds per thousand, shall be $1.75 per thousand, and on those weighing more than three pounds per thousand, $6.00 per thousand, and also to provide further for the manner in which tobacco and cigarettes may be put up in packages.

Motion agreed to.

TARIFF CHANGES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to ask the Finance Minister, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, whether he is yet in a position to state whether or no the Government propose to make any changes in the tariff? It is supposed that we are to close the Session very soon, and it would be well that this should be known.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not in a position to state to-day. I hope I shall be able to do so in a little while.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he might be able to state on Monday next.

Mr. FOSTER. I might.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will see that it is a matter on which notice should be given, otherwise the Session might be delayed longer than he might wish.

SUPPLY—ENQUIRIES.

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

Mr. PERRY. Before that motion is put, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that the answer he gave to my question in reference to the Tignish breakwater the other day, was not correct, and is likely to mislead the members who represent the district where this breakwater is. The question I asked was this:

"Has the Department of Public Works given instructions to repair the Tignish breakwater, Prince Edward Island? If so, is the work to be let by tender? If not, under whose management are the repairs to be made?"

The answer which the hon. Minister gave was this:

"Instructions have been given to repair the Tignish breakwater, Prince Edward Island, by day work. The work has not yet been commenced, but at the proper time a Clerk of the Works will be appointed."

The first part of the answer may be correct, that orders have been given to repair the breakwater, but the second part, that "the work has not yet been commenced," is not correct. My hon. friend must know that the work is now going on; I am sure it is not going on without his authority. I have received letters from home since this question was asked, stating that work is going on, that money has been paid, that men have been employed, and that stuff has been bought. Is it possible that this work is going on, and that money is being spent among favorites of the Government, without the knowledge of the Minister? If that is allowed to be done, I am sure the breakwater will not be much the better for the little repairs they may make on it. I am astonished that the Minister is not prepared to give an answer which would set me right, as well as the House and the people at large, on this matter. I do not mean to say, that the Minister did it wilfully; perhaps he did not consider the question; perhaps he had not time to do it; but it is a matter of great importance, if there are men there secretly carrying on this work, giving contracts, and paying wages to favorites of the Government, without the knowledge of his department. I say it is an outrage; it is squandering money. It would be better to take the $2,000 or $3,000, or whatever it may be, that is being paid, and make a present of it to the half-dozen favorites of the Government there, because the breakwater will not be any the better from the expenditure of that money. If it has become indispensable that this country must support some of the favorites of the Government there, it should be done by an annual subsidy, and not in this underhand way. Perhaps the hon. Minister is not aware that this work is going on, but I have several letters certifying that it is, and that a certain gentleman named Thomas Bernard is hiring people, buying piles, and superintending the work. It is a sorry thing for me to have to get information from an outsider. When I go to the trouble to ask a question of the hon. gentleman, I expect an intelligent answer, but he gave me an answer which was no answer at all. Even little boys, not seventeen years of age, are hired there, and are getting men's wages—why? Because they belong to a certain person who seems to be a favorite of the Government. I can look on it in no other way.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman might have spared himself that excitement. If he had only put the question to me quietly, and asked me if there was not some mistake in this statement I made the other day, I would have read the statement I have in my hand from which I made the answer. It is a statement signed by the chief engineer of the department, and dated from his office, the 10th of April. The statement is this—I will read every word of it:

"Instructions have been given to repair the breakwater, the work to be done by day's labor, as following the practice which has obtained in the department for years in case of small repairs. I am not aware who is the foreman, as the last information I have is to the effect that the repairs had not been commenced, and, indeed, I could not see how they could well be until the ice and snow had disappeared."

Of course, I cannot be on the spot, and I must rely on the chief engineer, who gave me this statement. I do not know anything about what the hon. gentleman has said in reference to a man named Thomas Bernard being engaged on the work, and I will certainly enquire about that.

Mr. WELSH. When will the report of the Government engineer, on piers and breakwaters in Prince Edward Island, be brought down? I would like to see what amount of money is required for these repairs before we go into these estimates.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I sent word to the chief engineer to give me a report as soon as possible. In answer to the enquiry made by the hon. gentleman, the statement sent to me was that it is impossible to submit now a report on the piers in Prince Edward Island, or an estimate of the cost of repairs, for the simple reason that there is no information as to their present state and condition, and to obtain that information would require a regular visit and examination. Where attention has been called to a particular pier, an examination has been made and a report and estimate of cost and repairs submitted. On receiving this, I wrote him back for a statement with regard to the piers in Prince Edward Island, concerning which there were estimates. He is preparing it, and I have no doubt it will soon be before the House.

Mr. WELSH. It is a very strange thing that, after a gentleman has been visiting the Island on Governement work, connected with those piers and harbors, we have no report, after nine months have elapsed, from him. This proves the disgraceful way in which public works are attended to in Prince Edward Island. I will move very shortly for a commission into the way public works are managed in Prince Edward Island, since there seems to be no other way of finding out what is done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to call the attention, either of the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Public Works, to the fact that, last night, I asked the Government what they were going to take up to-day, and they informed me they were going to take up some Bills first. I have no objection to their going into the Estimates, but, as a matter of convenience, the statement of the Government in such matters should not be departed from.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is most likely that I did say we would take up some Bills, and then go on with the Estimates, but I thought it better to take up the Estimates at once, and I suppose the hon. gentleman has no objection to that?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not at all. I merely call the hon. gentleman's attention to this, because it might possibly happen that the change would, under other circumstances, be inconvenient. It would be better if the Government would make up their minds as to what they are going to do.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. the Minister of Militia has sent down a return which is only part of the information that I desire him to lay before the House. He has

sent a return of a number of Martini-Henry rifles. What I particularly wanted was a return of the cost of manufacturing the ammunition for these rifles at the works in Quebec. I should like very much, if the hon. gentleman would furnish us, the additional information, because it is important for us to know.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I did not so understand it. My deputy, who was here, took a note of what the hon. gentleman said, and I sent the return on that note. I have no objection, however, to supplement that return by one showing the cost of the ammunition manufactured in the cartridge manufactory.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would like to ask the Minister of Customs if the report in the Government organ at Montreal is correct, that the Government have decided to waive that portion of their Bill respecting the duty on inland tariff? I have a telegram from the Chamber of Commerce or Board of Trade of Halifax protesting against it. I do not want to say anything about it, but I wish to understand if the Government organ is well advised in stating that the hon. gentleman does not propose to carry that portion of his Bill into effect.

Mr. BOWELL. Whatever the intention of the Government may be, there have been no instructions, directly or indirectly, given the reporter of the Montreal *Gazette*, or anyone else, to make the announcement.

Mr. LAURIER. The Government have had for several weeks before them representations made by the lumbermen as to the policy recently adopted by the Government upon the increase of the import duty on logs. Can the hon. the Finance Minister inform the House whether the Government have come to any decision on that point or not?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government have not come to any decision, other than that already in existence.

Mr. LAURIER. That means nothing at all.

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

(In the Committee.)

Salaries of Officers and Inspectors of Excise.... $270,801 25

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a considerable increase in this vote. Will the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue explain it?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The increase is made up as follows: New appointments, $4,455; annual increments, $4,035; promotions, $2,026; transfers, $1,200.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What promotions are those?

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is entirely the outside service. They are promotions from third class to second class, and from second to first. In one case perhaps an inspector was appointed. Increases as the result of examinations, $735; increases without change of class, $1,145; increases due to change of class, $302. Total, $13,958. The reductions are made up in this way: Superannuation of George Travis, collector at St. John, $1,470; resignation of J. J. McHugh, $940; retirement of C. M. Hamilton, $90, being the balance of that year's salary; A. J. Smith, superannuated, $1,000, new appointments at St. Catharines, provided for but not made, $1,750, making a total of $5,250, which, deducted from the total increase of $13,958, leaves a net increase of $8,708.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). On what ground was Mr. George Travis superannuated?

Mr. COSTIGAN. To promote the efficiency of the service.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In what way?

Mr. COSTIGAN, The deputy collector of the office at that time, Mr. Burke, was promoted in his place. Mr. Travis was beyond the age, and perhaps the hon. gentleman will recollect that, at the time I came into office, there was a very strong report of my predecessor's against the whole staff of the St. John office for inefficiency and irregularity. A change was made of four officers, and Mr. Travis would have been retired at that time, in view of the report then made, but, as he had been appointed many years before with the rank of deputy collector, but without the salary of that rank, I gave him the minimum salary attached to the rank of a deputy collector, and, as the retiring allowance is based on the average of the last three years, I allowed him to remain in order to get the benefit of the salary which he had only obtained at a late date, and which was the minimum of the class to which he was appointed many years ago.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). How many officers are there in that office now?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot give you the names, but the staff is one less than it was at that time.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Burke is up here now, is he not?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; he was appointed deputy collector at St. John some years ago, and when Mr. Travis was retired, Mr. Burke was promoted to the collectorship, as being a very active and intelligent officer, and then promotion took place in all the other ranks, without any new appointments being made.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What is the increased expenditure in St. John?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is no increase there.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There will be an increase in consequence of superannuation.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; the superannuations took place over a year ago, and there is one less employed in the office.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What I wanted to get was the details of the increases.

Mr. COSTIGAN. A great many of our officers are excisemen, whom we can send, and very frequently do send, to any part of the country we like. I have already given the details of the increases. Of course the annual increments go over the whole service. The promotions are from one class to another, irrespective of any Province, and based upon the persons having passed the promotion examination. No man in the service has been promoted without having first complied with the law to the letter, and no one has received an increase of salary beyond the increment allowed by the law.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is as good a time as any to call attention to the state of facts which our Public Accounts disclose, and which, I think, calls for some little information from the Minister in reference to this department. If any hon. gentleman will take the trouble to examine the statements of our receipts and expenditures on this particular vote for the last nine or ten years, he will note that in 1879 our total expenditure was about $211,000, while our receipts amounted to $5,390,000, and they averaged fully that in the succeeding years. Now, from 1879 to 1888, the charge for these services, or for what I presume are nearly the same services, has swollen to $373,000. That is an increase of nearly 60 per cent. over the expenditure of some eight or nine years ago. A part of that might be accounted for, I presume, but when you recollect that our receipts from Excise were, in round numbers, $5,400,000 in

1879, and were quite up to that in succeeding years, and that in 1888 they had only risen to $6,000,000, the Minister will see that the increase of the expenditure from $211,000 to $373,000 is, on the face of it, quite a disproportionate increase. For his own sake, I think some reasonable explanation of that should be given. As I said before, some small part of that may be accounted for, but the increase, taken as a whole, is quite disproportionate to the service performed, and I should be glad to hear what the Minister may be able to say on the subject.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The increase in the force appears large, but it must be remembered that there has been an increase in the revenue, until now it amounts to nearly $7,000,000. Moreover, the imposition of higher duties requires a more strict supervision in the collection of the revenue. Then, again, the gradual increase of salaries can be accounted for by the fact that the Civil Service Act provided that the salaries of second and third class excisemen should be from $500 to $1,000 a year. We found it advisable at once, as soon as that Act was passed, to frame regulations, and divide the staff of excisemen into three classes, and to divide the salaries, so that every third class exciseman, every new appointment, came in at $500; he served six months on probation, and at the end of six months' probation he was confirmed, at $600, and remained there, to work up by annual increasement, at $30 a year, until he reached the maximum of that class. The whole staff, as it existed at that time, has since been kept down to the minimum, and growing up gradually. Further than that, I may state that I have been most anxious to keep down the expenditure as much as possible. With a view to the consideration of the Estimates for this year, I had a circular sent into every district of the department in Canada, calling attention to the desirability of reducing the staff, if possible, with a view of being able to decrease the estimate, or, at least, to prevent an increase. On looking over the reports from every inspector, I could not find a single place where an officer could be spared, or retrenchment could be made. More than that, in many of the districts, I have now before me requests from the chief officers asking for additional help. But I have not provided for any such increase in the present estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will note that I quoted from the year 1888, in which the income was six millions only. There was an increase of $600,000 in the total receipts over those of 1879. In order to collect that additional $600,000, the cost of the department had been raised $160,000. Now, that is, apparently, to say the least of it, a most enormous increase. The larger amount ought to have been collected at a lower percentage instead of a higher, but, so far as it appears in the Public Accounts, the additional sum of $600,000 cost us 25 per cent. to collect.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I see the hon. gentleman, in reply to the hon. member for St. John, has said that Mr. Travis had been superannuated in order to promote the efficiency of the service.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I see by a return brought down from the Inland Revenue Department, that Mr. Travis, collector, is put down here as superannuated to promote economy, not to promote the efficiency of the service. I observe $2,086 for superannuation in the department under the head of Excise, and one George Sutherland is put down for age, another man is put down for ill-health, and Mr. Travis is put down to promote economy. Are these items embraced in the expenditure given by the hon. gentleman now, the superannuation return of $2,000?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I was only referring to Mr. Travis.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It would appear that there has been $2,086 in superannuation allowances granted this year up to December 31st, 1888, in the hon. gentleman's department. That would increase the amount beyond what appears in the blue-book.

Preventive Service..... $15,800

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What has been the result of that preventive service?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Officers are appointed in different parts of the country to look after frauds, and they have been fairly successful, especially during the last year, in preventing illicit manufacture. Besides that, they travel through the country to look after the cigar and tobacco trade, and to the obliteration of marks upon oil barrels, and generally to assist the permanent staff in securing the observance of the law.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I see in the Auditor General's Report of last year, under the head of Preventive Service, $9,327 was paid to a large number of officers in the Inland Revenue Department. Then there were some items paid for travelling expenses, $4,817, which will make pretty nearly the item the hon. gentleman asks for now. But, in addition to that, there was the sum of $3,476 paid for information. The Auditor General appears to have asked the hon. gentleman for an explanation of what this money was paid for, and I see in a letter published on page E 164 of the Auditor General's Report, that the Minister of Inland Revenue declined to give that information. He says:

"The information I must, of course, decline to furnish. The sums referred to were expended in accordance with the intention of Parliament."

I do not know what the intention of Parliament was, or how it was expressed. If I remember aright, it was not voted for any secret service fund. If it was expended in that way, I would like the hon. gentleman to say. I refer the Minister to the Auditor General's Report, in which payments under the head of Preventive Service appear. I find, under the general head, an item of $3,476.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The item in the Auditor General's Report covers two cheques or drafts drawn by me, not exceeding $700 on the whole. The item of $3,000 odd has nothing to do with it. I have stated before in this House that there is an amount of $15,000 placed at the disposal of the Minister for the time being, for the payment of certain preventive service. The whole of that amount every year has been accounted for in the regular way, except last year there were these two special cheques. In a former year, one or two cheques were used in the same way, and no question was raised by the Auditor General with respect to them. When the Auditor General asked information with respect to the payment of these two cheques, I replied that I could not give it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You declined to give it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I explained the matter to his satisfaction, and he admitted himself that a payment might be made through me in connection with information given looking to important seizures, and that I could not give the Auditor General the name of the party to whom payment was made. There is no reason why he should receive it. Knowing that I was using the authority that I presumed I had to make those payments to the extent of about $700, and knowing that I was making those payments in a private way, I furnished the particulars to the leader of the Government, giving the name and the object for which the payments were made, this being done by me for my own protection and as a guarantee that proper payments had been made. But I could not give this information publicly, and the Auditor General admitted it. I think, since 1882,

when I came into office, I have used $300 in addition to these cheques in question in this private manner.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I see in the Auditor General's Report an item of $3,407 charged under the head of Preventive Service as being paid for information. There is also an item: Honorable John Costigan, $500.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The item appears in my own name, because I gave the cheques in my own name, $500 and $200 respectively.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). A return should be furnished as to how that money was expended, for it is not a very satisfactory way of bringing down an item in a lump sum, and this is a pretty large amount.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think I have given all the explanation I can offer, and I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite will accept it as a fair explanation, if I understand rightly the authority I posseses to retain any part of the money to make payments in that manner. In regard to the item of $3,400, that comes up under the head of the general service. It was paid in the regular way, and the department was recouped to some extent by the penalties imposed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I only want to know fhe fact. Does the hon. gentleman understand that he has authority, and if so, where does he receive it, to expend any and, if so, what amount for secret service? If there is any statute empowering it, I have nothing more to say; and if the House has voted it, I have nothing more to say; but I do not understand there is either any existing statute or legal authority or any vote of the House empowering this expenditure. If the hon. gentleman has power to expend $800, why should he not have power to expend $1,800? Is there any limit to his authority? Are we to understand that out of the $15,000 for preventive service, the hon. gentleman can expend any proportion he wishes, giving as a reason that the expenditure is for secret service?

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the expenditure is necessary to effect seizures or protect the revenue, and if is necessary to use in a private way a portion of the fund, I am justified in doing so, making a return to the leader of the Government in order that he may know exactly for what purpose the payments were made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) From what statute does the hon. gentleman derive that impression? Is there any statutory authority? I understand that public money cannot be expended except under statutory authority or an express vote of the House. There is no express vote of the House, and where is the statutory authority? It is inconceivable that there can be absolute authority exercised on the part of the Minister to spend what he likes.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have told the hon. gentleman that since 1882 the total amount expended by me under my own name out of the amount voted for the preventive service was about $900, and that it was spent in order to protect the revenue. The hon. gentleman asks under what statute I have acted. I do not know. My experience before I became Minister was that by the Government of hon. gentleman opposite that item was considered a special appropriation made for a special service. The hon. gentleman thinks that the Minister should not have the power to spend one dollar without giving the name and making a return. One of my seizing officers, however, need not give the name of the informer; he can pay a portion of the penalty to an informer and he need not publish his name. If he can exercise that authority, and if I have expended in this way the small sum I have mentioned during the last eight or nine years, I think there was nothing immoral about it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not expressing an opinion as to the morality of the transaction; but I am enquiring whether the hon. gentleman has asked for or received authority to expend this money. The hon. gentleman says that a certain amount is voted for preventive service. Such is the fact; and there are twenty officers who receive salaries for performing this service, and the details with respect to them are published. I repeat my enquiry, where did the hon. gentleman obtain his express authority to expend any of this money? The expenditure may be right or may be wrong; but there are many things not done, although they would be quite right, because there is no authority.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I may have been wrong, but I was under the impression that I had that power.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I observe that $13,065 was obtained in connection with a seizure, out of which an informer was paid $15, an officer $5,334, and $5,195 went to the revenue. Besides those amounts, the hon. gentleman paid out $3,476 for information, and $500 was paid by him privately under his own name. All the revenue received is $5,000.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think the House will accept the explanation I have made. I have not pressed for penalties as hard in every case, and perhaps I might be considered as over-lenient. I tried to allow them to get clear with a warning on the first offence, but where the second offence was committed I let the matter go to the courts. We get very little revenue from that class of seizures.

Increased pay to officers of large distilleries and factories	$5,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest to the hon. Minister that, another time, he might save discussion if he would assign what he requires for the service of preventive officers, and state when he wants a vote for special services. That account should be strictly by itself, so that the House would understand what it is doing. If I understood the explanation given by the Minister, about two-thirds of this went to the salaries of some twenty officers and that he wants to hold some $5,000 or thereabouts at disposal for obtaining information. I see here a number of men, beginning with Mr. Bogue and ending with Mr. J. Watson, were paid $9,327, as well as two items: one, "paid for information, $3,476," and "paid Hon. J. Costigan, $500." I think we ought to have the items divided, to show what is for special purposes and what for regular information.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman seems to be under the impression that two-thirds of this was for salaries and such information. I stated that every dollar of the amount voted has been accounted for except the $500 for which my name appears, and that is a very small proportion out of $15,000. I can give the vouchers of the officers who made these payments, to the hon. gentleman, but, of course, I cannot give the names of the informers themselves. The payment is a regular one, and it is accounted for in a regular way.

Mr. GILLMOR. Will the hon. Minister state the duties which Mr. J. Bogue performed, and where he resides?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot give much information as to where he resides, because the hon. gentleman, no doubt, knows that better than I do myself.

Mr. GILLMOR. I see he is set down as for St. John.

Mr. COSTIGAN. He is under the supervision of the head officer of that district, but he resides in some of the towns or villages of Charlotte County. His duties are to travel over a certain district outside St. John and look after illicit distilling.

Mr. GILLMOR. There is no illicit distilling in the County of Charlotte.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We don't know that.

Mr. GILLMOR. I never heard of it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We found illicit distilling where, perhaps, the hon. gentleman never heard of either. We seized over eighteen stills within the last few months.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Surely not in Charlotte County?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; but in other places. Mr. Bogue has also got to see that the law is carried out with regard to the sale of tobacco and cigars, and the importation of oil, and the proper defacing of the inspection marks. I think that this gentleman has discharged his duties so well that a request has been made to the Minister of Customs to secure his services and co operation as an active, intelligent and efficient officer. Personally, I do not know the gentleman.

Mr. GILLMOR. I was merely anxious to know what duty he performed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the practice of the hon. Minister with respect to officers in Manitoba? Do they still continue to receive increased allowance on account of the increased expenses of living there?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am almost sorry to say that they do not, because I think it is rather a hardship that that increased allowance is stopped since last year. They get nothing but their salaries, as fixed by law and the regulations of the department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you going to make any alteration with regard to the vote for cullers?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We will let the item stand, as I am in hopes of reducing it very materially.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will not interfere, if there is any hope of reduction.

Salaries of Inspectors and Assistant Inspectors of Weights and Measures..... $48,200

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What receipts does the department get for this expenditure?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think the receipts would make up about half the expenditure. I may say that recently I introduced a change which will result gradually in a very considerable reduction of expenses, that is, by proposing in future, whenever a vacancy occurs in an inspectorship, that vacancy will not be filled up, but will drop into the next inspector's district, and the duties will be discharged by that one inspector, until such time as the Weights and Measures divisions will be made co-equal with the Inland Revenue divisions. That will have the effect of reducing the number of inspectors of weights and measures, from about twenty to nine or ten. In that way a considerable saving will be effected.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to call attention to the fact that the total revenue received last year for the inspection of gas amounted to $7,000, while the expenditure was $20,000. Why should the people of the country, a great many of whom have to burn bad oil and pay a heavy tax on it, be required to pay for the inspection of gas in cities, for the benefit of gas consumers in cities? Besides, we know that the electric light is superseding gas. The revenue from the inspection of weights and measures last year was $37,000, and the expenditure $67,000. So that on these two items the expenditure is just about double the receipts. I submit to the House that the inspection of gas by the Government ought to be swept away altogether—that the consumer of gas ought to pay for his gas the same as anything else. I also think that the whole system of the inspection of weights and measures might be greatly simplified, and the whole expense done away with, by leaving these matters to the municipalities. I am satisfied that in St. John, both the inspector of gas and the inspector of weights and measures do practically nothing at all for the revenue they receive, and I think the hon. gentleman's office is a refuge for more useless officials than any other in the country.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am sorry to hear the concluding remarks of the hon. gentleman. I think what he says in reference to the inspection of gas is well worthy of consideration. That matter has struck me in the same way. But the same argument does not apply to the inspection of weights and measures, because the service performed in inspecting them is useful to the country districts as well as the cities. But I admit that the inspection of gas is for the benefit of cities, and that the country does not get the benefit of it. I will give the matter my attention, with the view of trying to balance accounts as nearly as possible, if the service is continued.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think a very desirable change could be made in the system of inspecting weights and measures. When the inspector goes around to inspect weights and measures, he usually goes into an establishment and looks over all the weights and measures; and then, perhaps, in the course of a day or two he goes around again and delivers to the person who owns the establishment a certain number of cancelled stamps to represent the weights and measures he has inspected. The man who gets the stamps never takes the trouble to see whether they correspond in number with the weights and measures which have been inspected; and if an inspector is disposed to do any wrong, he has ample opportunity; there is no check over him. Instead of the inspector giving the man a number of cancelled stamps, the stamps should be attached to the weights and measures in some way. Besides, when the inspector comes to town, he announces that he is at such an hotel for the inspection of weights and measures, and that people must bring their weights and measures before him. If they do not do that, he will hire a rig and charge them with the expense, for the purpose of going around and making his inspection. I say the present condition of things is wrong, and if a man is disposed to take advantage of it, and collect more money than he returns to the Government, he can easily do it. When a man inspects a weight or a measure, he should attach to it the official stamp or seal; then he should be charged with the stamps he receives when he goes out of the department, and credited with the stamps he returns when he comes back, and should account for the balance. That is the only system that will protect the department against fraud. But the present system encourages fraud, because it leaves the cancellation of the stamps entirely in the hands of the inspector himself. I know myself a case in which not a single stamp was cancelled, but the inspector collected the fees, and he may not have returned a single cent to the Government. There should not be room for that sort of thing. Then, under the present system, there are many cases in which scales escape inspection, as there is no stamp put on to indicate whether a scale has been inspected or not. When an inspector comes around, there are people who will say that they have only so many scales, while, perhaps, the rest are under the counter. If the system required the scale to bear the official stamp, the purchaser would know that it was a proper scale, and that it would be safe to buy goods weighed on it. I hold that, in order to deal justly with the public, the system should be changed, otherwise the merchant should not be called on to pay for the stamp at all. Everybody is in-

terested in having honest scales. The public is just as much interested as, if not more than, the seller. Consequently, I hold that every scale should be stamped free by the Government, and that the public should bear the whole expense. Some system to protect the public against the injustice I have spoken of should be adopted.

Mr. McNEILL. I should like to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that the selling of spring balances for private use is illegal. That seems to be a most extraordinary provision. If a poor man wishes to get a spring balance, which is the very cheapest style of a scale, costing about $4, for his own private use, it seems hard that it should be illegal for him to purchase it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is one of those cases in which it is impossible to please everybody. If a citizen has one of these spring balances, none of our officers has a right to interfere with or molest him. Parliament has passed a law to prevent the manufacture of scales which are not reliable. From the time you begin to use spring balances, the spring becomes weakened and they are no longer reliable, and therefore their manufacture is prohibited. We provide, however, for the manufacture of a cheap style of scale for housekeeping purposes, and provide a special rate for examination; in fact, we do all we can to meet the wants of the citizen.

Mr. McNEILL. It would be the proper thing to prevent the use of spring balances for the purposes of commerce, but not for private use. The hon. gentleman said that a private individual can have a spring balance, and he will not be interfered with; but it is made illegal for him to buy one or for a man to give him one.

Mr. COSTIGAN. They were all over the country before the law was passed.

Mr. McNEILL. They get worn out, and we cannot get new ones without infringing the law or inducing someone else to infringe it, If this class of scale is merely for private use, it is arbitrary to prevent a man purchasing it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know if the Minister intends making any change in the system of inspecting weights and measures? How does he ascertain from each inspector the amount of money collected?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The stamps are given to the inspector, and he has to account for them. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman has said, but he is mistaken in supposing that any radical change is required in the law or regulations. The cases he referred to were those in which the officers violated the law. Let the hon. gentleman send me the name of the man he referred to, and I will deal with him. Every trader receives a circular informing him he is not to make any payment to the assistant inspector of weights and measures until the weights and measures are brought back and stamped.

To meet the expenses under the Adulteration of Food Act $25,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to object to this vote, because, under certain conditions, it may be a very valuable vote; but I would like the Minister to state, in a very general way, how this Act works, and whether we receive anything at all from it? I believe we do not, that it is an expense incurred by us *pro bono publico*.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Of course the Act is not long in force, and is more experimental than anything else. I think the hon. gentleman will admit, from the discussion of, and allusions to, this service in the press generally, that it is looked upon with a considerable amount of favor. True, there is no revenue derived from it; but it is an expenditure believed to be for a good purpose, and, I think, with a little change, we can bring about very satisfactory results all over the country. I propose that the Chief Analyst, who has been in communication with some of the Ontario associations, should, during the summer, put himself in communication with all such associations throughout the country, to gather information, so that, next Session, some important change may be made in the law regulating this branch of the service.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Have there been any seizures or convictions under this Act?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Prosecutions under the Act in some cases have failed on account of the interpretation given the Act by some of the courts, and it was proposed to introduce a short amendment this Session to remedy that weakness; but after an interview with the Dairymen's Association, and after representations made by other organisations throughout the country, it has been thought advisable, instead of patching up the Act, to let it stand until next Session, and then bring in a more perfect and complete amendment to the Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does this inspection of food include liquors, &c?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And do the officers analyse specimens of these in the different Provinces now?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Are the results given in the report?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The results are given in the bulletins published by the chief analyst from time to time. They are not embodied in the annual report of the department, but they will be brought down in a report. I have been discussing this matter with the Minister of Agriculture with a view to having them distributed in the same way as he distributes the information in connection with the Experimental Farms.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is hardly worth while having the analysis made unless the results are published.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The newspapers get hold of these bulletins, and publish the results.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The analysis of the drink of the people is almost more important than the analysis of the food, because we know that there is more adulteration of drinks than there is of food. This is a very serious matter, and I do not think any greater benefit could be conferred upon the people at large, than that a proper analysis should be made regularly of the beer and the liquors which the people drink, in order to ensure their purity. If the proposition, which the Minister of Finance used to support, in favor of total prohibition were carried, of course that would not be necessary. But, when a large quantity of liquor and beer enters into the daily consumption of the people, it is of the highest importance that it should be in as pure a state as possible. Do I understand from the Minister, that we will have the result of last year's analysis placed in our hands in some form?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Last year the expenditure for the adulteration of food exceeded the estimate by $3,221. What was the cause of the excess?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We had some exceptional expenditure on buildings which we had to fit up for the assistant analysts. When the hon. gentleman sees that, in all the Provinces,

we have to take samples and pay for them, of food and drugs and drinks, I think he will not be surprised that we expended last year a little more than the amount voted, but there is no danger of an over-expenditure this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In your interest, Mr. Chairman, as well as in mine, I desire to call the attention of the hon. gentleman and the Minister of Public Works to the fact that, while it is very important that the liquor and the food of the people should be as pure as possible, it is also of some consequence that the air we breathe in this Chamber should not be more adulterated than it need be. Within the last week or two it has been growing gradually worse, and I hope those two hon. gentleman will put their heads together, and see if some remedy cannot be devised.

Mr. CHARLTON. We have had this question of the proper ventilation of this Chamber under discussion many times, and I am afraid that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has not redeemed the promise he gave last year that the mode of supplying air to the Chamber should be changed, and that the air should no longer be brought in through the sewers, but from places where the air is pure. I think we still have the air brought in through these ducts which go to the edge of the cliff, and, as long as that is the case, the ventilation of this Chamber must necessarily be imperfect. No matter what air is brought into the Chamber, it will, as long as that system lasts, be something like the air we get in cellars and sepulchres.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) For a few weeks past we have had beautiful weather here, and yet we find that the front doors of this building are always closed. If the corridors were ventilated, if the windows were opened, we could have pure air brought in, but there seems to be a determination on the part of some one to keep both the doors and the windows closed. If those windows were opened between 6 and 8 o'clock, we would have purer air when we returned at 8, but we cannot expect impossibilities, and we cannot expect that the air will be pure when 200 or 300 men are sitting here constantly, and frequently as many more in the galleries, without proper ventilation being afforded.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is perfectly impossible for us to expect this Chamber to be pure when there is so much corruption in it.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Hon. gentlemen forget that, if the doors and windows were opened, while it might be beneficial to members of the House, it would be very uncomfortable for some of the messengers about the corridors, and that would not do. I think it is very important that we should have some fresh air in this Chamber. I believe it would shorten the Sessions considerably, because we would all be in a better humor. It is a very important matter in connection with the health of members. Here we are poisoned with all the noxious gases which can be brought in. When the galleries are filled in the evening, the air contained in this Chamber will not last in a pure state for more than two or three minutes, and the carbonic acid gas which is exhaled from the galleries drops down upon us, and the result is that we are practically poisoned. I have no doubt that the lives of the representatives of the country are cut short by the impure air in this Chamber, and I think the country could not do better than to expend a few thousand dollars in giving us pure air, by building a new Chamber or by enlarging this Chamber, or by doing something to improve the present state of things.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Hon. gentlemen on both sides are perfectly right in saying that the air in this Chamber is vitiated, and, in fact, it is sometimes hardly possible to remain in the House; but the remedy is entirely in the hands of the House. During the Session, the authority that the Minister of Public Works exercises over these buildings on behalf of the Government is, to a very large extent, suspended, as far as the two Houses and the rooms occupied by members of Parliament are concerned, and it is left very much to members to improve the ventilation of the room. I spoke to the Speaker at the beginning of this Session in reference to this matter, and he gave orders that, at 6 o'clock, the windows and doors should be opened, so that we might have ventilation. That order is obeyed more or less, perhaps less, rather than more, at least I am afraid so. I think this little discussion will show the officers who have charge of the building that they must obey the orders, and must give us some of the air which we have in such abundant quantity outside. True, sometimes while the House is sitting, the doors or windows have been opened, and members have sent messengers to close them, although other members when they see them closed, might order them to be opened. We have done all that we could do in reference to the air ducts mentioned by my hon. friend opposite. Last year the question came up whether we should not build a new House of Commons.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At any rate, some members spoke of it; I do not say that the whole House was of that opinion, but the question was broached of having a new House of Commons. The matter has been looked into, and it would require a very large sum of money, because we could not erect a House of Commons here without making the new building accord with the architecture of the present Parliament building. But another mode was suggested, and it has been studied, but, unfortunately, the chief architect of the department, Mr. Fuller, has been very ill during the last three or four months, indeed his life was despaired of; therefore, the plans he was preparing had to be laid aside for the present. The idea was, and is, to enlarge this House by throwing down the partitions between this House and the outside wall of the building. Then we would have a room perhaps 40 or 50 per cent. larger than this one, and we would have light and pure air on three sides of the new Chamber. There would be more room for the members now, and it would accommodate an increased representation which we may have in three or four years. That matter is now being studied, but I am afraid that if we had been ready to make the change this year, the Minister of Finance would have said that the finances would not allow the matter to be considered now. I think that during the recess I will be in a position to lay the matter before my colleagues, with the plans, and that next Session, if the idea is considered a desirable or necessary one, the plans may be laid before Parliament, and we may ask from the House such a vote of money as may be necessary. But, as I said, I have done what I could in the direction of ventilating the Chamber. The hon. gentleman knows himself that this room was badly built for its present purpose; it would have served better, I think, for a Library than for a House of Commons. We have no ventilation, no opening, except two doors on this floor. The openings are over our heads, therefore we cannot have the same ventilation nor as much fresh air as we could have if the openings were on the level of the floor. However, the matter is being considered, and I hope that next Session I will be able to lay before my colleagues and before Parliament, some scheme to meet the views of the House. I do not think such a scheme can be accomplished without a considerable sum of money, but it will not cost anything like a new building.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would suggest that it might be of very great utility, after the House adjourns each night, for the doors and windows all to be opened; then the employés and messengers would run no risk of getting colds

in their heads, as suggested by an hon. gentleman on this side of the House. We could then have a complete change of air in the room, so that when the House meets again the following day the atmosphere would be bearable.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think that the radical defect in the ventilation of this Chamber—of course the situation of the Chamber is such that it cannot be perfectly ventilated—is that the air brought into it is brought through those ducts. That is a matter against which I have been contending for years. It is almost impossible to get at a remedy, and as long as the air comes into this Chamber through ducts, that air will be to a certain extent poisonous, and unless we change that mode of ventilation, the Chamber will be radically defective, whether you carry out the proposal of the hon. Minister or not. Now, I have urged the erection of a tower or chimney in this court where the machinery is situated, for the purpose of drawing the air from a height of, perhaps, 100 feet, and feeding the air through that chimney into the Chamber, in place of drawing it through these ducts. We would then get pure air directly from the source of all pure air, instead of bringing it through these subterranean passages which are often foul and always mouldy, which serve as receptables, sometimes, I dare say, for dead dogs and dead cats and various substances of this kind, that would make us shudder if we thought of the air we are breathing and the place from which it comes. I hope the hon. Minister will give his attention to that difficult matter, so that we may have good ventilation in this Chamber, whatever else may be done.

Minor Revenues..... $800

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice in last year's accounts an item of $653.18 to D. O'Connor, as costs of collecting ordnance rents; reporting on ordnance lands, $20. Who is this D. O'Connor, and how does this item come in?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The item properly applies to the Department of the Interior, although that payment, I dare say, was made by my department. The hon. gentleman will remember that this item was discussed in the Public Accounts Committee. The accounts for arrearages, hydraulic rents, and other ordnance property, were placed in the hands of Mr. O'Connor for collection. He collected a large amount of these old debts and received that amount on account of these collections.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How much did he collect?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know the exact amount; but I can state that the arrangement made with Mr. O'Connor was the same, and the percentage allowed him for collecting, was just the same as that given by the previous Governement to the same gentleman for the same service.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot understand why in Ottawa civil servants cannot collect these hydraulic rents, and, in my opinion, it should be done by some of our officials instead of by a lawyer. I know that the name of this gentleman, Mr. D. O'Connor, appears on almost every page of the Auditor General's Report, and when the different items are added up they amount to $18,000 or $20,000. It is a mere excuse to say that it is necessary to employ a lawyer to collect these rents, when it could be done by civil servants who are walking round with nothing to do. It is time this practice was stopped. It is quite evident that Mr. O'Connor is a particulnr pet and is encouraged and paid for some particular purpose. Is this the same man who appeared the other day and took an active part at the presentation to the Minister of Public Works? I believe he was the man.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is simply an assertion. The hon. gentleman says there is no necessity to employ Mr. O'Connor because there are sufficient clerks in the Government employ to make the collections. Without being discourteous to the hon. gentleman, I may say that these arrears have existed for years; that the Government in power from 1874 to 1878 found the same difficulty in collecting the arrearages the present Government has found, and no clerk was able to collect them during the administration of the previous Government. These arrears are accumulating, and we are endeavoring to bring about a settlement for the payment of those arrears, which amount to a very considerable sum. A considerable sum has been paid in by Mr. O'Connor on account of the collections. By threatening prosecutions the parties made a settlement, and we have already obtained a considerable amount, and the item of $600 is on account of services in connection with this matter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The amount charged is given, but not the amount collected. I remember a case in a Provincial Legislature where a man was employed to collect a certain dog tax. He charged a certain sum for commission, and when interrogated as to the receipts, he said the receipts would not pay the commission.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will bring down the amount of the collections.

Mr. McMULLEN. Both in the Public Accounts Committee and here, whenever fault is found with an item of expenditure, Ministers immediately say that the previous Government did the same thing. There must be a stop put to that. I am not here to justify the action of the previous Government if they acted wrongly. What we have to do is to criticise the actions of this Government, and when we find an item of this kind, it is no answer or explanation to say that the previous Government did the same thing. It is time there was an end to the giving of such answers with respect to the expenditure of public money.

Collection of Slide and Boom Dues..... $7,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that this vote is reduced to nearly one-third of the previous amount. Of course it is desirable that there should be decreases wherever possible; but I should like to know whether a complete change of system has occurred, or whether this large decrease has been found to be practicable, as compared with $20,000 previously voted. The presumption is one of two things: either that there has been a change of system, or that the previous expenditure was altogether too large. What is the cause of this very remarkable decrease, and does any part of it appear in the next item?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No. The reason why the Government have asked for this small sum is, that negotiations are in progress between the Finance Minister and the Governments of Quebec and Ontario, with a view to reconsidering the arrangement entered into before Confederation. This amount is to carry on the service until the arrangement has been completed, when this matter will be taken entirely out of the hands of my department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course I have no objection to this reduction, and I have always thought that it would be better if this subject were in the hands of the provincial authorities. What revenue was obtained last year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I can bring down the information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If we are going to hand over this matter, why should we pay anything for the service? What is it proposed to do with the $7,500?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Officers have been appointed to discharge these duties, on an understanding arrived at between the three Governments. It is now proposed, and an arrangement is pretty nearly completed between the Minister of

Finance and the Ontario and Quebec Governments, to discontinue the existing arrangement, but until it is discontinued we must maintain the offices and pay the officials.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope we are not going to be saddled with a heap of charges for superannuating these officers who do not belong to us, because, this being really a provincial work, the Provincial Governments should take this business over and look after the officers. Once or twice when such changes have been made, I have noticed they have resulted in a very considerable addition to the Superannuation Fund.

Mr. FOSTER. The Dominion Government have some officers of their own in that joint service, employed in the collection of slide and boom dues. Then these two Provincial Governments have some officers employed in the collection of timber dues. The rule has been that all the officers have been paid out of a common fund and the two Provinces have paid each one-third, being the share of each Province, towards the general expense. That was an arrangement not altogether palatable to the Provincial Governments or the Dominion Government, and when the delegates were here in the course of the autumn we came to the conclusion to abolish that system. The Dominion Government and the Provincial Governments are now considering the disposition of these officers. Some of them will, no doubt, be required by the Provincial Governments, and they will probably look after their proportion. Some others will be needed for that part of the work which belongs to the Dominion Government, and I do not think any difficulty will be encountered in making an arrangement, without entailing very much cost.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We have in the Auditor General's Report a statement of the arrearages, but we have not the amount collected. These arrearages require some explanation. Under the head of slide and boom dues, we have: Due 30th June, 1885, $40,000; due 30th June, 1888, $71,000. Some of these arrearages run back for a great number of years, and, no doubt, are out of date, and will never be recovered. If we pay salaries to these collectors of revenue on slides and booms, and that such arrears occur, the department ought to be able to give some explanation. I cannot see why, during three years, we should have increased the arrears by $31,000. There is evidently some insuperable difficulty in collecting those arrears, or some indifference or supineness on the part of the officers, and I think Parliament has a right to know.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Instructions have been given to the officers to press for the payment of these arrears.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it is intolerable that they are not pressed for. It is not fair to the other taxpayers of the country.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The amount of revenue received from the slides and booms will be found in the Auditor General's Report, page G-112, and it amounted to $46,651.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What my hon. friend says is quite true. If you turn to the Public Accounts you find that in 1888, $66,442 accrued from this source of revenue, but we only collected $46,000 out of that, while our annual expenditure appears to have gone up to $100,000, all told. There were nearly one-third of the revenues which actually accrued that were not collected. I think it reflects considerably on the management of the department that such a state of things should exist, and the hon. Minister might be prepared to explain. We will say nothing about back balances, but he ought to explain why this $20,000 was not collected last year.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I know of no reasons why the payments were not made, but finding that such a large amount were in arrears, I gave instruction to the officers to press for payment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand, the officers have full power to seize the timber and to hold it until every cent is paid. The tolls amount to a very small percentage of the value of the timber. It appears to me that with such excellent security in hand there ought not to be—whatever may be said as to bad claims—such a large deficit in the collection as $20,000 for the last year, 1888.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I believe we will get that before long.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What we want to know is why it has not been obtained.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will enquire if there is any particular reason why it has not been collected, and I will give it to the hon. gentleman on Monday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, but I would point out that this is precisely the sort of question which the Minister might expect when he brings down these estimates, and he ought be prepared with information to answer it. I will not press the matter, because we have other opportunities of bringing it up again. A loss of $20,000 out of a total revenue of $66,000, where you have got every full and ample means for collecting it, seems to me rather a doubtful proceeding.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). One reason why the balances occur is this: A good deal of the revenue derived from slides and booms is earned during the months prior to the 1st of July. These amounts are chargeable upon the timber, and are collected only when the timber goes to Quebec, and is disposed of, so that it would be natural that there would be a considerable balance at the end of each financial year, accruing to the department for that particular service, whilst, at the same time, I do not think that would at all imply that the balance, or any portion of it, remaining unpaid, would be lost to the revenue. My hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) will understand what I mean. The amounts are not collected at the moment the timber is cleared here at Ottawa, but when it reaches Quebec, and usually not until the timber is sold. The timber may remain undisposed of sometimes for over a year, and we are not to imply from this, that the revenue is going to lose anything by these balances going over.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be a very excellent explanation on one point, but the fact remains, that the balance due on the 30th June, 1888, was $105,883, showing that this plan of collecting back balances has not worked very well all through.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Perhaps not, but it will act to a great extent for the balances due.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It will account for the way in which the balance is allowed to creep up from year to year. We find that now the balances unpaid amount to nearly two years receipts, and that balance keeps increasing. On the 1st July, 1887, the balance was $87,130, and on the 30th June, 1888, $105,883.

Mr. LAURIER. The explanation of the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) might apply to the deficit in the collection from one year to the other, but there are arrears going back as far as 1871.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I quite admit that this does not account for the whole thing, but it accounts for it to a very great extent. There are considerable balances that

remain over for a considerable number of years, and my hon. friend, when he was Minister of Inland Revenue, knows how difficult it was to collect some of these amounts. There were certain contentions on the part of some of those against whom these accounts were held that they were not liable, and my hon. friend remember the difficulty there was in this connection.

Mr. LAURIER. This is not a novel discussion, and I have heard it year after year, but I notice there has not been any improvement in the system. The system is certainly wrong when the balances are allowed to increase from year to year. There must be something wrong, which cannot be defended at all.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I think myself the system is wrong.

Mr. WALDIE. I do not see why it is necessary to employ legal assistance to collect these arrears, as I understand before the timber is cleared at Quebec the dues have to be paid, and it is in the hands of the officers there to enforce payment. I know they collect in some instances, and I do not see why they should not do so in all.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). While on the subject of arrearages, I would like to invite the attention of the Government to an explanation on some other point. I see at page "G-152" of the Auditor's General's Report, under the head of "arrears due for interests and investments," that there is $14,548 interest to the 30th June, 1888. This is under correspondence. Then there is the Bank of Liverpool, interest on $30,000, for nine years, at 4 per cent; this is before the courts. Then there are the following items under Miscellaneous Consolidated Fund:

Quebec Turnpike Trust	$20,000 00
McGill College	7,990 00
Upper Canada Bank stock	750 00
Earl of Selkirk's mortgage	13,900 00
H. L. Boulton's mortgage	3,000 80
Total	$45,640 80

Then there are the Montreal Turnpike bonds, $67,200; the North Shore Railway, $970,000, two years and 263 days' interest at 5 per cent.; Quebec Harbor debentures; St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Co., interest due to 30th June, $17,356—correspondence going on, and the company remitted $10,000 on account; and Three Rivers Harbor debentures, one year. Perhaps some members of the Government will explain to us why these accounts are allowed to remain so long.

Mr. FOSTER. Some of these, I suppose, fairly well explain themselves; some of them I know nothing about at all. The Quebec Turnpike Trust and the Montreal Turnpike Trust bonds are two items which, I suppose, are in connection with the settlement of the accounts between the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec and the Dominion, which are now in process of settlement. With reference to the Upper Canada Bank stock, I suppose that has relation to that old bank matter which has been lying so long. I do not know what these two mortgages are, but now that my attention has been called to them, I will look into them.

Mr. ELLIS. With regard to the Albert Railway Co.'s account, I moved in the Public Accounts Committee for the vouchers for the payments, but there seemed to be no vouchers. The common report is that the money was paid over to some clerk in a dry goods house in St. John, and that the sum which the First Minister stated was to pay laborers was paid to the directors. The common report about St. John is that the directors paid themselves for five years' services out of the money given to them by the Government. In the meantime the railway company failed, and the railway has passed out of the hands of the original company into the hands of some third party. There is no probability of any interest ever being collected; but there should be some satisfaction given to the country as to whom the money was paid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would just call the attention of the Minister of Inland Revenue to this circumstance: that, although there has been a difficulty about collecting those arrears, in 1878 the total tolls accrued amounted to $78,449 and the total amount deposited to the credit of the Receiver General was $98,364, showing that we not only collected all the tolls, for the year, but had $20,000 to the good. There were large arrears when we came into office, but we brought them down considerably. So that I think, with the exercise of due diligence on the part of the Minister, it would be possible to collect as much in the year as accrued due.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hope the hon. gentleman will let this item stand until these arrearages are explained. The matter is more serious than we had imagined. I find that in the Ottawa agency, in hydraulic and other rents, there is about $60,000 due to the Government, and that the arrears of slide and boom dues have been accumulating for a number of years. If the Auditor General's Report is to be relied on, some of the largest amounts due to the Government have been going on since 1878. In Three Rivers there have been nearly $15,000 of arrears which have accumulated since 1885. There are some firms who are $13,000 in arrear for hydraulic and other rents, and $9,000 or $10,000 in slide and boom dues. It is impossible that this state of matters can continue. The hon. gentleman must see that it is unfair and unjust to the country at large as well as to those who are compelled to pay their dues. One man is compelled to pay, and another is let off. What is the reason? Is it political favoritism, or what is it? It is easy to collect the dues, because they form a lien on the timber as it comes down the slides, and if a man is in arrears for one or two years, his timber should not be allowed to come down until they are paid. I think the item should be allowed to stand until we get a statement on Monday. If it passes this year without any explanation being given, I give the hon. gentleman notice that if these arrearages come up in another year, I will challenge the opinion of the House upon them by a formal vote, because I think it is disgraceful to the department to allow such arrearages to accumulate from year to year.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice by the Auditor General's Report—I do not know whether this is a member of this House or not—that Perley & Pattee are in arrear to the amount of $40,000 altogether. I think it is unfair that the Committee should be asked to pass this item without having a fuller explanation of it. Have those accounts in the Auditor General's Report been settled?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The same question came up in the Public Accounts Committee, and I stated the difficulties found in bringing about a settlement, difficulties which had existed for years on account of claims put in. I stated that these arrearages ought to be paid, and that if I could not collect moneys through the ordinary course, I would hand the matter over to the Department of Justice. That was done, but legal proceedings were not necessary, because negotiations took place between the Minister of Public Works and these gentlemen, which resulted in a proposition satisfactory to both parties, and which would bring about a payment of those arrears.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We will accept the proposition on the distinct understanding that discussion may be had on this subject when any other items are proposed.

Esquimalt Graving Dock repairs $5,225
Lévis Graving Dock repairs $4,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). These items seem heavy for new works. We were given to understand last year that the expenses of the Lévis graving dock, when completed, would be very small, indeed. The returns from the Esquimalt graving dock are about $5,000. The Minister of Public Works explained that he had not, at the moment, the returns for the Lévis graving dock, but promised to bring them down shortly. The item here for the working of the dock seems heavy, and the repairs, considering it is a new work, are excessively heavy.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The $5,225 are for the repairs of the Esquimalt graving dock; it consists of coal, 350 tons, for the working of the machine; watering, 350 days, at $2.50; waste, oil, tallow, repairs and renewals, $2,000. The $2,000 is only an approximate sum, and we may have to pay a little more or less. For the Lévis dock last year we asked a certain sum only in the same way. It was an experiment, we did not know what it would cost, and, therefore, had to ask a certain sum, in order that we might know afterwards what amount would be required. The work there has been left for the season under the direction of the harbor commissioners, my department being, of course, responsible. The staff includes a superintendent, dockmaster, one engineer, for 12 months, and another for 8 months, then the two foremen and the watchman. Then, of course, there are the laborers that are required, in addition, during the season of navigation, for repairing purposes, $2,000. That is as regards the staff As regards repairs, we have, under that title, coal, waste, oil and tallow, and materials for repairs, and contingencies. We will be able, next season, after the experience of a year, to say exactly how much of these should be dropped or how much added. The hon. gentleman asked me about the return. I have not a return as complete as I would wish to put before the House, but I will tell him now what was the expenditure and the revenue of last year. The revenue of the previous year had been $21,902. We had a number of vessels in the dock, and one large steamer remained in it all winter. She paid $16,000 or so for having occupied the dock. This year we have had very little revenue, because very few vessels used the dock up to the 31st December. The revenue was only $2,349.10 for that year, against an expenditure of $7,108.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the Lévis dock is under the charge of the harbor commissioners at Quebec?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Lévis dock was attended to last year under the management of the harbor commissioners, through my department, because I was not ready to assume the work myself. I had not the officials I required, who had experience of such work, and the hon. gentleman will admit that the dockmaster must be a first class man. We had a very good one in British Columbia, Capt. Devereaux. The one in Quebec I do not know, but the chief engineer is preparing for me a report on the work for the season, in order that we may be in a position to decide what is to be done.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I hope the hon. gentleman does not propose to work the dock under the harbor commissioners.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, but under the direction of my own department. I did it as I did the work last season on the channel between Montreal and Quebec. The work had already been under the commissioners, and I made arrangements with them that the work would continue so for the season, they giving official information to my department, and my officers looking after the expenditure. But from the 1st of January that has ceased altogether, I have assumed for my department the control of that work, and any work will henceforth be conducted directly through my department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I) Has the capital expenditure ceased upon the Esquimalt graving dock.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I see that last year you spent $90,000 on this. What was the reason for that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose it was because the contracts were being completed.

Mr. MARA. Her Majesty's men of-war are docked free of charge, except in regard to daily expenses, and, of course, the expenses will appear great in proportion to the receipts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would ask the Minister what is being done, if anything, in the construction of the wharf or harbor at Cape Tormentine. A harbor has been built at Cape Traverse, and the hon. gentleman commenced to build one at Cape Tormentine, but the contractors threw up their contract, and I understand that the place was not very well chosen and should have been put further westward. What has been done, or what is being done, as to the letting of that contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I did not expect this question, as it is not under this heading, but I will give an answer to the hon. gentleman on the first occasion we meet. I gave the information some days ago when we were on the Estimates.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was not in the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will refer to the *Hansard*, and if he wants any further information, I will give it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What will be the probable receipts from the Lévis graving dock?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have already stated that, during the season before last, the revenue from that dock was $21,902.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). In regard to Cape Tormentine, I may state that the contract was let for the second time last year, and the contractor made good progress with it in the latter part of the year. I think the wharf was built out from the shore some 600 feet or 700 feet.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it built on the same location as the first wharf?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Yes. A very careful survey was made of the whole locality at that time. I saw the plans in the Department of Public Works, and I think an examination of the plans would convince anyone that the location was well selected.

Telegraph Line between P.E I. and the Mainland.... $2,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is the ordinary vote, according to the terms of Confederation.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Have the Government received any report, or has their attention been drawn to a new cable which has been patented by Capt. Trott and Mr. Hamilton, the engineer of the telegraph ship at Halifax? Instead of this being covered with wire, it is covered with hemp, and I am led to believe that it only weighs about half as much as the old-fashioned cable, though it costs nearly the same amount; but, from the information which they have in regard to hemp, which has been under water for a long time, its durability appears to be very much greater than that of the old cable. The parties who have the patent have already manufactured some 50 or 60 miles, and have laid that in the Atlantic in connection with the Anglo-

American Cable Company, where it has been in successful operation for some time. There has also been a cable of this kind working, for some time, across Halifax harbor to Dartmouth. The great advantage which seems to exist in connection with this cable is its durability. It is said that the length of time which it will last has yet to be determined, but the promoters have already found hemp which has been under water for a great number of years without apparent injury. I think it would be important for the Government, in view of any cable operations, or any assistance which they may be offering to any cable enterprises, to investigate this new cable.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand that Mr. Gisborne, the superintendent of our telegraph system and a very distinguished electrician, is kept *au fait* of these matters. If we require, as we may, to lay down a cable or cables, the best cables which will cost the least and which will be as good will be selected; but certainly I would not tell the hon. gentleman that though one cable may be less expensive than another, that should be a reason for us to adopt it, unless experience has shown that the cable which may be obtained at a less price is as good and durable as that which we have now. We will probably have three or four small cables to lay on the north coast before we reach Anticosti. If, as we are told, there is a company being formed to build or stretch a cable between Great Britain and Belle Isle, the question will arise whether we should extend our system from the east end of Anticosti to Belle Isle by a cable. If that occurs, I have no doubt we will find at once that our telegraphic system by the north coast will be a paying concern; but, until we are sure that that company will be in a position to begin their work and stretch their cable, it is not our intention to ask for a vote of money from Parliament to extend our lines in that direction.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am not expressing any want of confidence in Mr. Gisborne, who, I believe, is a very distinguished electrician, but sometimes people are prejudiced against new patents and new enterprises and discoveries, and have their attention drawn entirely to one class of cables. Therefore, I venture to recommend the Government, even in the event of such a high authority as Mr. Gisborne recommending their adhesion to the old cable, to take means to satisfy themselves in regard to it, and, in that case, I think they would arrive at the conclusion that this cable would be of great importance, even in reference to durability.

Telegraph Lines, N.W.T. $21,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose this is only for maintenance?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This is only in regard to what we own?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have several telegraphs in the North-West Territories, north of the Canadian Pacific Railway, some in the west going as far as Edmonton, and we have some in the east going as far as Saskatoon and Prince Albert. These lines, of course, later on, may be transferred or sold to some railway company, perhaps to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company themselves. I tried to have the company assume them at a fair price, but they were not tempted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there any sort of revenue derived from these, and if so, is it a progressive revenue?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, but I cannot tell how much.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there a reasonable chance, within a fair space of time, of these becoming self-supporting?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think so. I think those of the North-West Territories are likely to pay as well as those on the north coast of the St. Lawrence. In British Columbia it may take more time.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is there any new arrangement with regard to the Cape Race light? I see some new arrangement has been proposed between the Dominion and the British Government.

Mr. FOSTER. That has been handed over to the Canadian Government, together with the revenue fund which had accrued about $110,000.

Committee rose, and it being Six o clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

INDEPENDENT ORDER OF THE FORESTERS.

Mr. JAMIESON moved that the House concur in amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 74) to incorporate the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of the Foresters. He said: The Senate have amended sections 3 and 7, and recast them. They amended section 3 so that instead of giving the Supreme Court power to regulate the incorporation of subordinate courts, they provide that the trustees shall file a declaration in the registry office for the registry division within which the subordinate court is being established. In addition to that, they provide for the incorporation of the trustee of the court, instead of the court itself. Section 7 is also changed slightly. In the event of the dissolution of a subordinate court, it is made optional with the Supreme Court to take over the property, and if it does take over the property, it takes it subject to the debts. In that event there is a recourse given by creditors against the supreme body for the payment of the debts.

Mr. HALL. I have looked over the amendments carefully, and concur in what has been stated by the promoter of the Bill. They cannot be said to be unimportant, but they are such that this House can with safety concur with them.

Motion agreed to, and amendments concurred in.

UNION RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) moved that the House concur in amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Union Railway Company.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have looked at these amendments, and I think they are not material. There is a clause by which the bonds to be issued are divided into classes, that is to say, so much for the main line and so much for the bridges. The clause that has disappeared from the Bill leaves it under the provisions of the general Railway Act.

Motion agreed to, and amendments concurred in.

DIVORCE—G. M. BAGWELL.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 123) for the relief of George McDonald Bagwell.

Motion agreed to, on a division, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. DAVIES. I want to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the form these Bills take when they come before this House. I do not object to them for any special reason, but when the Senate passed these Bills dissolving marriage for the crime of adultery, they declared "that the marriage between the parties is dissolved, and shall henceforth be null and void, to all intents and purposes." That is the form. They then go on to make special provision that the party who sues for the divorce may marry again and that the issue of the second marriage shall be legitimate. These clauses, I presume, are unnecessary, although I do not object to their insertion as a matter of precaution, but it seems to me that as the Bills are now passed permission is given to the guilty party also to marry afterwards. That is entirely contrary to the practice in England, and I think it is a provision which should not be passed. If one or other party commit adultery and the marriage is dissolved at the instance of the innocent party, the guilty party should not be allowed to marry again. Such permission is contrary to all prudence and justice. I call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that all our Bills are framed in the same way. It appears to be unfair and bad legislation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think there is a great deal of force in the statement of the hon. gentleman, and, with the permission of the House, I will consider it before the third reading, and discuss with my colleagues as to whether there should be a change.

Bill reported.

DIVORCE—IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 124) for the relief of Arthur Wand (from the Senate).—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 125) for the relief of Henry Middleton (from the Senate).—(Mr. Small.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Post Offices..... $2,959,710

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say a few words with respect to postmasters' salaries. In looking over the list, I find a great many small postmasters throughout the country receive little or nothing for their services. During the Session a Bill has been brought in and passed, for the purpose of increasing the salary of the postmaster at Toronto to $4,000. I hold there should be a general readjustment of the salaries paid to postmasters throughout the Dominion. In my own constituency there are several postmasters who receive only $12 or $15 a year. It is a gross injustice to country postmasters to ask them to work for the public at a pittance, while, at the same time, a city postmaster receives $4,000 a year. In my own town, where we have one of the most efficient and faithful servants in the Dominion as postmaster, and who attends to the office himself, and keeps one of his family there, this postmaster receives only $1,000. In the town of Harriston, where there is a very faithful and efficient postmaster, who has been employed for many years, this public officer receives only $900 a year, and he has to be in the post office from 5 o'clock in the morning till 10 o'clock at night. A great injustice is done to these postmasters, who have discharged faithfully and efficiently their duties in the country post offices, and who in many cases receive not more than $12 or $15 a year, while the salary of a city postmaster is increased to $4,000. I acknowledge that the duties of the city postmaster are, perhaps, more responsible than the duties of the country or town postmaster, but I contend that $2,000 a year would be an ample allowance to any officer for discharging the duties of a city post office. The office does not require any extra ability, and the postmasters in Toronto and Montreal would be well paid at $2,000. It is wrong to ask country postmasters to work for virtually nothing. I know some post offices in my own riding where, out of receipts amounting to $100 or $120, the postmaster receives only $20 or $25, or only one-fourth of the receipts as salary. I repeat that there should be a readjustment of the whole system by which country postmasters are paid. I am sure the Postmaster General, who has recently been installed in his position, feels the necessity of some change being made in the system and of allowing them something more than they at present receive. I know a postmaster at an office which has been in existence over 25 years—and he is an excellent man, who has discharged his duties faithfully, and who keeps the post office open during regular hours, and sometimes at night—who receives $36 a year for the whole service. That post office is in a very important central district, and serves a part of two counties. I was talking to the postmaster recently, and he said he had a very strong inclination to give up the position. There are undoubtedly great complaints respecting the miserable allowance given to country and village postmasters, compared with the ample salaries paid to similar officials in cities. There should be some change made in regard to this matter, and I deemed it to be my duty to bring it before the House.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I desire to ask the Postmaster General whether any appointment to the position of assistant postmaster at Kingston has been made. I think the hon. gentleman will remember that a little over a year ago the assistant postmaster suddenly left that city. I would like to know whether any man has been apppointed in his place, and if so, who is he?

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot tell at present. There has been no appointment since I took charge of the office.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I called the attention of the Postmaster General to this because, if he will turn up his report, he will find that in Kingston and in post offices in the neighborhood some twenty-six letters containing money were mislaid or taken from the post offices, and the probability is that the greater portion of those were mislaid at Kingston or abstracted from the post office there. It will be remembered that the attention of the House was called, last Session, to the fact that the assistant postmaster of Kingston was a man named William Shannon, a brother of the postmaster, James Shannon, that irregularities had existed for a long time at that office, and, ultimately, the assistant postmaster was discovered in the act of purloining letters with money in them. It was represented to us then that those letters contained only a few postage stamps and a few cents of money, but, on looking over the matter carefully, I find that in Kingston, and the adjacent post offices, somewhere in the neighborhood of $300 was supposed to have been lost. I complain that when the assistant postmaster was discovered stealing the letters, that the inspector so far neglected his duty as to allow this man Shannon to escape without being arrested. I am informed that he not only remained in Kingston a few days, but that, after going away, he was permitted to come back to the city of Kingston for a day or two, and there was no arrest made. That is very different from the manner in which the Government treated other assistant postmasters. I suppose the Postmaster General will remember that when an assistant postmaster in St. Thomas was found guilty, some years ago, of taking letters, he was not permitted to escape, but he was arrested and

tried summarily before the police judge, and condemned to penitentiary for five years. I desire to press on the Postmaster General that if the assistant postmaster at Kingston was permitted to leave the country without being punished for his crime, it is hard on the former assistant postmaster at St. Thomas, who has been in the penitentiary for nearly four years, that the Minister of Justice should refuse a remission of one year on his sentence, in answer to petitions sent in here requesting that the term of his sentence should be commuted. I believe it is right that this man should be punished, but if he has to serve in the penitentiary for five years for stealing four letters, the man Shannon, at Kingston, who, from the return brought down by the Postmaster General, appears to have been implicated in the theft of twenty-six or thirty letters containing $300, should not be allowed to escape. When this matter came before the House last year it was very unstisfactorily treated by the First Minister and by the Postmaster General of the day. I now again call the attention of the House to the fact that while—as the member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has said—the Government have treated postmasters in certain places in one way, they have treated other post office officials in other places in another way. If Mr. Shannon was allowed to escape,through the connivance of the inspector and a desire on the part of the Government to treat him leniently on account of his brother being postmaster and having served a useful purpose to the Conservative party in years gone by, it is very unfair that this young man should be incarcerated in Kingston for the full term of his sentence. It may be said that this young man ought to have been committed for 15 or 20 years, but if so, why was Shannon allowed to go scot-free. We should treat all our officials in the same way and under the same circumstances .I think it is a hardship that this young man to whom I refer, should be compelled to serve out the full term of his sentence. I do hope that the Government will see the justice of this case and deal more leniently towards that young man.

Mr. HAGGART. Most gentlemen in the House will remember that the Kingston matter was thoroughly threshed out here last Session. I am of the opinion of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, that I do not know any reason why that assistant postmaster should have escaped the punishment that was meted out to the other party I think for the crimes which the hon. gentleman says he has been guilty of, if caught, he ought to receive the same punishment as the other one.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I see that a notice is put out that all the mails for England are henceforth to be forwarded by New York. Is that owing to a determination arrived at by the Government not to send any more mails by Montreal or Halifax ?

Mr. HAGGART. No. The contract with the Allan Company was supposed to have expired on April 12th. A notice was given to the company itself and to the different postmasters that, in default of the Allan Company taking the mails, they should be sent by New York. The Allan Company contend that the contract extends until the arrangements are made for carrying the mails by the fast line of steamers. That arrangement is not yet completed, but I think there is no doubt that an arrangement will be made by the Allan Company to carry the mails as usual.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I understand that the Allan Company do not refuse to carry the mails ?

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, no.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Under these circumstances, was it necessary to advertise that all the mails should go by New York, if the Allan Company were willing to continue to carry them until a new arrangement should be made with the Government ?

Mr. HAGGART. It was only in the event of their refusal that the mails should be carried by New York.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to ask the Postmaster General whether he is going to take any action in reference to the post office at Pickering, in my riding. Some years ago, an enquiry was made by the inspector, at the instance of the Government, into the conduct of the present postmaster, when he was the deputy postmaster, and I understand that the inspector made a report unfavorable to him. Strange to say, in the face of that report, he was appointed to fill the vacancy of postmaster when it occurred a short time afterwards, and, as was to be expected, the people there have ever since been finding fault with his appointment and his conduct. The Postmaster General will say whether I am right or not, when I say that a petition has lately been forwarded to him, setting forth very good grounds for the dismissal of this postmaster. It is a matter that the people of that locality, irrespective of party, are very anxious about.

Mr. HAGGART. It was only a few days ago, that I got a letter from the hon. gentleman, stating the facts which he has related to the House. My deputy stated that he had a report on the subject, but I ordered him to make enquiries and get a further report from the inspector. As soon as I get it, I intend to send it to the hon. gentleman. I have not yet had time to look into the matter. That was the first time my attention was drawn to it.

Mr. EDGAR. Am I not correct that a petition has been presented to the Postmaster General, setting forth grounds for his removal.

Mr. HAGGART. There was a petition, and I think it was forwarded to the inspector to report upon.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to the point I mentioned a moment ago. For instance, in my riding in one post office the receipts were $150, and all that is paid to the postmaster is $27. That post office has been in existence for twenty-five years; it is in a very important locality, and serves a great many people. In the post office of Egerton the receipts are $161, and all the postmaster gets for his services is $24. There is a large section served by that post office, and it has been in existence over twenty-five years. The man in charge of it, a short time ago, told me that he had a good notion to give it up, as the amount of trouble he was put to was in excess of what he received. I do not know that I would have brought this matter up unless I saw other increases made which are unnecessary. It is absurd to pay a man in Toronto $4,000 a year, and to ask postmasters in country districts to perform their duties for practically nothing. At the Harriston post office the receipts are $3,189, and the postmaster, who is a most efficient officer, and a man of high standing in society, only gets $940, and I know he is in his office from 5 o'clock in the morning till 10 at night, and he has to keep one of his family there also. I contend that the pay that is given to country postmasters should, as a general rule, be increased, and the pay of city postmasters should be reduced. I notice also that the arrearages are increasing. Last year the amount in arrear in the hands of postmasters was $19,614.80, and this year it has run up to $21,795.29. I notice the names of some men who have been in arrears for several years. I would like to know why they are not called on to pay up, and whether any attempt is being made to compel them to pay up more promptly.

Mr. HAGGART. In reference to the first question, the salaries of postmasters are paid on a principle. They receive up to the first $800, 40 per cent, and on sums above that 20 per cent. The rent and fuel allowances and the allowances for forwarding are fixed by the inspector on a principle also. It may appear from the accounts the hon.

gentleman has named that those postmasters are not getting enough, but the rates were fixed a year and a-half ago, and if the receipts have increased, the comparison does not hold. The salaries of all the postmasters in the Dominion have been gone through, and are fixed on that principle. As to the salary of the postmaster in Toronto, we had that out some time ago, and the House passed its verdict upon it. As to the other question concerning arrears, a good many have been in the books for many years, and it has been found impossible sometimes to collect the amounts due. The postmasters were perhaps defaulters, had left no estate, and left the country. We are very particular now with the postmaster. The moment he is in default, he is brought up with short term, and if he does not make the amount good in a short time, he is dismissed.

Mr. TROW. I question very much the justness of the system adopted in the payment of postmasters. I can name one instance in the town of Waterloo, where the revenue is no criterion of the work done, for the simple reason that there are no less than five insurance companies, whose stamps are sent to the respective offices when the yearly or half yearly premiums are paid. The result is that about three-fourths of the postage rates of these insurance companies may not be purchased in the town they reside in. As a consequence, the revenue does not come to these particular offices, but comes from abroad with the letters.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the system of paying postmasters should be changed, and the whole system recast. Some additional sum should be allowed those who are doing very desirable service. It is absurd to expect a man to keep a post office, and make a monthly return for $12 a year. In looking over the Auditor General's report, I see there are a number keeping post offices for as low as $12 and $10 a year. No one should be asked to keep a post office for less than $25 or $30 a year. The department does not pay running expenses. If that is the case, why should country postmasters be asked to discharge the duties of an office where the receipts are $100 for $25 or a little over? They must be the worst paid lot in the Post Office Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is it the Postmaster General proposes to reduce the Canadian Pacific Railway from $110,000 to $105,000 in Ontario? I notice that in the Supplementary Estimates for the present year a large increase is going to be asked for the Canadian Pacific Railway; but $22,000 of it are for Ontario. Are we to, understand that $105,000 will meet the expense under the head of mail service for the Canadian Pacific Railway for 1890, although the hon. gentleman finds it necessary to ask for $22,000 additional to the Estimates provided for the current year?

Mr. HAGGART. It is owing to an arrangement made with the late Postmaster General. They found that the car accommodation for the carrying of the mail was not nearly sufficient, and they got cars built with half additional accommodation, on the understanding that the rates would be increased in like proportion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, I presume, this apparent decrease of $5,000 in the Supplementary Estimates for 1890 will disappear, and be replaced by a large increase?

Mr. HAGGART. By an increase of nearly $60,000 for the whole Dominion.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has a postmaster been appointed at Goderich yet?

Mr. HAGGART. Not as yet. An officer of the department is taking charge of the post office there. The late postmaster died only a short time ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may take an opportunity of saying a word or two as regards the deficit on this service. For the last year the deficit is about $729,000. To that decrease, if you want to estimate the matter correctly, you are obliged to add the cost of the post office at headquarters, which, with contingencies, amounts to about $259,000. Of course, nobody can blame the present Postmaster General for that, and it is possible, looking at the enormous demands made on the post office from all sides, that the department is not to blame for it either, but the Postmaster General will see that, putting the expenses of the head office in connection with the deficit, we have an annual deficit of about $1,000,000 per year. The exact amount would be about $950,000, all told. I desire to enquire of the Postmaster General whether he has yet had time to consider the question, and whether he thinks there is any reasonable chance, of reducing that deficiency to any considerable extent in the ensuing year?

Mr. HAGGART. I had great difficulty in getting the Bill through the House for the purpose of increasing the rate on drop letters and registration. The increase I calculated to make from those two items would be in the neighborhood of $140,000. That is nearly eaten up by the extra amount we pay the Canadian Pacific Railway for carrying our mails. As long as newspapers and periodicals go free through the post, the reducing of the deficit is a good way off.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would just state one means of saving which the hon. Minister might put into effect. It is to be regretted that the Government are not more careful in the manner in which they advertise in the newspapers. I hold a newspaper printed in Yarmouth, N.S.—you can see the size of it—which is full of advertisements asking for mail contracts. Just fancy six Government "ads" in this little paper. It is printed in Yarmouth on Monday evening, and has no circulation out of that town at all, probably not more than 50 or 100 copies are printed. It is printed in connection with the *Times*, in the same place, and no doubt is published just to get the Government patronage. This little newspaper alone has got no less than $259 worth of "ads" of the Government. That is just so much money thrown away. There are no other "ads" in this paper. If the Postmaster General wants to have good postmasters, and give more salary, he might be more economic in the expenditure of money in "ads." $44,520 were expended last year for advertising in newspapers in the Dominion. I believe that newspapers should be encouraged, being an old newspaper man myself, but I do not like to see the public money squandered as it has been squandered by this Government in simply giving pap to newspapers which support the Government. I think this useless expenditure could be cut off, and this is only one sample of the profligacy of the Government in regard to advertising in newspapers.

Mr. HAGGART. The attention of the Government has been drawn to that matter, and it has been stopped altogether. I have never given an order for advertising in any newspaper. Of course there are papers on the official list which are entitled to advertisements, and they receive them.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How is the official list made up? Is it made up of newspapers which have the largest circulation, or is it made up exclusively of newspapers which support the Government, because this advertising should be given out on business principles.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose that is the ground upon which they are selected.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What: the fact that they support the Government?

Mr. HAGGART. No; on business principles.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Auditor General's Report shows that no Reform newspapers get any of this pap. I should be sorry if I understand the hon. gentleman to say that advertising in the newspapers is to be stopped altogether.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not say that; but orders have been given that no more advertisements shall appear in that paper.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. There is another little paper published in Ottawa, the Ottawa *Investigator*.

Mr. HAGGART. That is also shut off.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That paper received $228.45 last year, and you can see the size of the *Investigator* by the copy which I hold in my hand. That paper was published——

An hon. MEMBER. Once a month.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. No; not once a month, but once a year. It used to be brought out at the commencement of every Session of Parliament. One year it have the portrait of the Secretary of State and the history of his life, and I believe the last one had the portrait and the life of the Minister of Inland Revenue.

An hon. MEMBER. And that killed it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Yes, perhaps that killed the paper and the man too, for he disappeared from Ottawa altogether very shortly afterwards. However, the Government paid $228 for that portrait and that paper. I am glad to hear that the Minister has put his foot down on that, but I do not think he should stop advertising altogether, because judicious advertising is essential for the Post Office Department, as it is in business matters.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is a question in reference to the Halifax *Herald* and the Halifax *Mail*. These two papers are published in the same office, and I understand the *Herald* is the morning edition and the *Mail* the evening edition. They are practically the same newspaper, but last year they received together $10,431. I should like to know if the Postmaster General has cancelled the advertisements in these newspapers, as he states he has in the paper referred to by my hon. friend.

Mr. HAGGART. I have not heard anything about those newspapers.

Mr. McMULLEN. I observe that the Liberal paper in Halifax got $2.20 last year.

An hon. MEMBER. That was two dollars too much.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Postmaster General tells us that the salary of the country postmasters is regulated on principle. I think the country postmasters are aware of the principle, and I do not think they will all endorse that principle or that I will endorse it. There is no doubt that exceptions often prove the rule. We find postmasters in the cities and large towns whose time is taken up by their work and who receive very large salaries. No doubt they are doing very good work, but, in the country places, the postmaster or some of his family have to remain in the post office during the day. Their time is taken up, and they are paid on principle. I fancy that the postmasters will not get very rich on this principle, because, in many places, although the offices are required for the convenience of the people, they receive very little salary. In sixteen offices in the county which I represent, in the rural portions of the riding, the officers receive altogether $355.50 a year, or an average salary of $22.21 a year; and yet the Postmaster General will state that these postmasters are paid on principle. It is a peculiar principle which will give $4,000 a year to the postmaster in Toronto, and in a country place will give the postmaster only $22 a year. I think that, at all events, there ought to be a leveling up to some extent. That principle is carried out with a vengeance, and I think there might be a change and that, where the revenues are small but the offices have to be maintained in the interests of the public, a larger allowance should be given to the postmasters. I think the Postmaster General, who has shown such a great desire to promote the interests of the people over whom he presides, will, on consideration, see the reasonableness of what I say.

Mr. STEVENSON. Carried.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is not carried yet, but I believe my hon. friend would vote for this improvement if it was not directed against the Government, but he does not like to do that as long as he has some locks to be built in his county. I think the Postmaster General should consider this matter. I am not bringing it up to embarrass him or to assist any of my friends. The Liberal party do not care for office. They are desirous only of the good of the country, and, as long as the good of the country is obtained, we do not care who governs it. We do not seek power because we love power. We are satisfied if justice is done to all classes of the community. The Postmaster General came into this House at the same time that I did myself, and I should like to see one of the men of 1872 do justice to the people who are under his care, instead of increasing the salaries of those who are now overpaid for the work they do. I do not know on what ground he can justify the increase he has asked for. I hope the Postmaster General will stamp himself as being one of those who desires to do what is right to those who are underpaid now, whom he must admit are underpaid, and whom everybody understands well are underpaid. It would be well for him to curb the expense—I won't say extravagance; I do not suppose there is any extravagance since he came into the office. I believe he unloads all the extravagances on his predecessor. That is a good way to do it, and it may be correct enough, but his predecessor managed the affairs of the office very well. He ran the office as a party machine, to some extent. I remember there was a post office established in my riding, and the salary of the postmaster was to be $10; the Minister would not name the postmaster on my recommendation until he saw what the party wanted in the matter. He did not like even $10 to go out of the party. It was going to be ruin and starvation to somebody if $10 went out of the party. The member that was elected by the people to speak for the people, was not to be consulted, but the party was to be consulted lest $10 should go out of the party.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want an answer from the Minister with regard to the Halifax *Herald*. I also see that the Moncton *Times* got $10,973 for printing; the St. John *Sun* got $14,000, and altogether these and the other papers have drawn from the Post Office Department about $35,000 last year.

Mr. HAGGART. How much from the Post Office Department?

Mr. McMULLEN. It does not say what the printing is for, but they got that amount of money.

Mr. KIRK. I notice, as far as Nova Scotia is concerned, that a great deal of complaint is made with regard to the small allowances to country postmasters. In some instances it is almost impossible to get a man to keep the post office in Nova Scotia because the salary is so small. In my county there is a post office that has been vacant for the last four or five years, because the salary was so small that no one could be got to take the office. Some one has said that the salaries should not be regulated according to the amount of revenue derived from the office. I agree with that opinion. The salary should be regulated according to the special circumstances of the case. There was a case in my own county where the postmaster receives but $20 a year.

Besides serving the public of the settlement from the office, he has to receive and despatch mail bags every night, and sometimes in the winter season and in stormy weather, he has to remain up until three or four o'clock in the morning until the mail arrives.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Why does he not resign?

Mr. KIRK. I am coming to that. It is only two or three years since the present postmaster was appointed. The former Postmaster General has put in the Auditor General's Report $160 for arrears for keeping that office. The incumbent notified the Government that he would not keep the office for the money that he was receiving; he gave notice a number of years before he finally abandoned the office. But he kept on performing the work and discharging the duties of the office for a number of years, retaining the amount that the Dominion gave as his salary, and when the Government finally took the office from him he refused to pay back anything. There was, I believe, $100 or $160 due the Government, which he refused to pay, simply because he considered that he was entitled to the money, because he had notified the Government years before that unless they paid him so much, he would not keep the office. But finally the office was taken away and another man was appointed, I think, with an addition of $5 a year to his salary. But the new man lives a considerable distance from the road, and the courrier instead of taking the bag into the offices, pitches it down alongside the road as he passes, and lets it lie there until the postmaster thinks proper to send for it; and sometimes it remains there all night. Then the postmaster, on his part, hangs the bag on a stake for the courrier to pick up when he passes along. This is the way the work is done now, and the people have to travel some distance from the road in order to get their mail. The place I refer to is the office at South End Lochaber, in the County of Guysborough. In this case I think the Postmaster General should increase the salary to enable the postmaster to attend to his duties properly. $40 a year would not be sufficient for the work he has to do.

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who accused the Postmaster General of making large payments to the *Morning Herald* of Halifax, and to the paper published in Moncton, let me inform the hon. gentleman that if he looks at the accounts, he will find that the whole amount the Post Office Department paid to the Halifax *Morning Herald* consisted of two sums, $9.80 and $22.40. The Halifax *Evening Mail* got $21.20.

Mr. McMULLEN. I challenge the hon. gentleman to turn up the Auditor General's Report, for he will find that the papers got the amount I have mentioned for printing. They may not have got it from the Post Office Department, but they got it from other departments.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like to point out another way by which economy could be effected. I see that the Government, as a whole, including, of course, the Post Office Department, paid $597 for Ottawa *Citizens* last year. Now, while we are discussing this question of economy, and a good many members of the Government are here, perhaps they would answer for their respective departments what they do with so many Ottawa *Citizens*. I do not remember the price of the *Citizen*, but I think it is not more than $4 a year. That would give 149 copies of the *Daily Citizen* delivered to the Government every day in the year. I should like to know what they do with them. Does every clerk and messenger around the buildings enter his name for the *Morning Citizen* and have it charged to the Government? And we have the same occurring with respect to other papers throughout the country. For the Brantford *Courier*, a newspaper not known outside of Brantford, the Government subscribes $150 a year. The subscription price is $3. For the Halifax *Herald* $239 is subscribed.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman must have been out of the House when the discussion took place about this newspaper business, as we were going over the items of civil government. The discussion was carried on with a good deal of vigor for some time, and I took occasion to make a statement to the House which, no doubt, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will remember, that we had looked carefully into the matter and had come to the conclusion that too much was expended on newspapers; that the whole matter had been revised, and I hoped when the accounts came down next year the House would see a very great reduction has been made. That statement appeared to be accepted by the House, and I do not think we should waste any more time over the matter.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I was not aware that the matter had been discussed, and I am glad to know that the Finance Minister is going to economise in that direction.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Some years ago, a petition was presented to the department, praying for the opening of a post office at Corinth, and in reply, the Postmaster General wrote me a letter, stating that an office would be established there. That occurred three or four years ago, and to this day an office has not been established. I asked in the following Session why the delay had taken place, and why the office had not been established, but I obtained no satisfactory answer. I am frequently asked by the people of that section when the promise made by the Postmaster General in the letter which he sent to me, and which I caused to be published in the newspapers of the day, would be carried out. The honor of the Crown is pledged to the opening of that office, and we desire to know whether the Postmaster General is going to redeem the honor of the Crown, or allow it to be trailed in the mire. I state now that the office is required at a place called Corinth, in the township of Bentinck, that it would be 2½ miles from any office now established, that it would serve a large number of people in the place, which contains a store, a schoolhouse and a church, and it is very much required by the people living there. I believe it would not entail much expense, because a mail goes within 2½ miles of the place now, and it would be a great convenience to the people. I hope the Postmaster General, now that I have brought the matter to his attention, will look into the petition presented and have the office established without delay. It would be doing himself credit to maintain the honor of Her Majesty. Sometimes we hear the Tories boast of their loyalty and speak of the love and reverence they have for the Crown, and the word of the Crown, as expressed by an officer of the Crown, a member of the Dominion Government, should not be allowed to appear before the people as being of no avail in this country. It is the duty of the Government to see that such a state of things does not prevail. It might be possible the Government thought at that time that if they postponed establishing the office until after the elections, they might be able to appoint one of their own friends as postmaster, at a salary of say $10. No doubt they wanted to keep the money in the party's pocket even at the inconvenience of the people there. I hope the Postmaster General in the interest of the people of that section and of the people he is elected to serve, and whom I think he is willing to serve, will open the post office in question, as it will be a great convenience to the locality.

Mr. HAGGART. I have hardly got the names of the post offices at present established, and I forget the names of those proposed to be established. I will, however, look into the matter at the department, and if the petition is well recommended, if there is a suitable place, and if a

suitable person can be obtained as postmaster, I shall endeavor to comply with it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would suggest to the Postmaster General that he pick up these names a little more quickly, and then I will consider him a suitable Postmaster General; but if he fails to do that, and to open this post office, then I think we shall have a change at the top.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What is the cause of the decrease in the item for New Brunswick?

Mr. HAGGART. The decrease is in steamboats and sailing craft. There is a transfer of some of the service, which previously appeared under the head of post offices, to mail subsidies. Under the new Bill the Postmaster General takes to himself power to pay for actual work done, and not for work done in the form of subsidy.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). There is a vote for an assistant inspector. Has one been appointed?

Mr. HAGGART. Not yet.

Mr. ELLIS. Has the hon. gentleman had under consideration the granting of a gratuity to the family of John Campbell, post office clerk on the New Brunswick division, who was killed while in the discharge of his duty?

Mr. HAGGART. He was burned on the car in the discharge of his duty. No claim has been put in to the department for a gratuity.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). He was burnt to death while discharging his duty on the Maine Central Railway. He has left a family, and they should receive some gratuity. He was a long time in the service, and he was discharging his duty when he met with his death.

Mr. HAGGART. There is a rule, that a couple of months salary is given to the nearest relative. No claim has yet been received by the department.

Mr. KIRK. I should like to ask the Postmaster General whether the appointment recommended by me of a postmaster at Oyster Point has been made. The recommendation was made early in the Session. I made an enquiry across the floor of the House, and the Postmaster General said the matter had been referred to the Post Office Inspector at Halifax, which I thought a rather singular proceeding.

Mr. HAGGART. I think the matter was referred to the Post Office Inspector at Halifax to report upon. If he has reported, his report has not been brought to my attention. I will look into the matter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to call attention to the carriage of the mails in Prince Edward Island in the autumn. Last year when navigation closed, and the steamboat was put on between Pictou and Georgetown, there were no means of carrying the mails across the straits to Charlottetown. A memorial was sent to the hon. gentleman from the Board of Trade and other residents of the town asking for a special train, and the hon. gentleman put it on late in the season. I want to ask him so as to make sure whether there will be any trouble in this train running next year as soon as navigation closes, for there is an absolute necessity for a train at that time more than at any other time in the year.

Mr. HAGGART. I know there was a difficulty at the beginning of the season last year. The delay arose from my trying to make the best arrangements I possibly could with the railway department. I had to come to their terms, and as soon as I saw that I could not do better I put on the train. I will take care that no trouble occurs again.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to know what is the cause of this reduction in the British Columbia expenses of nearly $14,000. Am I to understand that that is a permanent reduction, or that it is due to some temporary arrangement, and that we will have it all back again in the supplementary estimates?

Mr. HAGGART. It is part of the transfer of the subsidies that are paid to the different steamers. They are charged to a different account. I think, however, that the subsidies are reduced.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to call the attention of the Minister to the salaries of officials in British Columbia and Manitoba. I see that in Manitoba and British Columbia there is put opposite the name of each official a certain sum for provisional allowance. This may have been necessary years ago, but I do not understand that it is necessary now to make a special allowance on account of the extra cost of living, on which ground it was originally granted to the officials in these two Provinces. I understood from the Minister of Inland Revenue to-day that so far as his officials are concerned, he has put them on the same footing as the officers in the other Provinces. I wish to ask the Postmaster General how he justifies the continuance of the extra allowance to post office officials in these two Provinces?

Mr. HAGGART. The provisional allowance to all the employés of the post office in these Provinces is at a rate of 20 per cent. on their salaries, and I found that to be the practice when I came into office. It is the intention of the Government to reduce it, but the post office employés, I think, as a rule, do not receive the same salaries as the other officials, and it is pretty hard to make a reduction.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have no doubt it is pretty hard to make a reduction, but I want to see the same principle applied to the officials in all the Provinces alike. It seems to me that if in small towns in these two Provinces extra salaries are paid, the salaries of the officials in other Provinces should be raised up to that standard, or the others should be reduced. The reason for granting this additional allowance in Manitoba and British Columbia seems to have ceased since the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. They can live as cheaply there as they can anywhere else.

Mr. HAGGART. I have made a careful enquiry into that and find it is impossible for the officials to live in Manitoba and British Columbia at the same rate as in the eastern Provinces. In most of these places, notably in the post office at Victoria, I have cut down this extra allowance and any person who gets promotion I make it a *sine qua non* that the provisional allowance shall cease. I have greatly reduced this allowance and I hope in another year to get rid of it altogether.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I understood from the Minister of Inland Revenue that he cut off this extra allowance from the officers in his department. I do not see why the officers of the Post Office Department should be treated differently from those in the Inland Revenue.

Mr. PRIOR. I am sorry to hear the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), state that living is as cheap on the Pacific coast as it is in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island, because I can positively state that I know it is not. Time and time again the members for British Columbia have pointed out in this House that living is much higher in British Columbia than it is in the eastern Provinces, and I know that the hon. gentlemen at the head of the different departments have these statements corroborated by the reports that have been sent to them from our Province. Any person who has studied the matter at all knows perfectly well that living is a great deal more expensive on the Pacific coast than it is on the eastern side of the continent. I am glad to have heard the Postmaster General make the statement that he thought he

was only doing right in giving a provisional allowance to the officials in British Columbia, for I know that these men could not possibly live on their salaries unless they get this allowance. I do not suppose that the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) wishes employés of the Government to work for less than a fair remuneration. At present the employés in British Columbia only get enough to live upon, and in fact I do not think you could get men to work there at all unless you gave this provisional allowance.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The officials in the eastern Provinces are complaining of the smallness of their salaries too. I do not know where the hon. gentleman gets his information that living is more expensive out there than it is in the Maritime Provinces, but perhaps the officials live in a more swell style there. I know officials of the post office in the the Province from which I come who have hard work to make both ends meet, their salaries are so small. I do not see any reason why a special allowance should be made to the officials in Manitoba and I believe we should have the same rule all over the Dominion. If it is necessary to give large salaries out there let the Government give the same salaries to officials in the other Provinces as well. I believe that years ago when the cost of living was high in Manitoba and British Columbia there was a reason for this, but now they have communication in Manitoba and British Columbia by the Canadian Pacific Railway and in the latter Province with the States of the American Union to the south. There is no difficulty in getting in supplies. I have yet to learn that the cost of living is so much greater in Manitoba than it is in the other Provinces.

Mr. PRIOR. That may be, but the fact remains that all wages and salaries are far higher on the Pacific coast than they are here. Take for instance the wages of laboring men out there. I know that in the town of Victoria bricklayers get $6 a day, and you cannot get them for love or money to work for less. It is not only so in the town of Victoria, but in the adjacent towns in the States, which are booming, they can get an equally high rate of wages. The same rule applies to almost every trade, and the whole scale of wages is higher on the Pacific coast. Men who have lived in British Columbia and have lived down here all agree that expenses are greater on the Pacific coast than they are in this part of the Dominion.

Mr. McDOWALL. I can endorse what the member for Victoria said with regard to the cost of living in the North-West and also in British Columbia; and I can state positively that it is much more expensive there than it is in the eastern Provinces. I have practical experience of living down here and also in the North-West, and I can state this from experience. I know that the post office officials in the North-West have a hard time to make both ends meet on the salaries they receive, for everything they use is more expensive. In some places they have no gas, and they have to buy coal oil which is more expensive.

An hon. MEMBER. There is plenty of gas down here.

Mr. KIRK. What do they pay for coal oil there?

Mr. McDOWALL. Ninety cents a gallon. Everything is much more expensive up there, and when you come to consider the cost of freight it is not to be wondered at. The salaries of the officials may appear high to hon. gentlemen down here, but in the North-West they find they have hard work to live on them.

Mr. LISTER. I think it is unnecessary for hon. gentlemen to allege that the salaries of officials in Manitoba, British Columbia and the North-West should be greater than in any of the other Provinces in this Dominion. In the North-West they raise wheat and export it, they raise beef and export it, and I venture to say that in the towns and villages of the North-West you can get board as cheap as in the eastern Provinces. If all those officials out there were to resign to-morrow the Postmaster General would have not the least difficulty in filling up their positions.

Mr. PRIOR. We would not want that class of men.

Mr. LISTER. I am very glad to hear the Postmaster General say that this matter is to receive his consideration, and before this House meets again, I hope the proper reductions will be made.

Dominion Lands..... $185,748 25

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is one of those items which ought to have the serious consideration of the House. When we come to put together the sum for Dominion lands chargeable to capital, the sum chargeable to income and the amount charged to civil government in connection with their administration, we find that we are paying about $420,000 a year, while the total annual receipts from all sources amount to something under $220,000. Now, when we remember what was promised to this House, when we remember how continually hon. gentlemen opposite were in the habit of asserting that we would receive, not a sum equal to our own expenses, but a sum that would leave us with a net profit of $58,000,000 or $70,000,000 by 1890 or 1891, we have a very good right to complain of the fact that we are called upon to spend about $420,000 a year while our total receipts barely amount to $200,000. I must say that a large number of these offices appear to be made merely to provide employment for persons whom, for various reasons, it is not convenient to appoint here. The great mass of this money must necessarily be wasted; and these votes are about as loud a condemnation of the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite as could be made. Over and over again the predecessors of the Finance Minister, over and over again the First Minister himself, have declared from one end of this country to the other, that they were going to defray the whole expense of the Canadian Pacific Railway out of the moneys to be received from the administration of these lands; and yet we find that out of all the enormous resources of the North-West, we cannot scrape together enough to pay one-half of the annual expenses of management.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before this item is carried I would again call attention to the enormous expense connected with the North-West. I see that the Land Board at Winnipeg cost over $30,000 last year. I hold that that board is quite unnecessary. Last year the revenue of the Department of the Interior from all sources was $217,083, and the expenditure in Winnipeg and west of Winnipeg was $149,646, leaving a balance that came to Ottawa of $67,437. The expenses at Ottawa were $100,387. Taking the $67,439 from that, we find that it leaves a net loss in the management of North-West lands, ranches, mines, minerals and everything else, of $32,950. Now, it is absurd to say that it is necessary that we should have the enormous number of officials we have in the North-West. I notice among the items of last year a salary of $3,500 to Rufus Stevenson as Inspector of Colonisation Companies; then we have seven or eight homestead inspectors; we have a man named Mr. Smith who gets $5,000 a year as chief land commissioner in the city of Winnipeg; and we have a large number of other officials who are drawing large salaries and virtually doing nothing. We have five or six registrars and an inspector of registry offices, all drawing large salaries, and the entire receipts for registrations last year were only about $7,000. Any person who has gone through the North-West and knows anything about it must come to the conclusion that its affairs are most extravagantly managed. When we put together the items of management of the North-West in connection with the Department of the Interior, the feeding of the Indians, and the Mounted Police,

we find that we are spending an enormous amount of money annually in place of having the large amount of revenue that was promised us by the First Minister and the different Finance Ministers. We were to receive, in 1889 according to one $53,000,000, another $70,000,000, another $59,000,000; but all these millions have dwindled away, and in place of getting any returns, we are virtually about $33,000 short of paying the annual expenses. I say this condition of things is absurd, and there is no department to which the pruning knife should be applied more vigorously than the Department of the Interior. It is high time that a thorough and vigorous criticism of these expenditures should be gone into; and we should insist on the Government removing from office a whole host of these unnecessary officials.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I perfectly agree with both the hon. gentlemen who have just spoken, that the expectations with regard to our sales of lands have not been realised; but they must recollect that although we have not sold as large a quantity of land as we expected to do, we have given to railways a great many million acres, and although we are not selling the lands, the railways are selling them, and we have the railways for the lands. At the commencement of this Session this question came up on the estimates for civil government. Hon. gentlemen are aware that I am not so well acquainted with the Department of the Interior as I am with the Indian Department, with which I was more particularly connected. But I have prepared, with the aid of my officers, a memorandum in reference to the business of the North-West, and if hon. gentleman will bear with me for a short time, I think I shall be able to convince them before I get through that the expenditure is not excessive compared with the work we have to attend to. Certainly, as far as I have been able to gather, the expenditure compares most favorably with the expenditure incurred by hon. gentlemen opposite when they had charge of the North-West. Hon. gentlemen must bear in mind that the sale of lands is not the entire business that the Department of the Interior has to look after. We have officials who must look after the general business of the country; inspectors have duties to perform which we could not get along without, and land agencies are scattered over that large territory. The hon. member for Bothwell, in the course of the discussion which took place when the civil government estimates were under discussion, compared the operations of the Department of the Interior with those of the Illinois Central Railway, and stated that the sales of lands by that railway were double the sales made by the Department of the Interior, while the expenses of administration in the case of the railway were not 10 per cent. of those of the department. I do not know where the hon. gentleman got his information respecting the Illinois Central Railway, but I submit that the comparison is in no respect a fair one. If the business of the Interior Department were now chiefly the sale of lands, as it was at the time the hon. gentleman was head of the department, there might be some reason in what he says, but I need scarcely state to this House that for the last six years, that is to say, from 1883 up to the present time, there have been but few sales of Dominion lands in the ordinary sense of the term, for all the odd-numbered sections within the Canadian Pacific Railway belt and within the territory traversed by the Manitoba South-Western Railway, the Manitoba North-Western Railway and the South-Western branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway have been reserved from ordinary sale, and have been granted either to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as a part of its subsidy under the statute, or to one or other of the colonisation railways mentioned, in lieu of money assistance in aid of construction. The revenue of the department is therefore almost solely derived from timber dues and pre-emption payments. The hon. gentleman has also stated that the expenditure of the Department of the Interior, including the office at Winnipeg, was about $50,000, in 1877-78; and upon this presumption he bases the statement, first, that there had been a fourfold increase in the expenditure since that time, and, second, that there had been no corresponding increase in the public service to warrant this very large expenditure. Now, Sir, either the hon. gentleman was not careful to inform himself as to the facts or else he was laboring under a very serious misapprehension when he stated that the expenditure of the department over which he presided from 1876 to 1878 was only about $50,000, including the expenditure in the Winnipeg Branch; for on reference to the accounts I find that in 1876-77 the expenditure on Civil Government alone amounted to $36,409, and the expenditure under the head of what is now called Dominion Lands come, that is to say, the cost of the service of the Department in Manitoba was $35,604, or a total of over $72,000. In 1877-78 the expenditure under Civil Government had risen to $38,356, and the cost of the management of Dominion lands in Manitoba to $44,339, or a total of over $82,600; and in 1878-79, the last year mentioned by the hon. gentleman, and under estimates framed by him, the expenditure was $47,152 on Civil Government account, and $42,260 on account of management in Manitoba, being altogether $89,412. I should like the House and the hon. gentleman to clearly understand that these are figures extracted from the accounts and records of the department, and that although in the hon. gentleman's time the expenditure on surveys was not kept in a separate account, yet the cost of that work has since been calculated with great care and a good deal of labor, and the cost of the surveys has therefore been entirely left out of consideration in the statement of expenditure which I have just made. Now, so far as Civil Government is concerned, I beg to inform the hon. gentleman that since 1878 the expenditure has not quite doubled, and it is the cost of administration in Manitoba and the North-West alone that has increased in the proportion mentioned by the hon. gentleman. Now, if it were correct, as the hon. gentleman has stated, that there is no corresponding increase in the public service to warrant this difference, the matter would be one of more serious consequence. Let me remind him, however, that during the first year of his administration there were, in the whole country west of Lake Superior, just two land agencies in addition to the head office in Winnipeg, namely the agency at Emerson and that at Portage la Prairie, while during the last year of his administration there were but four agencies in the Province, the two already mentioned, one in the Pembina Mountain country and one in the Little Saskatchewan district; whereas, to-day, there are seventeen agencies, covering the whole country between the eastern boundary of the Province of Manitoba and the Pacific coast, within each of which there is a large area of surveyed land. It is quite true that from several of these agencies there has so far been comparatively little revenue, indeed the question of revenue from public lands has, for several years past, become a secondary consideration, and the convenience of the public, especially that portion of the public who, as actual settlers, are taking up homestead lands, has been the chief point aimed at by the Government. Now, Sir, contrast this condition of affairs with what we find to be the facts in relation to Manitoba during the period when my hon. friend from Bothwell was Minister of the Interior. There was then no distinction between even and odd sections, and nothing to prevent speculators from taking up lands in large blocks, at the nominal price of $1 per acre, without any condition whatever as to residence or improvement. It is true that then, as now, the law limited the area which could be purchased by one individual to 640 acres, but the hon. gentleman is well aware that means were

found to overcome this provision of the law, and that large areas of land in the neighborhood of Winnipeg, in the Pembina Mountain country and in the Little Saskatchewan district were bought up by speculators, who hold them to the present day, to the serious detriment of settlement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The lands in the neighborhood of Winnipeg were chiefly half-breed lands.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Not in the immediate vicinity of Winnipeg.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) The half-breed grants lay around Winnipeg.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman has also ventured the statement that there is no such machinery in connection with the Department of the Interior at Washington as that in connection with the commissioner's office in Winnipeg. It is surprising to find the hon. gentleman so poorly informed on a matter of this consequence. It is within the knowledge of a great many of the members of this House, and it is the fact, that there is a land commissioner in connection with the Interior Department of the United States with exactly similar powers, and charged with exactly the same kind of duties, as the land commissioner at Winnipeg. The only difference is that the land commissioner in the United States has his office at Washington, while the land commissioner of the Department of the Interior has his office in Winnipeg. This difference, I imagine, most hon. members will be prepared to admit is, as regards every point, in favor of the system we pursue in Canada. I have no doubt that in the United States the same arrangement as is made here would prevail in respect of the location of the commissioner's office, were it not that the territory over which the Department of the Interior there exercises jurisdiction extends all the way from Florida, Louisiana, Texas and New Mexico on the south, to the 49th parallel on the north, and includes the States and Territories of Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Colorado, Dakota, Florida, Illinois, Idaho, Iowa, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin and Wyoming. Washington, therefore, is as central a position as could have been selected. As to how well the commissioner's office and the Department of the Interior at Washington fulfil the just expectations of the public, and the good opinion which the hon. gentleman seems to entertain of them, I refer him to the annual report of the commissioner of the General Land office for the year 1888, on page 7 of which he will find the statement that at the end of the fiscal year 1889, assuming the rate of progress which characterised that department in the previous year to be still maintained, there will remain at least 233,624 cases undisposed of among which were, at the date of the report, 45,375 final homestead entries awaiting examination, in which class of entries, as the commissioner states, the homesteader is required by law to show five years' residence on his homestead before he can submit his case to the commissioner's office or demand a patent for his land. "Hence," says the commissioner, "the delay suffered by this class of entrymen is the more grievous." The hon. gentleman and his friends behind him are entitled to all the credit which they may think is due to the management of the public lands of a country to which they are continually directing the eyes of this House and of the people of Canada. The hon. member for Bothwell has also submitted to the House a statement in which he professes to show how delays may occur in the settlement of cases submitted to the commissioner and decided by him when that decision is not accepted as final. It would be much more satisfactory if the hon. gentleman would state the cases in regard to which I understand him to complain. To his general affirmation of the possibility of delays under the system in force, I take pleasure in replying that the cases which he has conjured up have, to the best of my knowledge and belief, no foundation in fact. After paying the most careful attention to the affairs of the department during the months I have been in office, and having lived in the North-West for ten years among the people who are affected by the administration of the Department of the Interior, I am prepared to challenge comparison between the methods of doing business which are adopted in it, and the promptness with which it disposes of all cases, with the methods and promptness of any other department of the Government of this country and the United States, or of any commercial institution in this country of any considerable size. It is quite true as the hon. gentleman says, that when a settler is dissatisfied with the decision of the commissioner, he has the right to appeal and he does appeal to the Minister of the Interior. Surely, however, the hon. gentleman would not contend that because a citizen of this country has and exercises such a right as that, the Government and the department are wrong in placing facilities within the reach of the settlers for finally disposing of their cases without appeal to the Minister of the Interior. I tell the hon. gentleman that it would be out of his power, as it would be out of the power of any single human being, to himself dispose of every case of contest or conflict which arises in a country of the extent and containing the population now to be found within the boundaries of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. One would imagine from the way in which the hon. gentleman has spoken that there was no institution in his day corresponding with the office of the commissioner at the present day. The officer, it is true, was known by a different name, that is to say, he was known as the chief agent, but his duties were precisely the same, although necessarily on a very much smaller scale, and therefore involving very much less responsibility. This officer had a staff about him to assist him in the discharge of his duties very much larger in proportion to the volume of the business at that time, than the staff in the Commissioner's Office at the present day. I find that so far back as the 15th December, 1876, an Order in Council was passed at the instance of the hon. gentleman himself, providing that the report of the Department of Justice should be final in relation to all claims under the Manitoba Act, and in the course of the report making this recommendation the hon. gentleman pointed out that it was impossible for Ministers to devote the time necessary to investigate the masses of papers connected with the claims submitted. Now, I may mention to the House that the total number of such cases disposed of by the Department of the Interior during the two years during which the hon. gentleman was head of the department, as shown by the published reports of the department, was 176 in 1875, 330 in 1877 and 438 in 1878. As an evidence of the vigor with which my hon. friend and his colleagues dealt with these cases, I may say that out of 3,258 claims made to land by virtue of occupation at the time of the transfer, and on account of which patents have been issued, they disposed of but something like 1,200 cases during their whole term of office. Be it remembered, too, that these were cases about which there was little or no dispute, and that they left to their successors in office the pleasing duty of disposing of all those about which there was difficulty and doubt, and further that these difficulties and doubts were greatly multiplied on account of the long period of time which had elapsed between the taking over of the country and the date at which a final settlement was attempted. Not satisfied with an officer under the title of chief agent, in charge of the little strip of country which was then open for settlement, who had a salary of $2,400 a year, with an assistant, Mr. Whitcher, who had a salary of $2,000, and still another assistant, Mr. Belch, who had a

salary of $1,500, they had the Chief Justice of the Province appointed as a Commissioner to inquire into disputed cases under the Manitoba Act, and I need scarcely say that he did not perform his duties for nothing, in fact, if I remember rightly, he was paid a salary of $1,000 a year for this particular service, in addition to his salary as chief justice. I had almost forgotten to say that during the last year my hon. friend was in office he appointed an agent at Prince Albert, but as in that year he had only commenced to make surveys, and as everyone knows, it takes considerable time after the surveys have actually been made before the land can be put in the market, it was a long time after his appointment before this gentleman did anything beyond drawing his pay. The hon. member for North Wellington has also, in the course of this discussion, compared the receipts on account of public lands and the expenditure in the same relation during the past year, stating that the cost of the Land Board at Winnipeg is $180,000, without contingencies. As an hon. gentleman who chooses to look at the figures can see for himself, the cost of what the hon. member for North Wellington calls the Land Board at Winnipeg really includes the cost of every one of the seventeen agencies of the department in Manitoba, the North-West Territories and British Columbia, the cost of extra clerks at the head office in Ottawa, and the cost of advertising, copying, &c. He says that to this sum must be added contingencies, and that they will be over $22,000. Where he gets his information on this point I am completely at a loss to comprehend, for the Estimates show specifically that travelling expenses, fuel, rent, stationery and printing, and every possible outlay which is usually classed under the head of contingencies, is included in the Estimate. The hon. gentleman also says that the revenue of the department for the year amounted to $217,083, saying that these figures are taken from page 48 of the Public Accounts. I called the hon. gentleman's attention at the time to the fact that this was exclusive of scrip, which the department is compelled to receive in payment of lands at its face value. This scrip consists partly of warrants issued to members of the military expedition to the Red River, partly of the consideration granted to half-breed heads of families, original white settlers and children of the half-breeds residing in the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories at the time of the transfer, and partly of compensation to volunteers who took part in the suppression of the rebellion in 1885. There is no reason why this scrip should not be classed as cash. It is a promise to pay on the part of the Dominion Government, and the only difference between a scrip note for ten dollars and a Dominion ten dollar bill is that the one is redeemable in gold and the other in land. I think that in all fairness the revenue derived from the public lands should be credited with payments made in scrip just as if they had been made in cash. The hon. member for North Wellington, at another stage of this discussion, went into an examination, item by item, of the outside service of the department, and he commenced by counting, as a portion of that expenditure, the salaries and expenses of registrars in the North-West Territories. Why that expenditure should be particularly charged against the Department of the Interior and the public lands, I cannot myself understand. The hon. member for Bothwell himself introduced a Bill into this House in 1878, providing for the registration of titles in the North-West Territories, under what is known as the Torrens' system. Subsequently the Minister of Justice in this Government not only introduced, but obtained the passage of such a measure. I have reason to believe that it was not the intention originally to put upon the officers of the Department of the Interior the additional labor of administering this law, but the obvious convenience of the arrangement finally decided the matter in this way. If, for instance, the Department of Justice had been charged with this duty, would the hon. gentleman have considered it a fair thing to charge the expenditure on account of registrars to the Department of the Interior? He might just as well charge the cost of administering justice in the North-West to the Department of the Interior. On this subject I may say, however, that while it could not be expected that a service of this sort, applied to an immense territory like the North-West, a proportion of which is sparsely populated, could at first be self-sustaining. The revenue for the first year during which the system was in operation, that is to say, during the year 1887, was within $2,400 of the expenditure; and although I have not been able to obtain the figures for 1888, I am informed by the responsible officers of the department that the revenue of about equal to the expenditure. It will be somewhat interesting to compare for a moment what I have already referred to as to the practice of the hon gentlemen opposite during that period when they had the opportunity is practising, and their preaching now that they are in opposition and irresponsible, with the practice of the present Government during the period they have been responsible for the management of the public lands of the North-West. Let us assume, to begin with, the basis on which hon. gentlemen themselves have challenged comparison, that is to say, the cash basis. And let us also assume that the hon. member for South Oxford is right in insisting that the expenditure for surveys should be charged against the receipts from the public lands, instead of being charged as at present to the capital account, and what do we find? That in the five years of their administration they spent for Civil Government, management of lands in the North-West, extra clerks at head office and surveys, $1,063,377, and received $93,005. In other words, that which they now call the legitimate cost of administration was at the rate of $1,143 for every $100 of revenue; whereas, during the ten years of the administration of the present Government since 1878, the total expenditure on account of Civil Government, management of lands in the North-West, extra clerks at the head office, and surveys, has been $5,060,188 and the total cash revenue $4,961,215, or about $100 of cash revenue for every $100 of expenditure. I submit, however, that the fairer plan would be to include in the receipts both cash and scrip, from which it appears that during the five years in which the Liberals managed the affairs of this country, the total expenditure for Civil Government, management of lands in the North-West, extra clerks at headquarters, and surveys, was, as stated, $1,063,377, against a revenue of $350,440 ($257,454 of which was scrip) or $303 of expenditure for every $100 of receipts; while during the 10 years covered by the administration of this Government, total expenditure, as already mentioned was $5,060,188, while the receipts were:

Cash	$4,961,215
Scrip	1,414,613
Or a total of	$6,375,828

being but $79 of expenditure for every $100 of receipts.

Mr. LISTER. I call the attention of the House that the hon. gentleman is violating the rules. On our side I have seen hon. gentlemen stopped who were only attempting to read a few lines, as guilty of a violation of a rule of this House.

Mr. DEWDNEY. These are all statistics.

Mr. LISTER. No; they are not. The hon. gentleman is reading his speech for the newspapers.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No, I am comparing the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite with our own. It was not until I began to read a portion of this memorandum which was unfavorable to the former Government of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the hon. member for Lambton (Mr.

Lister) rose to stop me. However, if the hon. gentlemen do not wish me to go on, of course I will stop.

Mr. LISTER. I do not want to interfere with the hon. gentleman at all, but I want the rule to be applied to both sides of this House. If we are not permitted to read any portion of our speeches, I certainly object to any hon. gentleman on the other side reading the whole of his speech, particularly a Minister.

Mr. BOWELL. Go on with your speech.

Mr. DAWSON. It was a common thing some years ago for hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side to read their speeches.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Even according to this showing, hon. gentlemen opposite should be very chary of criticising on the ground of cost, the administration of the present Government in the North-West. But, Sir, this Government decided, at a very early stage in its history, and this House has approved of that decision, that the cost of survey is not a fair charge against the receipts from the public lands from year to year. Part of the agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the construction of the road which now unites every section of this wide country was that a grant should be made to them of 25,000,000 acres of land, and upon the completion of construction the company was entitled to a conveyance of so much of this land as was included within the 48-mile belt along the line of railway. In order to put the Government in a position to carry out this part of the contract, it was necessary that the land should be surveyed, and surveyed far in advance of the actual present requirements of settlement. Any one who chooses to look at the map published by the Department of the Interior on the 31st August, 1885, which I am informed was widely distributed among members of this House, will observe that all the lands within the railway belt and for a considerable distance on each side of that belt have already been sub-divided and set out for settlement. The same is true in regard to the lands along the North and South Saskatchewan, the Battle River, the Belly River, and, to some extent, the Red Deer River, and considerable sub-division work has also been done along the line of the highway leading from Edmonton to Calgary. This work has been done in a substantial and permanent way, a point upon which I can speak with some authority, because I have gone over the greater portion of that country and have seen the work for myself, and with my own past experience as a member of the surveying profession I claim to be able to come to fairly sound conclusions on a subject of this sort. Altogether there have been surveyed and set out for settlement 71,810,012 acres, or 438,564 farms of 160 acres each, capable of maintaining a purely agricultural population, on the basis of five souls to a homestead, of 2,192,820 persons. On examination of the statistics furnished by the annual report of the Department of the Interior, I find that of this area 4,792,292 acres, or about 30,000 farms of 160 acres each, had been set out for settlement by the Conservative Government previous to June, 1873, and that from 1874 to 1878, inclusive, only 5,861,993 acres, or 36,637 farms of 160 acres each, had been sub-divided all the rest of this work having been done by the Conservative Administration either prior to 1874 or after 1878. A map was prepared under instructions from the right hon. the First Minister, and exhibited in this House a few years ago, showing in one color—the very appropriate color of rouge—the survey work performed by hon. gentlemen opposite, while in another color—the equally appropriate one of blue—was shown the work of this kind done under the Conservative Administration. I would like very much to have a similar map now, to show the work that has been done respectively by the hon. gentlemen in the Liberal Government who have occupied this position at various times, and those belonging to a Conservative Government. I have thought it worth while to lay a copy of this map on the Table once more, so that hon. gentlemen may have the opportunity of seeing for themselves just what it shows. I may add that when the Conservatives returned to power in 1878, they found that the very little survey work performed during the days when they were in Opposition consisted almost wholly of the sub division of townships, the outlines of which had already been run, and that when settlement began to extend westward in 1879, and 1880, no outlines had been run and no sub-division work of any kind could well be performed until the lapse of two or three years, during which time the outline surveys necessary before sub-division can be performed had to proceed. For the 5,861,993 acres surveyed in the five years when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, $711,642 were paid, being at the rate of 12·14 cents per acre, while the average cost of all the surveys performed during the ten years of the present Government, has been 4½ cents per acre, or less than one-third. In this calculation, too, is included a very large amount of outline work, which hon. gentlemen understand perfectly well is the most expensive of all work, whereas in the cost of 12·14 cents per acre for the period of the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, the chief cost was in sub-division work.

Mr. BARRON. I rise to a point of order. I submit that the Minister has no right to read his speech.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have a few more statistics here, and I would like to go through with them.

Mr. BARRON. I call attention to this rule:

"It is a rule in both Houses of Parliament that members must address the House orally and not read from a written previously-prepared speech; for the reason as stated by Mr. Fox in 1806, that 'if the practice of reading written speeches should prevail members might read speeches that were written by other people and the time of the House be taken up in considering the arguments of persons who were not deserving of their attention.' It is the invariable practice to discountenance all such written speeches, and it is the duty of the Speaker to interfere when his attention is directed to the fact. Members may, however, make use of notes in delivering a speech."

Mr. DAWSON. It is not a speech, but simply a statement of figures.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This memorandum contains only some information I have collected in the department. I had nothing to do with the department until recently, and I wish to give this statement because a very large number of hon. gentlemen must have been misinformed, if they took for gospel the statements made by some hon. gentlemen opposite at the commencement of the Session. They no doubt felt, as I felt, that the Administration of the North-West made a very bad showing; but since I have taken the trouble to look into the matter and have arranged this memorandum which I am anxious to give to the House, I have come to a different conclusion, and I believe hon. gentlemen when they study these statistics will come to the same conclusion, that we have done the best we could, that the affairs of the North-West have not been extravagantly managed, and that the money we come down and ask to-day is not an extravagant sum. However, Sir, I take the ground, and take it strongly, that in view of the fact that so much sub division work has been done, in a permanent manner, in advance of the needs of settlement in many cases, and that all the country which is likely to be required for settlement for many years to come has been outlined, so that at any time a surveyor can go into any part of the North-West and make a sub-division for the purposes of settlement on three months' notice, it is only fair and reasonable that this large cost should be charged to capital account, and that figures professing to show the cost of administration should not include the cost of survey. As already explained, the cost of survey from the very commencement has been carefully extracted from the books and accounts of the Department of the Interior, and we now

know definitely what the cost of administration of the public lands in the North-West has been, year by year, since the date of the acquisition of the country, apart altogether from the cost of survey. For the five years of Liberal Administration the cost of Civil Government at Ottawa was $204,470, and the total revenue including cash and scrip, was $350,440, in other words the cost of Civil Government alone was 58 per cent. of the total receipts. During the 10 years of Conservative Administration since 1878, the cost of Civil Government at Ottawa has been $756,778, and the total revenue $6,375,828, or, in other words, the cost of Civil Government has been but 11 per cent. of the gross revenue. For the corresponding periods of five and ten years, the cost of management in the North-West, and extra clerks at headquarters has been $147,264, and $1,295,291, against total revenues of $350,440 and $6,375,828 respectively, that is to say, during the period of five years for which hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible, the cost of management which is now charged to Dominion lands income, was 42 per cent. of the revenue, while for the ten years of Conservative rule it has been but 20 per cent. of the revenue. Adding together the cost of Civil Government, and management in Manitoba and the North-West, the total expenditure during the five years of Liberal Administration was $351,735, against a total revenue of $350,440, or 100 per cent. of the revenue, whereas during the ten years of Conservative Administration the cost of Civil Government and management in Manitoba and the North-West has been $2,052,070 against a total revenue of $6,375,828, that is to say, instead of swallowing up the whole revenue it has been but 32 per cent. of it. If you are very anxious to have this matter regarded from a purely cash basis, hon. gentlemen opposite may find some consolation in the information that during their five years in office the cost of Civil Government at Ottawa, which has already been stated to be $204,470, was 219 per cent. of the cash revenue, which was $93,005; while for the ten years of Conservative Administration the cost of Civil Government at Ottawa has been only 15 per cent. of the cash revenue. Just mark the difference, Sir, for every $100 which they drew from North-West lands in actual cash, they spent on Civil Government alone $219 in actual cash; while this Government, for every $100 of cash revenue, has spent in cash—$219? No, Sir, not even $19, without the $200; only $15. Then let us take the cost of management in Manitoba, and let us compare the figures in that respect, on the cash basis. During their period in office, as already stated, they drew a cash revenue from the North-West of $93,005, and they spent upon their outside service and extra clerk at headquarters $147,264, or 158 per cent. of their revenue, while the Conservative Administration has during the past ten years expended on the same service only $26 for every $100 received in actual cash. This discrepancy between income and expenditure calculated on the cash basis is not quite so great in this case as it is in regard to Civil Government; but the difference between 158 per cent. and 26 per cent. is considerable, in fact six times 26 is 156, as any schoolboy knows, and 156 is a little short of 158. Similarly, Sir, for every $100 of revenue they collected in cash they spent $765 upon surveys, whereas this Government, although it has practically surveyed the whole country, having outlined the whole of it and sub-divided the most of it, so that the needs of settlement can be met in the future with comparatively little expense to the country, has only expended in surveys—765 per cent. of the revenue? No, not even 65 per cent; only 60 per cent. the exact figures being, Sir, 60 per cent. of the cash revenue. The contrast between 765 per cent. and 60 per cent. is one of which my hon. friends on the other side are not likely to say much. Then, still on the basis of the actual cash revenue, let us add together the cost of Civil Government and that of outside management, and we find that hon. gentlemen opposite when they had the opportunity spent 378 per cent. of all the cash they received upon these services, whereas this Government has spent but 41 per cent. of its cash revenue in the past ten years upon these services, and hopes to do a good deal better in the future. I may add, Sir, that in their time the proportion of expenditure to revenue was never higher than 2,506 per cent. in any one year, and never less than 54 per cent, including Civil Government, outside management and surveys; whereas the highest proportion under the present Government was in 1880, when about half a million was spent upon surveys, 226 per cent., and the lowest in any year was 36 per cent., with the average being greatly increased in favor of revenue and greatly diminished as regards expenditure. These figures, Sir, I submit for the information of the House, in fulfilment of the promise which I made during the discussion which took place on the motion of the hon. member for Western Assiniboia, for all memorials addressed to the Government by the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories, which sat recently at Regina. I regret that my hon. friends on the other side of the House find it consistent with their conception of the duty which they owe to their country to keep on insisting that the land regulations and mining regulations which affect the North-West are bad, and telling the people in the same breath that similar regulations in the United States are good, and liberal, and everything that is desirable. I challenge hon. gentlemen to be more specific in their statements, and I defy them to show that in any one particular the land regulations governing the disposal of homesteads and pre emptions in the North-West are not incomparably more liberal and better in every way than the regulations under which similar lands are disposed of in the United States. Let us see for example what the Secretary of the Interior for the United States says in his last report to Congress, being for the year ending on the 30th June last, in relation to the land business of the United States. On page 7 of his report he says:

"The most pressing information exhibited in this report relates to the accumulated business of the land office. The Commissioner states that a thorough examination has been made of all the unfinished business in his office and that the results presented may be accepted as accurate. This information carries a heavy reproach against the Government, and seems to call for action which shall relieve the condition exhibited."

He explains that many contests must necessarily arise in relation to cases before the department, and that, at best, different causes of delay will protract the issue of the final evidence of title. He says:

"It is obvious, however, that it is of great importance to all honest and rightful claimants that the evidence of their title should be speedily issued. Yet how dreary is the prospect opened to the settler by the figures now exhibited of the arrears of business.

"Of final entries, there were pending on the 30th of June last 238,156; and the number of such entries made during the last year was 70,488. This latter number exceeds all the final entries disposed of by patent during the last year; so that instead of a diminishment of arrearages, the accumulation of cases has increased. The Commissioner expresses the hope that it will be possible to dispose of 75,000 of these cases during the current year: a number which will not diminish sensibly the mass, if, as may be reasonably expected, so many final entries shall be made during the current as during the past year. No reasonable expectation is, therefore, held out to the settler who has met all the requirements of the law, that he can receive the evidence of his title for nearly four years after his proof shall have been submitted. When it is also considered that, in many instances, defects of proof will require further action on his part, to be followed by further delays in securing a final disposition, the default of the Government to its citizens becomes glaring and painful."

I am glad to be able to inform the House that on the average no settler of Dominion lands in the Canadian North-West experiences a delay of more than four months, as compared with four years in the United States, between the time of submitting his final proof to the day when his patent is actually placed in his hands. Remember, Sir, this is not a criticism of the condition of the Department of

the Interior at Ottawa by the hon. member for South Norfolk, but the frank and candid admission of the head of the Interior Department at Washington to the Congress of the United States and to his fellow citizens. Further on he says:

"Of miscellaneous selections and pending claims, the Commissioner reports railroad selections aggregating 25,429,866.11 acres as unadjusted and undisposed of at the end of the year; besides 731,857.59 acres in State selections under swamp-land grants, and 1,850 000 in State selections for educational and internal improvement purposes."

Mr. Villas does not claim for the United States' system the perfection which my hon. friend from South Norfolk seems to see in it; on the contrary he says:

"That some efficacious changes of method ought to be devised and put in operation at the earliest day to afford to the public the relief to which they are entitled from their Government."

And although he agrees with the Commissioner that an increased force of his office is necessary, he submits that a thorough and radical reorganisation of the Land Office ought to be the first step taken; and as if this were not enough he winds up his appeal for reform in the following words:—

"If this business were in the hands of any private establishment of capacity and intelligence it would be no unreasonable expectation that by proper organization and provision for its needs, the congestion might be relieved and its affairs transacted with prompt efficiency in the period of a couple of years. As it is, a backward glance over the long course of time through which its business has become more and more entangled and involved, gives little promise for the future. The inadequate salaries paid its responsible officers and chiefs of divisions, their brief and uncertain tenure, the position of private interest to public duty, and the want of adequate co-operative legislation so many times recommended without avail, constitute elements of weakness which cannot but tend hereafter, as heretofore, to render the performances of the office unequal to the demands upon it. It ought to be made the subject of single and special examination by some commission or Committee of Congress in co-operation with the officers of the bureau and the department, by which, perhaps, a scheme of relief may be devised, adequate to the circumstances and possible of adoption."

Mr. SOMERVILLE I would suggest that as there are no figures in this the Minister might save time by handing it into the *Hansard*.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is reading an extract from a report of a department at Washington.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), as already pointed out, has stated that there is no machinery in the United States system corresponding with our Commissioner's Office in Winnipeg. Is there not indeed? Let us see what Mr. Villas, the Secretary of the Interior in Mr. Cleveland's Government, has to say upon this subject. Under the head of "Appeals and Contests," page 9 of his last report he says:

"The judicial functions of the Commissioner in review of the action of local land officers and of the Secretary of the Interior on appeal from the Commissioner or, more rarely, in original exercise of the supervisory jurisdiction imposed by law over the public lands, have gradually expanded with the multiplication of interests, development of new questions and the growth of precedents into a strong semblance of the court of chancery, with much of the machinery, methods and peculiarities, *mutatis mutandis*, of that venerable tribunal; a likeness not lost in its consequence of expense and delay."

As a further proof of the efficiency of the homestead laws of the United States, I ask the hon. gentleman to refer to page 14 of the report of the Secretary of the Interior, from which quotations have already been made, from which it will be seen that no less than 29,729,761 acres have been actually restored to the Government of the United States during the past four years for abandonment, illegality and other causes. We have heard something, Sir, about the alleged delays in dealing with the claims of half-breeds in the North-West Territories. What does Mr. Villas say in regard to a similar class of claims, the claims by occupation arising under Mexican cessions, and of lands within the territories of the United States, and similar cases in Louisiana and Florida which are alledged to rest upon French or Spanish grants at law? Why, he says that though the Department of the Interior at Washington has persistently urged these matters upon the attention of Congress, no subject furnishes greater discouragement of further recommendation to that body by reason of its neglect of all the interests involved. This is not a surprising statement in view of the fact that, as he says, not a few of these claims date back to the last century and some even beyond:

"It is a reproach to the Government, he says, that after nearly forty years the South-Western Territories should lie under the shadow of clouds which portend such lightning strokes to individuals and devastation to public interests."

No wonder that he finishes up by exclaiming:

"But the right of wrong of particular cases has become a thing almost of comparative indifference in view of the overwhelming and menacing wrong of their not being decided at all."

It will also be interesting, especially to hon. gentlemen opposite, to learn as we do on the authority of the report of the Land Office officials at Devil's Lake, Dakota:

"The actual and presumptive cases of land being appropriated by aliens who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, but who make final proof under the pre-emption law without having done so, many of whom never do take out their final citizenship papers (this being especially true of Canadians, who cross the line, settle upon, acquire and sell land, and return to their homes without becoming citizens of the United States) would suggest a change in the law in that respect."

I will not detain the House any longer with these extracts, and I will only apologise for having delayed the time of the House to this great length; but I feel that it was my duty to the House, as I feel it my duty to the country, to show that the statements which were made in the House at the commencement of this Session were certainly not borne out by facts. I am sure that hon. gentlemen will think so if they study the report which I have read this evening.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has been a long time in incubation. The speech which the hon. gentleman has made to-night—if you may call it a speech, but I think he said it was a report from his department—would have been better if put before the House in the form of a report than in the form of a speech from the hon. gentleman. It would have been more appropriate if the portion misrepresenting myself and the members of the Government who were in office some 12 years ago, had been omitted. The hon. gentleman has undertaken to institute a comparison as to the cost of the administration of the Interior Department in 1876 and in 1878, and the cost of the Department of the Interior to-day. The hon. gentleman says that the Department of the Interior cost from $36,000 to $38,000 at that time, and that it now costs $82,000. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman omitted to inform the House in the statement which he made, that in 1876 and 1878 the Department of the Interior, also had an Indian Branch, that it included the department now called the Department of Indian Affairs, that the Indian Department at the present time has cost $42,415, so that the Department of Indian Affairs to-day has cost $4,000 more than the entire Department of the Interior including public lands and Indian Affairs did in 1878. So it appears that even taking the hon. gentleman's own statement the Department of the Interior has cost $86,000 more than it did in 1878. Well, Sir, that $86,000 is not all, because I find that the hon. gentleman has transferred to the North-West an expenditure of $35,000 for the extra sessional clerks who are employed in the office here. If the hon. gentleman would add this $ 5,000 to the $82,000 and to the $42,000, he will have much more than four times the cost of the Department of the Interior to-day compared with that department in 1876. I understated the facts at the beginning of this Session when I stated that the Department of the Interior cost about four times what it did at that time. The hon. gentleman says that the Department of Indian Affairs of the North-West and the Public Lands Office in 1878 cost about $40,000. My recollection is, although I have not carefully looked into the figures for many years, that the cost of one was something

over $18,000 and the cost of the other $20,000. I find that the hon. gentleman's Land Branch at Winnipeg cost $54,100; that to provide for clerks, forest rangers and so forth he asked for the sum of nearly $40,000; to provide for the travelling expenses of persons employed in Crown timber agencies and for inspection of ranches and so on he asks $48,830, and that altogether the hon. gentleman is asking for salaries and travelling expenses connected with his department—leaving out altogether the Indian branch of the North-West—$135,700 this year. Now, let the hon. members of this Committee look at the facts. Here are $82,762 that the hon. gentleman asks for the Department of the Interior, excluding the Indian branch; here is the hon gentleman who is at the head of that Indian branch asking $42,450 for the expenses of management of that branch here, and the hon. gentleman is asking in connection with his department in the North-West, $185,748, omitting altogether the expenses of the Indian branch of the North-West Territories. I find that the general expenses of the North-West are charged in the Indian vote at $152,486, so that the branch which the hon. gentleman says cost in Ottawa and in the North-West Territories something like $80,000 in 1876 is to-day costing $185,000, $152,486, $11,218, over $42,000, and $82,000, making altogether not far short of half a million; or, in exact figures, including the Minister's salary, $481,664. And yet the hon. gentleman says that when I stated that the expenses were now more than four times what they were in 1876, I had exaggerated the facts. The hon. gentleman and his department by a peculiar system of bookkeeping and by dividing up these expenses, have sought to conceal the facts, and they have concealed them from those members who have not taken the trouble to investigate them. But I say, with a full sense of the responsibility of my statement, that the expense connected with these two branches of the Government to-day are more than double what it ought to be, and that any member of this House having ordinary capacity and industry, who would undertake the management of these departments, could produce greater efficiency for less than one-half of the sum of money now expended. The hon. gentleman has also told us of the cost of the United States system, and of the advantage of the system which he has adopted over that which prevails in the neighboring republic. Well, Sir, I have nothing to do with the defense of the American system. All I have said, and I say it again, is that the Illinois Central Railway Company in one year of its existence, has sold more public lands, and given more patents for those lands than the Government of Canada has in the whole North-West Territories in any one year, and it has done so at, I will not say one-tenth, but one-twentieth of the expense this Government has incurred. No man carrying on a large business would maintain in his place twenty-four hours a man who would manage his business so inefficiently and extravagantly as this Government during the past ten years have managed the affairs of the North-West Territories. The hon. gentleman says that the Government of which I was a member were so extravagant that we appointed a man as land agent on the North Saskatchewan three years, he might have said four years, before he had anything to do. We did not appoint him an hour before he had anything to do. When we sent surveyors to survey that settlement, we also sent an agent to enquire into the rights of the settlers who were there, so that their locations could be entered into the land book immediately on the completion of the survey; and the agent had plenty of work to employ him during the time the survey was going on. But when the survey was completed, we were out of office; we left office on the 17th of October, and the survey was not completed until the 27th of October, and the report of the survey was received a little later. What did the hon. gentlemen do when they came into office? They left this man three years without instructions; he wrote to them asking for instructions, and his communications are before the House; they left him without books; there was no opportunity for the people to make entries; and it was not until they were on the eve of insurrection, and until they were meeting in council with the half-breeds, that those gentlemen chose to hand over the books to Mr. Duck, and enable him to open the office at Prince Albert. It is true that he was there three or four years with nothing to do; but why? Because hon. gentlemen opposite neglected their duty; because they were much more anxious to look after their party interests at Ottawa and wherever there were votes to be made, than they were to look after the interests of the population in that distant country who had no power to exercise any influence on their own behalf; and it was not until the half-breed population were in arms that these hon. gentlemen attempted to discharge their duties. We had clergymen from that country and representatives of the North-West Council importuning the Government and warning them of the difficulty that would arise if they failed to discharge their duty, and it was not until arms were taken and property destroyed and life lost, that they woke up to the situation and gave Mr. Duck something to do.

Mr. DEWDNEY. He was appointed long before that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes; and the work was there for him to do.

Mr. DEWDNEY. And he was doing the work; I was in his office, and he had books and everything else.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I suppose the hon. gentleman slept in his gubernatorial chair; we have no communication from him, but we have letters from Mr. Duck, which can be found in the proceedings of this House; and any hon. gentleman who chooses to read them will see that he wrote again and again for instructions. He was appointed in 1878, and he did not receive the books to enable him to open his office until 1881 or 1882, and he might have been there till this time without having anything to do if there had been no rebellion. The hon. gentleman has told us about the delays which took place, and the expenses which were incurred in the immediate vicinity of Winnipeg in locating the half-breeds there and settling their claims. Why, Sir, there were people whose claims were being settled, first by the Lieutenant Governor, whom we constantly urged to the discharge of this duty, but who left his office before the duty was completed, and we transferred the work to Chief Justice Wood. What was the work assigned to him? Was it the ordinary work of a land dispute that arose after the surveys were made? Not at all. There were people who lived in the country before there were any surveys, before it was acquired by us. When the surveys came to be made two parties were found claiming the same lot, and their claims had to be investigated, and we appointed Chief Justice Wood to make that investigation, and to report in order to secure a satisfactory settlement. But if there was delay in locating the half-breeds whose fault was that? When the Government that preceded us in office ordered the census to be made, in order to provide for the distribution of the 1,400,000 acres, they took the census of the entire half-breed population without discriminating between children and the heads of families. What was the result? The present Prime Minister, who was Minister of Justice, reported that the heads of families were not included in the grant to the children of half-breeds, and there was no census upon which to make the distribution, so that a new census had to be taken. But a large proportion of those half-breeds were scattered over the North-West Territories, and it was impossible to ascertain where they were; and so the work which the hon. gentlemen could easily have done, if they had paid the least attention to the interpretation of the statute which they invited Parliament to pass,

when we came in it was found a source of infinite trouble, which might have been done with ease if it had been properly done in the first instance; and it was because they did not give it any attention that the census was taken in such a way that the distribution of the land could not take place. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman has told us of the very large percentage of increase of the population, and of the resources of the country since his friends have come into office. That reminds me of the story of the man who said, when he was seeking to get credit, that his personal property had increased a thousandfold during twelve months, and who, when asked how that happened, said that he had purchased a sow, and she had had ten pigs since he bought her; and so the hon. gentleman tells us that because there was a small population there when we were in power, and the population is larger now, therefore there has been a very great increase, and that increase is due to the extraordinary efficiency of the policy of the Administration. The hon. gentleman has told us how much land they surveyed, and how little we surveyed. But why should we have surveyed more? What was the object of carrying on surveys years in advance of settlement? Our object was to secure the settlement of the country with as little expense to the treasury as possible, and we saw that an ample quantity of land was surveyed, to afford facilities for settlement, but hon. gentlemen opposite have gone on surveying an extensive territory that will not be settled for centuries, at the present rate of settlement. The boundaries will be obliterated; the surveys will have to be made over again; the stakes will have disappeared, and a large proportion of the country will require to be re-surveyed before settlement actually takes place. We abstained deliberately from surveying, because it was not in the public interest. The hon. gentleman's colleagues caused a large extent of territory, unsurveyed, to be surveyed, in that country, not because they believed it would be to the advantage of the country, but because it was desired to give employment and to bestow patronage upon friends who had supported them in the elections. And they did it in this way at the expense of the public treasury, and to the detriment of the public interest. The hon. gentleman has told the House that the expenses were greater, in proportion to revenue, under Mackenzie's Administration than they have been under the present Administration. That was a necessary consequence of the condition of the country at that particular time. There was no railway, either in Canadian or American territory, reaching within hundreds of miles of Manitoba, either from the south or from the east. The country was far more inaccessible than it is now, and yet we find that the number of people who have gone in since is a smaller average per year than the population that went in during 1877 and 1878; and that the issue of patents in 1877 and 1878 was larger than for some years succeeding. The hon. gentleman says that they have only appointed the land agents as they were required. Well, the Government have done this: they have adopted a policy of undertaking to encourage settlers to go far beyond the limits of Manitoba and far away from those districts, into places not easily accessible; and the result is that, without any advantage to the country at large, there has been a very serious addition to the cost of carrying on the settlement of the country. The hon. gentleman has given us a number of comparisons with regard to the expenses of the Government and with regard to the amount of revenue that has been received. The hon. gentleman has charged a very considerable proportion of the expenditure to capital account that were not so charged in our day, and, what is more, the hon. gentleman's leader told the House and the country in 1881 that by this time there would be upwards of $60,000,000 of revenue in excess of the actual cost incurred. It is clear, from the statement of the First Minister, that he expected in a few years that the amount of sales would extend, and that settlement would go on

much more rapidly than it has. What do we find? At the present day, when we take into account the cost of survey and of maintaining these various departments of the Government in the Territories, the amount of revenues that have been derived as yet have not been in excess of the amount of expenditure. In every department there has been an enormous increase in the cost of carrying on the Government, without any adequate increase in the amount of public services rendered. It is impossible that the hon. gentleman can say the contrary, because the demands of the Government for the purpose of meeting the current expenses from year to year, and the reports of the condition of the country, and the progress of settlement, show that the statement I make is wholly within the mark.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to call the attention of the Committee to a specimen of the way in which the public money is expended in advancing the settlement of the North-West. In 1886-87, the Government had as an official, Mr. Rufus Stephenson, Inspector of Colonisation Companies, with a salary of $3,000 a year, and travelling expenses, $1,278.50. Mr. Stephenson had for assistant, W. J. Boucher, who received $388.50 salary, and travelling expenses $641 85. Another assistant, Mr. F. J. Clarke, received $100. Altogether there was paid for the inspection of Colonisation Companies, in 1886-87, $5,378.85. The House will be surprised to learn that the total receipts from the companies in 1886-87 amounted to the magnificent sum of $903.63, showing a loss of $4,475.50. No reasonable man would suppose that the Government, knowing this, would have left unchanged this system of spending money, and retained the services of Messrs. Stephenson, Clarke and Boucher; but they did not see it in that light; and in the next year Mr. Stephenson again acted in this capacity. He was paid his salary of $3,000, and expenses, $2,035.98, making a total of $5,035.98, and the total receipts from Colonisation Companies amounted to $470, showing a net loss of $4,565.98. Any one would have thought that these two years of public experience would have induced the Government to set Mr. Stephenson aside, and decide that his services were no longer required in the interests of this country. But we find, on the 24th February of this year, that Mr. Brien put the question:

"Whether Mr. Rufus Stephenson, late Inspector of Colonisation Societies, has been employed by the Government in any capacity since the 30th June last? If so, what were his duties? What was his salary? How much has he received, either as salary or travelling expenses, between the 30th June, 1888, and 1st day of February, 1889?"

To which Mr. Dewdney replied as follows:—

"In November last Mr. Stephenson was asked to undertake the inspection of several colonies. The 'Commercial,' situated near Kinbrae; the 'London Artisans' Colony, near Moosomin; and the Primitive Methodists, if time would permit of his visiting the latter. He was subsequently asked to inspect the 'Church' Colony, near Churchbridge station, on the line of the Manitoba and North-Western Railway. We have reports from him on all except the Methodist Colony. He is to be paid $10 a day and travelling expenses. He has not received any salary between the above dates. $500 was advanced him on account of travelling expenses."

I think this statement which I have made shows clearly that the Minister of the Interior and those who preceded him in the administration of the department over which he now presides, have not been actuated by a desire to promote the welfare of the country and the economical management of the finances of the country, but by a desire in far too many cases to promote the interests of some hanger on of the Government, some man like Rufus Stephenson, who is a pet of the Government and who lives in the same town with Mr. Henry Smyth, who received last year $1,500 on immigration account, for which I believe he did nothing. This shows that these gentlemen are simply determined to keep on the pay-list men who render no services at all and whose work is no profit to the country. It is nonsense for the Minister of the Interior to tell the House that they are endeavoring to economise. They are not endeavoring

to economise. They are extravagant in every department of the public service, and in no department can we find as much extravagance as there is in the department presided over by the Minister of the Interior

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister of the Interior has referred to a statement which I made to the House some time ago and has challenged the accuracy of that statement. I will quote from the Auditor General's report. We find that the Land Board at Winnipeg last year cost $30,745; travel of Superintendent of Mines, $2,299.38; travel of Inspector of Agencies, $1,270.46; travel of Inspector of Colonisation Companies, $2,035.98; contingencies of Land Board, $2,007.59; travelling expenses, $1,091 40; removal expenses, $2,727.68; special services paid at Winnipeg, $1,408.24; homestead inspection, $14,913 29; Inspector of Ranches, $1,202.23; Intelligence Officers, $2 051.21; Forest Rangers, $787.50; Half breed Commission, $9,384 08; then, expenses in Ottawa in connection with matters of the North-West, $10,619.77; Examiners for Land Surveyors, $880.70; legal expenses, $1,256.07; advertising, British Columbia, $327.69; Dominion Land Agencies, as per page E 73, Auditor General's Accounts, $52,158.57. The whole comes, as I stated before, to a total of $149,646.61. If you add to that contingencies at Ottawa, $22,127, and salaries at Ottawa, $78,060, and deduct from that the entire revenue as given by the Auditor General at page G 183, $217,083.07, you have a net loss of $32 950. I would call the attention of the Committee to another point which I stated before. The Minister of the Interior said just now that the receipts from the registry offices in the North-West were about equal to the salaries. We find that the salaries paid last year were $13,400, and the entire receipts for registration were $7,591, leaving a net loss of $5,804. If all the rest of the statements which the Minister has brought before the House, compiled no doubt by some clerk in his office, are as correct as that, he has made a very erroneous statement.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon gentleman did not understand what I said. I stated that the revenue for the first year, when this system was in operation, was within $2,400 of the expense, but I said that, from the information we have to-day with regard to the fees that are paid, the revenue is about equalling the expense. I did not refer to the figures of the previous year, but to those of the year just closed.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman is attempting to take advantage of the fact that this House has only the returns up to the 30th June last, and says now he is referring to this year. He did not say that this was in connection with the receipts up to this time, but he now tries to shield himself behind that statement when he is brought face to face with the Auditor General's Report. That is another way of sleeking over the facts, and is in accordance with the idea that an Inspector of Registry Offices should be employed at a salary of $4,000 a year to inspect five offices, and is on a par with the expenses in connection with Rufus Stephenson. There is a system of extravagance pursued in connection with the Department of the Interior and the North-West lands which is most disgraceful and should not be submitted to The North-West is nothing short of what the late leader of the Opposition called it, a happy hunting ground for the political hacks of hon. gentlemen opposite. Any gentleman whose services are not recognised by the constituencies in the old Provinces is sent off to the North-West on a happy hunting tour, and is paid a high salary. I defy the hon. gentleman from the Auditor General's Accounts to contradict my statement. The entire receipts from all sources in the North West last year were $217,000, and the expenditure in the North West, including agents, inspectors, ranch inspectors, registrars, &c., was $149,546, leaving a net sum of $67,437 to come to Ottawa; and the net cost in Ottawa, including salaries and contingencies in the office of the Department of the Interior, was $100,387, which shows a positive loss of $33,000 less $46. Now, I say this is a disgraceful condition of things, in face of the promises that were made us a few years ago when the people's representatives here were induced to vote an additional sum of 30 millions to complete the Canadian Pacific Railway. Glowing statements were then made by the then Minister of Finance of how many acres of land were going to be cultivated that would produce so many bushels of wheat and he even prophesied that there would be 640 million bushels to export, and that we would have an enormous revenue from the sale of lands. We also had the First Minister repeating these ridiculous statements. Where are they now? They have gone to nothing. There was nothing in these statements. They were mere wind, there was no substance in them. I say the whole system should be altered, and these people who are drawing salaries and doing nothing should be struck off the list, and these expenses should be cut down something within decent limits. But it is a positive disgrace to this Dominion to have so many men stamping round there virtually doing nothing, every one of these homestead inspectors getting $1,200 a year and $4 a day for travelling expenses. In addition to that, we provide them with a horse and a buckboard; they go out to the various farms to inspect them, and no doubt they receive the best of attendance and are charged nothing at all, but still their $4 a day for travelling expenses are charged to the Government.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Are you sure of that?

Mr. McMULLEN. We can show it. Turn up the accounts and you will see it. If you do not know it, it is time you did, because I know it. Not only that, but the hon. gentleman provides them with a horse and rig, and allowance, don't you? I know you do. These charges are made upon the country, and I say it is absurd for us to put up with them any longer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) While the Minister was reading his ministerial statement to-night, endeavoring to induce the House to believe that matters were very pleasant, and going on agreeably in the North-West, and that the Government's administration of matters there deserves the approval of this House, I amused myself by extracting from the Public Accounts a few items of our expenditure there just to show what this country is paying for the Government of the North-West Territories. I find that in the matter of Dominion lands, from which we were told a few years ago we were to derive an enormous revenue, we have in the Estimates for the coming year an expenditure amounting to $438,000, made up of the expenses of the Department of the Interior, including Minister's salary, salaries of other officials and contingencies, $53,000; $100,000 for Dominion lands chargable to capital which we intend to expend; and $185,000 charged to income, making a total of $438,000. I find that the receipts for last year from these lands were $217,000, so we are going to lose the small item of $221,000 alone in the administration of the Dominion lands in the North-West. That is a very small and almost a contemptible item in comparison with the total expenditure in that country, and there seems to be no offset at all, no receipts at all. I find we spent about $100,000 on immigration; $941,000 on the Indians; $720,000 on the North-West Police; $145,000 on the Government of the North-West; $6,000 for the Government of Keewatin; for inspectors, registrars, and clerks in all the Territories, $15,000; North-West Council, $16,250, and $20,000 for Banff, making a total of $1,862,000. If you add to that the total lost of the administration of the Dominion lands, we find we are sinking the small item of about two million a year in the administration of the Government of that country. We all know that that estimate does not take into account the interest upon the millions that have been spent on the surveys that have been made in times gone by, it

takes no account of the interest on the millions that have been spent on the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has been given to the company; it takes no account of the interest on the money spent to acquire the territory in the first instance—it is simply for the administration of those North-West Territories during the coming year. As a matter of fact we are going to sink about two millions this year. The fact is that about 8 or 10 years ago hon. gentlemen opposite had their heads turned with the promises made to them by the then Finance Minister, Sir Leonard Tilley, and the leader of the Government, Sir John A. Macdonald. They told us we were going to have 71 millions returned by 1890 for these lands, although they revised that statement to $58,300,000, they were so certain of the estimate that they would not take off $300,000. Here we stand to-day. Not only were those promises not fulfilled, but the balance is very largely on the other side. When these prophecies were indulged in by hon. gentlemen opposite, I say the head of the Government and the heads of their supporters were turned, and they made their expenditure upon a scale commensurate with the receipts which they stated they expected to receive. They indulged in a career of mad extravagance in that country, and here we are to-day, the overtaxed people of the other Provinces paying a sum of two or three million dollars a year for the administration of that territory. Still the Minister stands up, and, without the slightest attempt to economise, he challenges the House to the conclusion that he is administering the affairs of the country well. My hon. friend to my left has shown how foolish and ridiculous his comparison of the expenditure now is with the expenditure under the Mackenzie Government, when that great country was being opened up. Now we have got it opened up, and the expenditure, instead of decreasing, is increasing; and so far as I can see, under the administration of the hon. gentleman, we may look from year to year for a very large increase still. There seems to be no desire for economy on the part of the hon. gentleman; but I am very much mistaken if, in the near future, events which he cannot control will compel an economy which they refuse to exercise of their own mere motion.

Mr. LISTER. I desire to ask the Minister whether Mr. Rufus Stephenson is still in the employ of the Government, and if he is, what is he doing, and what salary is he receiving?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Rufus Stephenson is not now in the employ of the Government, and is receiving no salary.

Mr LISTER. When did he cease to be in the employ of the Government?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot give you the exact date, at the commencement of the month, I think.

Mr. LISTER. Had he discharged the duties for which he was employed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He had, completely.

Mr. LISTER. I think that it is time the Dominion Government dispensed with the services of Mr. Rufus Stephenson. From 1882 down to the present time, he has been in the employ of the Government and in the receipt of an enormous salary. He was appointed by the Government as inspector of colonisation companies, at a salary of $3,000 a year and with two or three assistants. He has nothing to do, and the Government have employed two or three clerks to help him to do it. The Minister of the Interior has made a new departure to-night. I have had the honor of holding a seat in this House for seven Sessions, and I have never yet seen an hon. gentleman on the Government benches rise and read a long speech prepared by an officer of his department.

An hon. MEMBER. The Secretary of State did.

Mr. LISTER. It seems that the Secretary of State did it. It would save a great deal of trouble if other Ministers would adopt the same course. The hon. gentleman was please to tell us that the speech he made to-night was prepared by an officer of his department, I assume it was prepared by his deputy Minister. I think under all the circumstances his deputy Minister might have had more honesty and more decency than to have put into his hands, to be read to this House, and to go to the country, a falsehood, so far as the previous administration were concerned. He put into the hands of the Minister of the Interior to be read here to-night a statement that the expense of this Government in the North-West was little more than that of the Mackenzie Administration, when it was, in point of fact, over $480,000 I do not blame the Minister so much, because I do not think he knows anything about his department, but I blame Mr. Burgess, a man who owes his position to the Liberal party, and who should not have forgotten what was due to them and should not have departed from the truth as he has done in the statement he has given to the Minister to read to this House. The hon. gentleman has told us he is not very much acquainted with the details of his department. For what did the Government take him into office? For what did they make him Minister of the Interior? Was it on account of his vast parliamentary experience, was it because he had served his country faithfully, honestly, and heroically in the past, or was it because he was the primary cause of the rebellion which has cost this country nearly $7,000,000? We heard only the other day, for the first time, that the Government assumed the responsibility for the rebellion. Up to that time the Government permitted it to be charged against the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Minister of the Interior, that it was on account of his malfeasance, and his neglect of duty that the rebellion was to be attributed.

Mr. HESSON. That is not correct.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman says that he is not acquainted with the duties of his office. This is a new mode of explaining the Estimates, it is a new mode for the purpose of satisfying the House for a Minister of the Crown to come here and read a statement prepared by his deputy, not to answer any questions asked, but an assault upon a previous Administration, which was not in question.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It was not an assault at all.

Mr. LISTER. It was an assault on the Mackenzie Administration, and that was not in question. What we seek to know is what the Government are now doing with the public funds, and it is no answer to rise and say that the amount is more or less than the expense by the previous Administration. It has been said here to-night, and there is no doubt about it, that the Minister of Finance is now applying the pruning knife to the various departments of this Government, and if he applies that knife to the administration of the North-West Territories, he will find the most enormous extravagance and corruption pervading every part of the Territories. It has been said that the North-West Territories is a place for needy followers of the Government to draw salaries and make a living, which they are not able to make in other parts of the Dominion. We have one instance of that in the case of Mr. Stephenson. Mr. Stephenson's work did not occupy him two months of the whole year. It was a summer jaunt for him, and for it he received from this liberal Government $3,000 a year and expenses, and was provided with two assistants. What were the predictions of the hon. gentleman? The predictions as to this country were as visionary as they always are when the Government are asking this House for some favor or some grant. The hon. gentleman whom this Minister of the Interior followed told this House they would export from that country within 10

years 640,000,000 bushels of wheat, that the country would be densely settled in that time; and that was said for the purpose of inducing this House to grant enormous subsidies to the Canadian Pacific Railway. What has been the result? A beggarly 150,000 people occupy that country, and we are spending there double the sums we receive from it. So far as the hon. gentleman is concerned, it is perfectly evident that he is not acquainted with the duties of his office; but so far as this House is concerned, hon. gentlemen have a right to expect from him a full, concise and clear statement as to the administration of the affairs of that office. I say he has not given to this House such a statement, but he has given to the House a statement prepared by an officer of his department, which is false in many particulars.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will only say a few words with respect to the remarks which the hon. gentleman thought proper to make with respect to my deputy. I should like to know to whom a new Minister taking charge of a department should go for information? I think the Deputy Minister is the proper gentleman to whom he should apply, and that he is the proper party who should give the Minister information. I take the whole responsibility for this memorandum. It was made at my suggestion, and I gave him my views and what I required. If there is anything in it which hon. gentlemen think reflects on them, I did not intend that it should reflect on them. All I claimed to lay before this House—and I think I have a perfect right to do so—was a comparison with the administration of a similar department in the United States, and also a comparison of the administration of the department when it was administered by hon. gentlemen opposite as compared with the way it has been administered during the last few years. That is the reason I gave this information, and I do not think blame is attachable to my deputy. In regard to not being acquainted with the details of my department, I do not pretend to be so much acquainted with them as I hope to be in the course of another year, but if there is any information which hon. gentlemen opposite want to obtain in regard to this vote which is now before the Committee, I am prepared, and I desire to give it. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is not in his place. If he was, I should like to have asked him to correct himself, or I would correct him, with respect to the travelling allowances made to the homestead inspectors. There was an Order in Council passed under which no officer in the North-West can receive more than $3.50 per day. In looking through the Public Accounts I have not yet come across the homestead inspectors, but the superintendent of mines, who is an official in a higher capacity than a homestead inspector, and the inspector of agencies, both charge at the rate of $3.50 a day. I am quite sure the Auditor General would not pay more than that sum, so the hon. gentleman is wrong in that particular.

Mr. LISTER. I may say that of course when the hon. gentleman made the statement as he did, I took it for granted that he assumed all responsibility for what he contained. But I say furthermore, that so far as the Deputy Minister is concerned, it was a contemptible statement for him to put into the hands of the Minister.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to the course pursued by the Minister of the Interior in coming down here and reading a carefully prepared statement got up for him by his department, and having the character of a reply to remarks made in regard to the administration of that department by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) many weeks ago, two months ago, I would just say this: The Minister of the Interior will see that for public convenience, if he deems it necessary to demand such a document from his department, instead of coming here and reading a statement of that kind, which no mortal man could follow by any possibility, read as it was here, embodying a vast mass of calculations and statistics, it would be much more convenient and more in accordance with the practice of Parliament, that it should be brought down in the shape of a report, ordered by the hon. gentleman and signed with his name. Some course of that kind should be adopted if the hon. gentleman should consider the interests of the public service demand such a document; and it should be brought down and printed and communicated to members of the House. I think that might be fairly done. Besides, my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) the party aimed at and the party repeatedly referred to in this long report that we have had to-night, would have had an opportunity of examining the various facts and statistics which the department has put together, and have had an opportunity to reply to them if he had deemed it worth while or necessary to reply. I think if any of the Ministers find it necessary to reply to a speech in Parliament in this fashion, because this is a reply to a speech in Parliament made many weeks ago, that course should be adopted. I am not complaining of the hon. gentleman replying, but I do not think the mode he took was a well advised one. As to the conduct of the deputy, I may point this out to the hon. gentleman: It appears to me that it was an improper thing for him, knowing better as he did, to have mixed up together the Indian Department expenditure and the expenditure for the Department of the Interior proper, which the Minister will see by referring to the Public Accounts for 1878, were not connected then. That fact of itself vitiated the whole comparison that was made between the expenditure during the administration of my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) and the expenditure that is now going on. My point is this, that if Ministers deem it necessary to reply to statements made in this House by reading a formal report they had better put it in print and communicate it to the whole House, so that an opportunity may be had to review and investigate it. The hon. gentleman has brought down this statement at a late period of the Session. It will be printed in our *Hansard* to-morrow and of course my hon. friend (Mr. Mills), if he deems it necessary to go over it, can reply to it in minute detail, but it will mean a very long debate later on, perhaps on Concurrence, or perhaps when items similar to this are brought down in the Supplementary Estimates. I do not object to this, but it is the necessary consequence of the course the Minister has pursued this evening. To all the Ministers I may say that if they find it necessary to do that, it ought to be done in the regular way and not in the way adopted by my hon. friend to-night.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) stated that he would go into this matter again before the Session was over. It was on account of that that I prepared myself, and my idea was that this was a proper time to bring it up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the rule which I suggested will be found much more convenient for all parties. Might I ask the Minister what are the precise duties of the superintendent of the mines, for whose salary this amount is asked?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Pearce was appointed superintendent some few years ago, when his duties were expected to be extensive. He was appointed in a great measure to supervise the mines in the railway belt of British Columbia. He resides at Calgary now and has supervision of the mines on this side as well; he is also a member of the Land Board.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand it this gentleman is appointed to supervise the mines of

British Columbia. I believe that we have no mines in British Columbia.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is hardly correct. It appears that by the late decision we do not own the precious metals, but I think the far more valuable mines, of base metals, such as coal, iron, copper and lead are owned by us.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does not the recent decision take away the mines from us altogether?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Only the precious metals. As far as I gather it has deprived us of only the gold and silver.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And that only?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is all there was in dispute.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose we are to understand that the effect of the decision was that Canada simply took the interests of an ordinary proprietor and that the Government of British Columbia retain all the right that the Crown shall retain against the private individual.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We presume it to be so, but we have no information except the definite result.

Mr. LISTER. Why is the salary of the secretary to the land commissioner increased?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A year or two ago Mr. Burpé's salary stood at the same amount which it is proposed to increase it to now. It was reduced to $1,800 on account of his ill-health. He is now completely restored to health and is attending the duties of his office, and it was thought advisable to increase his salary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the assistant secretary's salary been increased for the same reason. Has he been ill and restored again?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Ruttan's, the assistant secretary's salary, has been increased by $100 on account of the efficient manner in which he has discharged the duties of his office, on the recommendation of the commissioner.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many officers have you got as Dominion lands agents?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are fifteen. Mr. Whitcher, the head land agent at Winnipeg, gets $2,400; all others get $1,200.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. These range over the whole of the North-West?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes. Mr. Whitcher resides in Winnipeg, Mr. Hiam at Brandon, Mr. Pentland at Birtle, Mr. Young at Manitou, Mr. Flesher at Deloraine, Mr. Hilliard at Minnedosa, Mr Stevenson at Regina, Mr. Rowe at Calgary, Mr. Gauvreau at Edmonton, Mr. McHugh at Carlyle, Mr Brokovski at Battleford, Mr. Kirby at Lethbridge, Mr. Nash at Banff, Mr. Rochester at Medicine Hat.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). One would suppose that the hon. gentleman would not find population enough in the North-West to fill all these places?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. One thing is pretty clear, that if you deduct the Mounted Police and all who live by them, the Canadian Pacific Railway employees and those who live by them, and the Dominion employees, and those who live by them, from the white population of the North-West Territories, it would be a very pitiful remainder that we would see.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is always the case in a new country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not in countries in which a hundred millions of the public funds are expended, which we were told would produce a great settlement there.

Mr. CHARLTON. How many Crown timber agents have you in the North-West, and who are they?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are four. A Mr. Stephenson——

Mr. LISTER. Another Stephenson, besides the one who is a Dominion lands agent?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Both sons of the inspecter of colonisation companies?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know who the land agent is at all. I think the Crown timber agent is a son of Mr. Rufus Stephenson.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have in my desk a petition—a copy of which I think was sent to the Department of the Interior—from some of the settlers about Battleford—and I suppose similar representations have been made from other districts—complaining of the charge the Government makes for cutting dead timber, and using it for firewood, also complaining of the amount they require to pay for timber for fencing their lands. They state, what I have no doubt is the fact, that a large number of people have been driven out of that country by the timber regulations. Here are people, hardly able to purchase the absolute necessaries of life, compelled in that cold climate to pay large sums of money for the privilege of getting the necessary firewood to keep them warm in the winter season. How can you expect that poor people will be contented to remain in the country under those circumstances?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have come to the same conclusion as the gentlemen who sent the petition. A short time ago, the members from Manitoba and the North-West called on me, and among other matters we went into that subject, and I agreed to take the duty off the burnt and dry firewood, and that has been done now for six weeks.

Mr. WATSON. That is a change which will be very popular all through Manitoba and the North West. It has been one of the great grievances, as the hon. gentleman knows, that the Government should make this change for dead and fallen timber. Ever since I have been in this House I have called the attention of the Government to that matter, and I am glad to know that as soon as a man took charge of the Department of the Interior who had some experience in that country, he has seen fit to remove what I have always considered to be a very unjust tax. The timber is granted practically free, because I believe the regulation is that a person must take out a permit, which costs only 25 cents, and which simply prevents the holder from selling this timber as a business. Another matter to which I would like the Minister to give his attention is the license fee collected for the cutting of hay. I think the Government ought to do away with this license. I believe there never was a better regulation in the North-West than that which prevented any person cutting hay on the Hudson Bay Company's land until after the 20th July. Under the present system a person gets a permit to cut a certain number of loads of hay on a piece of land; in some cases these permits are duplicated and trebled, and persons are granted permits for double the quantity of hay that is on the land, so that the one who first comes is first served. The consequence is that they cut the hay too early in the season, before the grass comes to seed, and the hay land soon becomes practically spoiled. After cutting the hay off the ground too early in the season, for two or three seasons it practically spoils the hay lands; and if the Government would not allow anyone to cut hay, say, before the 20th July, which is a fair time for haying to commence, and then allow every person to cut hay, they would be conferring a benefit on the country. In some places this is considered a great grievance. It is not for the revenues derived from the fees charged that the Government are maintaining these licenses. This

is a small grievance, no doubt, but at times it causes the people to leave the country, or not settle in it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is considerable difference of opinion with regard to the hay matter. There is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman says in reference to the cutting; but permits are liable to be given for more hay than there is in certain localities, because it varies so much according to the season. In some points it is necessary there should be some protection, because if you do not protect the poor settler, some man will come in with his teams, and machines, and cut the whole hay in the district. That has led to great complaints, and I was not able to make up my mind about the hay matter as I was with reference to the wood.

Forestry Commissioner—salary..... $2,000

Mr. LISTER. What are the duties of the forestry commissioner?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He was appointed for his experience in forestry matters, to report on the different districts in the North-West as to what should be done. His report is very interesting, and he has made some useful suggestions with regard to tree planting. The Experimental Farm have done more in that respect than anybody else in the North West, and the trees they planted last year have wintered very well.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We have paid Mr. Stephenson for living allowance 326 days, and I am prepared to say that a large proportion of that time he was in the town of Chatham. He charges $1,141 in addition to his salary of $3,000. This gentleman has been in the service of his country since 1882, and has been drawing about $5,000 a year; and his sons have also been in the employ of the Government. The whole family have been feeding at the country's crib the last four or five years. I am glad to hear that the Minister has cancelled his appointment, and I trust Mr. Stephenson's accounts will be looked into closely. Last year he put in a bill for the use of teams at $1 a day, and one of the managers of a colonisation company told me a few days ago that, during the time Mr. Stephenson was inspector, the moment he came to one colonisation company's ranche, they met him with their best team, drove him all around, "wined" him and dined him, and then drove him to the next company. So that he had no occasion to hire any teams. Yet he was paid $600 for use of teams.

Mr DAVIN. The hon. gentleman must be misinformed in regard to Mr. Stephenson being able to drive from one colonisation company to another. Now, anybody who knows anything of the location of the country knows that is impossible. I happen to know as a fact that Mr. Stephenson had to travel on the railway. If he came up to Temperance Point he would have to travel on the railway to Regina, and go north. That story bears on its face improbability, and could not possibly be true.

Mr. SCARTH. It is quite evident the hon gentleman does not know the North-West. The people there might be able to dine Mr. Stevenson, but certainly they were not able to "wine" him. If all the other statements of the hon. gentleman are on a par with this, they are statements which should not have been made in this House.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am informed by a gentleman whose word may be relied on, and who knows the North-West as well as the hon. members for East Assiniboia and Winnipeg. Mr. John Northwood, now at Chatham, and who formerly was in the North-West, and had a great deal to do with the Qu'Appelle Farm, stated this to me, and a few weeks ago in speaking about this account for hire of teams he stated to me the reason why they took such good care of Mr. Stephenson was that, when he came down after his first visit, he reported to the Government that the company had not treated him well, and the Government wrote up stating that, unless they treated the inspector better next year, they would hire a team for him and would charge it to the company, and after that they treated the inspector like a king. As soon as he reached the ranche they placed the best team they had at his service, in order to get a favorable report from him; and, when he had finished his work on that ranche, they drove him to the next ranche without any cost to him.

Mr. SCARTH. I will state from personal knowledge that, if the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Campbell) had gone through the hardships which Mr. Rufus Stephenson went through in that country, he would not have made the assertions he has.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Do not give us that; it is too thin.

Mr. SCARTH. The hon. gentleman says it is too thin, but it is much more thin for the hon. gentleman to make the statements he has made. I know that country far better than he does, and I know the hardships which a man has to suffer when he is travelling through it in winter. I have driven over 5,000 miles of that country myself, and I know the hardships which must be endured. This talk about the dining and wining of Mr. Stephenson there is nonsense; it is simply impossible.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Scarth) evidently has an idea that they cannot get wine into that country. If he would ask the Minister of the Interior, who was formerly the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West, and who issued a great number of permits, or if he would ask my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who, if the newspaper reports are to be believed, was once caught in regard to that matter, I think he would become aware that it is possible to get any quantity of liquor into the North-West, and, therefore, it cannot be doubted that the statement of my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell) is perfectly correct.

Mr. SCARTH. It is utterly incorrect.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How does the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Scarth) know that it is incorrect? Did he travel round with Mr. Rufus Stephenson?

Mr. SCARTH. I did not travel round with Mr. Rufus Stephenson.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then how does the hon. gentleman know what Mr. Stephenson drank? I think the statement of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Scarth) has no foundation in fact. He has proved, on his own statement, that he knows nothing at all about it, whereas the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) gives his authority for saying that Mr. Rufus Stephenson was dined and wined there; and from what I knew of Mr. Rufus Stephenson—and I have known him for a good many years—I think it is not unlikely that he would enjoy being dined and wined. The idea which the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Scarth) suggests, that no such liquor can be got in there, is incorrect, as can be borne out by the Minister of the Interior, who granted an unlimited number of permits when he was Lieutenant Governor, more permits, I believe than there were inhabitants, and there was a great deal of fault-finding in regard to that, and I think my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) will agree with me that this system was not properly administered.

Mr. SCARTH. I may say that I know a great deal more of the North-West than the hon member for Kent (Mr. Campbell.) I know every colony in the North-West, and I repeat that the statement that Mr. Stephenson was wined in that country must be incorrect; and it is incorrect.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Why?

Mr. MACDOWALL. I take a somewhat different view of this question. The hon. member for Kent (Mr Campbell) has given us a second-hand story. I am a young member of the House, though I think I have been as long here as the hon. member for Kent, but I must say that, if we are to get through the work of the House, and to discuss the matters which are before us, we should do so from what we know ourselves, and not from old wives' stories, which we may have heard. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Northwood told him this story, and he thinks, because Mr Northwood was interested in this stock ranche, though he lives at Chatham and lived there all along, that should give him great knowledge of the North-West. I regret to say that I think the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) has been led astray by these stories. In the North-West, there is not the enormous consumption of liquor that he seems to think, and as to being driven from one colonisation company's land to another, I think that is impossible, because these distances are, as they have been described, magnificent distances, and I do not think one company would undertake to drive a man 200 or 300 miles to another company's land. I think these statements are unfounded, and I think it is unjust to the North-West to put them in circulation.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would ask if the statement of the member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) indicates that the consumption of liquor in the North-West is enormous, as the hon. member for Saskatchewan says?

Mr. MACDOWALL. I did not say so.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The member for Kent said that Mr. Stephenson got all he wanted of wine, and the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) would lead the House to believe that, because Mr. Stephenson got all the wine he wanted, the consumption of liquor was enormous.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Scarth) has referred to the hardships he endured in travelling through that country in the winter time. We know that Mr. Stephenson did not travel in the winter.

Mr. SCARTH. Pardon me. Mr. Stephenson has been travelling there all through the past winter, and under great hardships.

Mr. LISTER. Then he cannot possibly have discharged his duties. I have known Mr. Stephenson to be here in Ottawa during several Sessions past. He has been here this Session, and he has been here during many other Sessions.

Mr. SCARTH. I am only speaking of this winter.

Mr. LISTER. When was Mr. Stephenson travelling there this winter?

Mr. SCARTH. Within the last three months.

Mr. CAMPBELL. He was appointed in November at $10 a day and expenses, and he has been back for about a month. But what we have been talking about is last year, and we find that he admits being there only up to the 23rd December. I am quite certain that he left Chatham about the 20th September, and I know he was back there before Christmas. He has charged 326 days at $3.50 a day, and I submit to the House whether a man who receives $3,000 salary ought not to pay his own board, especially when he boards at home half the time. I think this is a fraud on the Government and on the country, and I am glad to see that the Minister of the Interior has cancelled the appointment. There was no need for the appointment to be made at all. Surely with the large number of men in the service in the North-West, you could have found some more capable man than Mr. Stephenson to go around and inspect these companies, without appointing a man from Ontario As for the statement I made respecting Mr. Northwood, I believe it is correct in every particular. I believe it is true as true can be, because he is a man who had no interest in telling me that which was not so, and he was at that time particularly anxious to get a favorable report from the inspector of colonisation companies, and I believe they did dine him and wine him as they best knew how.

Mr. MACDOWALL. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) has uttered a curious anomaly. In referring to Mr. Northwood, he said he had no object to gain in stating the advantages of his company, and in the next two words he said the object he had to gain was to get a favorable report.

Mr. WATSON. The member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) stated he had an object, and he was warned by the Government that unless he treated Mr. Stephenson better the next time he came up there would be trouble. I know something about that country. They do not require a man to go 200 miles to inspect colonisation companies. There are two of them in my county, and the only way to go from one to the other is by driving about 15 or 20 miles, that is from Binscarth to Shell River Colony. There is no other means of going to the York Colony except by driving, which is about 50 miles from Binscarth. I believe Mr. Stephenson is well treated by these people, and that he makes very favorable reports as to the working of these companies. I know Mr. Stephenson, he is a jovial good fellow, and I think there is very strong evidence in favor of the statement of the hon. member for Kent that Mr. Stephenson was at home in Chatham the greater portion of the year. I do not believe he would stay in the North West unless he was wined and dined.

Mr. SCARTH. As the hon. gentleman says that Binscarth is in his own county, I would like to ask him if in that particular colony he thinks he would be wined and dined?

Mr. WATSON. I believe that Mr. Stephenson would be used there as well as he would be used elsewhere. I never went there, but I was well treated.

Mr. SCARTH. I would remind the hon. gentleman that the manager of Binscarth is a great supporter of the cause advocated by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), and I do not think he would get any wine there.

Mr. WATSON. I happen to be in that position myself, and if there was any liquor there they would not offer it to me, knowing my principles. I would like to ask the Minister if he does not think it would be well to encourage tree culture by granting a homestead or pre-emption. I believe that the growing of trees has a good deal to do with the climate and with the rainfall in these prairie sections of the country. I am of the opinion that it would be well to encourage tree culture by granting tracts of land to the people, providing they would plant a certain number of acres in trees each year.

Mr. LISTER. Would the Minister state who this forestry commissioner is, and when he was appointed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is Mr. Morgan; I think he has been appointed two or three years.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Can the Minister state whether he has done anything? I have read his report, and I cannot find out that he has done anything at all.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Does he not give some account of his travels?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes; he tells us that he travels through the country during the summer. He says:

"The settled part of the country was then glowing with rich harvests, and the farmers seemed to have no anxiety outside that of having trees and shrubs to shelter and beautify their homes. Since then, the cold winds bearing the blighting breath of frost, came sweeping over the vast treeless plains, causing much loss and disappointment, and en-

tailing great pecuniary loss to many of the hard working and industrious settlers."

It is very beautiful language, but I do not think we can afford to pay a man $2,000 for writing beautiful language. It is not necessary to tell intending immigrants "that the cold winds sweep over the plains, causing much loss and disappointment to the hard-working farmers." It is not desirable to pay $2,000 a year to a gentleman to write reports of this character concerning the nature of that climate. This appointment looks very much like a political job, and I say it is a shame and disgrace to keep him there at this salary.

Mr. MACDOWALL. The hon. gentleman thinks it is not worth while to pay $2,000 for traducing the country in those few words. I fancy the country has been paying a good deal more money to gentlemen who have traduced the country in a much more serious fashion.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. gentleman accused me of making contradictory statements. I stated that Mr. Northwood had no object in telling me anything that was not correct. I said that he was anxious to use the inspector well in order to get as favorable a report from him as he could, and it was natural that they should all treat the inspector as well as they could, but Mr. Northwood had no object in telling me what was not true.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In answer to the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) I may say that I have considered the feasibility of offering some inducement for planting trees, but I have not yet decided to do so. The proposition of the hon. gentleman has been tried in the United States, and it was found there to be a failure and frauds were committed, and the regulation has been repealed. Therefore, I do not think it would be well for us to try the same experiment. But if anyone will enunciate some scheme by which we could induce the people to plant trees, I will be glad to adopt it. I think the Experimental Farm will do a good deal in this direction, and I think in a couple of years we shall see a good many trees planted at Indian Head, and when the people see the advantage of them, every farmer will plant trees for himself.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What kind of trees have been planted?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A large number of varieties, pines, firs, maples, ash and black walnut.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I) On what ground does the hon. gentleman justify asking for this vote of $2,000 for a forestery commissioner? His report shows that he has done nothing so far.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am sorry to say that the gentleman who has occupied that position is now at the point of death, and I doubt whether he will keep the position another year. If we appoint a successor to him we shall try to find one who will be of some use.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is money so very plenty that you can afford to ask the House to vote thousands of dollars in the mere hope that something may be done by it? You have had a man appointed two or three years, you say he has done nothing, and now you ask a vote to appoint somebody else. Has there been any experiment made?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We propose to carry out the suggestion of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson).

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Does the Minister require a commissioner of forestry to carry out that suggestion?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He might be of some service.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I) In the absence of any explanation the House should refuse to pass this vote for $2,000. The hon. gentleman should not ask it unless he is satisfied that it is necessary in the public interest. We heard a good deal at the commencement of the Session about applying the pruning knife, but no attempt has been made to apply the knife to this expense. Extravagance runs riot in the hon. gentleman's department. He does not care, he hopes that something good may come of this expense. He might apply that statement to ten or twenty new officials. If all the departments were run on such a footing, where would the country land?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I desire to enquire from the Minister why the land commissioner is paid $5,000 a year, which is nearly $2,000 more than the salary of the deputy head of a department? This is a most extraordinary salary to pay for the services of the commissioner.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman is aware that the predecessor of Mr. Smith, Mr. Walsh, was appointed at that salary, and it has been continued. I am sure from the work that is carried out in the office, a very experienced and specially good man is required, and I doubt, if the Government could get a man to carry out the duties for less salary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I believe the hon. gentleman can obtain a man fully competent to discharge those duties for at least $2,000 less than this party is receiving. Surely if the hon. gentleman has a deputy at $3,200, he can get a party capable of acting as commissioner in that country for less than $5,000. I understand a large portion of Mr. Smith's time is taken up with his duties as general political manager for the Government in the North-West; that he is frequently called here for the purpose of consulting with the Premier in regard to the management of elections in that country; that he was here again and again immediately before the last general elections; that the duties he discharges in that respect are quite as onerous as those which devolve upon him as commissioner in the public service. It appears to me that this House will be wanting in its duty if it permits this officer to receive any such salary as that which he is receiving without dividing upon it.

Mr. SCARTH. The hon. gentleman probably forgets that the organs of his own party in Manitoba and the North-West admit, from one end of the country to the other, that Mr. Smith is thoroughly competent for the position he occupies, and has the confidence of the whole country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). For which position?

Mr. SCARTH. For the position of Dominion Lands Commissioner. The hon. gentleman has said that he occupies another position. That statement is like a great many other statements the hon. gentleman makes. It is not founded on fact.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes; it is founded on fact.

Mr. SCARTH. The hon. gentleman has a right to say that it is, I happen to know that it is not. He is not general political manager in the North-West, and I believe the hon. member for Bothwell knows it thoroughly.

Mr. WATSON. Who is?

Mr. SCARTH. I am not aware that I am called upon to answer that question; Mr. Smith is not. Mr. Smith has a very vast acreage to manage in the North-West, and if there were in the position any man not so honest and responsible and as competent as Mr. Smith is, he might land the Government in great difficulties. I am satisfied the salary he receives is not too much for the duties he performs, and the manner in which he performs them.

Mr. LISTER. The commissioner receives a salary equal to that of a judge of a superior court, who has for years been preparing himself for the position. In so far as Mr. Smith is concerned: before his appointment he was political agent for the party, he was travelling round from point to point, and for all we knew he carried the boodle; at all

events he appeared suspiciously in all quarters of Ontario when the elections were going on, and he was the recognised political agent of the party. Mr. Smith did not receive any training to particularly fit him for the position; yet he was appointed and that at a salary equal almost to the salary of the judges of the superior courts of the country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scarth) smiled when asked who was the political agent in the North-West and Manitoba. Of course, he would not admit it.

Mr. SCARTH. I denied that Mr. Smith is.

Mr. LISTER. That you were?

Mr. SCARTH. No.

Mr. LISTER. That is a matter of no consequence as you were not paid by this Government for it. The point to which we object is that the Government should pay Mr. Smith $5,000 for work not equal to the work done in the office by the deputy of the Minister of the Interior, or by almost any deputy under the Government. His responsibilities are not so great, his work is not so great, and he is paid enormously more. It is evident why he was appointed to that position, and why he is kept in it. Everyone in Ottawa knows, and the papers tell us, that he is constantly coming here during times of political excitement, no doubt to consult the leader of the Government, no doubt to advance the interests of the party in the North-West and to help hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I do not think the hon. gentleman should take any exception to the salary of the commissioner, because although he compares it with the salaries given to the judges, he must consider, if he knows anything of the work Mr. Smith has to perform, that he has to discharge onerous duties. There are many cases of disputed land claims coming before the Land Board, and it is necessary to have a thoroughly reliable man there and one possessing a knowledge of the duties of the office.

Mr. WATSON. I am not apt to find fault with Mr. Smith's salary in particular; I think he is receiving a very fair salary and is doing the work there very well. I contend that a man capable of earning $5,000 a year should be quite capable of finally deciding on claims placed before him. Mr. Smith has not the power as a land commissioner in Manitoba and the North-West that I should like to see him possess. I believe he should have power to settle almost all claims that come before him without submitting them to Ottawa. There is much delay caused by the board not having the power they should possess, and from claims having to be submitted to Ottawa. I repeat that if Mr. Smith is worth $5,000 a year, the salary paid to the best judges in the land, he ought to be sufficiently qualified to be entrusted with the final disposition of claims coming before him in Manitoba. I do not know whether Mr. Smith performs any other duties outside of those of land commissioner; but I have this to say that, as regards Mr Smith as land commissioner, he gives very good satisfaction and if he does anything more than that, if he does any outside transactions, such as being financial agent for the Government in Manitoba, I do not know anything about it. The member for Winnipeg (Mr. Scarth) is in a better position to inform us on that point than I am. He says Mr. Smith is not, and he should know and does know.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin.) The Minister should give the Committee some explanation with respect to the item of $46,818 for clerks, forest rangers, &c.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is $8,000 more than was required last year. The increase is required to defray the cost of extra clerical assistance required from time to time during the year at the different agencies of Dominion lands.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the other $4,816 for? I may say that formerly, when the hon. gentleman who now leads the Government sat on this side of the House, he insisted, when we asked for estimates for the public service, that we should give a detail of the names of the parties and the sums that were required. Now, we have a statement that $46,818 is required, but we have no means in the world of knowing what it is required for. We ought to have the names of these parties, their stations and the amount of salaries they receive and what their duties are.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I can give you all that.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will see that every name and the salary attached to each, that the hon. the Minister could read out, is published at page 62 and 63 F of the Auditor General's Report. It does seem to be taking up the time of the House unnecessarily, that a report should be read over to get what is already published there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that there are certain land offices established in the North-West. The report shows the amount of business done at those offices. The Auditor General's Report does not show where these men are located, you see the name of the party and the salary received, but you do not know whether or not there might be five times as many persons employed in the office as the business of the office requires.

Mr. FOSTER. The Auditor General's Report gives the number of employés in each office.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It shows the parties generally that are in the public service in the North-West connected with public lands, but there are local land offices established all over the country. The hon. gentleman has read the names of three or four persons at the office at Brandon, and we should know what amount of business is done there to necessitate the employment of all these people. My impression is that the business is not sufficient to necessitate the employment of more than one employé. The hon. Minister in coming here and asking us to vote these sums of money, ought to come with a statement of the amount required for each of these offices, and then we would be able to vote intelligently, for we could see from the report the amount of business done at these offices.

Mr. LISTER. Can the hon. gentleman distinguish how much of this sum of $48,850 is for travelling expenses, how much for contingencies, and how much for printing and stationery?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot state just now. I will get you a statement of that. I would like to state that I have informed myself with regard to tree culture. The Act is not stopped in the United States.

Mr. LISTER. What are these extra clerks required for?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are required in the office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the use of this enormous host of extra clerks? We surely have clerks enough, without having to employ several hundred extra clerks, to whom we have to pay $28,000?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The returns have to be copied.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do we require to pay $28,000 to get a few returns? It is a most enormous charge. The only return we have got is this paltry sum of $94,000 as the total receipts for sales of land in the North-West, and we were promised a return of $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 a year. The whole of this business shows how badly the Government were informed, and the gross frauds that were perpetrated on this country by Ministers of the Crown when they induced the country to plunge into huge expenditure in the North-West, under the promise of the Government, over and over again, that they would reimburse themselves out of the money derived from the sales of lands. Here we

have been for an hour trying to probe the hon. gentleman in charge of the department and to ascertain as well as we can whether there is the remotest chance of our obtaining from the sales of lands in the North-West enough to meet our expenditure. It is quite clear that for every dollar we receive we spend two in that department alone, without including other incidental expenses. We find the hon. gentleman's department has got 71 officers, deputy heads, chief clerks and the rest employed, besides these extra clerks. $82,672 are required for the Department of the Interior, besides this $28,900 for extra clerks, making $111,000; and all this expenditure for the purpose of collecting $94,000. The thing is perfectly absurd, and it behooves the hon. gentleman and his department, instead of coming down here and spending an hour or thereabouts in reading a long lecture in answer to the criticism made weeks ago by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), to give some sort of intelligible reason why these $28,000 are wanted.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If the hon. gentleman will come to my office, he will see that all these clerks are working from 10 a.m to 4 p.m every day, as hard as any clerks are worked in any office in the Dominion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What on earth are they doing?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The extra clerks are employed the whole time with North-West work, the returns from the land offices have to be filed; the accounts audited, the reports examined, and so on. If I can find that we can do with less clerks, I will remove those that are not required. In two or three weeks we propose to move into the new building, where I will be able to have a better supervision than I have in our present quarters.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How in the name of wonder would any land company expect its business to prosper, if it required to expend, as we have in the last two years, something like $888,000 for the service of the department, and barely collect $420,000. There must be an intolerable amount of red tape, and circumlocution, about the office to keep all these clerks employed. A good many of them must be occupied in perfectly useless occupations, such as duplicating returns, reports, &c. I have always felt, myself, that this attempt to govern the North-West from Ottawa was in many respects a huge mistake. I know something of the charges for managing large quantities of land in the United States by the railway companies; and I am sure, if the hon. gentleman would make enquiries, he would find their charges for administering large quantities of land, and administering them well, will not compare at all with the charges we are inflicting on the people. The reports of the Department of Agriculture are simply worthless. We have absolute proof that they are, for they assure us that 166 000 settlers had entered, while the census of last year showed that 44,000 did not remain. That is the evidence given to us from their own returns and from their own census returns. We know that, in all human probability, not more than 2,000 or 3,000 settlers, with their families, go in there in two or three years. Even this year, though it is said there is a very much greater immigration than usual, I doubt very much if more than 2,000 families, that is 10,000 people, will be found to have gone into the Territory which is under the hon. gentleman's department, though it is possible that more may go into Manitoba. The number who have settled in the Territories certainly, do not warrant the employment of this huge staff, as far as we can see, and we have a right to ask the hon. gentleman why he cannot get on with less. He says they are all employed, but how can they be all employed? I do not suppose that, all told, there can be more than a few hundred additional settlers for whom he has to provide patents for homesteads. I would be very glad indeed to believe that a large number of immigrants were settling there, but the returns of the Government do not show it

Mr. DEWDNEY. Immigration is going on very rapidly this spring, but for the last few years we have not received, I admit, the addition to the population which we expected. Now, however, the country has taken a start, and I have no doubt that condition of affairs in regard to settlement will improve. As to the lands we sell on time, and as to homesteads, every homesteader has to make his entry, and that means a large amount of business for the department. I think it is not fair to argue in the way which the hon. gentleman does in regard to the bad showing which we have on account of receipts. We have the work to do although we do not get the money, and the only reason for that is that we have not made the sales of land which we expected to make. We cannot expect to make those sales when we have given away the lands to the railway companies who are practically in competition with us, and they have their agents pressing the sales of their land, and they sell on long terms, so that we cannot expect to get as large an amount of money from the sales of land as we anticipated.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why do you want so large a staff?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The work is all the same, whether we sell a quarter-section or allow a quarter-section to be homesteaded.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). How many extra clerks are employed in the department here?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot say exactly, but I think about 150 or 155.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What conceivable work can there be for 155 clerks to do?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I see that these extra clerks cost last year $62,000.

Mr. SCARTH. I think the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will admit that the comparison between the land companies and the Government is not a fair one, because the land companies get revenue for every acre of land they have. They sell all their land, while the Government have not only sales of land but large grants to railways, and they have also all the homestead lands for which they get no revenue except the $10 entrance fee. I think the hon. gentleman himself will admit that the comparison he makes between the Government and the land companies is not a fair one.

Mr. LISTER. The Minister stated that the $28,000 for extra clerks at Ottawa was for copying and matters of that kind. I suppose the duties of these extra clerks is to copy documents in the department?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They have various kinds of work.

Mr. LISTER. Then you have another item for advertising, copying, &c, $7,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is for the returns that you ask for.

Mr. LISTER. It does not say so, and there are very few returns this Session. I do not think twenty returns have come down this Session.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think we should not pass this vote without impressing upon the Minister that next Session he must give to the House more distinct and explicit information than we have now. Many questions have been put to-night which the Minister has been unable to answer. I admit that he has been only recently installed in his position, and it may take a little time for him to master the details and to answer the questions in regard to his department, especially when the department has been split up between the office here and the office in the North-West;

but I believe there is an amount of extravagance in the management of that department which compels us to ask for more explanation than we have, before we pass the item. I put a question, and my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) put a question to the Minister, as to what a certain man had done for the $2,000 paid to him. The Minister could not tell us, but he asked us to vote that amount over again for a man who has, for years past, been drawing his salary and doing nothing. I put a question as to how it is that we pay a man in Winnipeg on another ground, and the Minister could not answer that. We must insist upon receiving more information than we have. We have been wading through a volume of expenditure for the last three hours, and we have had no such information as we should receive from a man at the head of a department. There is an amount of extravagance that cannot be explained. There are a lot of officials who are drawing salaries and doing nothing for them. There was the poor man—whose case we discussed yesterday—whom the Minister of Customs dismissed, who was getting $400 a year, and had served for a quarter of a century, and was kicked out on the street after paying all the time to the superannuation fund, without getting anything at all. I should like to ask if these people are contributors to the superannuation fund?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Not the outside service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The policy of the Government has resulted in a scandalous and disgraceful failure. From first to last, the North-West Territories, and Manitoba also, have been used not to promote settlement there. The whole interest of this country was wrapt up in developing that country, and planting there a large population as we would have planted, if my hon. friend from Bothwell had remained at the head of that department, by this time 600,000 or 700,000 souls in that country, with a large and profitable trade. We would have had the Canadian Pacific Railway on a sound commercial basis. But, to-day, we have expended one hundred millions of the public money, and we have positively not added fifty thousand souls since 1881 to the population of Manitoba and the North-West. That is about the position which we are in to-day, after expending one hundred million dollars. We find that every promise which was solemnly made to us, and on the faith of which this country was committed to engagements which are now weighing it down, and which are as a millstone around the neck of every man, woman and child in the older Provinces of Canada, have not only not been redeemed, but we find that the Government are not able even to pay the ordinary expenses incident to the management of the North-West. We find that these are not only not redeemed, but that the gentlemen who are now in charge are absolutely unable to pay the ordinary expenses out of the resources of the North-West. That is the position we find ourselves in. Can any hon. gentleman wonder if we complain, can hon. gentlemen wonder that we recall these promises, that we recall to the minds of the people of the country how grossly and shamelessly they were deceived?—and more particularly when we look across the border and see that Dakota alongside, a country which is not any better than Manitoba, which has no greater advantages than Manitoba, in which the United States, I believe, has not spent a dollar of public money, still we find there a population of 600,000 or 700,000 souls. Now, the truth of the matter I take to be this: that instead of concentrating their resources, instead of endeavoring to develop a tolerable closely peopled district there, the Government committed the fatal mistake of allowing whatever immigration we had to be scattered all over the country. The consequence is that we find this money is frittered away, that an enormous number of agents are wanted, enormous expenditure is incurred, whereas if the population had been properly scattered as it ought to have been, and as it ought to be now, if the Government could do it, all this enormous waste would have been spared, and we would have been ten times better off. Now, it is our duty to call the attention of the people of Canada to the fact of the failure that has been made. Unless the failure is distinctly recognised, there is very little chance of anything better being done. I hope myself—although after what we have seen I do not venture to hope very strongly—that so far as Manitoba is concerned, there is a chance of something better being done. I am aware that there is a large immigration going on there, and at any rate from certain parts of Ontario, and I presume, now that we have got rid of the railway monopoly, and now that Mr. Greenway, who understands the country well, is given some little chance of being allowed to develop the country as he wanted, and has convinced the Government that it will not do to attempt to trample on the rights and liberties of the people of Manitoba, I am in hopes that something better will be done there. But all that does not in the slightest degree account for the expense that the hon. gentleman has been asking us for, and that does not account at all for such a vote as this in particular, this demand for 40 or 50 extra clerks to help the 70 clerks that he has got in the Department of the Interior. I say that 70 men ought to do ten times the work that can possibly be required to be done at headquarters, at any rate with respect to carrying on the necessary correspondence, and preparing the necessary papers, and all that kind of a thing.

Mr. DALY. I suppose the hon. gentleman has made the usual fling that he has had for several years at the North-West. He has been gracious enough to acknowledge that there are certain people going to Manitoba. It may be that the hon. gentleman has land there to sell, which he expects will increase in value by the fact of people going there. He does not acknowledge that people are going to the North-West, but they are going into Manitoba. Now, he said that during the time that his hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) administered the affairs of that country, it was prosperous, and that if he had continued to administer its affairs, that country would have been more prosperous. Now, Sir, I want the hon. gentleman to understand that there never was a time when the administration was so rotten and corrupt as it was during the time of the administration of the hon. member for Bothwell—never was so rotten on God's earth as it was at that time. Let the hon. gentleman remember the water stretches: take the Fort Frances locks—I say that during that time great rottenness existed in the affairs of the Department of the Interior as regards the North West, more than there has ever been since or ever will be. That is the fact and I can prove it. He knows it. Why, Sir, he refers to Mr. Greenway. Mr. Greenway dare not open a constituency in Manitoba to-day. The man that was elected last July——

An hon. MEMBER. Ha, ha!

Mr. DALY. He laughs, "ha, ha, ha!" We have heard that laugh before. I say that Mr. Greenway cannot open a constituency to-day. Mr. Jones, his treasurer, has had to come down to Ontario, his business connections brought him down here. The fact is that Mr. Greenway cannot open Winnipeg North, he cannot open a single constituency in the whole Province of Manitoba to-day, simply because he knows that the man whom he puts up would be defeated. We have had the same arguments presented to the people of Manitoba that the hon. gentleman has presented to this House, and that he has presented to the people of Ontario, and the people of Manitoba found that they were rotten, they have found that these hon. gentlemen are hypocrites, and I brand that hon. gentleman as the worst enemy to Manitoba and the North-West that stands in Canada to-day, and I will tell you the reason of it. He bought land years ago at $1 an

acre, and he has not got the money out of it that he expected to get. But I want that hon. gentleman to understand that that land to-day is worth $9 for every dollar that it was worth nine years ago.

Mr. LAURIER. I must protest; the hon. gentleman is departing from the question under discussion.

Mr. DALY. But you have departed from it, you cannot have all this thing to yourself. I respect Mr. Laurier—I beg your pardon, the hon. member for Quebec East—I respect you, you are a gentleman; but I want you to understand that that hon. gentleman from Oxford is everlastingly, on every possible occasion he can get in this House, trying to deprecate our country, and I stand here as a representative of that country to tell him that I will not listen to it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will have to listen to it.

Mr. DALY. Yes, no doubt; and we will listen to it probably for two years longer, but it won't have any effect upon the country. But I want to say this: that so far as regards the administration of our affairs to-day, the hon. gentleman who occupies the position of the Minister of the Interior has done all that he reasonably could do during the time he has held office, and I believe that his duties will increase from year to year. Now, the hon. gentleman has taken exception to the number of extra clerks. I, myself, have found that he needs them. I have written to the Minister on an average of two or three letters a day, and if each of the other members from Manitoba write as many as I do, you see it will entail a certain amount of extra correspondence and a certain amount of work in the Department of the Interior. Then if you take the number of men that are writing to the department from all over the North-West, if you take the number of land agents, the number of railway companies that have been organised there, you will understand that there is an immense correspondence; and if the hon. member for Bothwell held a position that the Minister of the Interior holds to-day, he would not be able to carry on the department at less expense than does that hon. gentleman. I want the hon. member for South Oxford to understand that notwithstanding anything he may say, notwithstanding anything that hon. gentlemen opposite may say, that country is going to prosper, is going ahead in a ratio to-day that Dakota will never exceed The hon. gentleman on every possible occasion holds out to the people of Canada that they should not go to the North-West, that they should not go to Manitoba, but that they should go to Dakota. All I can say is: God help the man that goes to Dakota.

An hon. MEMBER. He never said so.

Mr. DALY. Yes; he has said so. In the Committee the other day we had the same thing. Hon. gentlemen opposite in Committee tried to hold out that Dakota was a better place than Manitoba for our people to go to. They took exception to the fact that the Government had employed a man to go amongst the people and represent to them that Manitoba was the place to go to in case they chose to emigrate from Ontario. Now, Sir, I say the Government were perfectly justified in that matter. We have got to look to the fact that if our people in Ontario or Quebec feel that they cannot do well there, and they want to emigrate, they want to go to greater Canada—to Manitoba or the North-West—not to Dakota. I would tell the hon. gentleman for his satisfaction, that there are thousands of people who have gone to Dakota through the agency of the American railway companies, who wish to God they had never gone there, who were starving, and who have starved during last winter, and who are now going over the border. I say the Government cannot expend any money in a better way than by developing the North-West, and if the Department of the Interior to day has 159 or 160 clerks as the hon. gentleman says, if the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) or the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will go to that department, they will find that they are employed in their legitimate work, for of course the work has developed year by year. It may be that we have not got the number of immigrants we expected, but we have men in that country who have gone in, probably with scarcely a dollar in their pockets, and yet we find they have developed the country, they have increased their earnings, and they have done in that country in five years, what they could not have done in any other part of Canada in twenty-five years.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is a quite sufficient answer to all the tirade of abuse the hon. gentleman has indulged in, and to his criticism of the action of this House with respect to the estimates of the Department of the Interior, to repeat the receipts and expenditure. The revenue received from that country during the last year was $217,000, while the expenditure was over $250,000. It is quite clear that we are paying more for salaries for clerks and officers than is proper, for the revenue we receive. The hon gentleman who has had his wrath pent up for some time, sought this opportunity to attack the hon. member for South Oxford. It is quite clear to any public man, or to any man who understands business, on a consideration of the receipts and expenditure, that the whole system is in an abominably rotten system, notwithstanding the statements made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LISTER. The Minister of the Interior in his estimates inserts $28,000 for extra clerks, $7,000 for copying. This is supposed to be for the preparation of returns brought down to this House. I call the attention of the Minister to page 75 of the Estimates, where he will find item 186, payment for extra clerks for services rendered in the preparation of returns ordered by Parliament, $5,000. So we have extra clerks receiving $28,000, we have the item of $7,000, and we have the item of $5,000, making in all $40,000 paid in the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. That covers all the departments, and does not refer to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. LISTER. That $5,000 is for the returns brought down to this House in all departments, and no portion of the $7,000 is expended for bringing down returns here. I was somewhat surprised by the speech of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly). He was not in his usual good temper this evening when he made an attack on the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). One would think, to see the hon. gentleman jump up if a word is said in regard to that country, that no one has the right to say anything about Manitoba and the North-West. The hon. gentleman will remember that the hon. member had a good deal to do with the Government of the country, with the early development of the country. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) is a recent importation into that country, four, five, or six years at most.

Mr. DALY. Eight years.

Mr. LISTER. Eight years at most. So he has gone in since the other Government was in power; and, let him talk as he will, every person in Canada desires to see that great Territory developed, and we hope it will develop in the future. But we have no right to shut our eyes to the facts as they are to-day, and while we contend and believe that our country is far superior to the country to the south of us, we have the spectacle before us that the population has not increased in the manner we have the right to expect, while it has increased with marvellous rapidity in the country to the south of us. Why is it? Is it because it is

better governed or more honestly governed? It cannot be because it is a better country.

Mr. HESSON. They have 60,000,000 of people to draw from.

Mr. LISTER. You will find in the States whole townships peopled by Canadians. We have the fact that in Manitoba, with everything to attract settlers, we have a miserable 140,000 settlers altogether in the Territories and Manitoba.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I should like to call the hon. gentleman to order for calling the population of the North-West "miserable."

Mr. LISTER. 140,000 white people is all the population we have in that country. Why is it? Is it on account of the bad Government of the country, is it on account of the Government that has created monopolies which have destroyed the country?

Mr. HESSON. It is on account of the bad speeches from the other side of the House.

Mr. LISTER. I can understand why the hon. gentleman has just spoken. I should like to recall the time when that hon. gentleman ever voted against anything this Government proposed, be it ever so bad; and he never will vote against it. He cries like the babies do for Castoria. The Government have the hon. gentleman bound hand and foot; he has two sons in the public service and we do not know how many more he will ask to have put into Government positions, and he will wind up by asking a position for himself.

Mr. HESSON. You have not a decent son to put in.

Mr. LISTER. If the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has invested his money in the North West, perhaps it is a good deal more than any hon. gentleman opposite has done. It shows, at all events, that he has faith in the future of the country; and if his lands are worth $9 an acre, so much the better for him. But hon. gentlemen opposite instead of going to Manitoba, spend their money in Texas in cattle ranches, which have not turned out very profitably, I understand; and when they want to spend their own money and take their friends in again, they will probably go to Manitoba and the North-West.

Mr. SCARTH. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has, on several occasions, made a comparison between Manitoba and Dakota, and has been followed by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) I think the hon. member for South Oxford must know that Dakota has twice the area of Manitoba, and has also very large mining interests, which we have not, and a large proportion of its population is a mining population. But, apart from that, the hon. gentleman always forgets to state that when Manitoba was locked up, when it had no railway communication whatever, when it was a part of the Hudson Bay Company's Territory, Dakota was in touch with railway communication, and had been so for nearly nine years before Manitoba obtained that advantage. I do not intend to detain the House. I just want to point out that when Manitoba and the North-West was comparatively unknown, Dakota and Montana had railway communication. I think the hon. gentleman should state those two facts when he compares the increase of population in Manitoba with the increase in Dakota and the North-West States.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to suggest that we ought to do a little business now. We have had a pretty good fling.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). On both sides of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, on both sides of the House; and I think we ought to get a little business done now.

Mr. LISTER.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You cannot possibly take many more items to-night.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to take four or five with regard to steamboat subsidies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I want to point out is that the statement is a deliberate falsehood by whomsoever made, that I or any other man on this side of the House have ever preferred Dakota to Canada. I say it is a deliberate falsehood made from the basest possible motives if any man states so. What we have stated, and what I state here again, is this that in my judgment a large part of Manitoba is better than Dakota. I have always maintained that, but I say, that to my own positive knowledge one-half at any rate of the northern portion of Dakota over a stretch of 60 miles by at least 150 miles, has been filled, and is filling steadily for the last eight or nine years, with Canadians who would have much preferred going to Manitoba but who were driven out of Manitoba by the evil policy of the present Government, by their villainous National Policy, by their villainous railway policy, and by their still more villainous land policy. That is what I maintain on the point.

Mr. DALY. One-half the people who have gone out there cannot come back to Canada. They dare not come back.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that if there has been a slander uttered with regard to any portion of the Canadian people, it is the statement made at this moment against Canadians who have sought homes in Dakota and the western States of the Union. I do not believe that any hon. gentleman on that side of the House, beside the hon. gentleman who has made the statement, will say that the two or three hundred thousand Canadians who are now residing in Dakato are criminals, and dare not return to Canada.

Mr. DALY. Take that back; I do not impute they are criminals.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman said that they dared not come back to this country.

Mr. DALY. Exactly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And the hon. gentleman has repeated over and over again the slander, that had its origin on that side of the House, that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have advertised and have recommended to the people of this country Texas and Arkansas and Dakota. I say that this statement is wholly without foundation in fact. I say that the gentleman, whether inside of this House or outside of this House, who utters that statement is an unveracious calumniator of the gentlemen who sit on this side of the House. We were told that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) had recommended Texas. I say that there is not an hon. gentleman on that side of the House that can turn to any sentence or to a syllable of a sentence ever uttered by the hon. member for East York that recommended Texas as a place of settlement for the people of this country. Let any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House stand up and repeat that statement and produce the evidence.

Mr. TAYLOR. His name was never used in that connection.

An hon. MEMBER. It was the member for West Durham.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The name of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) was never used in that connection. It was the hon. member for East York. The hon. member for West Durham was charged as recommending Kansas as a place of settlement, and that statement is as devoid of truth as the statement made with reference to the hon. member for East York. I defy any hon. gentleman on that side of the House to turn up a sentence of any speech

made by the hon. member for West Durham, where Kansas is recommended as a place of settlement. That had its origin in the misstatement made by hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. Why, at the very time that these hon. gentlemen had been uttering those calumnies against hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, the Minister of Agriculture in the pamphlets which were being issued at the expense of the country, advertised lands for sale on the American side of the border. I see the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) holds up a pamphlet with Mr. Blake's portrait upon it. Who published that pamphlet? Why, Sir, the person who was the editor of their organ for years, and I dare say he published it at expense, if not of the hon. gentlemen opposite, at the expense of the public Treasury. Those hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches have driven the people out of Manitoba. The Canadian people went from Ontario and from Quebec to settle in the North-West, but by the policy of the Government, they were driven across the border. Dakota was filled up from Manitoba.

Mr. McNEILL. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says "no." I say it is true. Look at the report of the Minister of Agriculture. What is the report made by the predecessor of the hon. gentleman who at this moment holds the office? Why, Sir, in their report they represented a population going into Manitoba more than twice over what is to be found in Manitoba at the present moment. Where have all those people gone? Have they all perished? Why hon. gentlemen know they have crossed the border and live on the American side of the boundary. These hon. gentlemen say that we are striving to prevent the growth of Manitoba. That is not so. We say that the country is a good country, but it has been scandalously governed.

Mr. BOWELL. "No D. M."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And no "M. B." or no whatever else you like. The hon. gentleman says, "no D. M." I opposed and I would oppose to-day any scheme of jobbery or any improper transaction.

Mr. BOWELL. Quite right.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says "quite right," and I suppose the hon. gentleman says "no" and signs his initial to every document of which he does not approve. If I were in the hon. gentleman's shoes I would not have signed "M. B.;" I would not sign it for blind shares. I did not engage in any transaction of that sort.

Mr. BOWELL. Do you say that I did? Because if you do I say that you are telling an untruth and I will use stronger words if necessary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Be a little cool. The hon. gentleman is not usually very civil, but he might try and be civil now.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to take it from you. You must not think that because you are protected behind the Rules of Parliament you can insult gentlemen in this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The proper thing would be for the hon. gentleman to keep his seat. No doubt he feels a little uncomfortable, but it would be more dignified if he would sit down.

Mr. BOWELL. Not while you are indulging in insolence and impudence and falsehood.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Let the Minister of Customs take his punishment like a man.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We know very well the policy of slander in which those gentlemen on that side of the House have indulged.

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order. I would ask the Chairman is the item under discussion being discussed now?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The item under discussion is the speech of the hon. member from Selkirk (Mr. Daly). That is the item.

Mr. DALY. The member for Selkirk will rise again when you get through.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Sproule). I must say that both sides have indulged in considerable latitude in this debate, and that the discussion ought to be confined to the particular item before the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. The Chairman has ruled that the item is not being discussed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not so understand the Chairman's ruling.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. member for Bothwell will be inclined, now he has got out some pretty hard words, to let this matter drop.

Steam communication with the Magdalen Islands... $10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do you want an increase there for?

Mr. FOSTER. This is no increase. These subsidies have been paid interchangeably, some by the Post Office Department, and some by the Department of Finance. It is proposed now, under the Bill that the Postmaster General has before the House, that he shall pay, according to certain rates, for the mail that is taken on all these steamers, and the rest is furnished by the Finance Department.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I see that the subsidy of $7,500 for steam communication between Halifax and St. John is taken away this year. That is a very important line of communication.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will have a chance to discuss that when the Supplementary Estimates come down.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I see that the item of $2,000 for steam communication between Halifax and St. Pierre has been dropped. I hope the Minister will be able to tell me that that will also be considered in the Supplementary Estimates. It is a very useful line, and it would be a pity if it should be withdrawn just now.

Steam communication between Prince Edward Island and the Mainland..... $5,000

Mr. ROBERTSON. Has the hon. gentleman made any provision for service between Pictou and King's County.

Mr. FOSTER. It is exactly the same service as that of last year, but at a lower rate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But there is no service for King's County?

Mr. FOSTER. There has not been for years.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think it is unfair that King's County should be called on to pay a portion of this subsidy and that it should receive no part of it. I think the Minister should make provision for a small subsidy there, in order that we might get a daily boat from Georgetown to Pictou. It would be a great benefit to Pictou, as well as to King's County and to the trade on the Intercolonial Railway; and as he has been able to make a reduction of $5,000 in the subsidy, I think he might afford to grant a subsidy for the eastern county. Perhaps he will yet consider the matter in the Supplementary Estimates. I know that there are a number of business men in the county who are desir-

ous of putting on a boat if they only get a little encouragement by a small subsidy. The *Stanley* runs there in winter, but as soon as she is able she goes to the other ports.

Mr. FOSTER. There have been communications with various parties with reference to the subsidy of which the hon. gentleman speaks, but the Government cannot see their way this year to grant a subsidy.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Perhaps the Minister will take it into consideration in the coming year.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes.

Steam communication between St. John and Ports in Basin of Minas.....$3,000

Mr. ELLIS. Why is there a reduction in this item?

Mr. FOSTER. In accordance with the general policy to shorten a number of these, and I believe it is sufficient to carry on the service.

Mr. ELLIS. The performance of that service seems to be done very irregularly, and there ought to be some check kept on the trips. When the boat takes a trip, it ought to be checked.

Mr. FOSTER. She is paid only by trips, but not to exceed a certain amount.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1:50 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 15th April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have received a communication from the Governor General's Secretary to the effect that the Hon. Mr. Strong, acting as deputy to His Excellency, will proceed to the Senate Chamber, to-morrow, at four o'clock, for the purpose of giving assent to certain Bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons.

TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE.

Mr. SMALL moved:

That all the rules and orders of this House be suspended as regards the Bill (No. 135) from the Senate, entitled "An Act further to amend the several Acts relating to the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto," and that the said Bill be now read the first, the second, and the third time and passed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will please explain the reason why he wants this.

Mr. SMALL. The Toronto Board of Trade is at present engaged in erecting a building at a cost of $400,000, and it has recently discovered that it can hold real estate only to the extent of $250,000; and, as the matter is urgent, the Bill was passed in the Senate, and concurrent legislation is required in this House.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Under the circumstances, I suppose this Bill ought to carry.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first, second, and third times, and passed.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 136) to consolidate and amend the North-West Territories Acts. He said: This Bill proposes to consolidate the three Acts on our Statute-book in reference to the North West Territories, chapter 50 of the Revised Statutes, the short Act passed in 1887, and the Act of last Session constituting the Legislative Assembly for the Territories. The Bill is substantially for the consolidation of the present law, and proposes to give enlarged powers to the Legislative Assembly. That is the principal amendment. There is also an amendment giving the Legislative Assembly power to deal with the question of the sale of liquor to the same extent as the Local Houses in other Provinces, and retaining until the new Legislature meets, the present liquor law.

Mr. LAURIER. I protest most emphatically against the introduction of such a Bill at this period. The hon. gentleman cannot expect the House now to go into the subject of consolidation. If there are urgent amendments required in the North-West Territories, I am not prepared to say that we should not grant those amendments, but it is impossible at this late period to give the Bill the hon. gentleman proposes to introduce, the attention it requires, and, as far as this side of the House is concerned, we will not consent to legislation of this kind at present.

Mr. DAVIN. From the explanation given by the hon. Minister of the Interior, it seems to me that the amendments are so simple and so obviously needed——

Mr. LAURIER. I say nothing as to the amendments, but the hon. gentleman said he was going to consolidate the whole legislation. This is what I object to. As to the amendments, we shall deal with them when they are brought down; but my hon. friend must admit that it is impossible at this time of the Session to take up an Act consolidating the whole legislation of the North-West Territories.

Mr. DAVIN. I cannot agree with my hon. friend, because the amendments, after all, as I understand them, are of such a nature that the consolidation will not be an elaborate affair. The North-West Territories Acts which require consolidation are not numerous, and I hope that the leader of the Opposition will not take an attitude so hostile to the interests of the North West as he has suggested it is his intention to take.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the Government had any important legislation to present in regard to the North-West Territories, it ought to have been before the House a long time ago. We have been in Session two and a half months. The hon. gentleman expected to bring the Session to a close within the week, and, at the last week, he proposes to introduce a Bill for the first time. Surely the officers of the hon. gentleman's department, if the legislation were necessary, must have informed him of its necessity long ago; and if they failed in their duty in that respect, the measure can stand over until another Session. It is a most monstrous proceeding that would not be tolerated by the strongest Government that ever sat in England—the introduction, at the last moment of a Session, of a measure for the consideration of the House. I have called the attention of the House over and over again, to the fact that during the last fifty years every important measure of an English Administration, whether Tory or Reform, was introduced the first

month of the Session, although their Sessions last seven months. Yet the hon. gentleman proposes, the last week of the Session, to introduce a measure for the first time. Such a proceeding is intolerable. The hon. gentleman treats the House as if its business were simply to record whatever the Government chooses to submit to it, without any serious consideration. I do not believe hon. gentlemen on this side are prepared to so interpret their duties.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I should be sorry to see this Bill withdrawn. There are certain matters that need attention, and although the hon. gentleman who has just spoken may not have a long time to look over the Bill before it comes up for discussion, still, with his knowledge of the country, he will be ready promptly to grasp the questions touched upon, and I am sure it will be a great benefit to the North-West that the Bill should be proceeded with.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Whether a benefit or not, it was the duty of the Government to inform themselves that this was an important measure, and to bring it down at the proper time. I do not think it is possible that sufficient consideration can be given to the Bill, unless the Government are prepared to keep the House sitting for a very much longer time than now anticipated; and, in any case, the practice of bringing down a Government Bill four days before the time the Government declare it was their desire to adjourn is a practice which cannot be defended on any precedent or ground whatever, except that of extreme urgency, in which case we would not desire to fetter the hands of the Government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not usual to oppose a Bill on the first reading; and I think my hon. friends opposite have been unduly alarmed at the word "consolidation" which my hon. colleague used in presenting this Bill. The fact is that the amendments he proposes to make in the North-West Territories Act are few and simple. He stated them, I think, as being only three. It will be desirable to have the three Acts relating to the North-West Territories—not the whole legislation, as the hon. gentleman for Quebec (Mr. Laurier) has said, relating to the North-West—consolidated, as they would be by passing this Bill, because that would avoid an incoherent kind of legislation which it would be very difficult for the North West Legislature to administer. But, as I have said, the amendments are very simple, and I think, when the Bill is printed and laid before hon. gentlemen, they will not find it so formidable or requiring so much attention as the word "consolidation" seems to lead them to imagine. I do not think we are open to the reproach of delaying this Bill until within the last four days of the Session. There is not, on either side, the slightest idea that the House will close before the end of next week at the earliest, and, if the task of consolidating these three Statutes is too formidable a one, it may be thought desirable that legislation should be confined to the amendment of the Acts at this Session. I think, however, that the Bill should be now advanced a stage, and laid before the House, so that it may see whether it is of such a formidable character as is supposed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No 137) further to amend the General Inspection Act. He said: The amendments are not many, and I do not think they will cause much discussion. The first is to give power to the inspectors to appoint deputy inspectors of grain in the North-West and Manitoba, who are to be deprived of having any interest in the purchase of grain. Further, in regard to wheat, at present the wheat produced east and west of Port Arthur is governed by different standards, but this Bill provides that a Board of Examiners shall be selected from Port Arthur westward. This is in compliance with the request made by the representatives of Manitoba and the North-West, and the Boards of Trade in that country, and I think it is a most reasonable one. In addition to that, there is a short amendment proposing to change the inspection fees on pearl ash and potash, and so forth, from 10 cents per 100 lbs. to 20 cents. There is an inspector in Montreal, who keeps an office there for the discharge of that particular duty, and he has established a credit for his inspection which gives it great value in the country. All this pearl ash and potash goes through his hands for inspection, but it has been found that the fee of 10 cents per 100 lbs. is not sufficient to keep up his office and give him any remuneration. Last year, he applied to the Government to pass an Order in Council allowing him to collect a higher amount. Of course, that could not be done, because no Order in Council could override an Act of Parliament, but the parties interested in the trade asked for such a change, and all agreed to pay him 20 cents instead of 10 cents per 100 lbs. I told him that we could not give him the authority to collect any more than 10 cents, and that, if he did collect more, there might be a refund demanded. However, the trade has paid him 20 cents, recognising the fairness of the demand, and this amendment proposes to legalise it.

Mr. LAURIER. I must enter the same protest to this Bill as I did a moment ago to the Bill introduced by the Minister of the Interior. This legislation of the hon. gentleman is most important, and should not have been introduced at this late period of the Session, but should be brought in during the very early days of the Session, so that it might have been before the public long enough to give them the opportunity of looking into it, and making up their minds upon it. The hon. gentleman proposes to introduce an alteration in the recognised grades of wheat. I do not say the change is not wanted. It may be wanted. For some years, I believe, it has been said that there should be a change, but I am not able to say now, whether the alterations which are proposed are those which are required to suit the trade or not. The hon. gentleman says this amendment is demanded by the Boards of Trade of the west. So it may be, but the Boards of Trade of the east should also have an opportunity to speak on the subject, and the proposed alteration should be brought at an early period of the Session, so that the public should have had an opportunity to see it and offer any comments they desired upon it. The hon. gentleman must admit, and the whole House must admit, that it is not fair to the House, or to the country, to introduce important measures such as this, in the very last days of the Session. We expected that the Session would close at Easter. That hope is no longer entertained, but we have heard the remark made by the Minister of Justice, that we may close at the end of next week. Is it possible, in two weeks, for these amendments to receive the attention which they deserve. I again protest against this legislation being introduced at such a late date, and I hope it will not be proceeded with.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman may not have heard me correctly, but this is not a question of change of standards. That power is given under the present law. The only question is whether the standard should be fixed by a board from the western section or not. It is simply to provide for the organisation of a Board of Examiners to fix the standard. Of course, we are glad to receive the views of all these Boards of Trade on these questions, and that is one of the reasons for the delay. The Bill was under consideration by the Government in the early part of the Session. The Boards of Trade throughout

the Dominion did not agree, and it is only recently the Winnipeg Board of Trade came here to make their representations.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DIVORCE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 123) for the relief of George McDonald Bagwell (on a division).—(Mr. Brown.)

Bill (No. 124) for the relief of Arthur Wand (on a division).—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 125) for the relief of Henry Middleton (on a division).—(Mr. Small.)

DIVORCE—W. G. LOWRY.

Mr. SMALL moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 119) for the relief of William Gordon Lowry.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Before you leave the Chair, I have to call the attention of the House again to this Bill. I stated when the Bill passed the second reading that I would do so, and that I should have to oppose the Bill unless it were based upon a different case from that which was presented when it came here from the Senate. I find that the Bill does not present, on the evidence taken before the Select Committee on Private Bills, any new case, and that the evidence there taken has been confined to an exoneration of the petitioner from the charge or suspicion of collusion with his wife as regards any application for a divorce, and as regards the elicitation of any evidence for the purpose of sustaining the application. I think that, so far as that point goes, the evidence is satisfactory to show that the petitioner was not guilty of any collusion. The case, however, still rests solely upon the admission of the wife, obtained, as was shown by the hon. members who addressed the House on it about two weeks ago, under very peculiar circumstances. In the first place, the admission was solicited by the husband and by a witness whom he took with him for the purpose of being a witness, the admission on the part of the wife being made under circumstances in which it was her interest to make it, because it was apparent that she was desirous of obtaining a divorce, fully as desirous as the husband was to get one, because it is apparent that at that time she had not only formed the desire of marrying again if possible, but had selected the person with whom she wished to unite in matrimony. Under these circumstances she made the admission which was necessary, apparently, in the judgment of those concerned, to obtain a divorce. This is the only evidence relied upon in this case, and it seems to me that under the true English interpretation as to the opportunity for an offence to have been committed with the man Wilson with whom it is charged as having been committed, and taking all the circumstances into consideration, there is no presumption whatever that the offence was then committed, and that the case rests, as it did at the outset, simply upon the evidence of the wife's admission, made under circumstances which make that admission of very little value. I can only say, speaking as one who is acquainted with the practice in divorce courts, that no divorce, in courts whose procedure I am acquainted with in cases of this kind, would be granted upon this evidence. I am not aware of any case in which it has been granted upon such evidence elsewhere, and I am assured by those gentlemen who are accustomed to the judicial practice from day to day in cases of judicial separation, that the evidence here would not be deemed sufficient for that purpose in their courts. Under these circumstances I feel bound to move that you do not now leave the Chair, but that the further consideration of the Bill be deferred to this day six months.

Mr. SMALL. I believe it is the practice in the English House of Lords to grant a divorce on the admission of one of the parties, when the surrounding circumstances are such as would warrant it. I think the evidence given by the blacksmith in the house where the respondent and Mr. Wilson met, is quite sufficient to warrant us in granting relief to the petitioner in this case. Those who have read the evidence clearly come to that conclusion.

Mr. JAMIESON. I desire to make some remarks on the motion before the House. Inasmuch as the Bill has reached the present stage, according to regular procedure of both Houses of Parliament, I think it is entitled to a considerable amount of consideration at the hands of the members of this House. These Bills stand in a somewhat different position from other Bills which come before Parliament, more especially public Bills. In cases of this kind the petitioner has no other alternative but to resort to Parliament for the purpose of obtaining relief, when he deems himself entitled to relief. Consequently, he is put to a good deal of expense, and it behooves members of this House to approach the consideration of Bills of this kind with a great deal of judgment and to exercise care in determining them. Reference was made the other evening to the vote on this Bill in the Senate. I must say, without charging the Minister of Justice with anything wrong in the matter, that he was rather disingenuous in making the statement in this House that this Bill had passed the Senate by a very narrow majority. As a matter of fact, it passed the Senate by a vote of 28 to 4. It is quite true there were 23 votes cast against it in the Senate, but 19 of these votes were cast by Senators who, under all circumstances, vote against measures of this kind, so that practically the vote in the Senate stood 28 to 4, or almost unanimous. I may say too, that the facts were carefully scrutinized and examined by the Senate, and that body is so accustomed to deal with questions of this kind, that I think its judgment may be relied upon to a very great extent. The Bill was attacked in the Senate, and when I saw it attacked there, I came to the conclusion that it would also be attacked in this House, and the gentlemen who attacked the Bill there did not appear to me to attack it fairly or on its merits. The Bill was defended in the Senate by the chairman of the Divorce Committee, and in referring to the attack made upon the Bill, the hon. gentleman said:

"As chairman of the Committee it becomes me to say a few words in respect to this case The evidence is short and the proof is, to my mind, conclusive. My hon. friend, from whom I am exceedingly sorry to differ on this occasion, had not the advantage of hearing the witnesses give their testimony."

That was the language of Senator Gowan, a gentleman who occupied a seat on the Bench of Ontario for over thirty years and whose experience and judgment are almost unquestionable. He further said:

"The petitioner in this case is a young farmer, twenty-four or twenty-five years of age, a very respectable looking young man, and his demeanor in giving his evidence most favorably impressed me, as it did, I think, every member of the Committee. And so with regard to every witness that was examined before us."

I might refer to the discussion that took place in the Senate, but I do not desire to do so at the present moment. With respect to the evidence, the Bill was referred to the Private Bills Committee of this House, so far as I understood the matter, largely with a view to having the evidence as to collusion cleared up, and, I think, in the judgment of every member of that committee, it was established beyond question that there was no collusion between these parties. In regard to the facts of the case, I have just a word or two to say. We are told that it is not proper to grant a divorce upon the admis-

sion of the parties. As a lawyer, I have always been led to understand that a party's own admission of guilt was the very highest kind of evidence. In this case, it could not possibly be for the interest of this woman to admit her own degradation; consequently, her admission should be relied upon, if nothing else were shown to this House. But, in addition to that, we have collateral evidence which goes very far to show her admission of guilt was true. The Minister of Justice says it has not been the custom to grant divorces on the bare admission of the parties. I would refer the hon. gentleman to the Joynt's case which came last year before the House of Lords. In that case the only evidence, in addition to the admission of the respondent in the case, was the fact that she had been seen by a policeman to enter the house of the adulterer. I leave it to any hon. gentleman who had read the evidence to say whether this case is not a very much stronger one than the Joynt's case, as shown by the evidence before the House of Lords. In this case we have evidence that the young woman had immoral connection with the young man Wilson before her marriage. We have it further in evidence that some seven months after marriage she was delivered of a child; in addition to that we have evidence that she admitted to her husband the fact that she had had improper connection with Wilson. In addition it was proved that some months after marriage she met this man Wilson at the house of Mr. Wright, who was called in this case, and that they spent from ten o'clock in the evening to one o'clock in the morning together. I do not desire to prolong the discussion, but, taking all these facts together, a very strong case has been made out for the relief of this unfortunate young man whose prospects in life have been blighted in this manner.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would somewhat resent the observation of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), that I had been disingenuous in stating that this Bill has passed by a narrow majority in the Senate, if I thought the hon. gentleman understood the word he made use of. On the occasion when this Bill was before the Senate there was an ample discussion of the facts bearing on the case, and then there was a division taken, the lists of which I can place in the hands of hon. members in a few minutes; every phase of the evidence was fully discussed and the majority in favor of the Bill did not exceed five, two Senators excusing themselves from voting because they had not read the evidence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to make one observation, and one only. I understood the member for Lanark (Mr. (Jamieson) to say that the circumstances of the meeting were more than suspicious, and that from this he was led to the conclusion that there had been undue familiarity. I have read that evidence closely and I do not think the evidence taken before our Private Bills Committee strengthens by one iota the evidence taken before the Senate Committee. On the contrary there is nothing in the evidence from which you can draw a legitimate conclusion that they were together for half an hour. The man who said they were together in the kitchen said he was asleep, and he did not know what time they might have been there. His evidence was that he could not form an exact idea of the time, and he could give no reason for coming to the conclusion that they were together for twenty minutes. Of course we can grant the divorce, but all I can say is that if we do we grant it on the flimsiest of evidence.

House divided on amendment of Sir John Thompson.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Fiset,	Montplaisir,
Audet,	Gauthier,	Neveux,
Béchard,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bergeron,	Godbout,	Perry,
Bernier,	Grandbois,	Rinfret,
Boisvert,	Hesson,	Riopel,
Bryson,	Joncas,	Robertson,
Carling,	Jones (Halifax),	Robillard,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Lang,	Roome,
Casgrain,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Rykert,
Choquette,	La Rivière,	Ste. Marie,
Cimon,	Laurier,	Somerville,
Costigan,	Lovitt,	Thérien,
Coulombe,	McDougald (Pictou),	Thompson (Sir John),
Couture,	McIntyre,	Tupper,
Daly,	McMillan (Huron),	Turcot,
Davies,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Weldon (St. John),
Doyon,	McMullen,	Wright.—55.
Dupont,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Baird,	Hudspeth,	Prior,
Barnard,	Innes,	Ross,
Bell,	Jamieson,	Rowand,
Borden,	Jones (Digby),	Scarth,
Powell,	Kirkpatrick,	Scriver,
Bowman,	Landerkin,	Shanly,
Boyle,	Laurie,	Skinner,
Brien,	Lister,	Small,
Brown,	Macdonald (Huron),	Smith (Ontario),
Burdett,	Macdowall,	Sproule,
Cargill,	Mackenzie,	Taylor,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McCulla,	Temple,
Casey,	McDonald (Victoria),	Tyrwhitt,
Colter,	McKay,	Waldie,
Davis,	McKeen,	Ward,
Denison,	McNeill,	Watson,
Dewdney,	Madill,	Weldon (Albert),
Dickey,	Mara,	Welsh,
Fisher,	Moffat,	White (Cardwell),
Foster,	Moncrieff,	White (Renfrew),
Freeman,	Perley,	Wilmot,
Gordon,	Platt,	Wilson (Lennox),
Hall,	Porter,	Wood (Westm'l'd).—69.

Amendment negatived, Bill considered in Committee, and read the third time, reported and passed on a division.

INDIAN AGENT AT CAUGHNAWAGA.

Mr. DOYON asked, Whether the salary of A. Brosseau, Indian agent at Caughnawaga, was increased during the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1888; if so, at what date, by what amount, and for what reasons?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Brosseau's salary was increased on the 10th of July, 1887, by $200 per annum, owing to increase in the duties of his office.

BRITISH COLUMBIA MINERALS.

Mr. BARNARD asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government, in order to encourage the development of the mineral resources of British Columbia, to place quartz-mining, reducing, or smelting machinery on the free list, for a short period?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a question which it is impossible for me to answer.

REPAIRS TO THE WHARF OF STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE.

Mr. DESSAINT (translation) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make, in the course of the coming summer, the necessary repairs to the wharf at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, in the County of Kamouraska?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. gentleman, I may state that I have enquired at the department whether there were particulars relating to that matter. I was told there was not. I shall enquire about the circumstances and see what we can do.

NEW DEPARTMENTAL BUILDING, OTTAWA.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Has the contract for painting the new departmental building on Wellington street been let? If so, was it by tender, for what amount and to whom awarded? How many tenders were received, and was it given to the lowest; if not, why not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am informed by my chief architect that there is very little painting connected with the building, and what there is is included in the contract of Mr. Charlebois, who was the lowest tenderer for the whole work The oiling and varnishing, of which there is a good deal, is also included in the contract.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What amount?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I don't know; it is a portion of the contract.

GRAND NARROWS BRIDGE.

Mr. FLYNN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to bring to the notice of the First Minister (whom I do not see in the House now) the promise he made here on the 5th April last, in discussing an item of $400,000 for a bridge across the Grand Narrows, to bring down the papers connected therewith. That promise was made a week ago last Monday, and subsequently the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) repeated the request, and the First Minister again said he would bring down the papers next day. The papers have not been brought down yet. This is a very important question, and we are now nearing the close of the Session. I do not see why the papers should not be brought down before this.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I know that the leader of the Government took a note of this, and promised to bring down the papers, and I have no doubt they will be brought down without delay.

TARIFF CHANGES.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to enquire of the Minister of Finance if he is prepared to set a day when he will ask the Committee of Ways and Means to sit, and whether we are to have any changes in the tariff?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not prepared to-day to answer that question.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 121) to amend the Summary Trials Act.—(Sir John Thompson.)

SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 126) to amend the Summary Convictions Act, chapter 178 of the Revised Statutes, and the Act amending the same.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This section repeals the first section of last year's Act, and merely has the effect of striking out the provision about costs.

On section 2,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We adopted, last Session, an amendment to the Summary Convictions Act, and in the Senate the Bill was amended in such a way as to provide for the recovery of costs in certain cases. The provision made by the Senate was, that the fees should be as nearly as possible the costs in proceedings before justices in civil cases in like matters, and I promised, when the amendments were agreed to in this House, that this Session we would adopt a schedule of fees. For that purpose, I have prepared this measure. The fees provided for are those in use now in Ontario, in summary conviction cases, before justices of the peace, under provincial statutes.

On section 6,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The period of limitation now prescribed by the statute is three months. That is the shortest period of limitation that I know of, and I propose that it shall be extended all through Canada to twelve months.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I prefer the shorter term.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Twelve months does not seem to me to be too long, and very few statutes have prescribed a shorter term.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It keeps it hanging over the head of the man all that time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Very many of these offences are not discovered until after three months have expired.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). My impression is that they are generally put through pretty quick under the Summary Convictions Act, except where the party evades service. But if the complaint is made, and the warrant is issued, then he may be proceeded against any time afterwards.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have had cases repeatedly in which justice has been entirely defeated, owing to the shortness of the period of limitation, and to the fact that, while proceedings were being taken, and proof being obtained, the time had expired. But we have no objection to make it six months. I presume it could be made uniform.

Bill reported.

EXPROPRIATION OF LANDS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 131) respecting the Expropriation of Lands.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are a few amendments required in this Act, and it was thought that it would make them plainer, and more convenient, if the Act was consolidated. We intend to repeal the old Act, and re-enact it with some amendments.

On section 9,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose the hon. Minister has considered the question as to how we can exercise the power of general expropriation. Of course in building railways, where we have the power to incorporate, we must have the power to expropriate or to authorise expropriation; but that is an entirely different matter from a general provision in regard to expropriation. I do not see any power given to the Parliament of Canada for general expropriation except for one purpose, namely, that of taking lands for purposes of defence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It can only be done for the purpose of any public work we are authorised to carry on. It is only for works we have a right to construct that this power can be used, and I will see that it is limited to that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The power is stated in the 107th section of the British North America Act, and it is limited to purposes of defence.

On section 16,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is a new clause shown to be necessary by recent proceedings with respect to the construction of railways. It provides that in certain events the Exchequer Court may, after due notice, appoint a guardian with authority to sell and convey the property.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the property is situated within the limits of a Province, how can we confer ability or remove present disability to enable anyone to convey land, or how can we remove present incapacity or change the capacity of a party? Surely this is a civil right, and, if a railway company, incorporated by this Parliament, chooses to expropriate lands, they must conform with the laws of the Province in which they are situated, and deal with the parties who have the capacity under the laws of the Province. We may legislate on this subject in the Territories, but I confess I do not see how it can be done with regard to Provinces.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Sections 16 and 17 had better stand in order that I may consider this point further.

On section 22,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is a new section and affords the means of overcoming the resistance to the officers of the Crown entering upon land without bringing such officers into actual collision with the persons resisting. There is a provision something like this in the Railway Act, but no company is allowed to exercise such power without payment of the compensation, or the securing of the right by paying the money into court. The supposition is that there is no security so good for compensation as the public Treasury, and, therefore, the Crown is not to be compelled to make payment before taking possession.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Suppose persons claim adverse titles to the lands.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This clause is merely to prevent violent resistance. There are ample provisions to protect the rights of parties concerned.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have a case in the Exchequer Court in which the Crown are occupying a piece of land on the Prince Edward Island Railway, and the person defending the suit alleges certain equitable reasons why the Crown should not be permitted to oust him. The person, under the present law, would remain in possession until the Crown expropriates the land, but if this section passes there will be no necessity to bring the question before a court at all. The Crown would simply issue its warrant to oust him by force.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The present law would cover that case. We can, by filing the plan, oust him and leave him to his recourse against the Crown in the Exchequer Court, either by expropriation proceedings or petition of right. We have the right to expropriate his property, and this section is merely to say that he shall not resist.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In nine cases out of ten that would work as the hon. Minister suggests, but this case I quote is the tenth case.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We may possibly limit the operation of this section to cases of construction of public works, and not for the recovery of lands when the public work has been erected.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does this enable the Crown to turn a man out of his house, or is it for the possession of land alone?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We can take his house for any public work, under the present law. I think with my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), that it ought only to be for a construction of a work that we should exercise this summary process.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Suppose any Local Legislature were to legislate on this subject and would provide by general law the terms upon which property would be expropriated for any public purpose, and make that applicable to Dominion works; does the hon. gentleman think that this law would operate?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would not think they had any power to do that, because I think they have no power to pass legislation relating to the expropriation of lands for public works under the control of this Parliament. I would think their powers of legislation with regard to expropriation were confined to works which they could undertake themselves.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course the right of eminent domain, strictly so-called, could be only exercised by the Government which has the right to exercise it; but where you make general provision for general expropriation and compensation, it seems to me the Government should undertake to protect the civil rights of its citizens by stating on what terms the property might be taken, if those terms were such as not to interfere with the liberty of the Government here, and if they did not impose any conditions greater than they did for their own public purposes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is open to argument at least whether it would not be well to qualify that section by declaring that the judge may issue his warrant after having called upon the party to show cause why it should not issue. It might be made the means of oppression, without giving the defendant some chance to show cause why he resisted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will let the section stand in the meantime.

Committee rose and reported progress, and it being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MENNONITE IMMIGRANTS—LOANS.

Mr. CARLING moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider resolution (p. 1146) respecting the amount due on certain loans made to Mennonites in Ontario for assistance to Mennonite immigrants.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CARLING. In 1875, a loan was made to Mennonites in Ontario to induce a number of their poorer brethren to settle in the North-West, and bonds were given by a number of gentlemen in Ontario, in the County of Waterloo, that this money should be repaid with interest at 6 per cent. No money was to be asked for from them until after four years, and then it was to be refunded, and interest at 6 per cent. was to be paid until the whole sum was paid back. The Mennonites met with a series of reverses, there were devastating floods in that part of the Province in which they were settled, which caused a great deal of loss and hardship to them, a number of them were unable to pay the money loaned, and this was secured to the Government by these gentlemen in the Province of Ontario. They applied at numerous times to have some relief, but they have paid up the whole of the principal to the Government with 4 per cent. from the time the money was loaned until the 1st of July, 1888. The resolution I now move is to accept the principal and 4 per cent. interest from the time the money was loaned until the 1st of July 1888, in full discharge of the debt.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the Mennonites who benefit from this reduction of interest, or is it the persons who advanced the money to the Government in their behalf?

Mr. CARLING. The Government dealt entirely with the committee of gentlemen who undertook the repayment of this money. This committee reported that a number of the Mennonites who settled there were unable to pay, and they were obliged to meet the payments for them. Mr. Shantz, who was chairman of the committee, a highly respectable gentleman, a man who has taken great interest in immigration, and is well known in Ontario, represented to the Government, for this committee, the state of the case, and, after full consideration, the Government thought it well to accept the amount they have offered.

Mr. BOWMAN. My hon. friend (Mr. Watson) asked whether the persons who obtained this loan were to get the benefit of this reduction, or the persons who went security for them in the County of Waterloo. I have a pretty full knowledge of the circumstances under which this loan was obtained, and am well acquainted with nearly every one of the persons who secured this loan. I can assure the hon. gentleman that not one of these persons who went security for this loan will benefit to the extent of one cent by this reduction. On the contrary, these very same persons assisted their co-religionists in Manitoba in two ways, besides going security for them. They assisted them by loaning them a large amount of money in addition to the loan which they got from the Government, and, in another way, they aided them by large subscriptions to contribute towards their expenses in settling in Manitoba, without getting a dollar of it back again.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. CARLING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 138) respecting a loan therein mentioned to certain Mennonite immigrants.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the hon. gentleman ought to tell us why this measure was not introduced earlier in the Session.

Mr. CARLING. It was intended to introduce it early in the Session, but for some reason or other, it was delayed. I do not think there can be any objection to this measure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The reason I put the question is, because I think that when the Government have nine months out of the year, when the House is not in Session, in which to prepare their measures, they ought to be ready with them early in the Session. Although they ought not to be precluded from introducing a measure arising out of unforeseen matter, still the House is entitled to have those measures submitted at the earliest possible period of the Session. If the hon. gentleman had done this, there is no reason in the world why the business of the House should not have been concluded this week. It is only because measures are introduced now at the very last moment of the Session that we are delayed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that is very unjust. I do not think that in any Session of my recollection, and I am quite sure not in my hon. friend's recollection, has the business in the hands of the Government been earlier introduced, or more steadily pressed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Three Government measures were introduced to-day for the first time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What of that? There was plenty of Government work before you all the time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, you had. On every Government day there was plenty of work for the House to do. The House has been fully employed, and earlier than in any other Session, and since we asked for additional days, we have employed the House busily on Government measures. If there is any cause of complaint, I think the blame must be shared by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would just say to the hon. gentleman that the practice in England is to introduce Government measures in the first month of the Session, and this is done, as a rule, in order that the country may know what is contained in the measures of the Government, and that the members of the House may be able to consult their constituents in reference to them. Now we have no opportunity of consulting our constituents upon any one of the measures of the Government now introduced. It is quite unfair that the Opposition should be asked to quietly consent to the introduction of three important measures at this late period of the Session. The First Minister has said that there is enough remaining to do on the paper, and these Bills are very important, particularly that relating to the Inland Revenue, which will affect every part of the Dominion, and one which a great many men would desire to consider before it became law. It is unfair that the Opposition should be asked quietly to consent to the introduction of these important measures now, to be rushed through and become law, while many men in the Dominion, better versed in the particulars than the Minister himself, or perhaps any hon. member on this side of the House, are not afforded an opportunity of expressing their views. If the public are to be allowed an opportunity of criticising Government measures with that intelligence and experience which many men are able to bring to bear on such questions, they should be introduced long before this late hour. This course is unfair to hon. members on this side of the House, because we cannot give the measures that careful criticism we should bestow upon them, and if the Government were to discharge their duties thoroughly, these Bills would have been in the hands of the House long before this period. It is unfair to us and unfair to the country. If the Minister of Inland Revenue was in a condition of health, or in any other condition to unfit him introducing that Bill, the duty should have been committed to some other Minister, instead of introducing it on this, the last Monday, when the Government have already intimated their desire to close at Easter. It is unfair to expect the Opposition to consent to such an injustice; I do not feel disposed to do so.

Mr. HESSON. If the hon. gentleman would take the trouble to look over *Hansard*, he would find he had occupied a very large portion of the time of the House this Session. I do not think it would have been possible for the Government to have brought forward their measures with greater rapidity, unless that hon. gentleman had occupied less of the time of the House. I do not think there is anything in the Bill now before the House which is objectionable, and I consider it should pass with the usual explanation from its introducer. As to delay, there are many hon. gentlemen who have occupied more time, perhaps, than was absolutely necessary in the interests of the country, or that was necessary for fair criticism of the items before the House. We all know that we might have spent Easter at home, except for the numerous occasions when the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) occupied the time of the House with unreasonable criticisms.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider resolution to amend the Inland Revenue Act, and to make better provision for the working of the said Act (page 1221).—(Mr. Costigan.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. COSTIGAN. I desire to substitute $1.50 per thousand instead of $1.75 per thousand as the excise duty on cigarettes weighing not more than three pounds per thousand. The duty of $1.50 per thousand would exactly equal, according to the present system of manufacturing cigarettes, a duty of 60 cents per pound. Cigarettes pay the largest duty of any tobacco, and as we have no desire to increase the duty, we propose the amount should remain at $1.50.

Resolution reported, and concurred in.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 139) further to amend the Inland Revenue Act. He said: The changes proposed deal entirely with departmental matters. The legislation in the North-West Territories makes it necessary to ask for certain changes in connection with the issue of writs of assistance. In prosecutions under the Inland Revenue Act it is provided under the present law that these prosecutions must be taken up and proceeded with under the Summary Convictions Act, and that limits the time for prosecuting to three months. The Customs Department found it necessary to extend the time to twelve months, and the same is asked with respect to the Inland Revenue. It has been found that the time expired before the necessary information was obtained and prosecutions instituted. Some other clauses of the Bill deal with the matter of ascertaining the duty payable upon malt, that is, the gauging of the malt. The present gauge is compulsory as taken from the kiln. The floors of the kilns are found in many cases to be unequal and uneven, and the gauge is, in many cases, unreliable, and, therefore, we take power that, while having the right to take the measurements of the kiln, we have also power to weigh the malt so as to ascertain the exact quantity upon which duty should be paid. The next change is to take the power to collect 15 cents per gallon upon certain products manufactured from spirits in bond. The reason for that is that last year, when amending the law with regard to the manufacture of methylated spirits, which we found had been abused, we struck too much out of the Act. This simply re-enacts that portion which we struck out, and is necessary to enable us to collect the duty, and the House will see that in this case it dates back to the time of the repeal of the Act. This is done with the consent of the manufacturers, who have actually paid the duty in good faith. We simply wish to legalise what they have paid. The other clause provides for the collection of duty on cigarettes by the thousand, instead of by weight as is the case at present. This change will be a matter of convenience to the department and to the manufacturers, without changing, lessening, or increasing the duties levied.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE—PENSIONS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved second reading of Bill (No. 118) to authorise the granting of pensions to members of the North-West Mounted Police force. He said: I gave an explanation of the objects of this Bill when the resolution upon which it is founded was before the House. The intention of it is to give some inducement to the members of the North-West Mounted Police whom we desire to retain in the service, to re-enlist in the force. I explained that it was of very great importance that the men who are best qualified to perform the various and complicated duties of mounted policemen should be retained in the force, and that at the end of the five years, which is the term of enlistment, those men who may be valuable members of the force and who are yet, for various reasons, not fit to be commissioned officers, should be induced to remain. It takes some years before an enlisted policeman really learns his work. The House must not consider that these men are to be looked upon as mere soldiers—as a mere fighting commodity to use in case of war, or rumors of war, or serious outbreaks—they are peace officers, they serve processes, and they must be all educated men; in fact they are all educated men. Besides this, the physical standard required from recruits is very high, and at least fifty per cent. of the recruits are rejected because they do not come up to this standard. A young man joining the force at first is of exceedingly little use until he learns his business. Suppose an emigrant—one of those crofters, for instance, and I think those crofters are all educated men, because they are Scotchmen—but suppose one of those men is enlisted and sent out to the North-West, he would be quite helpless at first in that strange country. As the hon. gentleman at whom I am looking (Mr. Watson), knows, these emigrants have to be looked after when they come here first; someone has to show them how to settle, and where to settle, and what to do, and it is the same way with the police recruit. He has to be trained to his business. There are some men we do not desire to re-enlist after their five years' term is served, although very often they wish to remain. This class of men have no confidence in themselves to make out a living; but the really good men, if they have no prospect of a provision for them in life, leave the service at the end of five years. The object of this measure is to promote the efficiency of the force, and to retain the men whom it is desirable to retain. The difference between the five years' man, who has shown aptitude for the performance of his duty, and the recruit, is the difference between skilled and unskilled labor. As I mentioned, the expense to the country will not be much when you consider that everyone of those men who served five years in that service is worth two or three recruits. The Bill provides that pensions for life shall be given to men who have served not less than fifteen years and who have become incapacited by infirmity of mind or body. This must be on a medical certificate, but those who have served for twenty-five years or more shall be pensioned without a medical certificate. We do not want to enlist men under twenty, although we are obliged to enlist them at eighteen. If they are five years in the service, and they enter at twenty, they are twenty-five years old when their term is up; and if they enlist again for five years, that brings their age up to thirty. They are ten years in the service, and they have really lost their chance of settling in civil employment, but they are then the most fitted to remain in the service. As regards the cost this proposition will entail, I will recite the quotation that I made from the report when I introduced the resolution. The following statement shows the number of men now serving in the force who, in the event of incapacity of mind or body, would be entitled to pensions during the next eight years: In 1888, 1; in 1889, 4; in 1890, 5; in 1891, 2; in 1892, 2; in 1893, 3; in 1894, 7; in 1895, 0; in all, 24 men, up to 1895. With regard to those men who will serve twenty-five years, the memorandum is as follows:—

"The present state of the health of the men included in the above summary justifies the expectation that very few of them will be incapacitated prior to having completed twenty-five years' service. Should all remain for that period, the following will become entitled to long service pension between 1898 and 1905:—In 1898, one man; in 1899, four; in 1900, five; in 1901, two; in 1902, two; in 1903, three; in 1904, seven; and in 1905, none."

This force is a very small body, consisting of a thousand men, who are to keep watch and ward over the whole of the North-West—who are to patrol the frontier of Manitoba, and to be ready to do the same thing in British Columbia, as was done last year. Their duties are very severe and complicated. They are employed to repress crime, smug-

gling, cattle raiding, stealing—to protect the white man from the Indian, and the Indian from the white man. Their duties extend all over that territory, and they are doing very successfully a work which it takes 15,000 men to do in the United States. There are 30,000 men employed in the United States, of whom 23,000 are regularly enlisted. These are not all on the frontier, but fully half of them are on the western and northern frontier, watching the Indians; and I must say that very friendly relations subsist between them and our men in connection with the suppression of crime there. For these reasons, I move the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the hon. gentleman whether he did not long ago reduce the pay of the police?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They are not receiving what they did a few years ago.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, they are receiving the same.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The House will, no doubt, consider very carefully the observations which have fallen from the leader of the Government, with respect to the usefulness and the character of the Mounted Police force. I have no doubt he has given a very fair description of the educational attainments and respectability of the men who compose that very important branch of the North-West service, and I have no doubt that that corp is very necessary in the present condition of the country. Admitting all that, it may be questioned whether the necessity has arisen for the step which the right hon. gentleman asks this House to take to-night. While admitting that a trained man who has been five or ten years in the service would understand his duties better, and would be more useful and reliable in the majority of cases than a new man, I claim, at the same time, that people equal to all that the occasion would require, could be had under any circumstances, to fill any vacancies that might occur. The hon. gentleman admitted to-night, that so far from having any difficulty in filling up the Mounted Police force, they had more applicants than they could accept. In this condition of affairs, it would appear that the necessity of offering greater inducements to men to join the service is not so clear. Then, again, in providing for these retiring allowances or pensions, the Bill is introducing a principle, which, if once admitted, may lead to very serious results in the burden which it will impose on the taxpayers of the Dominion. If the Government propose to adopt the system of pensioning the Mounted Police, I do not see where they can stop. They surely will have to introduce it into their military organisations, their "A" and "B" Batteries, all their schools of military instruction from one end of the country to the other. Those people who have entered the batteries, and have served a number of years, will be able, in my judgment, to establish just as strong a claim on the country for pensions as the Mounted Police. The hon. gentleman has given us the number of Mounted Police who would probably be pensioned up to 1900, amounting to 24. That is not such a large number, but the objection lies in what the introduction of this new principle is going to lead to. Under these circumstances, I think it would be very unwise for us to agree to this Bill, and, therefore, I move in amendment:

That this Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved, with due regard to the rights of those who have already been placed on the pension list, that a percentage of the salaries shall be retained and placed to credit of employés of the Government, which shall be payable to them, with interest, on their leaving the service, or to their families, in case of their death in the service.

Under this proposal, the Government would have it in their power to make a certain provision for these men, provided a certain amount were deducted from their pay during the time they were employed; and if there is any branch of the service where this principle could be introduced effectively, it is the Mounted Police. Those who compose that body are usually young men; they have no family incumbrances, and all their wants are paid for by the Government; they could, therefore, very conveniently lay aside a certain amount for their pension, which would be returned to them when they left the service, or to their families, in the event of their death in the service. I think this principle would be generally considered much more reasonable and acceptable to the country than the pension proposed by the hon. gentleman in this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think this amendment, as drawn, is quite in order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a resolution affecting the whole Civil Service. It provides that, with due regard to those on the pension list, all Government employés shall have a certain amount subtracted from their pay, and funded for their families.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What I understand the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) proposed was, that the Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that, if the Government desired to make provision for those parties, they should retain a portion of their salaries to be paid over to them with interest. If the resolution does not express that, my hon. friend can alter it. The principle my hon. friend submits is perfectly clear, and it will be perfectly regular if he puts it in that form. The right hon. gentleman has himself declared that these policemen should be provided for. Now, the hon. gentleman proposes to provide for the pensioning of a number of men who have been some years in the public service. These men entered the force without such provision having been made. The good faith of the country had not been in any way pledged that they should be pensioned on retirement from the service. The right hon. gentleman has also, on a former occasion—although he seems to have forgotten it—reduced the pay of these policemen. The hon. gentleman, if I recollect rightly, declared then that the wages paid were greater than necessary to induce persons to enter the service, that a sufficient number could be secured at a lower rate of pay, and accordingly the pay was reduced, and the number of the service increased. Now we find that the hon. gentleman, who then reduced the pay about 30 per cent., proposes to create a pension list. Surely he does not deem it necessary to provide for the pensioning of this whole force, upon condition that the men remain a certain number of years in it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question now before the House is with reference to the point of order raised, as to whether this amendment ought to be allowed or not. I have not put the question, I have not asked the House whether they will adopt the amendment or not, and I would like to hear hon. gentlemen express their opinion on the point of order.

Mr. LAURIER. This amendment is perfectly in order. The proposition of the right hon. gentleman is to place these men on the pension list. The amendment provides that, instead, the contrary should be affirmed, and that it would be preferable to keep from the salaries of these men a certain percentage, which would be returned to them, with interest, on their leaving the force, or to their families, in case of death. This proposition is quite germane to the proposition of the hon. gentleman. This is not a new proposition. It has been already several times laid before the House, not only with regard to this force, but with regard to the Civil Service.

Mr. DAVIN. The principle of this Bill is to provide a pension for constables who are incapacitated, or who, from sufficient reason, are retired. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) comes forward with an amendment to the second reading which should properly be brought forward

when the Bill is in committee. It is an alternative proposition. The right hon. gentleman proposes to provide for retiring suitably by pension, and the hon. member for Halifax proposes to lay out a fund by deducting so much out of every salary. It would, therefore, be properly introduced by an amendment in committee.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) proposes that the Bill be not now read the second time, but that something else be affirmed. You can affirm what you please, if it is an alternative proposition. If this motion were carried, it would be the duty of the Government, or someone else, to introduce a measure which would be based on a principle different from the principle of the Bill. The Bill proposes to make an additional charge on the Treasury. The amendment proposes that there shall be no additional charge on the Treasury, but that there shall be a certain amount retained in order to make this fund.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Surely the hon. gentleman will not say that, on a motion to postpone the reading of a Bill, you can put in any resolution you like?

Mr. LAURIER. If it is germane.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. For instance, you could not propose that the Bill be not now read the second time, but that the salary of the Governor General be reduced.

Mr. LAURIER. That would not be germane.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think there are some words missing in this amendment, and I will send it back to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) before deciding.

Mr. FISHER. If the Bill were read a second time, this amendment could not, I think, be introduced in committee, because it would not be according to the principle of the Bill. It provides a different way of maintaining these officers after they have ceased to be efficient, or their families after the officers are dead. The Bill of the First Minister provides for the ordinary mode of pension, and, if that principle were accepted by the Bill being read a second time, it seems to me the proposition of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) would not be in order, as being radically opposed to the principle of the Bill.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before we pass the second reading of the Bill, I claim to have an opportunity of expressing my opinion on the whole pension system.

Mr. SPEAKER. The amendment is not yet properly before the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The amendment is contrary to all parliamentary rules.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The amendment which I move is this:

That the Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be resolved: That a percentage of the salaries of the North-West Mounted Police shall be deducted and paid to such persons on their leaving the service, or to their families in the case of their death in the service.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would simply break up the force. If a resolution was passed providing that these men are to receive nominally the pay of 75 cents a day, and that there is to be a percentage taken out of that, you would get no men for that force. The hon. gentleman speaks as if we could get any number of men for that force. That is not the case. There are a great number of recruits —there are a great number of gentlemen's sons, to use the ordinary pseudonym—who go into the force, but, in order to keep up the force, you have not only to get recruits, but to induce men who have proved themselves competent, who are good, efficient men, to remain in the force after they are properly trained and are fully fit for their work. The Government can have no object, and I can have no object, in desiring to increase the expense of that force, but I am satisfied, and all those who have really considered the question, including the officers in command, agree that it is of the very greatest importance, and that it is the wisest economy to keep these skilled men in the force, and not to have a body of recruits who are unfit for the work until they are properly trained. It is better, by giving a very small inducement of this kind to enable the skilled labor to look forward to some reward at the end of twenty-five long years service. That, I think, is a wise provision.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I resume the observations I was making a few moments ago in reference to this force. I am opposed to this principle. I think it is wholly at variance with the democratic tendencies of our population, and I am sure that the people of this country will not be satisfied to have 1,000 men pensioned on this country for an indefinite time to come. I said that the hon. gentleman had reduced the pay of this force some years ago. He seemed to think I was in error on that matter. I stated that the hon. gentleman did so because, as he informed the House, he had no difficulty in obtaining at a lower rate of wages, all the men that were necessary in order to keep up the force to the required number. On that occasion the hon. gentleman said;

"There is to be a reduction in the pay of the force of $8,000 a year. The men now receive 40 cents during the first year, and 50 cents per day during the other four years of their service. The late rates were 50 cents per day during the first year, and 75 cents a day during the remaining four year of the term."

So that when the hon. gentleman actually reduced, after the first year, the pay of the men in the police force by 33 per cent., he reduced it from 75 cents to 50 cents a day, and he gave, as a reason, that 50 cents was quite adequate pay to secure all the men that were required in this particular force. Now, the hon. gentleman proposes to do—what? He proposes that after these men have been a certain period in the service, we shall pension them off for the remainder of their lives. He tells us that if they entered the service at the age of from fifteen to twenty years, at the end of twenty-five years they would be entitled to be pensioned earlier than if they became unfit in the service from loss of health or other cause. Now, if they enter the service at twenty years of age, at the end of twenty-five years they will be forty-five years of age, and they are to be pensioned on the country for the remainder of their lives. I do not think, notwithstanding all that the hon. gentleman has said, that I can agree with the view that a man who has been ten or fifteen years in the service, is worth three men who have been there a shorter period. Now, if a young man who enters the service is fit for it, if he is sober, steady, and attentive to his duties, I have no doubt that, at the end of three years, he will be quite as efficient as he is ever likely to become—in fact, from all that I can judge of the force, the efficiency of those in the service does not increase with the term of their service, and I think, that being the case, the hon. gentleman ought not to persist in this Bill. It is wholly contrary to the wishes and the feeling of the people of this country. The only effect of putting this Bill upon the Statute-book will be to cause serious trouble in the future; for I have no doubt whatever that the people will not permit any Government to control the affairs of this country who undertakes to pension so large a number in the public service. Why, the hon. gentleman tells us that a great many of these men are not citizens of this country at all. They do not belong here; they are not natives of Canada. They are sons of English gentlemen, who have gone into the North-West to spend some time, and they are engaged on this police force. Now, to pension men who, at the end of their service, are likely to leave the country and to draw a certain sum from the public revenue for the remainder of their lives, after they attain the age of forty-five, is a proposition that I do not think will meet with favor by the public of this country.

I am sure that almost everywhere the system of pensioning and superannuation is unpopular. The people of this country are not satisfied with it. They think that those who are paid fairly well out of the public Treasury for their public services ought to provide for their own future by practicing economy, precisely the same as those who are engaged in the ordinary pursuits of private life; and the proposal of the hon. gentleman will only tend to make it impossible that judges, or any other persons in the service of the public, will be able to receive in the future any retiring allowance or pension whatever. The hon. gentleman, by undertaking to extend the pension list, will only make it impossible, in this country, to grant a pension to any person, however necessary the adoption of such a policy might be.

Mr. DAVIN. I think it must be obvious to the House that my hon. friends in the Reform ranks who have been speaking on this subject, do not really know it as profoundly as most other subjects which they discuss. I think that the way my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) if I may say so, botched his amendment, is emblematic of the way, if they had their will, that they would botch the Mounted Police. The hon. member for Halifax declares that this Bill is not necessary. Whether it is necessary or not, is a matter of fact. There are just two sections of the community who are capable of giving an opinion on this subject. The Government, dealing with that question, dealing with the management of the Mounted Police, knowing by reports what goes on in the Territories, can give an authoritative opinion; and the people living in the Territories, and meeting the Mounted Police force, observing it every day, and knowing what are the inducements that cause the mounted policemen to enter and leave the force, they also can give an authoritative opinion. My hon. friend from Halifax who could give us an authoritative opinion on shipping or on a cognate question, I rather think is hardly in a position to ask the question whether this measure is necessary or not. Now, as a fact, what the right hon. gentleman stated is palpable to everybody who closely observes the Mounted Police. The best men, the men that are most useful in the force, leave it after five years, when they are at the acme of their efficiency. Why do they leave it? Because the pay is not sufficient to keep them there. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) calculated that after a man spent 25 years in the force he would be about 43 or 45 years old, according as he entered it at 18 or 20 years of age. After a man spends 25 years in that force, he may be one of the most useful men we could possibly have in that force, but you know very well that if that man were to enter civil life, he would enter it under great disability. The man who spends 10, or 15 or 25 years in the Mounted Police may be efficient as a mounted policeman, but he re-enters civil life handicapped. They know that. What, then, are these men to do? The mounted policeman, when he has been five years in the service, asks himself whether he shall or shall not enlist again. He says to himself: If I enlist again, I shall spend 10 or 15 years of my life in this service. The pittance I am paid will not enable me to save much money, and at the end of that time I may go forth into civil life handicapped; whereas if I now leave the Mounted Police force, I have got a knowledge of the territory, I can get a situation, and can make my way. Why, Sir, this proposal of the hon. gentleman from Halifax, if he will excuse me for saying it, bears absurdity on its forehead. Why, these men are only getting 50 cents a day, and he asks you to deduct from this paltry pay, a sum sufficient to provide for them and their families in the future. Of course, this system of pensioning employees of the Government, and deducting so much from their pay or allowance is a good system when they are paid liberal salaries, but to do so when a man's pay is 50 or 75 cents a day would be very absurd indeed. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) said that men could easily be had. So they can. But what is a mounted policeman? An efficient mounted policeman is a man drilled like a soldier, he is a man drilled to do soldiers' work if necessary, he is a man trained to go from one part of the country to another in search of horse thieves and all sorts of breakers of the law; and men who have just entered the force and men who are willing to enter the force, these men for the first twelve months, or for the first two years for that matter, are very useless in the force. They spend most of their time drilling, and if they are required to be sent from one part of the country to another part, they do not know the country. As to the statement of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), that this House should not adopt this measure because the Government could always get men, that is a fallacy, because the men you can get are not efficient; you have to take them and train them. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), used what seems to me to be a very curious argument. He said this little Bill, if passed, would probably lay the axe to the root of all pensions whatever; that it would create such a commotion in the country and would raise such an indignation in the minds of the people against pensions that we would not be able to pension our judges and the whole pension system would be swept away. Of course that is absurd, and I think I will show it is absurd. What amount would the Government be called upon to pay during the eight years following 1898, when the first man, according to the classification, would be ready to receive a pension? They would not be called upon to pay more than $9,000. And yet we are told that it would create such a commotion that we would not be able to pension our judges.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How do you make that calculation?

Mr. DAVIN. You can easily calculate it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Every man would receive it in years.

Mr. DAVIN. I have made the calculation, and you will find it to be perfectly correct. The pension of a constable will vary from 22 cents per day for 15 years service to 50 cents for 27 years service; the pension of a sergeant would vary from 30 cents for 15 years service to 66 cents for 27 years service; that of a staff-sergeant from 27½ cents for 15 years service to $1 for 27 years service. How do these sums compare with those paid in other services? We have the service in Australia and the service of the Irish constabulary. The pensions of the Irish constabulary are calculated on full pay, including the constable's rations or subsistence. The calculation in this Bill of the right hon. gentleman is made on the bare pay of the mounted policeman. Liberal provision, again, is made for the Irish constabulary when incapacitated from infirmity of body or mind after five years' service. This Bill is not sufficiently liberal in my opinion. Instead of providing for incapacity after 15 years service I should prefer that it provided for incapacity after 10 years service. In New Zealand and New South Wales provision is made as follows: superannuation deduction is 3 per cent., but the pensions are very liberal. For 15 years and under 20 years service the amount must not exceed half pay, for 20 years and under 25 years service it must not exceed two-thirds pay, for 25 years service and under 30 years it must not exceed three-fourths pay, and for 30 years service full pay is granted. So, if we compare the Bill of the right hon. gentleman with the provisions made in other countries where police forces are in use, we find that, instead of the Bill being a very liberal one in pensioning the Mounted Police, it is a very moderate one indeed in its provisions. The services that these men render the country are of a very various, laborious and sometimes dangerous character, and I think it would be a great mistake on our part if when we come to deal

with the question of giving them inducements to remain in the force and be efficient constables, we approach the question in a niggardly manner. These men, as the right hon. gentleman has very properly described them, are really in physique about the finest body of men in the world. The standard is very high, and for the very reason that so many are anxious to enter the force, we are able to keep it up to a high mark, and in consequence of that you cannot find a weak or weedy man in the whole police force in the North-West. As to their intelligence, they are very well educated, some exceedingly well educated men, and for the services they have to perform this is a matter of very great importance. When such men think of their future they naturally shrink from continuing to perform those laborious services and continuing in such a service if in 15 or 20 years they have to leave the service without, by reason of the smallness of their pay, having accumulated anything for the future and without receiving any stay such as a pension would provide. I happen to know that men in the force have looked forward to a measure of this kind with great anxiety, and some of them have paused as to whether they would leave the service or not in the hope that such a Bill would be passed. The idea put forward by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mill), and endorsed by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), that men who have but recently joined the force are as efficient as the men who have been there for some time, is an idea of which they would be disabused if they spoke to any officer of the force or anyone who is familiar with the North-West Territories. If you take a man who has been to Prince Albert, Edmonton, Battleford, and travelled across the country, and who knows the Wood Mountain country, and been along the southern frontier, in fact knows the whole country, and compare him with a man who has recently joined the force, and who is unacquainted with the country, and who is not equal to the rigors of the service at that time, it is the comparison of one man who is the raw material with another who is the manufactured article.

Mr. LAURIER. You want protection.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, we go the whole hog. We believe in the manufactured article. This Bill provides what justice demands. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said that no faith was pledged to these men. The right hon. gentleman does not proceed as if faith had been pledged to the men. There is no such idea underlying this proposition; there is no such absurd notion underlying the Bill. We are not thinking whether faith is pledged to them or not. What we are thinking of is this: Is this provision a measure that justice demands? Not only is it a measure that justice demands, but it is a measure that expediency and efficiency demand.

Some hon. MEMBERS, No.

Mr. DAVIN. I hear some hon. gentlemen say "no," but they know nothing about it. We in the North-West who do know something about it say that this Bill will add 30 per cent. to the efficiency of the North-West Mounted Police. Instead of having men you have trained for five years, and out of whom you have probably got only two and a-half years' efficient work, leaving the service for which they were admirably fitted to continue in to the advantage of the country, and going into civil life; when this Bill becomes law, as I am sure it will, those men will remain in the service. If you were to speak to any of the men who have commanded that force, from Colonel Macleod down to Commissioner Herchmer, they will tell you that their great difficulty was to get efficient men to remain in the force. I have no doubt whatever that not only do the men look forward to this Bill with anxious hope, but that those who are in command of the force, and who are responsible for its efficiency, look forward to its passing as a means of keeping the best men in the service. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said that this Bill was contrary to the democratic tendencies of this country. I have yet to learn that democratic tendencies are necessarily opposed to providing pensions for men who have served the country. I suppose the country below the line is democratic enough, but yet we hear of their pension Bills and of the enormous pensions which they pay. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) who looks to the United States with so much reverence, and all these gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House, who sit so to speak at the feet of the Republican Gamaliel, surely ought be ready to take a hint from the democracy below the line as to pensions. The whole reasoning of my hon. friends from Halifax (Mr. Jones) and Bothwell (Mr. Mills), is a reasoning of mistaken facts and defective analogies. The hon. member for Halifax used one analogy after another for which there was no base, and my hon. friend from Bothwell declared that pensions are contrary to democratic tendencies although below the line where you have a democracy that he worships, pensions are in vogue. But we are not wholly a democratic country, although Lord Dufferin stated that we were more democratic than our friends below the line. We are members of a great Empire. No doubt we have a strong democratic streak running through our community, but we are also an Imperial people. We are also proud of being citizens of a great Empire and I have shown you that in various parts of that Empire, in Ireland, in New Zealand and in New South Wales the pensions are provided for the police. The hon. member for Halifax declared that the result of this Bill would be that this system would press very heavily on the taxpayers. If he will do what he did in regard to his amendment; if he will get first the hon. member for Bothwell, and then the hon. member for Queen's P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), and then the leader of the Opposition, to assist him in making a calculation, as he got them to assist him in making an amendment, he will find that this would not press very heavily on the taxpayers. I think I have shown that there is no basis whatever for the various representations of the member for Halifax. I do not want to be offensive—I could not possibly be offensive—but I must say that the contention of my hon. friend is an ignorant contention.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. DAVIN. I will take that back if it is in the least offensive, but I shall have to say that his is a contention based on defective knowledge.

Mr. WATSON. As I come from the west and have some knowledge of the North-West Mounted Police when they are enlisted, while they are in the service, and after they have been dismissed from the service, I beg leave to differ with some statements made by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. The reason that he adduces that a long service in the police unfits men for active pursuits in life is the very reason why I oppose the passing by this Parliament of any legislation which will induce those men to remain in the force for the long term of 25 years. I know a number of those mounted policemen who have discontinued service after 15 or 20 years in the force, and I know that those men are practically unfitted to cope with others in the ordinary avocations of civil life. They are men who acquired indolent habits while in the force, who have little or no business aptitude, and the result is they are unfitted for any other service. For that reason I strongly oppose any system by which these men will be induced to remain long in the service. I have nothing but praise for the ability of the men who are in the police force. They are smart, intelligent men, and they are that for the simple reason that some three men apply to get into the mounted police force for the one who is accepted.

There are any amount of men who wish to join the police force and with the choice the Government has, and the careful inspection which they make, it must be taken for granted that the Mounted Police force is made up of the very best young men we have in Canada. I think this can hardly be denied, because the other night when we were going through the Estimates we found that $2 each was paid for the inspection of recruits, and that three candidates presented themselves for every one who was accepted. There is this other reason why I would prefer the term of service to be for a short rather than a lengthened period. At present, we have at the end of every five years first class drilled soldiers. It has been stated that twelve months after a recruit joins the force he is being drilled, but there are men in course of being drilled, and who are recruits, and are yet quite efficient for the duties in which they are employed. They do not all require to be thoroughly drilled men, because they have got work requiring other qualifications. There is a certain number of teamsters among the force, and the young men are quite competent to act as teamsters for some time after they enlist. I am sure the Government have seen, during the last rebellion, the benefit of having a number of discharged mounted policemen in the North-West. If you adopt this pension system you have simply got 1,000 policemen at the end of 25 years, and they will be men who are getting old and feeble; but, by adopting the system of enlisting new recruits every five years, you will have at the end of 25 years, not 1,000, but 5,000 well drilled men, who are thoroughly competent to take their part in any trouble which we might have in the North-West. I hope, in the near future, that it will not be necessary to retain so many as 1,000 mounted policemen in the North-West. I believe that when the settlements grow up there, and they are growing very rapidly, the entire protection of the country will be taken in hand by the Local Governments. For these reasons I would strongly oppose any system of pensioning these men, and unfitting them for active life in other pursuits.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) seems to take it for granted, if we may judge from a remark which he made, that people who do not live in the North-West are not able to judge of the probability of our being able to secure such men as we may require for service in the Mounted Police force. One does not require to be a dweller in the North-West to decide that. The ranks of the Mounted Police are not recruited in the North-West, but in older Canada, and we know how easily recruits can be obtained for that service. My hon. friend has pointed out that when a call is made for men, three times the number called for apply for the places. There is, therefore, no urgency for this measure. Then, my hon. friend from Assiniboia said that if we adopted the Bill, the efficiency of the force would be increased 30 per cent. What does he mean by the efficiency of the force? I suppose he must have reference to the work to be performed; but we did not hear the hon. First Minister state that he intends to reduce the force by 300 men simultaneously with the passage of this Bill; and if my hon. friend's contention is right, it would follow that the duties would be discharged by 700 men just as efficiently as they are by 1,000 men. Therefore, failing to hear that the hon. First Minister intends to reduce the force, we take it for granted that the hon. member's view is not shared in by the First Minister. The only argument I have heard for the Bill is that advanced by the First Minister, that the men being enlisted for a long period would become more efficient. If that statement were well founded it would carry weight, but I am inclined to believe that all the efficiency required can be secured in the term of five years, and I agree with the hon. member for Marquette that it is probably a mistaken policy in the interest of the North-West to offer inducements to these men to remain in the force 20 or 25 years. I am rather inclined to agree with him, bringing common sense to bear on the subject, that you can secure as efficient a force under five years enlistment as you could under 25 years; and if during that time, under the proposition of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) the men laid up a little capital by which they could take up land and settle in the country, we should have a number of men well fitted to become permanent settlers. Then we have an additional advantage as he has pointed out by this very system which is claimed for our volunteer force. When fault is found that young men enlist, and after remaining a short time leave the force, and new men continually come in to take their places, the reply is that the effect of that is good, because instead of the available men being confined to the ranks of the militia, we have this vast body who have passed through the force receiving their training and taken up civil occupations in different parts of the country. It appears to me, therefore, that the argument is against the First Minister as to the desirability of inducing the men to remain 25 years in the service. Then, the argument of the hon. member for Halifax comes in, that if there be those in the force who are not so improvident as others, this proposition would receive their thanks. I think what has been pointed out by the hon. member for Bothwell is a conclusive answer to the claim for the necessity of this Bill. The hon. First Minister stated not long ago that it was possible, in the public interest, to reduce the pay given to recruits in that force 33⅓ per cent., which is proof beyond question as to our being able at all times to maintain an efficient force there. If we introduce this system, as the hon. member for Halifax pointed out, where is it to stop? If it is right to apply this principle to the Mounted Police, why is it not right to apply it to the men who manages our batteries, and who are connected with other parts of the service in this country? I think we would do well to hesitate before we make this new departure. I am inclined to think that even the First Minister himself, on reflection, may see that the weight of argument is rather against his proposition.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The efficiency of the force seems to be what we all mainly desire to attain; and it seems to be conceded on all sides that the inducements at present offered secure the results we desire. It is stated by the hon. member for Marquette that three men offer for every recruit required, and it seems, therefore, that it is not necessary to offer greater inducements in order to increase the efficiency of the force. But the hon. member for Assiniboia says that we must not form our own judgment on this matter, but we must be guided by the judgment formed by the Government. That would be very well, but which judgment are we to accept, the judgment of the Government to-day or its judgment the other day? We have had two systems in force for the maintenance of the North-West Mounted Police. We had one system from 1873 to 1881, under which a much larger percentage of pay was allotted to the men than they are allowed to-day. What was the result? We reduced the pay, and have gone on under the reduced pay since 1881, and we find that since that time the force has been efficient. I will read you an extract from a speech made by the hon. First Minister after he had had eight years experience of paying the men a larger sum than he pays them now. He said:

"The pay was originally very large, fixed at a time when it was new, and when the difficulties of going through an unknown country were perhaps exaggerated. But the pay was so good that there was a rush of men to the force; we found great pressure brought to send up gentlemen's sons—educated men, of broken habits—and the force was to some extent made to serve the purpose of an inebriate asylum. Under the present system we find that we can get good men, equal to the members of any constabulary force."

Here the House is met with a pronunciamento of the leader of the Government, that under the system of lower pay

which has now been going on for eight years we can get capital men equal to those in any constabulary in the world, and that under the system of larger pay we had men of broken habits, and that the force was to some extent made to serve the purpose of an inebriate asylum. That was the result before; the hon. gentleman does not want to return to it; and if, under the present system, three times the number of men offer that he requires, what is the use of adding this additional burden to the burdens already resting upon this overburdened new country? I object to the Bill altogether, and I think the proposition made by the hon. member for Halifax better meets the case.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken in regard to our being able to get three times more men than we want. That is not the case, nor anything like it. We can keep up the force. That there are three times as many men offering as we would take, I have no doubt; but I can only take the good men who are fit for their work, and we have no plethora of men who are fit to be accepted. The maximum pay is the same as formerly, 75 cents per day; that is to say, Parliament has authorised the Government to give to the extent of 75 cents a day to every constable. Formerly the pay began at 50 cents and then increased regularly, until, at the end of five years, it reached 70 cents; and if the men re-enlisted they were to get 75 cents. Well, we reduced the entrance pay from 50 cents to 40 cents. That is the saving that was made. Then, the minimum being 40 cents, the pay increased annually until it reached the maximum of 75 cents. The reduction was made from 50 cents entrance pay to 40 cents. Year by year it grew up to 70 cents, until the term of first enlistment expired, when the men received, if they re-enlisted, 75 cents.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). What I object to mainly is the principle underlying this superannuation Bill. The question is: Where are we to stop? What claim have those parties to receive a pension from the people of this country more than other people who are working outside the Government. Surely these men are not doing more in the interests of the country than the thousands of laborers, mechanics and clerks employed in the various institutions of the country, and I never could understand why we should spend the hard-earned money of the people in the payment of pensions. I take the position, that this is only an extension of the present established superannuation iniquity—for this is the most apt term I can give it. It is undoubtedly an iniquity to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars—the hard-earned money of the people—in pensioning a class who received very good pay while in the service. If these Government officials are not sufficiently well paid, I have no objection to pay them or anyone else who serves his country, a sufficient sum. Let them be paid 50 cents, or 75 cents; but after they have served the country many years and become disabled, they should step out just as any other clerks do, in other offices in the country. To ask the people to put their hands into their pockets to pay for the services of men, when they can serve their country no longer, is unjust. We are spending $150,000 every year in superannuation allowances to parties who no longer are giving their country any return for what they receive. This Bill would lead to abuse, just as the present superannuation law leads to abuse. No matter who will have the administration of this superannuation allowance, the system is bound to lead to abuse. Allow me to give you a few instances. I need go no further than the position of Clerk or Deputy Clerk of this House. We find that the honorable and esteemed gentleman who fills the position of Clerk with such ability receives $3,400 a year. I have no objection to his receiving that, or $4,000, if, in the judgment of hon. members, his services are worth that to the country. But outside of him, there is Mr. Alfred Patrick, superannuated clerk, receiving no less than $2,380 a year, without doing a single stroke of work. Then, Mr. Leprohon, who was Assistant Clerk, draws pay to the extent of $1,544 annually, and has drawn to 1st January, 1889, $10,164, and he was superannuated because, through sickness or some other cause, he was no longer able to serve in this House. There is another superannuated clerk, E. U. Piché, who draws $400 a year. Just think of it—$3,400 for the Clerk, $2,800 for the Assistant Clerk, $1,544 for the superannuated Assistant Clerk, $2,380 for the superannuated Clerk, and $400 for another superannuated Assistant Clerk—or not less than $10,524 paid by this Government for the purpose of filling up two positions. I ask any sensible man if such a system is in the interests of the people who pay the taxes? Let me give you another instance. In 1878—and I suppose hon. gentlemen will say this person was superannuated under the late Government, but I care not under whose Government he was superannuated, when such a system is placed in the hands of any Government, abuses are bound to arise through the pressure of the friends of the Government—Gilbert McMicken was Receiver General in Winnipeg. He became sick and was superannuated, and he now draws annually $1,579 from the superannuation fund; but since he received that amount he recovered his health, and who would not? $1,579 was the best medicine he could receive to restore his energies. His energies came back and he stepped out into the political arena of Manitoba, and ran for member for that Province, because he was too sick to keep the Government position he formerly occupied. He was elected a member of the Manitoba Legislature, and was appointed Speaker. He drew $1,000 as Speaker of the House, and $400 as member, and he receives from this Government $1,579, on the ground that he was not able to do anything. Is this not an anomaly? Let me give you another case. In 1878 John Gordon of the London post office, a man who had served in the post office 35 years, who was in the full vigor of his health, and better able to discharge his duties than at any other period, passed out because his place was required, it was said for the efficiency of the post office, but the efficiency consisted in getting another person in his stead. Mr. Gordon has drawn ever since his retirement $594 a year, or in all $4,800 during those eight years, and is now busily occupied doing other business. Let me give you another instance. You all remember Alex. McNab, who was Chief Engineer of the Prince Edward Island Railway. Well, he bungled that railway to such an extent that the people almost rose up against him. He was only 45 years of age when he was superannuated. He took ill with colic, or something else, for the purpose of receiving the superannuation allowance, and the Government came to his rescue, and gave him $1,715 a year superannuation allowance. Since that time, he has been as well as I have been, or as any other person in that part of the country; and rumor has it that he became an engineer of another railway and lived out of Canada a portion of that time, and yet, down to the present, he has drawn from the country for superannuation $13,862. Any system which leads to such abuses should not be tolerated, and the Act should be removed from the Statute-book, though without prejudicing anyone who is under its operation at present. There was another case which happened in 1879. Mr. Thomas Charles Patteson was the celebrated editor of the *Mail*, who wrote in favor of the present leader of the Government during the years the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was in power. When the present Government came back into power, Thomas Charles Patteson said to the leader of the Government: "It is largely through my able editorials that our party has come back, and I want something at your hands." "What do you want?" says the leader of the Government. "I want the Toronto postmastership." "But," says the leader of the Government, "Joseph Lesslie has been the Toronto

postmaster for 35 years, and he fills the office with credit to himself and with satisfaction to everyone in the city of Toronto." "But I want it," says Mr. Patteson. Well, what was the result? Joseph Lesslie was asked to resign. He opposed that request, and said: "I am as capable of performing the duties of my office as I was 10 or 15 or 20 years ago," but the pressure was brought to bear, and Joseph Lesslie resigned. He draws $2,480 a year from the Superannuation fund, or, since his superannuation, he has taken $24,208 from that fund; while Thomas Charles Patteson draws a salary of $3,000 and the result is that in nine years, the Toronto post office has cost this country $50,000 for the postmasters, which is altogether the result of this iniquitous system of superannuating individuals who are able to discharge their duties, and placing others in their positions. That system is not in the interest of this country, and, when the farmers and the laborers and the mechanics know that this is the system which is established in this country, I believe they will rise up as one man and insist on its discontinuance. I hope the time is not far distant when greater wisdom will prevail and less partisanship, when we may remove from the Statute-book such abuses as I have referred to, and this measure is but an extension of the abuse. I do not oppose the Dominion police. They are a fine body of able and useful men, and they require certain physical qualifications in order to fill that position. If 50 cents or 75 cents a day is not sufficient for them, come down with a Bill giving them sufficient pay for their labor and I will support it, but I will strongly oppose the extension of this principle, and I am very much mistaken if the people of the country will not oppose it as much as I do.

Gen. LAURIE. In following the remarks of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald), I find that he wandered considerably from the subject before the House. He went into the general question of superannuation. I do not propose to follow him into that question at all, but I propose to touch on one or two remarks which he made on this subject, and they were very few. He asks what claim these men have on us, what right have we to give them this, what right have they to ask it? That is not the question before the House. It is not that the members of the Mounted Police have asked for this, but it is that the Government who control that body and know what they require, who know the necessity of the existence of that body, and who have to handle it and to manage it, find the necessity of asking for this measure. The hon. gentleman says that, if 75 cents a day will not bring these men into the force, we should give them $1, but we are told on this side of the House that we can get three men for every one we now have. I think it was the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) who said so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I said that I had heard the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) make the statement, and I accepted his statement.

Gen. LAURIE. Well, you endorsed it, and I will take the two of you.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I). The First Minister said so also.

Gen. LAURIE. The question is not what recruits we can get, but can we keep them when we have got them? I speak with some little experience of service with military and semi-military bodies both in the British army and in foreign armies, and the difficulty in all those is not to get the recruit, but to keep the soldier after you have trained him. Take the continental armies. Take the German army, where every soldier has to serve under the system of conscription for two or three years. Take the French army, where every man has to serve five years with the colors. There they find that that is not enough to maintain the army in efficiency, and that they must have men of longer service, in order to keep up the backbone of the army. The result is that, though in France they have no system of pensions, they arrange by a mode of commutation from men who are not willing to serve, and out of that they pay a handsome bounty to men who are willing to serve the second time. Though their men are only enlisted in the army for four or five years, they encourage them to remain for 15 or 20 years in the service in that way. The Germans also find it necessary to encourage men to stay in the service, and the great complaint in all the European armies is that the service is too short to make the men efficient. It takes three years to make a soldier, and that is when he is serving all the time in the ranks, but, in the North-West Mounted Police, where a man has to be a soldier and a policeman as well, where he has to act individually in most cases, as well as acting with the troop in the field, it must take a longer time to make a constable and a soldier than to make a soldier when he is acting in the ranks. In the British army we have tried a system, which is something of the kind which the hon. gentleman proposes, of deducting a percentage from the pay of the soldiers. That is what is called deferred pay, and the experience of that is that nothing works much worse. The soldier looks forward to the amount reserved being put into his hands at a certain time, and he takes the first opportunity to leave the army, and as a rule, he spends the money at once, being, as my hon. friend has said, not used to civil life after serving in the force. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) says it is a great advantage to have so many pass through the force so that, when necessary, we may have them at command for service. I do not think we are calculating on having a great war in the North-West, and I do not think we need a great reserve. I believe it is far better for us to have 1,000 efficient men than to have 1,000 inefficient men, and 1,000 or 2,000 whom we might call upon when we might require them. Let us have a body of men perfectly trained instead of a portion partially trained and a portion trained who probably have forgotten their training. When the British army attempted to organise the reserve system first, they found that they had neither reserves nor soldiers, and that would be our experience. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says we would have a 1,000 pensioners on our hands. Does he assume that a 1,000 men will serve for 25 years? I have never heard such an extraordinary idea propounded.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They are to be pensioned at 15 years under certain circumstances.

Gen. LAURIE. Yes; but does the hon. gentleman think all these men will remain in the service for 15 years? Does he not think there may be some inducements for them to leave other than that of completing their term of service? Surely the Government will protect themselves by enlisting a man only for five years, allowing him to be re-engaged if he is a good man. The bargain is not all on one side. It is for the benefit of the country as well as for the individual. I take it that this measure of the Government is intended to get the very best service out of a man that can be got. I find that the Government were criticised because they cut down the pay between 1873 and 1881, and they are now criticised because, finding that they were unable to get good men and keep them, they propose a pension. This service changes like any sphere of civil life, and we must be prepared to accommodate ourselves to the practices of men in civil life from whom we draw our recruits. I shall support this measure of the Government, because I believe it is wise and judicious.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have always opposed in this House the tendency to increase our superannuation list, and I shall do the same in this case. Now, the complete answer to the proposition to create a superannuation system in the North-West Mounted Police, is the statement of the First Minister some years ago, that we were well able to keep the force

in an efficient order, even if we reduced the pay. The pay to-day is 75 cents, with clothing and food, and I think the class of men forming the North-West Mounted Police, is a class that could not possibly make any more money in any other calling in life. I am satisfied that taking them all through, the majority of them could not save the amount they are saving in the Mounted Police, if they were engaged in any other calling. The hon. member who has just taken his seat (General Laurie) has referred to the army of Great Britain, pointing out how necessary it was that a retiring allowance should be granted to them. But we must take into consideration that the pay received by soldiers in the British army is a mere pittance compared with what we pay our men. A man in the British army gets 1s. 4d. per day, while we are paying our men 75 cents. We are paying them all they are worth, and I contend that when we are paying fully as much as they could get in any other calling it is not necessary to ask the country to grant them an allowance when they leave the force. Our experience in regard to superannuation is that it has been a positive abuse. If we consent to the passage of this Bill to grant a retiring allowance to the Mounted Police, I am satisfied that it will be abused just the same as our superannuation system has been abused. We have in this country at the present time 450 superannuated officers of the Civil Service, who are strutting round and drawing about $160,000 a year of the country's funds, and if we consent to this proposition of the Government we will have quite a number of these people taking advantage of it to retire from the service and they will thenceforward become a drain upon the resources of this country. I fully concur with the opinion of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) that it is unwise to encourage the people to continue in the service beyond say 10 or 15 years. I believe that we can get plenty of men who would be glad to go out there for exploring purposes, for the purpose of seeing the country and making a little money at the same time; and after a number of years' service they will be glad to retire and take up their home in that country. I have no doubt that a great many of those now in the Mounted Police went there in the first place for that purpose, and every year they will leave the service and become settlers, and we hope that more will do so, because it is not desirable that we should have men putting in 25 years in that service, and then be turned out virtually useless. I hope, also, that in place of keeping up that force to 1,000 men, we will be able gradually to reduce it. There is no necessity to-day for 1,000 Mounted Police. I believe we could do with one-half that number to-day. We ought to be able annually to reduce the number. We raised the force to the present number only at the close of the rebellion. Prior to that rebellion we did not find that there was any need for more than 500 men. There are no more Indians and half-breeds in the North-West now than there were prior to the last rebellion, when 500 men were able to keep the peace in that country, and I do not see why the same number are not able to keep the Indians and half-breeds in peace now. Besides that, we now have a railway running up to that country, and we would be able to send in at short notice any number of men to put down any rising of the North-West that might occur. I do not think it is necessary that we should pay $860,000 a year for that force, and in addition to that, provide a pension to those who may leave it after serving a certain time. I am opposed to the whole system. Our past experience has shown that the system is grossly abused, that men are pensioned who never should be on the pension list, and I am satisfied that if we extend it to the North-West Mounted Police, it would be abused in the same way. It is our duty to reject the system, and get rid of the present superannuation list as soon as we can, and get down to a basis where we will not have to call upon the people of this country to pay away money in this useless and unnecessary way. I am satisfied that this is wrong, and that we can keep the force fully efficient without pensioning them at all, and if any emergency arises when it is necessary to increase the force in order to keep the peace, we have a magnificent accommodation in the way of a railway, by which we can send to the North-West any number of men from the volunteer force. I believe that in place of keeping up the force to 1,000 men, we ought to begin annually to reduce it at least by 100 men, with the object of getting rid of the whole expense at the end of 10 years.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Jones (Halifax):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Dessaint,	Meigs
Bain (Wentworth),	Doyon,	Mills (Bothwell),
Barron,	Edwards,	Mitchell,
Beausoleil,	Ellis,	Neveu,
Béchard,	Fiset,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Fisher,	Perry,
Blake,	Flynn,	Platt,
Borden,	Gauthier,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Godbout,	Robertson,
Bowman,	Hale,	Rowand,
Brien,	Holton,	Ste. Marie,
Burdett,	Innes,	Scriver,
Campbell,	Jones (Halifax),	Semple,
Cartwright (Sir Richd),	Landerkin,	Somerville,
Casey,	Lang,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Trow,
Charlton,	Lister,	Turcot,
Choquette,	Lovitt,	Waldie,
Colter,	Macdonald (Huron),	Watson,
Couture,	McIntyre,	Weldon (St. John),
Davies,	McMillan (Huron),	Welsh, and
De St. Georges,	McMullen,	Wilson, (Elgin) —66.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Audet,	Ferguson (Welland),	Masson,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Mills (Annapolis),
Baird,	Freeman,	Moffat,
Barnard,	Girouard,	Montplaisir,
Bell,	Gordon,	O'Brien,
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergin,	Guillet,	Perley,
Boisvert,	Haggart,	Porter,
Bowell,	Hall,	Prior,
Boyle,	Hesson,	Riopel,
Brown,	Hickey,	Robillard,
Bryson,	Hudspeth,	Roome,
Burns,	Jamieson,	Ross,
Cameron,	Joncas,	Rykert,
Cargill,	Jones (Digby),	Shanly,
Carling,	Kenny,	Skinner,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kirkpatrick,	Small,
Cimon,	Labelle,	Smith (Ontario),
Cochrane,	Landry,	Sproule,
Cockburn,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Taylor,
Colby,	La Rivière,	Thérien,
Costigan,	Laurie,	Thompson (Sir John),
Coughlin,	Lépine,	Tupper,
Coulombe,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tyrwhitt,
Curran,	Macdowall,	Wallace,
Daoust,	McCulla,	Ward,
Davin,	McDonald (Victoria),	Weldon (Albert),
Davis,	McDougald (Pictou),	White (Cardwell),
Denison,	McDougall (C. Breton),	White (Renfrew),
Desaulniers,	McKeen,	Wilmot,
Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Dewdney,	McNeill,	Wilson (Lennox),
Dickey,	Madill,	Wood (Brockville),
Dickinson,	Mara,	Wood (Westmland), and
Dupont,	Marshall,	Wright.—106.
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),		

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I observe that this Bill will go into operation in 1888. Will it include those incapacitated and those who resigned from the force last year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it only refers to men who are in the force after the passing of this Act. Any

men who are in the force when the Act comes into operation will have the benefit of the time they have been in the force since they enlisted.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then, any person who left the force last year from being incapacitated and who had then served 15 years would not have the benefit of this Act?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; these clauses are all taken from the Irish Police Act and have been found to operate very efficiently.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the third reading of Bill (No. 4) further to amend the Revised Statutes, Chapter 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise.

Mr. CHARLTON. I propose to suggest to the Government a slight alteration in this Bill and to move an amendment to that effect. I think this modification should meet with the approbation of the Minister of Justice and the leader of the Government. There is no question, although I am afraid the First Minister is not aware of the fact, that the country is thoroughly disgusted with this Bill. I believe that is evinced very clearly by the articles that appear in the newspapers supporting the hon. gentleman. I have, for instance, in my hand an editorial clipped from the Hamilton *Spectator*, of the 24th January, as follows:—

"A little while ago we were told that, being interviewed by a labor delegation of Toronto, Sir John A. Macdonald intimated that the Dominion Government might, during the coming Session, amend the Franchise Act in the generel direction of manhood suffrage."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a mistake.

Mr. CHARLTON. The editorial continues:

"Now we are told that Sir John said nothing of the kind; that he said precisely the other thing—that no step whatever will be taken toward manhood suffrage. We have no means of knowing which of these stories is the correct one; but it is to be hoped that the first report is the true one. It is the habit of Conservatives to say that the Dominion Franchise Act gives the people 'practically manhood suffrage.' We think that is so; but would like to see the 'practical manhood suffrage' divested of the cumbrous, expensive and most unsatisfactory accompaniments of revising barristers and voters' lists, and attendance at courts, and all the time-wasting, costly and bothersome nonsense which the existing regulations make necessary. If the present Act gives 'practical manhood suffrage,' there can be no harm in giving theoretical manhood suffrage as well. If every man can vote under the present rules, no man can vote under any other rules or under no rules whatever. There is no need whatever for voters' lists. A system of registration would be quite sufficient and more effective than any test system that could be devised. The registration would be necessary only on the eve of an election, and could be ordered at the time of the issuing of the election writ. Then all the expensive work involved in making and changing voters' lists would be unnecessary. The Government which gave Canada the present Dominion Franchise Act can give Canada manhood suffrage without stretching its conscience or its conservatism one hair's breadth further, and it is to be hoped that it will do it."

That is a quotation from the Hamilton *Spectator*, as straight a Conservative journal as there is in the Dominion of Canada. I have here an article from the Toronto *Telegram* of the 8th of April last, and the *Telegram* is also a paper which supports my right hon. friend in main, although it professes to be independent. The article is as follows:—

"NEEDLESS AND EXPENSIVE.

"A Committee of the Commons and Senate has been this Session endeavoring to limit the expense connected with legislation at Ottawa. Hon. George Foster has also been devising means with the same end in view, and it is said one of his schemes contemplates a sweeping reduction in all official salaries. If an honest effort is made the sessional expense can be largely reduced. There is no doubt either but that many official salaries could be cut down or abolished altogether without the public interest suffering. But a still greater saving can be effected by the abolition of the Federal Franchise Act. That Act has cost the country half a million dollars, and only one voters' list has yet been issued under it. In Dominion and Scott Act elections, held under its provisions, voters' lists from three to four years old are used. If a new list were issued every year the annual expense would fall little short of $500,000. The Act is entirely unnecessary. The municipal councils furnished more accurate voters' lists than the officials appointed under the Dominion statute possibly can furnish. In fact the latter are compelled to go to the assessment rolls for most of their information. The Dominion Franchise Act gives us a second and altogether unnecessary voters' list, and the abolition of that Act would save a heavy annual expenditure. Abolish it."

Now, Mr. Speaker, these articles from Conservative journals indicate the state of sentiment in the country and it is my belief that at least three-fourths of the voters of Canada who support the right hon. gentleman are tired and disgusted with this Act. I believe, Sir, that there are not ten members of this House, sitting here to-night, who would vote for this Act if they voted on their convictions. But the right hon. gentleman and his followers are something in the condition of the man, of whom Abe Lincoln relates the story, who called for help one day to a passerby on the road; the man was holding a hog by the tail against a tree and he said to the passerby: "Come here and help me." The man said: "What do you want?" and the other replied: "I want you to help me to let go of this hog." That is the trouble with the right hon. gentleman. He has got this hog, or rather this elephant, and his friends would be glad to get rid of it, but the difficulty is to find out how to let go of the animal. I propose to assist my right hon. friend in letting go of this elephant in a limited sense, and it will be a step to getting rid of the elephant altogether. This Franchise Act is entirely useless. There is hardly a member who supports my hon. friends who is not subject to an expense of five or six hundred dollars for the revision of voters' lists in his riding. I know that $500 is less than the actual average cash outlay required by this measure from every member who supports the right hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. It is cruel legislation on his part to submit them to this expenditure.

Mr. RYKERT. Did you pay that?

Mr. CHARLTON. I pay more than that. In my riding, a Reform riding and considered a sure riding, I may tell the gentleman, in confidence, that the legitimate expenses of the Franchise Act in 1886 cost me $750, and it did not cost the hon. gentleman from Lincoln anything less.

Mr. RYKERT. Oh, yes; a great deal less.

Mr. CHARLTON. This is a useless and unnecessary expense, and the fact that it is not a satisfactory measure is fairly and clearly evinced by the delay of the Government in issuing a second list. The operation of this measure was so unsatisfactory, and the expenses were so enormous, that, after the first list was created, they gave us a pause of three years before they made any attempt to give us a second list. The first list cost us $420,000. The Government have already paid for that list $414,000, and there are something over $5,000 in bills yet to be settled. I venture to say that the members of this House paid not less than $150,000 in expenses in connection with the revision of that list, and I venture to say that the public were damaged to the extent of not less than $500,000 in loss of time and in dancing attendance on the courts. We have an expense to the country in connection with that voters' list, directly and indirectly, of about $1,100,000, and that is an expense which must be incurred every time for the purpose of creating a list, inferior in every respect to the list formed by municipal officers for provincial franchise purposes. We have had the character of this Bill debated over and over again and I propose to say only a few words about it to-night. There is not a franchise in any English commonwealth under the sun that has the characteristics that this Bill has. The officer appointed for the purpose of forming these lists in Canada is a Government appointee; he holds his office during the pleasure of the Government, and there is not another commonwealth where the English language is spoken where the revising barrister is an appointee of the Government. The revision of this list is an act performed by the appointee of the Government, whereas in every English colony, and in

England itself, the revision of the voters' list is a legal act performed by an appointee of the courts. In England the lists are formed by municipal officers. The lists are revised by a revising barrister appointed by the courts, and in the forming of the lists and in the revision of the lists the Government can interfere in no way whatever. In all the colonies the lists are formed and revised in substantially the same way. In all the States of the American Union the lists are formed and the registration is made by municipal officers. The revision is made by municipal officers in every State except Oregon, where it is made by county judges, and the expenses in all cases are light and the list is formed just on the eve of the election or within a few days of the time that the people are to go to the polls. In Canada we have been voting in elections and bye elections on a list three years old, and we have a system of making the lists which in no case can cause it to be a list formed about the time that an election is held. With regard to the character of the list and with regard to the character of the qualifications I may say a few words. In the United States after a colonial experience of 150 years, and after an experience under a Confederation Act of ten years following that colonial experience—after all the accumulated experience of this period, the constitutional convention of the United States sat two years to consider the terms of their constitution and the matter of the franchise upon which the President of the United States and the members of Congress were elected was considered for six months, and five distinct plans were considered. The first proposal was that the members of Congress should be elected by the State Legislatures; the second was that the people of the State were to nominate a certain number of candidates and from these nominations the State Legislatures were to select the quota that the State was entitled to; the third plan was that they were to be elected in such a manner as the State Legislatures of the various States would direct; the fourth plan was that there should be a uniform proprietory freehold suffrage throughout the United States fixed by Congress; and the fifth plan was that the qualification for an elector of a United States Congressman should be in every State the qualification which was required for an elector for the most numerous branch of the State Legislature. After six months discussion and thorough consideration of these five distinct plans, the United States Constitutional Convention adopted the last named plan. At this time the franchises in the various States were diverse in their character.

Mr. RYKERT. Yankee all the time.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend from Lincoln says, "Yankee all the time." I can tell him that the experience of a great nation which has grown from 3,000,000 to 60,000,000 inhabitants, which commands the respect and admiration of the world, is an experience worthy of consideration, and that this system, which has been in operation and has worked with satisfaction and without friction for 100 years, is worthy of consideration; and if under democratic institutions the system has worked well in one country, it will work well in another. But gentlemen like the hon. member for Lincoln, no matter what example we may offer, if you only tell them that it comes from the United States, regard that sufficient for its condemnation.

Mr. RYKERT. What about the Wrecking Bill?

Mr. CHARLTON. The experience in the United States in this matter has been a satisfactory one. In 1886, after nearly twenty years' experience under the same system, and without a single request for a change, without a single expression of discontent, without a single desire expressed on the part of anyone in this broad Dominion of Canada, this Parliament threw aside that system, and adopted the system we have in vogue to-day. There was no demand for the change, and there has been no satisfaction with the change since it has been made; it has failed to meet expectations, it has failed to command respect or approval, it is unacceptable in any sense to the people of this Dominion; it is costly and cumbersome; in fact, Sir, it can be justly termed a piece of legislative abortion. Now, I hold that in this Dominion every man is a taxpayer; every man contributes to the revenue of this country, and contributes to a large degree, by the payment of Customs and Excise duties; and I hold that every one who is a British subject, and who has reached the age of manhood, being a taxpayer, ought to be entitled to the right of voting in this country. In Ontario a law has been placed on the Statute book which grants manhood suffrage to that Province. It has been claimed for the Dominion Franchise Act that it gives a suffrage in the various Provinces which is wider than the provincial suffrages, and for that reason it was an Act which ought to commend itself to the approbation of all those Provinces. There was some force in that claim; but now that manhood suffrage prevails in the great Province of Ontario, any Dominion Franchise Act which gives a narrower suffrage will be unsatisfactory to the people of that Province. The unpopularity of the Act will be intensified by this change which has been made in the franchise of Ontario. Now, Sir, inasmuch as this Act, when it was first placed upon the Statute-book, recognised manhood suffrage where it existed, the Government has a precedent which warrants it in going to the extent of providing that any Province may move in the direction of manhood suffrage. I do not say that the Government should introduce manhood suffrage over the whole Dominion; but I do say, under the claim made for this Franchise Act, that it was broad and liberal, and more so than the franchise in vogue in the various Provinces of the Dominion, that this Franchise Act did recognise manhood suffrage wherever it existed in the Provinces at the time it was enacted, and, therefore, the Government can consistently go one step further, and adopt manhood suffrage for the House of Commons in all Provinces where it has been adopted for provincial purposes; and I shall invite the Ontario members of this House to place themselves on record as denying to the Province of Ontario, if they choose to do so, a franchise as broad and liberal in its character for the Dominion House as exists for the Ontario Assembly. Therefore, I move:—

That this Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved: That, in the opinion of this House, inasmuch as the Franchise Act recognised manhood suffrage as it existed in two of the Provinces of this Dominion, at the time of the passage of the Act, therefore, in any Province where manhood suffrage has since been or may hereafter be adopted, the qualification under the Franchise Act shall be the same as under the provincial law of such Province, and the voters' list prepared in such Province for provincial purposes shall be used for Dominion elections.

Thereby saving in those Provinces all the useless expenditures that is now being incurred.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Charlton:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Flynn,	Perry,
Barron,	Gauthier,	Platt,
Beausoleil,	Godbout,	Rinfret,
Bernier,	Hale,	Robertson,
Bourassa,	Holton,	Rowand,
Brien,	Innes,	Ste. Marie,
Burdett,	Jones (Halifax),	Scriver,
Campbell,	Landerkin,	Semple,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Lang,	Smith (Ontario),
Casey,	Laurier,	Sommerville,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Sutherland,
Charlton,	Lovitt,	Trow,
Choquette,	Macdonald (Huron),	Turcot,
Colter,	McIntyre,	Waldie,
Davies,	McMillan (Huron),	Watson,
Doyon,	McMullen,	Weldon (St. John),

Edwards,	Meigs,	Welsh, and
Ellis,	Mills (Bothwell),	Wilson (Elgin).—59.
Fiset,	Neveu,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Welland),	Mara,
Baird,	Foster,	Marshall,
Bell,	Freeman,	Masson,
Bergeron,	Girouard,	Mills (Annapolis),
Boisvert,	Grandbois,	Moffatt,
Bowell,	Guillet,	Montplaisir,
Boyle,	Haggart,	Porter,
Brown,	Hall,	Prior,
Bryson,	Hesson,	Roome,
Burns,	Hickey,	Ross,
Cameron,	Hudspeth,	Rykert,
Cargill,	Jamieson,	Shanly,
Carling,	Jones (Digby),	Skinner,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kenny,	Small,
Cimon,	Labelle,	Sproule,
Cochrane,	Landry,	Taylor,
Cockburn,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Temple,
Colby,	La Rivière,	Thérien,
Costigan,	Laurie,	Thompson (Sir John),
Coughlin,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tupper,
Curran,	McCulla,	Tyrwhitt,
Davin,	McDonald (Victoria),	Wallace,
Davis,	McDougald (Pictou),	Ward,
Denison,	McDougall (C. Breton),	White (Cardwell),
Desjardins,	McKay,	White (Renfrew),
Dewdney,	McKeen,	Wilmot,
Dickey,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Dickinson,	McNeill,	Wilson (Lennox), and
Dupont,	Madill,	Wood (Brockville).—88.
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),		

Amendment negatived,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) By the 10th section of the Franchise Act of 1885, all those who were entitled, under the respective franchises of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, to vote in those Provinces, were entitled to have their names put on the Dominion list; and I propose that the arbitrary date which was inserted in that Act be changed, so as to provide that all those who are entitled to vote in British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, when the lists come to be made up, shall be entitled to have their names put on the lists. It is a ridiculous anomaly to have it provided in the statute that those who become of age before the 10th July, 1885, shall have the right to vote, and that those who come of age after shall not. I propose to substitute the first of June in each year before the lists are made up, so that a large number of our young men will not be excluded. I trust that those who have already voted that the Prince Edward Island young men who have the right to vote under the local franchise, should have the right to vote under the Dominion Franchise, will support this amendment. I beg to move in amendment:

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same by adding the following section: Section 10 of the said Act is hereby repealed and the following substituted:—

"10. In the Provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, respectively, besides the persons entitled to register as voters and to vote under this Act, every person, who, on the 1st of June, of each year, is of the age of 21 years, and is not by this Act disqualified, or by any law of the Dominion disqualified or prevented from voting, and is a British subject by birth or naturalisation, and a resident of the Province, and entitled to vote in the said Province, respectively, by the laws severally in force in the same, shall have the right to be registered as a voter on the voting list, so long as he is properly qualified to vote under the Provisions of the said laws respectively and no longer."

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I strictly object to these amendments intended to grant prerogatives to certain Provinces under the electoral law, that is to say, to the endeavors which are being made in view of giving to certain Provinces advantages or prerogatives which the other Provinces do not enjoy under that law. I consider that allowing a Province to vote under its electoral lists, especially when it has manhood suffrage, is a gross injustice to the only remaining Province under the control of the Dominion Government. Nearly all the Provinces of the Dominion have manhood suffrage except the Province of Quebec. The amendment moved aims at creating a prerogative in favor of Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, prerogatives which would give a right to vote to all men of twenty-one years of age, which, in the Province of Quebec, would have the limited suffrage. Mr. Speaker, should such an amendment be carried, the Province of Quebec would virtually be the only Province of the Dominion governed by the existing electoral system. And in the case of a Government whose majority would run the risk of being defeated in the general elections, that Government, whatever party they should belong to, would be tempted to influence the officers making the electoral lists in the Province of Quebec and would thus commit a partial injustice against the voters of that Province, so that our Province would be in the hands of the governing party in their efforts to get a Ministerial majority, in so far as it would be the only Province under the control of their officers. Mr. Speaker, the whole Dominion must undergo the existing Electoral Act, such as it is, without any amendment; or, if it is intended that the Government should use the local lists for the Federal elections, then the existing Electoral Act must simply be repealed and we must revert to the old system. I am opposed to all these prerogatives which certain parties are seeking to establish for the benefit of a few Provinces against another Province, because the Province of Quebec is the only Province now uncontrolled by manhood suffrage.

Mr. THÉRIEN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, when this Bill was moved in this House the other night, I voted against the Government, and I belonged for one single moment to the third party, that of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). I do not object to the principle of the Bill, but I find its carrying out too expensive. I see now that certain members are expressing views in which I cannot share and are moving amendments which I cannot support. Therefore, I shall vote against these amendments.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Davies (P.E.I.):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Flynn,	Perry,
Barron,	Gauthier,	Platt,
Beausoleil,	Godbout,	Prior,
Bernier,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Brien,	Innes,	Robertson,
Burdett,	Jones (Halifax),	Rowand,
Campbell,	Lang,	Ste. Marie,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Laurier,	Semple,
Casey,	Lister,	Somerville,
Casgrain,	Macdonald (Huron),	Sutherland,
Charlton,	McIntyre,	Trow,
Choquette,	McMillan (Huron),	Turcot,
Colter,	McMullen,	Waldie,
Davies,	Mara,	Watson,
Doyon,	Meigs,	Weldon (St. John),
Edwards,	Mills (Bothwell),	Welsh, and
Ellis,	Neveu,	Wilson (Elgin).—55.
Fiset,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Madill,
Baird,	Freeman,	Marshall,
Bell,	Girouard,	Masson,
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Mills (Annapolis),
Boisvert,	Grandbois,	Moffat,
Bowell,	Guillet,	Montplaisir,
Boyle,	Haggart,	O'Brien,
Brown,	Hall,	Porter,
Bryson,	Hesson,	Roome,
Burns,	Hickey,	Ross,
Cargill,	Hudspeth,	Rykert,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Shanly,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jones (Digby),	Small,
Cimon,	Kenny,	Smith (Ontario),

Cochrane,	Kirkpatrick,	Sproule,
Cockburn,	Labelle,	Taylor,
Colby,	Landry,	Temple,
Costigan,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Thérien,
Coughlin,	La Rivière,	Thompson (Sir John),
Curran,	Laurie,	Tupper,
Davin,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tyrwhitt,
Davis,	McCulla,	Wallace,
Denison,	McDonald (Victoria),	Ward,
Desjardins,	McDougald (Pictou),	White (Cardwell),
Dewdney,	McDougall (C. Breton),	White (Renfrew),
Dickey,	McKay,	Wilmot,
Dickinson,	McKeen,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Dupont,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilson (Lennox), and
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	McNeill,	Wood (Brockville).—88.
Ferguson (Welland),		

Amendment negatived.

Mr. WATSON. I am sure it must be the object of every member of the House to have a fair list prepared, and desire that the least trouble and expense should be incurred by the members of this House. I think there would be a great deal of trouble and expense incurred by taking these lists from the lists of 1885. There will be a great number of income voters who would not be entitled to vote according to that list, and a great deal of trouble will be incurred in getting those and others put off the list. Every member will also understand that a great number of names will remain on the list which should not be there, because it will be impossible to bring reasons before the revising officer in sufficient time to get them off. I do not desire to detain the House, and I, therefore, move:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole in order to amend the same so as to provide that the parliamentary list for the present year shall be made up from the last assessment roll, from the provincial list and records, and from solemn declarations made upon personal knowledge.

I believe that amendment must commend itself to every member of this House, and I think it would be a very fair provision. It would be very unfair to take the last list of the Dominion electors made four years ago as the basis of the next list of voters.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am sure that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will find the present list as inconvenient to them as we shall find it on this side. The lists which are now to be made the basis of the preliminary lists are about four years old. There will be a number of names to be struck off and a number to be added, and it would be much better to use the last assessment roll as the basis. There will be very little difficulty in using the assessment roll, and I think it will be a great convenience to hon. gentlemen opposite as well as to us on this side of the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot understand why gentlemen who are desirous, as I must presume the mover and seconder of this amendment are, to have a full list made, should desire to disregard the best means of obtaining a full list, and that is taking the present list as a basis. We have still a list which contains one half, at the very least, of those who are entitled to be on the new list. This proposal is that we shall disregard that list, and shall set about making an entirely new list from the municipal lists and from declarations. That would result in making the revising barrister disregard some part of the work which has been already done, and which is there at his hand, and would compel everyone who is on that list at present to make a declaration unless he happens to be on the assessment roll. It has been stated, time and again, that the assessment rolls are not made fairly in the interests of both parties. While that suspicion exists, it would not be fair for us to deprive these men of the right they have secured of being on the list, or to send them to make the proof, as would be necessary under this amendment.

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

POST OFFICE ACT.

Mr. HAGGART moved third reading of Bill (No. 93) to amend the Post Office Act.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I move in amendment:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be re-committed to Committee of the Whole for the purpose of providing that the registration fee on letters shall not exceed two cents.

House divided on the amendment:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Fiset,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	Neveu,
Barron,	Flynn,	Paterson (Brant),
Beausoleil,	Gauthier,	Perry,
Bernier,	Godbout,	Platt,
Boisvert,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Brien,	Innes,	Robertson,
Burdett,	Jones (Halifax),	Rowand,
Campbell,	Lang,	Ste. Marie,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Laurier,	Semple,
Casey,	Lépine,	Somerville,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Trow,
Charlton,	Lovitt,	Turcot,
Choquette,	Macdonald (Huron),	Waldie,
Colter,	McIntyre,	Watson,
Davies,	McMillan (Huron),	Weldon (St. John),
Doyon,	McMullen,	White (Renfrew), and
Edwards,	Meigs,	Wilson (Elgin).—55.
Ellis,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Mara,
Baird,	Freeman,	Marshall,
Bell,	Girouard,	Masson,
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Mills (Annapolis),
Bowell,	Grandbois,	Moffat,
Boyle,	Guillet,	Montplaisir,
Brown,	Haggart,	O'Brien,
Bryson,	Hall,	Porter,
Burns,	Hesson,	Prior,
Cargill,	Hickey,	Roome,
Carling,	Hudspeth,	Ross,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jamieson,	Rykert,
Cimon,	Jones (Digby),	Shanly,
Cochrane,	Kenny,	Small,
Cockburn,	Kirkpatrick,	Smith (Ontario),
Colby,	Landry,	Sproule,
Costigan,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Taylor,
Coughlin,	La Rivière,	Temple,
Curran,	Laurie,	Thérien,
Davin,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Thompson (Sir John),
Davis,	McCulla,	Tupper,
Denison,	McDonald (Victoria),	Tyrwhitt,
Desjardins,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wallace,
Dewdney,	McDougall (C. Breton),	White (Cardwell),
Dickey,	McKay,	Wilmot,
Dickinson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Dupont,	McNeill,	Wilson (Lennox), and
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Madill,	Wood (Brockville),—85.
Ferguson (Welland),		

Amendment negatived.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Postmaster General the other night, in the course of his observations, informed the House that he expected to derive $140,000 to $150,000 increase in the revenue from post offices by doubling the rate on drop letters.

Mr. HAGGART. From registration and drop letters both.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Then I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. However, be that as it may, the increase derivable from drop letters in cities where they are delivered free, will be a very important item, and in my judgment it will bear very unfairly on the business community. In the first place, I think that the hon. gentleman will be disappointed in realising the amount which he expects under the change, because, as was pointed out the other night, I feel quite certain that instead of dropping letters into the post office at one cent, as has been the custom heretofore,

under the operation of this Act, parties will hire persons to send them around. I looked over the Postmaster General's return to see how it would affect some of the cities where free delivery is provided. I took the Halifax post office first, which has a revenue of $50,310, against an expenditure of $31,837, leaving an apparent surplus in the Halifax post office of $18,473. The drop letters, according to the Postmaster General's return are 6,731 per week, or 350,000 per year, which, at one cent, would make $3,500. The letter carriers in Halifax cost $3,000; so that under the present arrangement the drop letters pay very nearly one-half the amount which is required to pay for delivering the whole matter in the city of Halifax. Independently of the drop letters which I have already mentioned, there are 1,191,000 letters and newspapers which these letter carriers have to deliver, as well as the drop letters which I have already mentioned From that I think it will be seen that it would be very unfair to put the whole expense of the letter carriers on the drop letters, when, as I have already observed, they have to deliver 1,191,000 letters besides Then I will take the city of Montreal, where the expenses are $246,811, against receipts of $112,985, showing an apparent surplus between expenses and receipts of $133,826. The city delivery of drop letters, by returns, amounts to 52,624 per week, making 2,736,448 per anum, which yields a return on the present basis of $27,364, against the cost of the letter carriers of $40,000. But when it is taken into account that the letter carriers in Montreal have to deliver 5,747,000 letters and papers besides drop letters, I am sure it will appear that that portion of the service should contribute a certain portion towards the expenses of the letter carriers. I next take Toronto, where the receipts are $287,478 as against expenses of $101,324, showing a gain of $186,154. The drop letters, according to the Postmaster General's return, were 91,437 per week, which would amount to 4,756,596 a year, which, at one cent, would yield a revenue of $47,565. In Toronto the total cost of the letter carriers is $38,333, showing a gain of $9,232 between the drop letters alone and what it costs for the whole expense of letter carriers to deliver all the business letters in Toronto. And when I mention that the general delivery in Toronto of letters and papers, besides drop letters, amounts to 11,597,612, which are delivered by these letter carriers, I think it will show that the city has already contributed a very large amount towards the general expenses of the Post Office Department I might, were it not so late, go over the return of the Postmaster General and give evidences from other cities of the Dominionto show that they are all contributing largely and paying expenses in the delivery of drop letters; but I think I have given enough to show to the House that in those cities which I have mentioned, and notably in Toronto, there is a gain of over $9,000 between drop letters, which yield over $47,000, and the expense of the letter carriers to deliver the whole mail of the city of Toronto, $38,000. I think if the hon. Minister has analysed the whole delivery of the cities which are provided with free delivery, he will arrive at the conclusion that they already pay a very fair and reasonable proportion of the expenses of the Post Office Department. I do not know whether it is too late for the hon. gentleman to change his mind on that subject; however, I propose to invite the House, by resolution, to pass their opinion on that point. Therefore, I move:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend clause 21 of said Act by omitting all words in the 5th line after the words, "such letter."

That section provides that in cities where there is a free delivery, the rate shall be two cents; by the adoption of this, it would provide that drop letters should be one cent.

Mr. HAGGART. You must remember, in the first place, the state of the Post Office Department, and the amount it draws upon the consolidated revenue of the country. Our deficit last year was $782,000; to that has to be added $214,000, the cost of management at headquarters, or $996,000. To that has to be added, as you will see by the Supplementary Estimates of last year, a vote of $63,000 for the Canadian Pacific Railway, which leaves the Post Office drawing on the general revenue of the country to the extent of $1,259,000. Now, how does the change I propose affect the revenue? The total receipts from city drop letters is $100,000. I do not think the change would make a difference of more than $40,000 or $50,000. I have had a general statement prepared to show how the city post offices pay. I find that the total revenue above receipts is about $400,000. From that is to be deducted a share for transportation and mail subsidies, and the share of the payment on behalf of railway communication through the country, which will leave a large deficit to be made up by the city post offices alone. Is it fair to the rest of the community who are not sending letters that $1,000,000 should be taken out of their pockets for the purpose of accommodating people throughout the country who send letters? The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) forgets that I have increased the weight that may be sent for three cents from half an ounce to an ounce; that the accommodation costs the country 6 per cent. on $1,800,000. I propose that in cities where there are deliveries by carriers the rate shall be two cents, and that it shall remain as at present in other places. I also propose a better system of transportation of registered letters, and to effect these two changes I ask between $20,000 and $30,000 to make up the deficiency. If we are to have the efficiency of the department increased we must accommodate ourselves to slightly higher charges. The rates which I propose to be charged on drop letters is similar to that in operation in the United States and is not half that of Great Britain, which has the cheapest postal rate in the world. It is very easy for hon. gentlemen to make themselves popular by asking for reductions of rates, but they must remember they are placing a tax on people who do not send letters, that one cent in cities does not pay for delivery, and it is impossible to make it pay at that rate. I am merely distributing the burden as equitably as possible, and not increasing the rate by more than a very small percentage.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the Postmaster General has adopted a change which will commend itself to the attention of the people of the country. In cities where letters are delivered and where there are post offices every few yards, it is not too much that a little additional burden should be placed on the citizens. When we consider, moreover, that a very large number of people never write letters in the country districts and that those who do have to travel some distance to post them, it is entirely unreasonable to hold that those should pay a large share of the burden of maintaining the service. The proposition at first introduced of making drop letters 2 cents all over the country was not in my opinion a fair one, because in the country where the people are obliged to travel sometimes 5, 6 or 8 miles for a letter they have done a great deal towards paying for the cost when they reach the post office, but in cities where the letters are brought to the doors the people should pay something additional. It is quite evident there is a deficit in the Post Office Department, and if it must be made up I do not see any way in which it can be done more equitably than by the plan proposed by the Postmaster General. He should, however, go further, and, no doubt, the country would have sustained him in his action, had he imposed a charge of half a cent a pound on all newspapers and periodicals, daily, weekly or semi-weekly, passing through the post offices, because we shall be obliged to come to that in the end as the deficits are regularly increasing.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. WATSON moved in amendment:

That the Speaker do not leave the Chair, but that the Bill be again referred to Committee of the Whole to provide that the fee for registration for tax or assessment notices mailed by the clerk shall not exceed two cents.

He said: This amendment is necessary in the interests of Manitoba. Under the Municipal Act is it necessary to register all municipal tax notices, and if this Bill were adopted without the amendment a heavy burthen would be cast upon the municipalities. These notices have no particular value, and there is no risk in carrying them by mail, but in order to insure delivery they require registration, and the fee should not be more then two cents.

Amendment negatived on a division, and Bill read the third time and passed.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:50 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 16th April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OCEAN MAIL SUBSIDIES.

Mr. LAURIER. I see that the Government have given notice of a resolution to be introduced to-morrow in connection with mail subsidies. I suppose the hon. gentleman will submit to the House the correspondence connected with that subject—the tenders, specifications, &c.

Mr. FOSTER. Full explanations will be given upon moving the resolution, so far as they can be given. With reference to the papers, I think it will be found that most of them are in such a condition, the negotiations are in such a condition, that it would be impossible to bring them down. If there are any papers which can be brought down, they will be laid on the Table.

Mr. LAURIER. If the Government now ask the House to pronounce upon the subject, the correspondence must be closed, and there can be no reason why the papers should not be brought down. I must say that we expect them to be brought down. The Government are very dilatory in bringing down papers. They often promise, and do not bring them down at all. Some time ago, when we had before the House an item in the Estimates concerning the construction of the Cape Breton Railway, the Government promised to bring down all the papers in connection with the construction of the bridge. The First Minister stated positively that the papers would be here on Tuesday last, and we have not got them yet.

Mr. FOSTER. Those papers are now ready and will be down to-day, or to-morrow at the latest.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 115) to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. LAURIER. The Government stated yesterday they would go into Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a Bill of which I gave notice the other night, and I wish to have it transferred from Public Bills and Orders to Government Orders, and to have it read the second time and sent to the Railway Committee. The Bill has something to do with enabling municipalities to lay drains under certain railways.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the hon. gentleman should let this item stand, as I do not think anybody has yet seen the Bill.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The intention of this Bill is to simplify the mode of crossing railway lines with drains, both municipal and private, authorised by a municipality. Perhaps it would be better for me to read some of the clauses of the Bill. As the law stands at present, all these matters have to be referred to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council for decision, but this Bill provides that:

"Notwithstanding anything in section fourteen of The Railway Act, it shall be the duty of every railway company under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada, and without any such contribution as is hereinafter referred to, to maintain and keep in repair all necessary drains, ditches, and water-courses in existence at the passing of this Act, in and for lands belonging to or held by such company."

That has reference only to the land held by the company. The next clause has reference to the case where a municipal council has decided, either on their own motion or on the application of any person, that it is necessary to carry a drain across the track of a railway company. It provides as follows:—

"Whenever the municipal council of any county, township, parish, or other municipality in Canada, either of its own motion or on the application of any inhabitant thereof, determines that it is necessary to construct a drain or ditch, for the purpose of draining lands in the municipality, across the lands and railway of any railway company, such drain or ditch shall, subject to the conditions hereinafter provided, be made and maintained across the line of such railway and lands, and on equitable terms to be settled as hereinafter provided."

The next clause provides that:

"Such council, hereinafter referred to as the applicant, may serve upon the company, by leaving the same with any agent or other officer in charge of the nearest station, a notice in writing of such decision, together with a description of the lands outside the railway to be benefitted by the proposed drainage, which notice shall be accompanied by plans and specifications, prepared and certified by a civil engineer or Dominion or provincial land surveyor, of that part or portion of the drain or ditch to be constructed across the company's lands and railway, and with an estimate, also so prepared and certified, of the cost of constructing the said drain or ditch across its property, and if the estimated cost of such construction does not exceed the sum of eight hundred dollars, the railway company shall, after the expiration of a reasonable time, construct that part or portion of the said drain or ditch across its lands and railway of the same size and dimensions as are specified on the plans and specifications furnished as aforesaid, unless it disputes in the manner hereinafter mentioned the propriety of the proposed work, or the correctness of such notice, plan, specification or estimate, in which case the dispute shall be enquired into and finally determined in the manner hereinafter provided."

This clause provides that, upon the application referred to by the municipality, the railway company shall be obliged to construct that portion of a drain which crosses their lands, provided it does not cost more than $800, and that, if they deem it unnecessary that the drain should be constructed across their lands, the matter shall be referred to another tribunal than the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. The Bill goes on to provide:

"If neither the applicant nor the company give notice of dispute as in the next section of this Act provided for, and if the company and the applicant do not agree as to whether the railway is to be benefitted by the proposed drainage, or, if benefitted, as to what contribution the applicant should pay towards the construction of the work, and if the whole cost of construction does not exceed the sum of $800, as estimated by a civil engineer or Dominion or provincial land surveyor as aforesaid, then the applicant may tender the railway company the sum that the applicant thinks is fair and just as its portion of the said cost of construction, and may offer to bear afterwards such proportion of the maintenance as it may think just and fair, and if the railway company does not accept the amount so tendered, or if it disputes that the offer is for the proper proportion of future maintenance, then the proportion of the cost of construction and maintenance, or of either as the case may be,

that each shall pay or bear, or the question whether it shall be borne altogether by the applicant, shall be decided by arbitration, and any amount or amounts awarded by the arbitrator or arbitrators to be paid to the railway company in respect of such construction or maintenance, shall from time to time be collectable from the applicant as a judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction for the amount or amounts so awarded to the company, or if the award determines upon the proportion of the cost of construction or maintenance payable by the applicant, without mentioning the amount, then such proportion shall be recoverable before any court of competent jurisdiction."

The fifth clause refers to the manner in which disputes are to be decided. It says :

"If any dispute, other than concerning the respective proportions of contribution which are to be settled by arbitration as aforesaid, shall arise between the applicant and the company, either in regard to the safety or suitability of the place designated for the work or the sufficiency or correctness of any plans, specifications or estimate, or the propriety of the proposed work, or the manner in which the same is to be maintained."

Then these matters are to be referred to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, but the other matters are to be determined by another tribunal, that is, by arbitration. The whole tenor of this Bill is that drains costing not more than a certain sum shall be constructed by a railway company across their lands, if it be deemed by the municipality in which those lands are situated, necessary, either for private or public purposes, that such drains should be constructed ; and if any dispute arises as to the proportion of the cost and maintenance to be borne by the railway company and the applicants, this Bill provides that the dispute shall be settled, not by the Committee of the Privy Council, but by arbitration, and it provides the mode by which those arbitrators are to be appointed. Then the sixth clause says that :

"Every railway company shall be subject to all general municipal regulations, not inconsistent with this Act, respecting the maintenance and repair of drains, ditches and water-courses in any county, parish, township, or other municipality in Canada through which the railway passes, unless exempted therefrom by the special Act of incorporation; Provided always, that nothing herein contained shall authorise any municipality by any rule or regulation to compel the use of the drains of the railway company for the purposes of general drainage other than is authorized by law."

I understand, from the promoter of this Bill, which originated in the Senate, and was there under the charge of Mr. McCallum, that difficulties had arisen under the Municipal Drainage Act in the Province of Ontario in cases where it was necessary to carry a public drain, or a private drain, across a railway track which was under the control and authority of the Local Legislature of that Province. This Bill is intended to provide a means by which these drains can be carried across the track, and that the railway company may be required to construct them and to bear the cost of the construction and maintenance without a reference to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have no doubt that this Bill will receive due attention at the hands of the Minister of Justice. I am totally at a loss to understand on what ground the promoters of the Bill should come here for the purpose of obtaining legislation. It is quite true that the hon. gentleman says that this Bill deals with railways incorporated by the Parliament of Canada, and not with those incorporated by the Province. I do not see how that can affect the jurisdiction of the Province in its municipal legislation. A railway incorporated by this Dominion is an artificial person. When it possesses land in the Province, the lands possessed by it do not differ from those held by any other proprietor. A railway company stands in the same position and is as much subject to the control of the general legislation of the Province as any other proprietor would be. If we choose to incorporate a railway company, and, in building up a grade, the company obstructs a water-course, and the result is that the water overflows the lands belonging to a municipality or to any private party, it could not be seriously argued that the Province would not have the same powers to authorise the municipality to compel the abatement of that nuisance or the proper drainage of the lands, and the proportionate contribution by the railway company, as it would have in the case of any other proprietor. There can be no possible difference. The fact that we create a corporation has nothing to do with the subject-matter upon which the hon. gentleman proposes to legislate. The moment we create that corporation and it goes into a Province and undertakes to possess itself of lands, it possesses those lands subject to the control of the Province precisely the same as if the corporation had been created by the Legislature of the Province. There can be no difference in that respect. The power to provide for the draining of lands, the question of property and civil rights, extend to property held by a railway and to the civil rights possessed by that railway in common with other proprietors, just the same as if that power were created by the Provincial Government. There can be no possible difference in this respect, and it does seem to me extraordinary that the promoters of this Bill should come to this House and seek legislation upon a subject where Local Legislatures have ample powers to grant the necessary relief to the municipalities for the removal of the grievance complained of.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose that coming events cast their shadows before them, and when we see the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) taking charge of a Bill introduced by the Government, it is an indication of an event which would be to the credit of the hon. gentleman. I congratulate him in advance upon the diligence that he exhibits in view of his expected promotion. In relation to the Bill itself, I must say that I regret that it is being brought forward at this moment, more especially in view of the constitutional objection which has been raised by my hon. friend, and which ought to receive more discussion than it can receive now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We were informed last night, I think by the First Minister, that Supply was to be the first order of the day, and now we find a measure brought in which, if discussed at all, may occupy a considerable time, inasmuch as my hon. friend has raised a constitutional question of some importance. So far as I could follow the hon. gentleman who seems to have it in charge, the provisions of the Bill are not quite so simple as might appear. I think that when an understanding is come to between the two sides of the House that you will proceed with a particular order, that understanding should be adhered to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It certainly was understood that we should go into Supply, and that is our intention. The reason why the Minister of Finance moved this now was in order that it may be sent to the Railway Committee. If it be a desirable Bill in itself—I believe it is wanted very much by the municipalities—I think my hon. friend will allow it to be read the second time now, and when it comes back we can discuss the constitutional point, and in the meantime go into Committee of Supply. No constitutional objection was raised in the other branch of the Legislature. If my hon. friend will allow it to go to committee now, we can discuss that point when the Bill comes back.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We have not seen the Bill at all.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The Bill has been before the House for three weeks.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has been printed for a long time. The committees will soon close, I hope, and I think my hon. friend had better allow the Bill to go to a com-

mittee at once. It can do no harm. When it comes back we will discuss whether we have a right to pass it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Had we not better settle that question now?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the progress of business my hon. friend had better let it go.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). We are affirming the principle of the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a matter of everyday parliamentary practice, both here and in England, for the expedition of business, that a Bill gets its second reading in order to go to a committee, with the understanding that it is for that purpose only, and in no way involves the principle of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

LABOR COMMISSION REPORT.

Mr. BOWELL laid upon the Table the report of the Royal Labor Commission on the relations of labor and capital in Canada, together with the evidence taken before the said commission.

Mr. MITCHELL. How many copies of that will be distributed for the information of our constituents?

Mr. BOWELL. There will be one copy distributed for each member, and if there is a sufficient number left, that can be duplicated if necessary.

GOOD FRIDAY—ADJOURNMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was our intention that when the House adjourned on Thursday night it should stand adjourned until Saturday, and then sit again on Monday. But there has been considerable pressure, if I may use the word, from both sides, that when we adjourn on Thursday, we should stand adjourned until the Monday following.

Mr. MITCHELL. For once I entirely agree with the hon. gentleman, and I would be happy to support him in this matter. I only regret—and I say this in all sincerity—that I cannot always support him as sincerely in many of the motions he brings forward. I think it is only reasonable that we should not sit on Saturday. We have never done so yet, and there is no reason why we should do so now. The Government requires a day for the consideration of their important measures, and some of us would like to get home for a short visit.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think that some consideration ought to be shown to those members of this House who have been here since the first day of the Session, and who are anxious to get home as soon as possible. The practical result of adjourning over Saturday till Monday will be that very little work will be done on Monday. Many hon. members will not be back until late on that day. The Maritime Provinces members ought to receive some consideration in this respect, inasmuch as we are not able to go home at Easter, and we are anxious to keep on with the work until it is completed. That would keep us dangling about Ottawa for two or three days more. I do not think the proposition is a fair one.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I quite agree with the views expressed by the hon. member to my right (Mr. Davies). Perhaps on Thursday the hon. gentleman may see how near we may be reaching the end of the Session, and in that event it might be very inconvenient to adjourn over Saturday. I certainly think we should meet on Saturday. I must confess I have never seen the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) so anxious that the Government should have proper time for deliberation since the Session began.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to justify myself. I think I showed just as much desire to support the Administration on a very important measure, in which the hon. gentleman aided me. I refer to the Jesuits' Bill.

Mr. FLYNN. I regret very much that the leader of the Government has not adhered to the notice he gave the other day, that the House should sit on Saturday and not sit on Friday. No doubt some pressure has been brought to bear on the right hon. gentleman with a view to induce him to adjourn till Monday. As the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), has said, I think any change will be very unfair to us particularly, as many hon. members have had the opportunity of frequently returning home, and have, in fact, gone almost every Friday and returned on Monday. If the suggestion should be adopted we would have to remain another week. I think the members from the Lower Provinces have a right to expect that the original announcement should be adhered to, and I trust that will be the determination of the right hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not expressed any opinion on the point. I have merely stated to the House that a considerable number of members, including members of both sides of the House, had communicated to me that they desired an adjournment from Thursday to Monday, and I mentioned it in order to ascertain the feeling of the majority. I will not ask a division on the proposition just now, but I will adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and on Thursday, after due consideration, I will ask the opinion of the House upon it.

Mr. BLAKE. The division is geographical on this occasion.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

Mr. BERGERON. I desire to communicate to the House a telegram which I received last night, and which reads as follows:—

"Beauharnois Canal will be ready to-morrow. Steamer *Anderson* came from Coteau to-night into canal.

"J. F. BÉIQUE,
"*Superintendent.*"

This is the first canal of the St. Lawrence system open to navigation to-day, and I hope the Government and the engineer who may be called upon to decide the question as to whether to enlarge or deepen the canal, or build a canal on the north shore, will take this fact into consideration, as I understand that if built on the north side it could not have been open for a fortnight later.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government will give it due consideration; but perhaps the hon. gentleman may run for a constituency on the north shore next time.

SUPPLY—CUSTOMS SEIZURES.

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

Mr. HOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I regret very sincerely that this important question to which I am now about to invite the attention of this House was not reached at an earlier period of the Session; but that it was not, is not my fault. As is generally known, a resolution relating to Customs reform was placed by me on an early day of the Session upon the Order Paper, and it was only dropped quite recently, when it became evident that an opportunity for its consideration would not occur if it were allowed to remain there. Had that resolution been reached, it was my intention to have presented a very full case to the House, illustrating the numerous points of objection or complaint against the

present Customs system by reference to actual cases as well as to the utterances and opinions of leading newspapers and prominent merchants throughout the country; but on this occasion, and under existing circumstances, I shall limit myself, as far as possible, to a specification of some of the points of objection. I will be brief therefore, and I trust I may rely upon hon. members to accord me a patient hearing. Whenever reference is made in this House, by way of complaint, to existing Customs laws and regulations, we invariably have from the Government, in reply, the general statement that these laws are just what they should be, and that the public interest does not demand, nor the public itself desire, their amendment, or something to that effect, and there we are supposed to let the case rest. Only a few weeks since, during the first debate of the Session, the hon. Premier stated, in effect, that these laws, though severe, were necessarily so in the interest of our great National Policy, that they are a protection rather than an oppression to the honest importer, that the smuggler alone has reason to dread their operation, and that no complaints regarding them had been made to the Government. This, then, must be accepted as the position of the Government upon this important question, and stated, though it has been by such a high authority, yet in the discussion of the resolution which I shall place in your hands, Mr. Speaker, I must differ from all these propositions. My contention is, and I shall endeavor to make it good, that the existing Customs laws and regulations, as well as the methods which are resorted to by the department for their enforcement, are unnecessarily harsh and unjust, and that whilst not dealing in the most effective manner with offences and offenders against the revenue, they do press unduly and unfairly on the honest importer.

ROYAL ASSENT.

A Message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

MR. SPEAKER,—

His Honor, Mr. Justice Strong, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of your Honorable House in the Chamber of the Honorable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

And having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Deputy Governor had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act respecting the St. Lawrence and Atlantic Junction Railway Company.

An Act further to amend the Act incorporating the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company.

An Act to incorporate the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Bay of Quinté Bridge Company.

An Act respecting the Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.

An Act to ratify an Exchange of Land between the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company and the Land Security Company.

An Act respecting the incorporation of the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Ontario Mutual Life Assurance Company.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Prescott County Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to "The Central Counties Railway Company."

An Act to incorporate the Canadian General Trusts Company.

An Act to consolidate the borrowing powers of the Ontario Loan and Debenture Company, and to authorise them to issue Debenture stock.

An Act to incorporate the Canada Congregational Foreign Missionary Society.

An Act to amend the Act respecting Queen's College at Kingston.

An Act to amend the Charter of incorporation of the Great North-West Central Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Quebec Board of Trade.

An Act respecting the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company.

An Act to amend the law respecting the Exchequer Court of Canada.

An Act further to amend the Act thirty-sixth Victoria, chapter sixty-one, respecting the Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal.

An Act to amend chapter thirteen of the Revised Statutes, intituled: "An Act respecting the House of Commons."

An Act respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company and the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and North Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to revive and amend the Acts relating to the Saint Gabriel Levee and Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Ontario, Manitoba and Western Railway Company.

An Act to enable the City of Winnipeg to utilise the Assiniboine River water power.

An Act to incorporate the Three Rivers and Western Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Dominion Mineral Company.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Superphosphate Company.

An Act to amend chapter eleven of the Revised Statutes, intituled: "An Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons."

An Act to amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships, chapter seventy-three of the Revised Statutes.

An Act respecting Rules of Court in relation to Criminal Matters.

An Act respecting the Alberta and Athabasca Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to "The North-Western Railway Company of Canada."

An Act to incorporate the Assiniboine Water Power Company

An Act further to amend "The Civil Service Act," chapter seventeen of the Revised Statutes.

An Act to amend "The Winding-up Act," chapter one hundred and twenty-nine of the Revised Statutes.

An Act further to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act.

An Act respecting the collection of certain Tolls and Dues therein mentioned.

An Act to incorporate the Title and Mortgage Guarantee Company of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Assets and Debenture Company of Canada.

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Massawippi Junction Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.

An Act to incorporate the Moose Jaw and Edmonton Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.

An Act to provide for the conveyance of certain Lands to British Columbia.

An Act in reference to the Western Counties Railway.

An Act further to amend "The Steamboat Inspection Act," chapter seventy-eight of the Revised Statutes.

An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to make further provision respecting the speedy trial of certain Indictable Offences.

Mr. HOLTON. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, when His Excellency's Message arrived, that my contention—and I will endeavor to prove it—is, that the Customs laws and regulations, as well as the methods which are resorted to by the department for their enforcement, are unnecessarily harsh, and unjust; that, whilst not dealing in the most effective way with offences and offenders against the revenue, they do press unduly and unfairly upon the importer, and that complaints, loud and long, have been made, and are to day being made against the system. It may be true, as the Minister has stated, that Boards of Trade have not made representations to the Government, and that citizens have not petitioned on the subject, but they probably learned a long time since the utter uselessness of any such proceeding on their part. At the same time, it is true that Boards of Trade have discussed the question, that they have debated and adopted resolutions demanding Customs reform, that the press of the country, regardless of political bias, has for years been denouncing the present system, and the outrages committed under it in unmeasured terms, and that, in a recent important case tried in the highest court in the land, the system of which we now complain has been exposed and denounced. Surely the Government cannot plead ignorance of these things, nor can it forget the haste with which the Minister of Customs was despatched to Montreal, upon the eve of the last general election, to consult with and to appease the mercantile body of that city. On that occasion the Minister had conferences with the council

of the Board of Trade, and with prominent merchants; he asked for and obtained suggestions in the direction of desired reform, and promised that, in the event of the Government being sustained at the polls, an adequate measure of reform would at the next Session be introduced by him and carried through Parliament. The Conservative candidates for the city of Montreal taking their cue, doubtless, from the Minister, adopted Customs reform as a plank in their platform, and upon their pledges in that direction they probably secured their return to this House. I say this knowingly, for the merchants of the city were thoroughly aroused at that time by recent revelations and scandals, and I doubt very much if without such pledges the hon. members for Montreal West (Sir Donald A. Smith) and Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) would have been elected. Well, the Government was sustained at the polls, but during the Session following the hon. the Minister of Customs proposed to Parliament no measure in fulfilment of his promises to the merchants of the country. Last Session, however, the Customs Act was thoroughly revised, but in no sense reformed; in fact, in many important particulars its provisions were made more severe and onerous, and to-day we have on our Statute-book a more one-sided, harsh and tyrannical Customs enactment than is to be found in any civilised country on the face of the globe. The law itself, together with the departmental regulations for its interpretation and enforcement constitute a system which is simply barbarous, and the only wonder is, that a free, self-governing people as Canadians pretend to be, should so long and so meekly submit to it. Gentlemen on the Treasury benches have for years resented with scorn any proposition looking towards extended trade relations with our neighbors to the south, they, in their professions are to be believed, do not want anything from the United States, but it was to that country they went for their unfortunate tariff system, as also for their present un-British Customs laws and methods, picking up the latter, however, only after they had been discarded by the American Government as an affront to the moral sense of the people. The Minister of Customs has many times asserted in this House, and, no doubt, we shall have a repetition from him of the statement on this occasion, that, under the interpretation and application of the present Customs laws and regulations, the honest merchant is amply protected and has nothing to fear. But my opinion, deliberately expressed, is that for every smuggler or actual offender against the revenue who is detected and dealt with, two honest men, if not more, fall into the traps and snares which the law and its agents deliberately set for them, and, though guilty of no improper intent, they are punished by fine and forfeiture, and by the still more severe penalty of having their names tarnished and themselves branded as smugglers. I say, Sir, that, under these laws, the honest importer has no chance whatever; his word, his invoice, his oath, his life-long reputation for integrity and fair dealing with his neighbor and with the Government all count for nothing when a charge of undervaluation is brought against him, even though his accusers are men who have plunder in view rather than the interests of the public service. Further, Sir, when the honest merchant, while acting in perfect good faith, and without the remotest desire to defraud the revenue of a single cent, has, unfortunately, got into one of these traps, he has not even the chance that is accorded to the rogue taken red-handed in his fraudulent practices, for while in the former case every dollar that can be squeezed out of the unfortunate is taken, in the case of the actual smuggler there is too frequently a compromise or quiet settlement. As I have already intimated, some of the points to which I desired to direct the attention of the House have been carefully considered and pronounced upon by the Supreme Court of Canada, and I cannot do better, therefore, than give some extracts from the exhaustive judgment of the Chief Justice in deciding the famous Ayer case. In rendering that judgment he said:

"I feel it the bounden duty of this court to investigate the matters connected with this case with the greatest possible care to ascertain if it can be possible, in the face of the action of the Customs authorities, and of a fair construction of the revenue laws applicable to this case, that mercantile and business men in the Dominion stand in such jeopardy, as they would be in if the contentions of the Crown can be sustained. If the law is so, I must so administer it, but before I can or will declare such to be the law, I must be satisfied beyond any doubt that such is the law. I am bound to say it is not easy to understand how honest business men desirous of making honest importations and carrying on business in this Dominion, could do more than it appears was done in this case, namely, to apply to the Customs officers to ascertain on what terms, and at what rate of duty the proposed goods could be imported into the country. * * *

"Nor can I conceive what honest and cautious Customs officials could do more than was done in this case, in reply to such an application, viz.: to state that when imported goods would be duly examined by the Customs authorities, and the correct rate of duty would be fixed.

"It would appear that when the goods were imported they were examined, samples taken and transmitted to the board of appraisers at Montreal and at Ottawa, the duty fixed, and the business commenced, and was continued thenceforward for a period of twenty odd years, until the seizure; that, too, without the slightest complaint of any irregularity, undervaluation or misdescription. * * *

"And no difficulties made until 1885, when Underhill, having been discharged by Ayer for alleged misconduct, came to Montreal, and combining with O'Hara and Brousseau, they appear to have concocted this scheme, to procure the confiscation of all the goods entered from 1882 to 1885 inclusive, and the forfeitures thereon, amounting to $385,313, from which they doubtless anticipated the realisation of enormous gains. These two officers appear, by the evidence of the Commissioner of Customs, to have acted on their own responsibility in making these seizures, and in their own interests, and undertook, with the assistance of the discreditable witnesses, Underhill and Flint, and for their joint pecuniary benefit, to cause this large amount of property to be seized, and which they now seek to have condemned, and enormous forfeitures adjudged against this unfortunate firm, who, from the start of their business in 1862 up to its close in 1884, so far as I can gather from the evidence, appear to have dealt with the Customs Department and acted throughout in an open, fair and business manner, without concealment or fraud.

"Notwithstanding this conduct on the part of the Ayers, and this action on the part of the Customs officials, which, in my mind, should exculpate them, if not legally, certainly, morally, from any imputation of fraud—they are now specifically charged with the disgraceful offence of smuggling. The conduct of O'Hara in thus conniving at the concealment of the books, and setting at defiance the order of the judge, the aiding of a witness to keep out of the way of the service of a subpœna by the claimants, the false suggestion of O'Hara—and as to this false suggestion, when asked if it was not made to deceive, he says: 'I suggested that, because the witness did not wish to come into court until called by the Crown, and I did not wish to afford any information to the other side' and the downright untruths admitted by Brousseau himself, the conduct of Brousseau in trafficking, or endeavoring to traffic in the proceeds, which he had evidently made up his mind he and Underhill, beyond all peradventure, were to make out of this seizure, and the equivocating and discreditable manner in which both of these officers gave their testimony,—all, in my opinion, open to the gravest censure.

"I regret, in the interests of justice and of the business community of the Dominion, who may have controversies with the Customs officials, to be compelled to make these observations in reference to persons holding responsible positions in the Customs Department at Montreal, whose duty it most certainly was to have obeyed the order of the Supreme Court instead of setting it at defiance, and if not to have aided, certainly not to have thrown obstacles, by false suggestions and false statements, with a view of preventing the service of subpœnas on witnesses the claimants desired to examine, and with reference to the conduct of these witnesses, considering the peculiar position in which they stood, it should have been marked with the greatest propriety, and with the same desire and disposition to answer all questions, as well those on the part of claimants as those on the part of the Crown, with fairness, truthfulness and honesty, which I regret to say was far from being the case. In other words, to have acted as public officers in the discharge of public duty—desirous only that justice should be done alike to the Crown and the claimants. Surely the public having controversies with the Customs are entitled to this measure of justice, and certainly that Customs officers should not act, as their conduct in this case would seem to indicate, viz., as partisans having a deep pecuniary interest in the result and with an apparent determination to effect at all hazards a condemnation."

The judgment closed in these words:

"The Crown, therefore, has failed to establish the charges in the information against the Ayer Company that the goods seized were illegally imported, or that they were undervalued, or that the entries did not correspond with the invoices, and that the oaths or affirmations made in entering them were untrue; and there being, therefore, no foundation for the seizure of the said goods, I order and adjudge that they be forthwith restored to the claimants, and the information *in rem* dismissed with costs.

"And the charges of undervaluation not being sustained, it follows that there were no goods illegally imported into Canada, and no unpaid duties for which the claimants are liable, and the information *in personam*, must also be dismissed with costs."

The costs payable by the Government under this judgment were considerably in excess of its share of the fines and forfeitures imposed last year for real or alleged breaches of the revenue laws. The Auditor General's Report of last year gave us a total of $98,360.75 of fines and forfeitures, of which $93,068.90 were paid to seizure officers, and on account of the expenses of seizures, leaving a balance to the public revenue of $5,291.85. So that I think I am safe in asserting that the costs which the Government will have to pay, or have paid, exceed by a considerable amount its share of the fines and forfeitures of last year. If time permitted, I would also refer to the Grinnell case, in which, as is probably known, large quantities of goods were seized for undervalution and improper entry, and all the penalties known to the law were sought to be imposed, to the great profit, of course, of certain officials. It was recently decided in this case, however, by the full bench of the Supreme Court, that the importer had acted throughout with the most perfect honesty, and that there was not even probable cause for suspecting the reverse. The court, therefore, dismissed the claims with full costs, and, in so doing, reflected very severely on the treatment meted out to honest importers by the Customs Department. These judgments, however, do not cover the whole question under consideration, and I will, therefore, point out, with all possible brevity, wherein the existing Customs laws and regulations are chiefly found to be oppressive to the importer, while not protecting honest trade and the revenue in the most effective manner. To begin with, we have a Customs Act wholly based on the assumption that every importer is a knave. Such a thing as an honest importation seems never to have occurred to the framers of this law. Why, Sir, the suspected felon is not more carefully tracked and shadowed than is the most upright merchant of the land in every transaction he may have with the Customs Department. Then, we have a tariff system which in many respects is so clouded with ambiguities as to be wholly unintelligible to the public as well as to the officials. Yet, when questions of valuation and classification for entry and duty arise, as they frequently do, the arbitrary ruling of the department invariably prevails, the unfortunate merchants' only appeal being to an arbitration board composed of three members, two of whom are appointed by the department. This, according to the peculiar notions of the Minister of Customs, may be fair and just and a very great protection to the honest importer, but the honest importer and public opinion favor an appeal to an arbitration board composed in the usual way; that is, to a board composed of three disinterested merchants, one to be appointed by each party, and the third by both, and their decision in all cases should be final. I submit, moreover, that where the authorities assume, arbitrarily, to fix the value of goods for entry and duty, those values should, in common fairness, be disclosed to the importer, before he is called upon to make his entry, and further, that the department, under such circumstances, should be bound by its own valuations. As it is now, a merchant may enter his goods at the very valuation fixed by the department, and yet, at any time within three years, be accused of fraud and undervaluation in connection with that very entry; and that this does frequently happen, the Minister well knows. The revenue could not possibly lose anything by such fair dealing as I now suggest, and what is of vastly greater importance, the merchant would be protected from the snares into which, no matter how honest he may be, he is in constant danger of falling. Another reform which I feel sure would be approved by the public is this: Where it is evident there is no dishonesty intended, there should be no penalty. Following the line of the argument of the court, in the two cases to which I refer, I think that no more should be required of the importer than to present an honest invoice of his goods, or to obtain their entry value from the Customs, if there be a difference in valuation between them, and then to tender all the duties which the tariff imposes upon such goods. But this wholesome method finds no favor with the Minister of Customs. He says to the merchant, whose only desire is to do all that the law requires of him: Enter your goods and take your chance of the score of traps and snares which, with the aid of a just law and an incomprehensible tariff, we have set for you; and under this system the grossest injustice has been done. I would like to refer, as illustrating some of the points to which I have just referred to a case of recent occurrence. Last year a merchant of Niagara Falls purchased in the United States a lot of paper hangings. On the arrival of his goods, and at the suggestion of a broker, he presented his invoice at the Custmos House to have the various articles checked and entered for duty. This was done by the entry clerk at the office, and the duties charged by him were duly paid. This was done alsoin subsequent importations by this merchant of similar goods. In every instance, the goods were examined by the Custom house officer and found correct. Some months subsequently, and after most of the goods had been sold, a special agent of the Customs from Ottawa and the collector of the port called upon this merchant and demanded to see his invoices for wall paper. These were immediately handed them. On comparing the invoices with the duplicate invoices, it was found that some of the goods, appraised and valued, as I have said, by the local Custom house officer, had been entered too high and some too low, and altogether it was found that, according to this new calculation, the merchant had paid 7, 8 or 9 cents too little for duties. He at once proposed paying the difference; but no, under threat of seizure of his whole stock, he was forced to deposit $65.95, which was far more than the value of the goods claimed to have been irregularly entered. He made the deposit with the expectation that his conduct throughout having been in perfect good faith, the money would be returned to him, but, after communicating with his representative in Parliament—the hon. member for Welland, I believe—and the Minister, he was informed that the money had been confiscated, and, later still, the Minister declined to re open the case. Well, if that was not pure and simple robbery, I would like the Minister's definition of it.

Mr. BOWELL. It might be if it were true.

Mr. HOLTON. I have every reason to believe that the statement I have given to the House is perfectly true.

Mr. BOWELL. I have not the slightest doubt as to that.

Mr. HOLTON. My information, I believe, is quite as reliable as the Minister's. I think, further, that the law relating to enclosures should be so modified that the importer should not be made to suffer because of the error of his agent or consignor abroad, when that is proved. Very grave injustice is being constantly done in this connection, and the law should be so amended as to give discretionary powers to collectors in such cases. But by far the most important and necessary reforms to which, I think, Parliament should direct its immediate attention, are the immediate total abolition of the moiety, or, as it is popularly and more properly called, the spoils system, and the reference of all cases of alleged frauds to the courts, where the party accused shall have a full, fair and public trial, a trial at which the ordinary rules of evidence shall prevail. As the case now stands, it is possible for a Customs officer, without responsibility of any kind for his action, to bring what charge he may please against an importer, to take his books

and papers from him, and then, having deprived him of his means of defence, to hold him guilty of such a charge unless he can prove his innocence. In fact, the seizing officer, the accuser, the judge and the executioner may be one and the same person, and at the same moment may stand in the very disinterested position of a prospective two-thirds sharer in the moneys which are to be extracted from the victim; and oftentimes merchants, though perfectly honest but recognising their helplessness under these circumstances, quietly yield and pay the demand. We saw very clearly in the Ayers case, how the present spoils system can work even in court, where, the Ayers being on their defence and having been deprived of their books and papers, the seizing officers treated the orders of the court with contempt rather than produce the firm's books or testify in a way which would diminish in the slightest their prospects of making a tremendous haul. These men had no thought for the public service, but were simply after plunder, and plunder they were bound to have at the cost of truth and fair play; and what happened in that case may happen to any importer in the country, for the same men are in office, moved doubtless by the same lust for spoil, and with the department still at their back upholding the unholy system. It is simply an abomination, and the public so considers it; yet my friend the Minister of Customs hugs the nasty thing to his bosom as the dearest object of his affections, and the Prime Minister tells us that all this is done in the interest of the honest trader. I am, of course, aware of the Minister's objection to taking his cases into the courts, for experience has shown him that, in the face of proved facts, judges cannot be relied upon to look at things as he does, nor to be moved by the same yearning desire to enrich the favorite spy, informer and official at the expense of the revenue or of the unhappy mortal who has got into the toils. The Minister does not recognise the equity and morality of giving the man charged with offences against the revenue the same fair public trial that is accorded to the most dangerous and degraded felon in the land. The latter is held to be innocent until proved guilty, but with the Customs' victims the reverse is the rule, and all this, forsooth, in the interest of the honest importer. The Minister may lack confidence in the courts of the land, but that is no reason why this Parliament should refuse a reform which the public demand. I, for one, do not hesitate to acknowledge the importance and necessity of protecting the public revenue, and punishing severely all frauds upon it; but I do not admit that this public revenue is so much more sacred than the lives, the property and the rights of citizens, whose only recourse for their defence is to be found in the courts, that such an extraordinary, one-sided and tyrannical law should be necessary for its protection. There is but one other abuse to which I will now allude, and that is the habit of allowing officials to receive remuneration for their services as such from importers, and I will illustrate the offensiveness of that practice by a special reference to a very objectionable practice which obtains in Montreal, and perhaps elsewhere—one of the methods resorted to by the Customs Department, for no other reason that I can see than to harass the honest importer and to hamper trade, and to line the pockets of some pet official. A large number of importers are in the habit of receiving daily from the United States, perishable goods, such as fish, fruit, oysters, and so on, for immediate delivery. A very extensive business in these commodities is carried on, and, of course, it is in the very nature of the trade that an immediate delivery of the goods should be made. As a strict adherence to the rules governing ordinary importations would result, in consequence of the delay, in the total loss of the goods, the collector has, very wisely and properly, detailed one of his officers to visit the trains, examine the goods, and allow them to be delivered, but, as I think, very improperly and illegally—though the Minister has justified his course—he has authorised the official to charge a special fee for each of such entries, and that as a remuneration for the performance by the official of such duties. To the importer of these perishable articles this means an annual tax, ranging from $20 to $60 per annum, and perhaps upwards; but to the fortunate officer it means an addition of several thousand dollars to his salary. Now, Sir, this is nothing more or less than an unjust and illegal tax upon these merchants, and, from information in my possession, I do not hesitate to characterise its imposition, as a most offensive species of blackmailing. It operates in this way: An officer makes his account once a month to the merchants, whose refusal to pay, or if they question the legality of his action, means that his goods will be sent to the examining warehouse, to be dealt with in its order, that is to say, after a delay of four or five days, which means their deliberate destruction. I am aware that the Minister has approved of this imposition; yet, notwithstanding that, I repeat that the fees exacted by the officer constitutes an unjust, an unauthorised, and, therefore, an illegal tax.

Mr. BOWELL. Do I understand you to say that I had approved of the imposition of fees of that kind?

Mr. HOLTON. Yes; and it may save time, perhaps, if I give the Minister now my authority for that statement.

Mr. BOWELL. If you please.

Mr. HOLTON. The attention of the department was directed to this imposition a little less than two years ago, in May, 1887, by one of these importers in Montreal, Mr. David Crawford. On February 21, of that year, he addressed himself to the Collector of Customs in Montreal, protesting against this charge. On the 25th of the same month, Mr. Ryan replied in acknowledgment of that letter. On the 28th February, in the same year, Mr. Crawford addressed himself to the Commissioner of Customs, Mr. Johnson, and on March 15 he received this letter from Mr. Johnson:

"OTTAWA, 15th March, 1887.

"DAVID CRAWFORD, Esq., Montreal, Que.

"SIR,—Referring to yours of the 28th ultimo, covering correspondence with the Collector at Montreal, and of complaining of charges made by Assistant Appraiser Hatchette for extra service, I have the honor to state in reply that the matter has been enquired into and submitted to the Hon. Minister of Customs, who, having examined into the complaint and answer thereto, directs me to state in reply that he does not consider the fee charged for services required to be performed before or after regular office hours, unreasonable."

So I think, under these circumstances, I can truthfully repeat that it was with the authority and approval of the Minister; and I would repeat that the fees thus exacted by this officer constitute an unjust, an unauthorised, and therefore an illegal tax. My opinion further is that the principle of allowing revenue officers to receive, under any circumstances, from importers, a remuneration for the performance of their official duties, is vicious in itself, and wholly opposed to the public interest. With the material before me, and the information I have at hand, I could very easily extend my remarks to a considerable length; but feeling that I have said enough to establish my contention that these Customs laws and regulations are oppressive and should be amended, and having respect to the period of the Session in which we now find ourselves, I will close with only one further suggestion, and that is, to remind the Minister that he and his subordinates are, after all, the servants and not the masters of the people; and when he comes to understand that truth I feel certain that other reforms now suggested will follow. I beg, therefore, to move:

That the Speaker do not leave the Chair, but that it be resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Customs Act in such a manner that while securing every proper and necessary protection to the revenue, it will relieve the honest importer from the danger of oppression, and in

the case of persons charged with violation of the Customs law, provide that no one shall be subject to fine or fines except after a fair and public trial; and provided further, that in no event shall the officers making seizures participate in the fine or forfeitures imposed for such offences.

Mr. BOWELL. I have very little to complain of as to the manner in which the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) has presented his case to the House. I frankly admit, before alluding to the cases to which he has referred, or before answering any of the arguments which he has advanced, that there is cause not only for diversity of opinion, but for differences of opinion, as to the manner in which the Customs laws should be carried out, and the revenue protected. I can readily understand that among those who have not had any practical knowledge of the working, particularly, of a protective tariff, and of the provisions of the law which it is necessary to enforce in order to secure a proper revenue and to protect the honest importer—there may be not only diversity of opinion, but there may be many arguments to sustain the position which has been taken by the gentleman who has just addressed the House. Having admitted that much, I must take exception to his introductory remarks in which he says that just before the last election I visited Montreal in great haste, in order to have a consultation with the Board of Trade, or to receive advice, or tender advice to the gentlemen composing that body. I have been in the habit, since I have had the honor of occupying the important position I now hold, in endeavoring to enforce the laws and regulations, which are onerous in their character, of visiting not only the Boards of Trade of Montreal and Toronto, but also in other sections of the country—*not* at the time of elections, however, but upon every occasion when complaints have been made to the department—and I have found I could come to a decision much better, more equitably, and more in accordance with the law, by visiting those who have entered complaints, and by having a friendly consultation with them. I have visited the Boards of Trade, not only of Montreal, but as far east as Halifax and as far west as Victoria, and upon all occasions, after consultation, we have come to an understanding as to the course that should be pursued, particularly in the administration of this, if I might use the expression, somewhat intricate law. With respect to the interview to which the hon. gentleman has referred—whether it was before the election or not I do not know, but I know I met a deputation, I think the executive committee of the Board of Trade of Montreal; and upon that occasion we discussed many of the clauses of the Customs Act and the mode by which they had been enforced by the Customs officials. I made no such promises as those to which the hon. gentleman referred. I do not say that the hon. gentleman has made those statements without believing them to be correct; I can only presume that he has taken statements made by irresponsible persons, and that appeared in the different newspapers in Montreal, at the time, in regard to what actually did take place at that interview. All that I promised the merchants at that time has been carried out since. Many amendments which they suggested I combated to the best of my ability, and I am vain enough to believe that, in some cases, I succeeded in showing them that their suggestions would be detrimental to the interest of the honest importer rather than beneficial to him. Although the hon. gentleman has not spoken so long, as I have no doubt he might have desired, upon this subject, he has said enough to necessitate my occupying a little more time than I would choose to do under other circumstances. I dissent *in toto* from the statement made that for every smuggler caught and punished, two at least of the honest importers receive worse treatment than does the smuggler; and I think a little attention to the working of the law and to the facts, if they were all before the hon. gentleman, would have led him to other conclusions. I do not propose to take up each case to which the hon. gentleman has referred, but while it is fresh in my memory I desire to reply particularly to his closing remarks in regard to the approval which, he says, I, as head of the department, gave to the exaction of fees by any officer in Montreal or elsewhere. I remember distinctly the case to which the hon. gentleman has called the attention of the House. I made enquiry as to what was the practice in Montreal, and instead of approving of the system of exacting fees from importers, I gave instructions positively that no officer should receive any fee from merchants; and if the hon. gentleman would turn to the rules and regulations which are now in force, but, unfortunately, which are not now before me, he will find they provide that no officer shall receive any fee for any service he may render to a merchant.

Mr. LAURIER. What about Mr. Johnson's letter?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Johnson's letter says nothing of the kind. There is a practice, and it has been in existence ever since Customs officers have been appointed in this country, of giving remuneration for extra services, either before the hour in the morning when official duties begin, or after the close of the Customs house at night. The Grand Trunk Company pays into the revenue between $15,000 and $20,000 annually towards covering such expenditure. Every railway, the Allan line and other ocean companies, and every steamboat on the inland lakes and waters, that requires the services of an officer after hours, to superintend the loading or unloading of goods so as not to have the vessels detained on their trip, pays so much per hour, or per month, as the case may be. The amount paid by the different railway companies and steamboat proprietors, ocean as well as inland, amounts annually to between $40,000 and $50,000. I admit that it is a grave question whether it would not be better to have day as well as night officials to conduct this business, instead of exacting the amount from the parties who now pay it. It is a question which has been under the consideration of the Government for some time. The principle is not a new one; it prevailed when I assumed office, and it continues at the present time. If the House should deem it advisable to take an extra appropriation annually, to the extent of $50,000, in order to enable the department to increase its staff and pay night as well as day hands, then we could do away, I have no doubt, with many of the complaints made, not only by the officers themselves, who wrangle about the amount they should receive, but also by those who have to pay this amount out of the proceeds of the enterprises in which they are engaged. That is a point, I repeat, which is very fairly open to discussion. But I desire to call the attention of the House to this fact, that that is one particular in which our system differs diametrically from that of the United States. There the fees, as I shall show before I close my remarks, are enormous. In some cases, with respect to small articles which are free under the tariff, these fees reach an amount equal to 50, 60, or 75 per cent. We have no such system in this country, and the only fee an officer or collector is entitled to receive from any importer when he desires to make an entry is 5 cents for the three forms upon which the entry is made, and that sum is paid into the revenue. Even as to that payment, the importer is not obliged to purchase the forms from the Custom house officer; they are simply kept as a matter of accommodation for the convenience of importers. And I desire to call the attention of the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) to the difference between the remunerating of an officer who performs duty after official hours, and the acceptance of fees, as the hon. gentleman put it to the House. I do not know any system that could be more abused than the system to which he has drawn attention, provided it prevailed in this country, and if it is practiced by any officer in Montreal it is contrary to the regulations of the department, as

there is no authority for any Customs officer to receive fees. The statement having been made, however, I shall take the earliest opportunity to call the attention of the collector at Montreal to it, in order that he may ascertain whether such be the fact or not. The hon. gentleman said that the extent to which this has been carried out has been such as to add thousands of dollars to the salary of the officer, Mr. Hatchette, who performs this duty, or others who may perform it. If this be so, Mr. Hatchette is receiving money to which he has no right, for all he is entitled to receive is payment for whatever time he may give to importers before or after office hours, at so much per hour, or so much per month, as may be arranged. My hon. friend has placed a resolution before this House, which, to my mind, is somewhat novel in its character, and I am quite sure that anyone who will reflect for a moment, must come to the conclusion that the policy involved in this resolution is one utterly impracticable, or if not impracticable, it would add a great deal more to the discomfort of the honest importer, and particularly those who are accused and not guilty, than any system which prevails at present. One part of his resolution reads, that the desire is:

"To amend the Customs Act so as to relieve the honest importer from danger of oppression."

The present law provides for all that is involved in that sentence. If the importer is dissatisfied with the action of the seizing officer, or if he is dissatisfied with the ruling of the department, all he has to do is to appeal to the courts, and he can then obtain just that publicity which my hon. friend desires he should have. The resolution goes on to say:

"And in the case of persons charged with violation of the Customs law, to provide that no one shall be subject to fine or fines except after a fair public trial."

I notice that the hon. gentleman left out the words "should he demand it," as his resolution originally read. I infer from this, that if a man is caught red-handed in smuggling across the borders, or evading payment of duty on enclosures, or breaking the law by any other means, the case must be put into court and a judge asked to adjudicate upon it. I confess that I had the same idea for a long time. It was a principle which I tried to impress upon my own colleagues, but when I began to reflect upon the result of the adoption of a policy of that kind, I came to the conclusion that it could not be carried out. It may surprise members of this House when I tell them that the average of seizures for some years past has been from six to seven or eight hundred; some small and some large. Just fancy a man having goods which are perishable, seized when smuggling them across the border; there is no question as to the fact of their being smuggled, the man was caught in the act, but under this resolution, if it was carried out, before you could condemn, or sell, or dispose of those perishable articles, you would first have to employ a lawyer to carry the case into court,—and so it would be in all of those seven hundred cases a year, some of which are of the most trivial character, although others are very important. The law at present lays down clearly what the importer may do, in case he is interfered with, either directly or indirectly, in the transaction of his business. If the goods are seized, a report must be made by the Customs officer as soon as possible, to the department, and as soon as the notification of the seizure is received by the department, the person whose goods have been seized is immediately notified, and he is given a full month in which to put in his defence. Then the ruling of the department is given, and if he objects to that decision, he has thirty days within which to put in his defence, and he can then go into the Exchequer Court, to oppose the decision. All he requires to do is to say, I will not accept the decision of the department——

Mr. HOLTON. He can only go into court, if the Minister allows him.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. If he will turn to the law, he will find that the person whose goods have been seized can object to the decision of the department; and, having objected, it is the duty of the Minister—except in certain cases where the notice of dissent has not been given in sufficient time—to put the case into court, before he can carry out his condemnation. There is no difficulty whatever in a man going into court, if he so desires it. During ten years experience I have no recollection of any importer, or anyone else, feeling himself aggrieved, being deprived of the right of going into court if he desired so to do.

Mr. HOLTON. If the Minister will allow me, I will refer him to clause 182 of the Act with regard to appeal to the courts. It says:

"If the owner or claimant of the thing seized or detained, or the person alleged to have incurred the penalty, within thirty days after being notified of the Minister's decision, gives him notice in writing that such decision will not be accepted, the Minister may refer the matter to the court."

The Act says that the Minister "may," and it is, therefore optional for the Minister to allow it.

Mr. BOWELL. Suppose the Minister refuses—which is never done—all that the person feeling himself aggrieved would have to do, would be to apply for a *fiat* to go into court, and it would be granted at once, as was done in the Ayer case. That permission has never been refused, nor is it the practice of any Government or of the Crown to refuse a *fiat* where there is any cause of complaint by a subject. We have allowed cases to go into court in which we knew the man had no case, and in which the correspondence showed that he had no case; but the person considered himself aggrieved, and when he asked for the privilege, it was at once accorded to him. The next contention of my hon. friend is, perhaps, the most important from his standpoint, and that is the question of doing away with the division of forfeitures, and what is termed the moiety system, to which I will refer in a few moments. One would have supposed, hearing the speech of my hon. friend, that this portion of the law to which he objects, was the creation of the present Government; that all these iniquitous clauses to which he refers, which legalise and allow so much of what he terms plundering—I cannot remember the other strong word which he used—to be perpetrated by the Customs officers and to be approved of by the Minister, were actually put upon the Statute-book by the present Government. If he will turn to the law which was enacted by my hon. friends opposite when they were in power, he will see that there are scarcely any changes made between that law and the law as it stands to day, except to simplify and, in many cases, to liberalise, instead of making more stringent, the provisions to which my hon. friend has referred. He may laugh, but I attribute that to the fact that he has not given this question that study and attention which he should have given to it before he attempted to deal with it. I should like to refer to a statement made by the Minister of Finance of the former Administration, the present member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in reference to the "iniquity" which he pointed out to this House, if the reference is not against the rules of Parliament. I am not very often absent from this Chamber, but, unfortunately for myself, I happened to be absent when the administration of my department was attacked. The hon. gentleman represented that there had been an actual case in which a man's invoice had been raised from a cash value some 50 per cent. I am not prepared to say whether it was 50 or 75 per cent. I know nothing of the case; if it were mentioned to me, probably I could explain it to him, but if the hon. member from South Oxford will look

at the Statute-book, he will find that when he was a member of the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), he assisted to put on the Statute-book a law (40 Vic., chap. 10, sec. 32) in which the principle is laid down that it is not the cash value that is to guide in valuing an article for duty, but it must be the credit price of the article in the market where it is purchased; and if he will turn to the numerous circulars which were issued by the Minister of Customs at that time, he will find this provision of the law particularly pointed out, and that the officers were instructed to raise the invoices for duty, and to see that the articles entered for duty were valued on that principle. I also find that another very iniquitous provision, that the onus of proof shall be on the importer, appears in much stronger terms in the law (sec. 52) which these hon. gentlemen put on the Statute-book, than in the present Act.

Mr. HOLTON. I know it; I have read it.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman knows it, but when he was denouncing the law, he left the impression on everyone listening to him that those provisions of the law had been enacted by the present Government, and not by those whom he is supporting, and whom, I have no doubt, from the peculiar conformation of his mind, he will support for all time to come.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOWELL. We know the vilest sinner may return. We know what the hon. gentleman was in the good old times gone by; we know what he is at present. I look with some commiseration on him in the position he occupies now, and I look forward with a good deal of pleasure ——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps you look to the time when you were with me opposing Sir Francis Hincks coming in.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know that I should be led into a discussion of my reasons for opposing Sir Francis Hincks. I had my reasons then ——

Mr. PATERSON (Brant) What section are you reading?

Mr. BOWELL. It is a section in the political history of the country to which my hon. friend called attention; and I was just explaining that I had no other object than what I believed, at that time, to be in the best interests of the country, in the opposition I gave to Sir Francis Hincks, and I am bound to extend the same credit to my hon. friend. The only difference that existed at that time between the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and myself was that if Sir Francis Hincks came up to the expectations of those who placed him in office, I would have had no hesitation in giving him what support my humble ability would enable me to extend; and now that he is dead and gone, I will repeat what I said in the House afterwards, that my experience of Sir Francis Hincks, and the manner in which he took hold of the questions then agitating the country, justified me in the course I took.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear, hear; I was his colleague at that time.

Mr. BOWELL. Now, Sir, let me return to the 52nd clause of the Act to which I referred, and which the Government of the hon. member for South Oxford placed on the Statute-book. That clause reads as follows:—

"The burden of proof that all the requirements of this Act, with regard to the entry of any goods, have been complied with and fulfilled, shall, in all cases, lie upon the parties whose duty it was to comply with and fulfil the same."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Was that the first time it appeared in the statute?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know anything about that. I dare say it was there before; if it was, they perpetuated it. If it was unfair then, I take it for granted that, if they shared the opinions of the hon. member for Chateauguay, they would have repealed it. I might here very properly remind that hon. gentleman of a most unjust and vexatious principle which obtained under the Act of 1877, for which his friends, as before stated, are responsible. By section 40 of such Act it was provided that:

"No evidence of the value of any goods imported into Canada, or taken out of warehouse for consumption therein, at the place whence and the time when they are to be deemed to have been exported to Canada, contradictory to or at variance with the value stated in the invoice produced to the collector, with the additions (if any) made to such value by the bill of entry, shall be received in any court in Canada, on the part of any party except the Crown."

The effect of such provision was often to compel a merchant, who had purchased, say, 50 tons of steel, at £20 per ton, on a falling market, and which, perhaps, was not shipped to Canada for some months after purchase—when, possibly, the price had declined to £15 per ton—to pay duty on £20, which was the price stated on his invoice. Yet, if between the date of purchase and the time of shipment the price had advanced to £25 per ton, his invoice would be thrown aside and duty would be demanded on the larger or market value. The present Government, becoming sensible of the unfairness of this principle, caused the passage of section 10 of the Tariff Act of 1879, which ensured the fair valuation of goods in such a contingency, and such section reads as follows:—

"The Governor in Council shall, from time to time, establish such regulations not inconsistent with law, as may be required to secure a just, faithful and impartial appraisal of all goods imported into Canada, and just and proper entries of the actual or fair market value thereof, and of the weights, measures or other quantities thereof, as each case may require; and such regulations, whether general or special, so made by the Governor in Council, shall have the full force and authority of law; and it shall be the duty of the appraisers of Canada and every of them, and every person who shall act as such appraiser, or of the Collector of Customs, as the case may be, by all reasonable ways and means in his or their power, to ascertain, estimate and appraise the true and fair market value and wholesale price (any invoice or affidavit thereto to the contrary notwithstanding) of the goods at the time of exportation, and in the principal markets of the country whence the same have been imported into Canada, and the proper weights, measures or other quantities, and the fair market value or wholesale price of every of them, as the case may require."

The hon. gentleman also stated, in reference to the amendments made to the Customs Act two years ago, that they were not amendments, but imposed still more onerous exactions and restrictions on the trade of the country, and on importers. If that be the case, it is somewhat singular that there was not a single division or objection taken, in this House, to the amendments I have suggested, after full explanations had been given of them On the contrary, those gentlemen who took an active part in the discussion of those clauses, and of the changes and amendments which were made, after they had heard my explanations, approved of every one of them, and every change which was made was in the direction of the protection of the honest importer, and to punish, if possible, the dishonest importer.

Mr. MITCHELL. Are not all these troubles of modern growth?

Mr. BOWELL. No. I will show the hon. gentleman that even when he was in power there were a good many seizures made.

Mr. MITCHELL. We never heard as many complaints.

Mr. BOWELL. Of course not, because there were not so many seizures, for the higher the tariff the greater the amount of smuggling. But I have failed yet to find that the honest importers ever found fault with the manner in which the laws have been carried out in regard to the punishment of those who have violated them. I know that the newspapers have taken up the cause of those who have been punished.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do not say so much against the newspapers now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He is an old hand.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, I am, and I used to write just as I thought, as plainly and honestly as I knew how; and I was never taken into court, nor did I ever have to apologise for what I said. In reference to the clause relating to enclosures, to which the hon. gentleman called the attention of the House, and which he declared to be so iniquitous, if he will turn to the 50th clause of the Act of 1887, he will find that it reads as follows:—

"If any package is found to contain any goods not mentioned in the invoice, such goods shall be absolutely forfeited."

There is no discretion given to the Minister or the officer, but there is a simple declaration of the absolute forfeiture of the goods. That word "absolute" is not now in the Customs Act. Perhaps it is just as well, while I am dealing with this question, to dispose of the attack which was made in connection with the case of an importer at Niagara Falls, which my hon. friend declares to be, not in the words of the lieutenant of the Opposition, "legalised robbery," but an absolute robbery, without any legality whatever. Now, let us see what are the facts connected with this case. The importer of a certain kind of paper had been in the habit of importing wall paper as one quality, when, in fact, it was another quality. The hon. gentleman told us that he had as good information on the subject as I had. I have no doubt he thinks the information, which he probably received from the importer, equally reliable with that of the officers of Customs.

Mr. HOLTON. Quite so.

Mr BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman knew that the invoice which was presented for entry gave a misdescription of the goods, perhaps he would not say so It requires neither the oath of the officer nor that of the importer, to prove what an article is, when it is seen, and if the invoice indicated one class of paper called "brown blanks," when, in fact, the merchant imported another class called "white blanks," which latter is taxed at a higher rate of duty, it would be an easy matter to detect the fraud.

Mr. HOLTON. But your own officer at Niagara Falls classified that for duty and entry, at the importer's request, and the importer paid the duty which was asked.

Mr. BOWELL. I am coming to that point. It is quite true that when an importer presents to the Customs clerk an invoice, the Customs clerk looks at the face of such invoice, and marks opposite each item the rate of duty; but if upon examination by the appraiser, the article is found not to be that described in the invoice, how is the Customs clerk, who had nothing but the invoice to go by, to be held responsible for anything wrong? That is this case precisely. The merchant presented the invoice to the Customs officer to be rated for duty, that invoice described the goods as "brown blanks," and the officer rated them accordingly; but when they were examined by the appraiser they turned out to be another kind of paper altogether. Then the importer made an affidavit, in which he stated that he went to the collector and his officers and asked for their rating. The moment that representation was made to me I did as I do in other cases: ordered an investigation to be made, and I refused, because the affidavit of the importer was so strong, to take the mere statements or *ipse dixit* of the Customs officers who transacted the business, and compelled them to make their statements under oath. Mr. Peter Flynn, the collector—and those who know Mr. Flynn, of Niagara Falls, would never suspect him for a moment of telling an untruth, and he could have no possible object to gain in telling one—wrote, concerning the statement of the importer, as follows:—

"The importer has mentioned my name in his affidavit as having refused him information as to how he should enter the goods."

The importer had made the direct statement that he had applied to the collector for information as to the mode of procedure in passing the goods. Mr. Flynn continues:

"In reply to this part of the importer's evidence, I must say he never asked me a question in regard to this or any other entry made by him. Personally, I know nothing of the matter in dispute more than accompanying Mr. Watters."

Mr. Watters, by-the-bye, was not sent from Ottawa to transact this business. He is an officer stationed in the west, who, in the ordinary pursuit of looking after smuggled goods, went to this man's store to investigate this affair, and made the seizure of the goods. Then there is the evidence of Mr. Clarence Bartle, Customs officer, who stated distinctly and positively under oath that he gave no such instructions as those referred to by the importer. That evidence is substantiated by Mr. Preston, the broker—not a member of the Customs staff, but a gentleman who makes his living as a Customs broker. Upon these facts the Commissioner made his report as follows:—

"The evidence submitted in rebuttal of the charge consists only of the party's own affidavit, while many of the statements therein are contradicted by the sworn statements of the officers of the department, and of the broker employed to make the entries."

Employed not by us, I wish the House distinctly to understand. The report continues:

"Apart from this contradictory evidence, the fact remains that the paper hangings were not properly described in the entry made at the Customs, and that but about one-third of the proper duty was paid thereon. There is a clear violation of sections 35 and 119 of the Customs Act, for which the importer must be held responsible. This evasion of the payment of the proper duty he has under the law forfeited the goods, or the ascertained value thereof as per section 193, and the undersigned respectfully recommends that the seizure be confirmed, and the amount deposited, as representing the value of the goods, be forfeited to the Crown."

Such are the facts in the case to which my hon. friend has called the attention of the House, and which he has described as absolute robbery, when in fact the whole thing resolves itself into this: that a merchant imports a class of paper, has it misdescribed in the invoice, presents that misdescription to the Customs officer, in order to have the goods rated, and, on examination at the warehouse by the appraiser, it is found that the duty was paid on another class of paper altogether from that which was really imported, and which called for a higher rate of duty. Then, when the merchant's affidavit is made, that affidavit is contradicted by the statement of the collector and the affidavits of two Customs officers.

I shall now call the attention of the House for a few moments to the question of distribution of proceeds of seizures. My hon. friend from Chateauguay had two very strong objections to the law as it now exists. One was with regard to the provisions respecting enclosures, and the other to the distribution of the proceeds derived from seizures; and he tried to lead the House to believe that the regulations governing these matters were the creation of the present Government. I see the hon. gentleman smiles, but I propose to place the paternity of these regulations, whether they are good or bad—and I am not now denouncing them—upon the proper persons. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the Order in Council of the 1st July, 1876, he will find that one of the clauses reads as follows:—

"In case of seizure of goods or chattels which have been condemned and sold, according to law, an allowance of not more than one-third of the net proceeds of each shall be awarded to the seizing officer, and not more than one-third to the informer, if any. In case of seizures made without information, and which have resulted from special vigilance on the part of an officer, the informer's share, or a portion thereof, may be awarded to such officer, at the discretion of the Minister of Customs. When seizure of goods or chattels has been made, and released by order of the Minister of Customs, on the condition of the payment of a fine or penalty, where such fine or penalty is of the amount of $100, or over, it may be considered as the net proceeds of the seizure, and dealt with in the same manner as if the goods had been condemned and sold."

So that you could distribute two-thirds of the amount, without reference to the expenses. The next clause says:

"When the fine or penalty is under $100, the Minister of Customs may, at his discretion, award the whole, or any portion thereof, to the officers and informer, if any, as a reward for vigilance. In respect of fines or penalties recovered for violation of the revenue laws, in cases where there has been no seizure of goods or chattels, the Minister may, in his discretion, award such portion thereof to the officers concerned and informer, if any, as may appear to be equitable and judicious under the circumstances of each case."

These regulations are based upon and under the authority of the Act 31 Vic., chap. 6, section 113, which was passed, or if my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) prefers the phrase, remained upon the Statute-book in 1867.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then that provision was first passed in 1867.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say so. I said the regulations were adopted by the Governor in Council in 1876, and these are the regulations under which I have been acting.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman spoke of these regulations having been passed in 1876, and no doubt he is quite correct, but does he remember what were the regulations prior to that date?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My recollection is that there were regulations before, which had been in existence from 1867 to 1876, regulating the division of these funds, and that this was a modification of those regulations.

Mr. BOWELL. I think my hon. friend is correct, because there is a clause in the law which provides that this may be done. Whether these regulations were modified, or made more restrictive than the former regulations, I am not prepared to say. I asked the Assistant Commissioner to investigate this question and see how far the earlier statutes agreed with the present law, and this is what he says:

"I find, upon tracing it back, that the wording is identical with the wording of the Act 31 Vic., section 113 (1867), with the exception that after the words 'Governor in Council' the words 'or the Minister of Customs' have been introduced. Upon tracing this back, I find this was done in the amended Act of 1877, and further, that it was there inserted in consequence of the Tariff Act of 1867 which gave the same power to the Minister of Customs as is therein contained, so that virtually the Acts of 1867, Customs and Tariff combined, gave precisely the same power as is now embodied in section 191 of the Revised Statutes."

My hon. friend referred to one matter in particular, that of increasing the value of goods for duty, as being onerous, and in regard to that subject—I do not say it offensively or intend it in that way—his whole speech would come very well from one who was employed to defend all the smugglers and violators of the law in the country. I do not believe that the hon. gentleman intended that, but certainly his speech could bear no other interpretation, and one would suppose also that this, so-called, iniquitous system of treating undervaluations arose under this Government. I hold in my hand circulars which were issued by my predecessor commencing with March 21, 1874, and ending a few months before those hon. gentlemen went out of office, calling the special attention of the Customs officials to the necessity of watching undervaluations. We all know the depression of trade which took place in the United States and in most parts of the world during 1874, 1875, 1876 and 1877, and, as trade became depressed, so in proportion did the values of goods fall and become depreciated in the markets in which they were produced. It is in such cases that in proportion to the surplus stock which manufacturers have on hand for the home market, so do they make a slaughter market of other countries into which they can send their goods; in order, first, to relieve their own market so as not to depreciate the price of the goods at home, and also to get rid of the stock without disaster to their own business. I find that, on March 21st, 1874, a few months after the hon. gentlemen opposite took office, a circular was issued by Mr. Bouchette, the then Commissioner of Customs, in which he says:

"The attention of the Minister of Customs has been called to the fact that different systems are practiced by collectors and other officers at the several ports and outports of the Dominion in the collection and protection of the revenue, causing much dissatisfaction among a large number of importers, who comply strictly with the revenue laws."

He goes on to point out the absolute necessity of uniformity—a very difficult thing to accomplish, as follows:—

"I am directed to request your careful attention:

"1st. To the necessity of a careful examination of invoices, not only with respect to their general correctness, but to the prices of the goods represented, especially the invoices of certain classes of Americain manufactures—such as machinery of various kinds, sewing machines, musical instruments, agricultural machines and implements, patent medicines, &c., &c.

"2. I am also to call your particular attention to the provisions of the "Act respecting the Customs," Section 29 and following Sections, providing for the proper appraisement of goods, and examination of packages, and to enjoin upon you and your officers whose duty it is to appraise goods, a strict compliance with the terms and conditions of the law; and you are to report monthly to this Department, all important particulars connected with the appraiser's duties, stating how many packages have been entered, and what proportion of such packages have been examined, with particulars of any illegalities which have been thereby discovered."

On the 20th July, 1874, the following Order was issued:

"The Minister of Customs having received certain evidence that manufacturing firms in the United States have adopted schedules of prices for their respective goods, specially adapted to purchasers for the Canadian market, at rates very much below those at which they sell to American purchasers, to the serious injury of Canadian manufacturers of the same articles——"

If I were to issue a circular containing this language at the present day, I should be accused of having done so in the interests of what, the hon. gentlemen term, iniquitous manufacturers and combines, which they say exist under the tariff. He goes on to say:

"I am desired to call your special attention thereto, with a view to your subjecting such goods to the most rigid examination, for the purpose of ascertaining whether the invoices are made at the 'fair market value,' in the producing or manufacturing country, and not at an exceptional rate adopted for this particular market. For example——"

Then he proceeds to particularise, a thing which would be iniquitous if I had done it, but which, I suppose, was all right when it was done by a free trade or revenue tariff Government:

"For example, a circular of a Pittsburg hardware manufacturing firm, with quotations of prices of bolts, nuts, hooks, rivets and various other articles, so specially reduced for Canadian purchasers, is in possession of the department, and where you have satisfactory proof of this description of undervaluation, you are to insist upon entry being made at the proper appraised valuation."

The system of appraisement existed then, just the same as it does to-day, with the exception of a Dominion Board, which now exists, and to which the merchant can appeal, if the appraisers at the ports where he transacts his business do what he thinks is not right in raising his invoices. In November, 1875, I find a circular issued, in which the Commissioner, under instructions from the Minister, calls the special attention of the officers to the conduct of the paper manufacturers of the United States in supplying paper, and entering the same for duty, "at ruinously low prices." The free trader of to-day will tell us that low prices are in the interest of the consumer who bears the burden. So they are, but it was in the interest of the revenue, which it was the duty of Mr. Burpee, then holding the position I now occupy, to see protected. His duty was precisely the same as mine, to see that the honest importer was protected, and that the provisions of the Customs Act and of the Tariff were literally carried out. He goes on to say:

"It is alleged that the sellers furnish their goods to be delivered in Canada duty paid, and free of all charges. Transactions of this nature are always liable to suspicion, and call for the closest scrutiny, not only of the article mentioned, but in every class of goods imported. In the present state of commerce in the United States, it is all important that the true principle of legal valuation for duty should be kept constantly in view, viz., the fair market value of the goods in the principal

markets of the country where the same are purchased for consumption therein, not for exportation, or under any exceptional consideration whatever."

I will not weary the House by reading a score of circulars of this kind, which I might do; but I find that, on some occasions, the then Minister actually indicated the value at which certain articles should be entered. In the circular issued on the 16th November, 1875, he says:

"I have especially to draw your attention to the article of nails, respecting which a distinct scale of value cannot be given, but it is safe to say that the larger description of cut nails, say 10 dy. and over, should not be invoiced, even in the present low market, at less than $2 85 gold per keg of 100 lbs., and the smaller nails proportionately higher."

I am finding no fault with the issue of these circulars because it was his duty to do precisely what he did, and to ensure what I have been endeavoring to carry out, but I have done it with the aid, I believe, of a better system of protection than he had, and I believe I have succeeded in carrying it out more satisfactorily. On another occasion by circular, dated 10th August, 1887, the Minister cautions Collectors of Customs to be on their guard as to valuations given in invoices of cast iron pipe and iron bridge work; he says:

"Entries must in no case be accepted without your being satisfied as to the actual 'fair market value thereof in the principal markets of the country from whence imported,' in the strict sense intended by sections 31 and 32 of the Customs Act.

"Much of the cast iron pipe from the United States is stated to be manufactured from Scotch pig iron, upon the exportation of which from the United States a drawback is allowed the manufacturer of the original duty paid upon the iron, thus reducing the price at which it can be sold for exportation to this country, far below the actual fair market value, as understood by the Canadian Customs law. Therefore, the price paid cannot be the 'fair market value.'"

Again, on 10th November, 1877, the Minister of that day instructs his officers as follows:—

"The fact is becoming every day more apparent that goods purchased in the United States markets are invoiced for Canadian buyers at much lower rates than those which are charged to purchasers for home consumption, and I have to remind you, as you have been frequently informed, that the value for duty under our Customs law, is not the rate which may be agreed upon in consideration of the goods being for exportation to Canada, but that which is usually paid by purchasers in the United States. No special rate, whatever may be the consideration, can be recognised under our laws."

And, in the same circular the attention of collectors is called to the practice on the part of United States vendors, of deducting from the usual market value of their goods, the drawback allowed by the United States Government. On this subject the Minister says:

"This practice cannot be allowed. On receiving invoices from the United States you are to satisfy yourself whether such deduction has been made or not, and if made you are to add the amount to the foot of the invoice so as to bring it to the 'fair market value of the goods' in the place of purchase when sold for home consumption and not for exportation."

He then gives a list of two or three pages of articles to which he calls special attention. He enumerates all the articles which he contended were being imported by this method at an undervaluation, and with respect to which he declares that it was the duty of the officers to increase the value when invoices were presented for entry.

There is a circular as long ago as the 28th of July, 1874, in which he calls attention to that much vexed question of which we have heard so often, the duty upon packages,—the law he points out providing that packages which form the receptacle of the article as sold in the home market shall be subject to duty. I find the following instruction was given on this subject by my predecessor, as follows:—

"If it be the first receptacle: whether box, barrel, cask, case, bottle, tin or other covering immediately enclosing goods for purposes of sale, such receptacle is a package liable to duty."

It is only the package used exclusively for export which is free of duty. I have read these circulars in order to show the House that the system which the hon. member for Chateauguay says is so iniquitous, that is, the scanning narrowly and closely of invoices which are presented for duty, is the system which prevailed when his own friends were in power, and which must prevail in every country having the same Customs law that now obtains in this country. I want to show one instance of how this is carried out; and I propose to read a letter sent to Toronto in the month of February, 1888. The goods were to be supplied by a company in the United States, and the case is one of scores that have come under my notice. The American firm writes to Messrs. Nichols & Howland, of Toronto—I give the names so that the House may know who they are. They say:

"GENTLEMEN,—We have no doubt you considered us very slow in filling your order, and we have to plead guilty to that charge, but allow us to say that we have not been able to fill orders up to the present time, and in this case we desire to send you something nice. Please be patient until they arrive. Is there any way we can ship it safely so we can avoid for you such high duties? Please reply.

"Yours truly,
"CORTLAND DESK CO. (LIMITED),
"W. A. MILLER,
"Treasurer and Manager."

Then, fearing that they would not be understood, he adds this postscript:

"Since the fishery question,"——

I suppose he means since we got $5,000,000 from them.——

"—we Americans think we are doing nothing wrong if we beat the Queen out of a little duty."

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

After Recess.

Mr. BOWELL. When you, Mr. Speaker, left the Chair at six o'clock, I had stated, that if fees were collected in the manner suggested by the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton), they were collected in violation of the rules and regulations of the department. Since the adjournment I have procured a copy of the rule, and I desire that it may be placed on record, in order that those who fancy that the department, the head, or the Commissioner, approve of any act of that kind on the part of their officers, may have their minds disabused. Here are the instructions to officers of Her Majesty's Customs in the Dominion of Canada, and they were approved by Order in Council on 14th June, 1875, when Hon. Isaac Burpee was Minister of Customs, and James Johnson, Commissioner. These are the rules which are still in force, and No. 1 reads as follows:—

"All officers of Customs, upon their admission to office, must take and subscribe an oath as required by law, not to take or receive any fee, perquisite, gratuity, reward or emolument, whether pecuniary or of any other sort or description whatever, either directly or indirectly, that is, either as a present or under the pretence of their making out documents which in their official capacity they are not required to do, or of paying for the same, or any other act, duty, matter or thing done or performed in the execution or discharge of any of the duties of their respective offices, other than their salaries or what may be legally allowed them, and any collector or other officer acting as such, shall promptly report any violation of this rule which may come to his knowledge, to the Commissioner."

I may add that within the last two or three years I dismissed an appraiser in Montreal for no other reason than because he had received presents and obtained credit on the strength of the position he held, from the merchants who were importers, and whose goods he had to assess for duty. I do not know, neither am I prepared to contradict the statement made by the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) that this rule has been violated. All I can say is, that if that rule, which is very strict, has been violated, the punishment which follows those who infringe it, will be meted out to the person who has accepted the fees in the manner in which it is said they are accepted.

Mr. HOLTON. The Minister will remember I stated that this officer received those fees with the approval of his superior.

Mr. BOWELL. I remember that you also stated that it was with my approval, because the Commissioner's letter says the matter had been fully investigated and the Minister had approved. What the Minister had approved was simply what I pointed out to the House before recess, and that was that the officer was entitled to certain remuneration per hour, or per month, for the performance of the particular service to which the hon. gentleman referred, but not to receive fees direct from merchants. I may add further, in explanation, that when money is received for extra services from railway companies, merchants, or others, who deem it necessary to have the services of an officer after hours, it is not paid to the officer himself, but to the Collector, who pays the man who performs the service. While upon this subject, I may refer, for a few moments, to the charge which has been made against the Customs Department of having exacted duty upon packages containing free goods, or in other words, imposing a duty upon the baskets which contain peaches brought into this country. I know that it has been a source of a good deal, not only of abuse but of amusement, on the part of those who look upon the exaction of duty upon these articles as a very small matter, and one to which the department or the Government should not descend. Well, I have this to point out, that it is not for the officers of the Customs Department, whose duty it is to carry out the law, to question as to whether the provisions of that law be absurd or whether they be onerous on the importers. Instead of abusing or condemning the officers who perform their duty, such condemnation should be aimed at the law or at the Government which retains it upon the Statute-book; and, I repeat, it is not fair to officers who are sworn to do their duty, to condemn them for having performed it. It was stated by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson), when the question was under discussion the other night, that the fees exacted on the American frontier, particularly in the west, were much higher and more onerous than the duty collected in Canada, or the duty which was imposed upon the packages containing free goods. The hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) smiled. He gave one of those ironical laughs in which he sometimes indulges, when the hon. gentleman called attention to the fact. Perhaps, after all, the hon. gentleman was laughing at something else, and if such was the case I withdraw my statement. I remember seeing a broad smile on the hon. gentleman's countenance, and I understood him to dissent *in toto* from the proposition made. During my absence, last summer, the question of duty upon peach baskets was brought before the department, and when I returned I found no little commotion, not only in the press but among many of our own friends, upon this question. I at once made enquiry as to what was the practice in the United States, and what order had been issued by the Commissioner and the then acting Minister of Customs. I found that the Commissioner had carried out the law literally as it stands on the Statute-book, and the acting Minister at the time had done precisely what I would have done had I been here—approved his conduct. I then asked the collector at the Falls and the Inspector of Customs to make enquiry as to what the practice was in the United States, and I found that although the United States authorities impose no duty upon packages containing free goods, yet the exactions in the way of fees are equal to a duty ranging from 25 to even 60 or 70 per cent. In order that the country may understand precisely the difference in the practice on the frontier between the two departments, I propose to read the letter of the collector, and also the report of the inspector upon this question. Mr. Peter Flynn, the collector at Niagara Falls, on 29th September, 1888, wrote me as follows:—

"In reply to your favor of 27th inst., I beg to inform you that the United States Customs do not collect duty on packages containing fruit, but they collect $1 on each entry of fruit, and all other non-dutiable goods; 25 cents is charged for manifest, 25 cents for blanks, and 50 cents for entry. Fifty cents of the dollar goes to the department at Washington, and the collector, as his perquisite, keeps the other half."

I have also here a letter from the collector at Hamilton on the same subject, but I will not trouble the House with it. The Inspector of Customs, Mr. Mewburn, wrote me as follows:—

"*Re* UNITED STATES CUSTOMS HOUSE FEES AT FRONTIER PORTS.

"At the inland port of Paris, Ont, a short time ago, in conversation with a railway official I was told that when a party shipped goods to the United States, in addition to the shipping or advance charges, a further charge for Custom house fees was made at the following places: Island Pond, $1.45; St. Albans, $1.55; Buffalo, 85 cents; Suspension Bridge, N.Y., $1; Rouse's Point, $1.50; Prescott, Canada, 70 cents; Fort Gratiot, $1.45, and Detroit, $1.45. I believe representations have been made to the Department at Ottawa on this subject. I beg leave, however, to submit to you a report covering procedure in the United States, and the system which prevails in Canada in relation to fees, &c.

"I find that the United States Government fees are on entry for consumption of goods imported in vehicles, railroad cars and boats of less than 5 tons:—

Receiving manifest	25 cents.
Entry of goods, including permit to land	50 do
Total	75 cents.

"At Detroit, I enclose sample forms A, B, C; these forms are required when the value is over $5, and for which a charge is made,

Say, entry fee	50 cents.
do blanks	20 do
Total	70 cents.

"The fee of 70 cents is charged if the goods come over, say, by waggon, or the ferry boat between Windsor and Detroit. If by railroad, then 25 cents additional for receiving a manifest. If, however, the value is less than $5, no entry fee is required; a stub book is used, and receipt given; see form "D," attached Detroit forms At Buffalo, Black Rock and Black Ferry, the Government fee is 50 cents, and collector charges 10 cents for a blank for free goods, and 20 cents if dutiable. The difference between Detroit and Buffalo is the former allows goods under $5 value to be entered without fees, the latter charges whether free or dutiable if the value is over $1. At Niagara Falls, N.Y, at the two Suspension Bridges I beg to call special attention. Certain parties residing in Canada were sometime ago allowed to cart sand from sand pits on this side to the other. The value of a load of sand at the pit is about 50 cents a load, when loaded ready to cart, about $1. These parties were allowed to make entry once a week or two weeks; say on one entry paying for entry, &c., $1. This has, however, been stopped, and the parties were called upon to pay $1 for every load for entry fees, so that if a party took over five loads of sand a day, he would have to pay $5 for fees, although sand is on the free list. The consequence is the parties sell to Americans living across the bridge who pay the fee themselves, but they as American citizens are allowed to make entry in the old way, once a week or once a month, which is manifestly injurious to our own people living in Canada. Within a short time a sand or gravel pit has been opened out near Lockport, N.Y., and I am told influences are being used with the collector to compel every load of sand to pay entry fees, so as to prevent sand being imported from Canada, in order to develop the sand pit at Lockport, N.Y. In reference to Duluth goods, I enclose you forms A, B, C, D, E. These are all required in making one entry; say one load mixed vegetables, value $3, duty 10 per cent.—30 cents. You will notice on the stub, receipt marked 'E.'

For duties	30c.
Entry of merchandise	50c.
Manifest	25c.
Blanks	25c.
Total for one load of vegetables, valued at $3.	$1.30

"I may, however, be permitted to say that the collectors might have charged 10 cents for each of the four blanks—40 cents instead of 25 cents and he would not have violated the United States Customs laws. The fee of 50 cents and 25 cents.—75 cents, is not retained by the collector, as perquisites, but is remitted to the United States Treasury. This, therefore, operates as an indirect addition to the United States tariff. I am not at all surprised at our people complaining of such indirect taxation in the shape of United States Customs fees.

"Our system in Canada is directly the contrary. No fees are charged with the exception of 5 cents for blanks if supplied by the collectors; at the ferries, if the value does not exceed $5 in value the amount is entered on the ferry book, and all the importer has to do is to sign the book, opposite the entry; over $5 entry is made at the head office without charge.

"I am told by the officials connected with the United States Customs Department that all these Government fees are to be done away with."

I hope the House is not wearied by my having delayed so long in pointing out the important difference between the

treatment received by Canadian exporters to the United States, even on free goods, and comparing it with that which prevails in this country. In Canada the importer, as I have already stated, is not even obliged to pay the 5 cents for the form unless he applies for it, for he can obtain it in any other place that he thinks proper. There are many other regulations in connection with the Customs on the other side of the line to which I could call the attention of the House, but I shall forbear doing so on the present occasion. I want to point out as an illustration of this fact, that while the people in Canada are continually finding fault with Customs officials for being too exacting, they should not forget that the regulations on the other side of the line are much more onerous and vexatious than they are here. A person sitting in the gallery and listening to the speeches which are constantly being made on the other side of the House must come to one of two conclusions: either that our rules and regulations are much more objectionable and vexatious than the rules in the United States, or that gentlemen on the other side of the House are anxious to point out every little defect in order to create all the difficulty they can between this country and the neighboring Republic. My hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) in defence of that portion of his resolution which provides for the carrying of every case into court says that the Minister of Customs does not seem to have much confidence in the courts. Well, if I were to speak frankly I would say that, judging from my past experience, my hon. friend is not far wrong. It may be presumption on my part to say that cases which have gone before the courts have not been decided in accordance with what I believe to be Customs law or Customs usages. My hon. friend referred to the Grinnell case and to the Ayer case, and he might have gone a little further and referred to the Bertin case lately tried in Montreal. The Grinnell case was one which came within the meaning of that section of the Act which provides that parts of machinery brought into this country shall be valued for duty relatively to the value of the whole article when imported. We all know why that clause was placed on the Statute-books. If a completed article bore a rate of duty of 30 or 35 per cent., the practice was to bring it in piecemeal and put it together in Canada, and in order to prevent that kind of fraud the law was so framed as to make them pay duty on the parts of an article relatively to the value they bore to the whole article. The Grinnell parties objected to the ruling of the department. It was taken to the Exchequer Court, and Judge Gwynne, who is certainly as eminent as the Chief Justice himself, gave a decision in favor of the Customs Department, and in giving that judgment he went a great deal further than the Customs Department ever thought of going, because he not only declared that the Customs officials were correct in imposing the duty in the manner I have pointed out, but that they would have been justified had they added the royalty which is paid in the United States, and then imposed a duty on the full value of the article, though it had to be put together when it came into this country. The practice of the department has been this: When an article is brought into the country in different parts, we deduct the expense necessary to put it together and complete it in this country, and charge the duty on the residue. Mr. Justice Gwynne decided that we need not even have gone that far, but that we would have been justified in collecting a duty on the full value of the article as if it had been complete when it came into the country. The Ayer case was on all fours with the Grinnell case. The Ayers had been in the habit of importing their patent medicines in bulk, as in barrels, puncheons, or casks, and then bottling it, and labelling it in this country. In that case we decided precisely as we had done in the Grinnell case. Chief Justice Ritchie took a very strong view in opposition to the decision of the department, and delivered the judgment which my hon. friend read to-day, and which, I am bound to say, to my mind was not creditable to a judge occupying his position.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Order.

Mr. BOWELL. It may be in order to defend a judgment, and to read to the House a condemnation of officials by a judge, as the hon. gentleman opposite has done, and to denounce such officials as everything that is wrong and villainous; but it is apparently out of order, in the opinion of the member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) to question that condemnation, particularly if it comes from so eminent a gentleman as a judge on the bench. But I say to my hon. friend who called me to order, that if he had been in the witness box, as I was, and the judge had prevented him from telling the whole story, as I was prevented, he would feel precisely as I do in reference to that matter. It may be the rules of court to stop a witness from telling the whole truth; but I question very much whether it is either moral or correct or equitable. In reference to the other Montreal case, I will call the attention of the House to it for a few moments as it makes one doubt, in Customs matters particularly, whether magistrates or judges are always ready to mete out for violations of the Customs law that justice, which perhaps they would insist upon for the violation of other laws. We had complaints, very strong and repeated, from the city of Halifax, that it was impossible for the importers of wines of a certain quality, such as clarets and burgundies, from Bordeaux and certain other parts of France and the continent, to get them and pay the duty, as cheaply as they could be purchased, duty paid, in the city of Montreal. That was rather a serious charge. The officers were put on the alert, and they made a seizure. The magistrate, after hearing the case, dismissed it, but had some little qualms of conscience, because he made the importer pay his own costs, and the Government theirs. Now, I propose to read the facts in connection with this case, as reported to me, in order that the House and the country may see how difficult it is to punish an offender when taken into court:

"Bertin keeps a small club on St. Antoine street in this city, and in addition has been for the past eighteen months acting as a sort of an agent for a house in Bordeaux, called A Delmon & Co His practice was to obtain orders for certain wines and send them to Delmon & Co Delmon & Co would ship the wines and send out an invoice to Bertin covering the whole lot, and then a number of separate invoices for each individual to show that the consignment would be direct. Suspicion falling upon him, Customs officer Grose went to his house and seized his books and papers, from which it appeared that a special invoice had been asked for specially for the Customs; and on examination it was found that the prices mentioned on the one produced at the Customs house was considerably less than in the invoices made out for the parties direct, or in the account current sent from Delmon & Co. to Bertin.

"Five informations were made out under section 192 of the Customs Act.

"The case made out for the prosecution was, I think, very strong.

"From Bertin's own letter-book we showed that the transactions commenced by a deliberate request on his part in writing to Delmon & Co, when asking for a consignment of wines to be sent out at prices named, he wished a special invoice to be made out for use of the Customs. In this letter he asked that it should be made out in a specific form and with prices set opposite it lower than those Delmon & Co. were to charge. On the face of this letter he also stated that the invoice for the Customs would be null as between himself and Delmon & Co Letters in the same sense were found throughout the letter-book.

"Delmon & Co. accepted Mr. Bertin's request and, for these five entries sent out what purported to be an invoice with prices set opposite as requested by Bertin. None of these invoices used at the Customs were made out on the regular printed ruled invoiced heads that Delmon & Co. appeared to have used, and on which they made out their invoices when sending direct to the individuals Sometimes these Customs invoices were on plain paper, entirely written and hand-ruled, and sometimes they were on a letter-head paper.

"The proof then showed on procuring invoices sent to the various individuals, that the prices mentioned in the invoices used at the Customs were about 50 per cent. lower than that charged by Delmon & Co. to the individuals. We produced also (having found it in Bertin's possession) an account current between himself and Delmon & Co., by which it appeared that Bertin was charged with the prices mentioned in the invoices sent to the individuals, and not charged the lower amounts

shown in the invoices produced at the Customs. It also appeared from these invoices that we found in the possession of individuals, that Delmon & Co. were in the habit of drawing drafts for the face amount of these invoices upon the individuals.

"This was the proof for the prosecution, and as far as documentary evidence could go, and documents found in Bertin's possession, one would think ought to be conclusive, the letter-book, the low-priced invoices to the Customs, the price or invoices sent to individuals, and the account current recognising the latter, there seemed to be little doubt as to the result of the judgment.

"The defence contended that the wines imported were very low priced, and a low class of wines, that Bertin was acting as agent for Delmon & Co., and got 20 per cent. commission on the prices mentioned in the invoices sent to individuals, which also included the duty, freight and charges.

"There was some proof, to which I objected, adduced that this wine was very inferior and of low class, and probably entered at the right price of duty."

This prosecution was not as to whether the wines were entered at an undervaluation, but it was a criminal prosecution on the ground that he had presented to the Customs a false invoice and not a correct one. The report continues:

"Two witnesses were brought to show that the prices they were to pay and mentioned in the invoices which they produced, included all charges, while one witness, who had been dealing with Mr. Bertin, said he understood that he had to pay duty and freight."

Which was not the case——

"A statement was produced to show that the price in the invoices sent the individuals could also include the freight and charge, and which statement is as follows:—Price of 50 gallons wine at Bordeaux, $20, charges, 30 per cent. Duty ..... $ 6 00
25 cents per gallon 12 50
Commission 4 00
Freight 2 00
Leakage 2 00
Insurance 0 25
Transportation 0 60
Brokerage 0 50
Interest 0 10
Exchange 0 20
$28 45

"Assuming the above charges, however, I make a calculation on the invoice produced by a man named Cizol. He was to pay for 4 bariques containing 48 gallons, $108.08.

The charges would be:—Duty 25 c. per gallon $48 00
The wine was entered at the Customs at $20 per hhd. or 90 francs per half barique, and 30 per c. on this would be 24 00
Bertin's commission at 20 per c 21 60
Freight 8 00
Leakage, &c 4 00
Total $105 60

"Deducting this from the amount of the invoice, it would leave $3.48 coming to Mr. Delmon for four bariques, or 60 cents a barique, or a trifle more than a cent a gallon. A somewhat similar result was shown in each of the other invoices that were produced by individuals."

And yet in the face of that evidence, the magistrate dismissed the case, but his qualms of conscience would not allow him to charge the Government with the costs to which this importer had to be put. I may here remark that, in relation to many classes of crime, there is but one opinion held by law abiding citizens: the universal verdict is that such offences must be stamped out, and the execution of the most severe laws is hailed with general satisfaction. Unfortunately for those who are charged with the administration of the Customs laws, there seems to be abroad among a large number of people, who give but casual consideration to the subject, a disposition to mildly reprobate the putting into execution of the inhibitive and penal sections of the Customs Act.

Let us take smuggling for example. This has been a common offence in all countries depending upon foreign trade for revenue. Strong repressive measures have been necessary for its prevention, and never more so than in our country at the present time, because of our proximity to the United States frontier and the facilities with which goods can be introduced into the Dominion, both by sea and by land from that country; and also because of the great temptation from high duties, and the hope of great profits to the smuggler. Under the old English laws, the punishment was of exceeding severity, bearing no reasonable proportion to the offence. Smuggling has never been looked upon as in itself a crime, and hence it has in no age encountered the restraining influences of morality and good conscience. It is of that class of offences which are criminal only because they are prohibited by law.

I give you that as a fair specimen of the frauds practiced on the Customs and the difficulties that present themselves in enforcing the law. Let me give you another that occurred in Montreal one or two years ago. When they were constructing the Montreal abattoir, they imported machinery for the construction of the abattoir, and entries were made for machinery valued at $500. The secretary of the company made affidavit to the correctness of the invoice as presented for duty. His books and the original invoices that were suppressed showed that $8,000 had been paid by the company for the very machinery which they had entered at $800. That case was brought before a magistrate of the district of Montreal. He took two or three months to deliver his judgment, and then dismissed the suit, on the ground that as the secretary-treasurer could have had no personal interest in the matter, he could not have been guilty of making a false affidavit; and this in face of evidence that, in addition to his being a paid servant of the company, he held $8,000 stock in it In the county of the hon. member for Northumberland, N.B., we had another case. A merchant of one of the towns in that county had employed a pilot to go to St Pierre to bring in certain quantities of liquor which he was to land upon a wharf and for which he was to receive a certain remuneration, the merchant taking all the responsibility after the liquor was landed. Subsequently the liquors were found, though a large portion of them had been hidden away in the woods. I came to the conclusion that this was a clear case, that the parties who induced the pilot to take his boat and commit the fraud of smuggling should be punished, and that a nominal fine of $100 should be imposed upon the owner of the boat. The case was taken before the grand jury, and what was their presentment? It was a condemnation of the Government for not having prosecuted the captain of the boat, the grand jury declaring we had no right to prosecute the man who was the principal and who had paid the pilot to commit the fraud. Let me refer to another case which occurred in Ontario. A man who had been actually caught in the act of smuggling, attempted to bribe the officer. The officer reported the fact to his collector The collector reported to headquarters. In the Audit Act, the punishment for attempting to bribe an officer is very severe, and I thought that was a good case in which to make an example of those who tamper with the honesty of the officials. The case went before a magistrate, and he came to the sage conclusion that, as the man did not take the money, the other party did not commit the bribery, but as the offering of the money was an attempt to bribe, which the law punishes by sending the offender to gaol and condemning him to pay a fine not exceeding a certain amount, the magistrate sent the accused to gaol for a few minutes and fined him a few cents.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Was he a Grit or Tory?

Mr. BOWELL. The Customs law is not political, but one which affects Liberal as well as Conservative, and which ought to be administered regardless of politics. These are not the only cases to which I could call the attention of the House, but I do not desire to continue this discussion any longer than necessary. I notice my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. Ferguson) made use of very strong language in reference to some seizures that had been made in his own county. I have no doubt that he had been told by those whose premises had been raided by these "pirates," as they are

termed, that they had been very improperly and very badly used. I looked up these cases, and what are they? What is the fact in regard to these druggists whom the hon. gentleman desired to defend? The decision in the one case was come to because no defence was put in by the party, and is as follows:—

"No evidence having been received by or on behalf of the party from whom the seizure was made, in rebuttal of the charge, the undersigned would respectfully recommend that the seizure be confirmed, and the amount deposited on release of the goods be declared forfeited to the Crown."

That was one case in which the person received the regular notice but put in no defence, and, under such circumstances, the department could do nothing else than declare the goods forfeited. The other case was where the individual acknowledged the smuggling, paid the money and abandoned all claim to the goods. These are some of the cases to which reference was made, at Niagara, when the officers went to that port to search certain stores, the keepers of which had been represented to have been smuggling It is true that one of the drug shops searched for smuggled goods was found to have none, and consequently no penalty was imposed. I quite admit that that appears to be an indignity to an innocent man, but the duty of the officers and of the officials here is, when complaints are made, to investigate them, and the officers did their simple duty in ascertaining whether smuggling had been carried on or not.

The argument that the law should be altered because of alleged abuse of its provisions by incompetent officers is surely a lame one. As well might all law be abolished in districts where it might be badly administered by the magistracy. Why, instead of general fulminations against the whole body of Customs officers, do not hon. gentlemen specify the exact occasions and circumstances under which the powers given them by law have been abused by individual officers? It would then be possible to investigate such specific charges, and if the officer were found to have exceeded his duty, or in any way misused his powers, he could be dealt with.

Let me read the deliberate opinion of the official in charge of the United States Customs at New Orleans, as to the results of a change in the Customs laws of that country, such as hon. gentlemen opposite appear to advocate for Canada. Writing to the Secretary of the Treasury, under date 8th September, 1885, the official in question, Special Agent Neven says:

"Undervaluations have been on the increase since the passage of the Act of 22nd June, 1874. It was comparatively nothing before that time The law of 1863 relating to the seizure of books and papers was a great protection to the revenue, and was only objectionable in the manner of its enforcement by certain officers. Instead of correcting the abuse, the anti-moiety Act was conceived and became a law, at once destroying the importing trade in the hands of American merchants and turning it over to foreign manufacturers, and costing the revenue untold millions."

I have this to say to my hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Holton): He states that the merchants of this country are horrified at the actions of the department and the seizures that have been made, but that applies only to those who have been violating the law or have been guilty of smuggling in some way or other. The best evidence of such fact is that which I shall now lay before the House.

A short time since, the department, mainly through the assistance of one of the reputable wholesale houses of the Dominion, was enabled to lay bare a scandalous system of fraud, extending even to perjury and forgery, which had been successfully carried out for years, by a Toronto hardware firm.

The facts coming to the knowledge of the general business community, various urgent representations were made to me that the principals in these crimes should be made examples of in such a manner as to deter others from the continuance of similar practices.

I hold in my hand and will now read to the House, a petition from the business men of Montreal on the subject of the propriety of, and necessity for, the most rigorous prosecution of the firm in question. The petition is as follows:—

"Montreal, 25th January, 1888.

"Hon. Mackenzie Bowell,
"Minister of Customs,
"Ottawa.

"Sir,—We the undersigned merchants and importers of hardware in the city of Montreal, having heard of the irregular and fraudulent entries made by a certain firm in Toronto in the same line of business as ourselves, do petition that you will investigate the matter thoroughly, and have the entries of the said firm during the years 1886, 1887, as well as 1888, carefully examined. Our reason for thus urging the matter is that, for a long time past, we have been unable to compete in certain lines of goods with the house in question, thereby losing us not only the confidence of our customers, but in many instances a considerable amount of business. We hope that, in dealing with this matter, you will protect the interest of the honest importer by inflicting the full penalty which the law imposes for such irregularities against the revenue."

"We remain, yours respectfully,

FROTHINGHAM & WORKMAN,	C. C. SNOWDON & CO.,
CAVERHILL, LEARMONT & CO.,	HOWDEN, STARKE & CO.,
BENNY, MACPHERSON & CO.,	L. N. HÉBERT,
CRATHERN & CAVERHILL,	PREVOST, PREVOST & CO.,
McCLARY MFG. CO.,	PIGHÉ, TISDALE & PAINCHAUD,
SEYBOLD, SON & CO.,	HENEY & LACROIX,
THOS DAVIDSON & CO.,	LEWIS BROS & CO.
R. & W. WARMINTON.	

Possibly hon. gentlemen, having heard this testimony, will admit the cojency of the reasoning of the Montreal merchants, whose business interests have suffered so tangibly in this instance, and it must be borne in mind that the strong probability is that this particular case is only an exceptional discovery, and that similar systems of fraud, equally baneful in their results, are still, and have for long been, going on undiscovered and consequently unchecked. It can thus be, perhaps, understood that the offering of premiums to the proper class of Customs officers is essentially in the best interests of the Dominion.

Now, why did these firms deem it necessary to send such a petition as that to the Customs Department? For the reason that, when information was put before me, and I sent officers to investigate the matter, the newspapers at once commenced publishing a series of articles condemning the Customs Department for going into honest men's establishments, seizing their books, weakening the confidence of the people in them, and destroying their business. When it was found that a thorough investigation was being made, a charge was then made against the officers, because they were acting civilly to the guilty parties, that they were being purchased and tampered with, and that these persons were to be let off with a nominal penalty. Well, the penalty inflicted was some $9,000, and when a criminal prosecution was to be instituted, both partners in the business left for the United States.

Another indication of popular feeling in this direction is now before me. In reply to a question recently asked in this House, I informed an hon. gentleman that John A. Grose, one of the detectives employed on the Special Agent's staff, had stated his intention of resigning and entering upon some other employment. This person may be held to represent the very class of Customs employé whose high-handed and, as alleged, illegal and offensive conduct in connection with the making of seizures, would presumably make the merchantile community anxious that the vacancy caused by his retirement should not be filled. But what is the fact? I have here a recommendation, signed by 32 of the wholesale firms in Montreal, asking that this position be filled, and recommending a man for it. This memorial is as follows:—

"MONTREAL, January 30th, 1889.

"To the Hon. MACKENZIE BOWELL,
"Minister of Customs, Ottawa.

"We, the undersigned merchants of the city of Montreal, have much pleasure in recommending [I need not mention the name] for the vacant position of Special Customs Agent.

"We are,
"Your obedient servants,

H. SHOREY & CO.,	GREEN, SONS & CO.,
GAULT BROS. & CO.,	JAMES CORISTINE & CO.,
D. MORRIS, SON & CO.,	HODGSON, SUMNER & CO.,
JAS. O'BRIEN & CO.,	BENNY, MACPHERSON & CO.,
JAS. LINTON & CO.,	RANKIN, BEATTIE & CO.,
JAS. POPHAM & CO.,	J. G. MACKENZIE & CO.,
MILLS & HUTCHISON,	R. HY. HOLLAND & CO.,
S. GREENSHIELDS, SON & CO.,	B. LEVIN & CO.,
McINTYRE, SON & CO.,	TOOKE BROS.,
E. A. SMALL & CO.,	H. A. NELSON & SONS,
R. TYLER,	LOCKERBY BROS.,
BEALL, ROSS & CO.,	KINLOCK, LINDSAY & CO.,
MACKAY BROTHERS,	J. W. MACKEDIE & CO.,
P. D. DODDS & CO.,	MINTO, LAVIGNE & CO.,
JAS JOHNSTON & CO.,	ROBERTSON, LINTON & CO.,
JOHN MACLEAN & CO.,	SILVERMAN, BOULTER & CO.

I might here remind the House that Montreal has within the past five years, furnished many serious examples of fraudulent transactions in respect of Customs entries, and the local press there has teemed with extremely hostile criticisms of the methods adopted by the Special Agent's staff, to which the person in question was attached. It cannot, however, be denied that this memorial from the merchants of Montreal must be accepted as the best possible testimony to the fact that the success of the honest merchant is materially aided by the employment of special Customs officers who are capable of successfully circumventing and suppressing the various schemes which are resorted to in order to defraud the revenue of its just dues. If the actions of the Special Agent were of such a villainous character as has been represented, if the honest merchants had been interfered with to such an extent and had become so disgusted with the system as it has been stated they are, would the most wealthy class of the community of Montreal, who are deeply interested in seeing that every man should pay the duty properly, have petitioned to have that position again filled by a man in whom they had confidence? I think I am quite safe in saying that the merchants and the honest importers throughout the whole country approve of the system which has been in force in Canada for a long time. I do not desire to be understood to say that, where so many cases are coming before the department and complaints are being constantly made in regard to dishonest importers, there may not be cases of hardship. When those cases come before the department, they are always considered and dealt with as leniently as the law will permit. That reminds me of a charge which was made, I must admit to my surprise, by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on a previous occasion, when, in speaking of these cases, he said:

"The case is referred of course to the head of the department, and the head of the department in nine cases out of ten will sustain the official whether the official is right or wrong.

"Mr FOSTER. No.

"Mr. CHARLTON. The system promotes tyrannical conduct on the part of the officials of the Government. It is in every respect a most vicious system, and these men will pay more attention to their own interest in the matter of making seizures than they will to the public interest."

I hesitate not to say that there is not a man in this House of the whole of the 214 members to whom I would not, if I had been in the House, have appealed more confidently in denial of that statement than to him. I told him I intended, when the question came up, to refer to the subject here, and I say distinctly that he of all men has no right to make that charge against the head of the department; he of all men in this House has had leniency shown him by the head of the department in dealing with penalties which had been imposed upon vessels in which he was interested. I do not desire to be understood as stating that he was a party to the violations of the law, but I do say that when representations were made by him on behalf of the captains of vessels which had violated the law, instead of enforcing the report made by the officials at the points at which the seizures were made, and the reports made upon them by the Commissioner and the Assistant Commissioner here, leniency was extended after a full investigation by myself into the cases in which he was interested; and, in some cases, captains were allowed to go without payment of any penalty other than the cost attached to their own negligence, while in other cases they have been refunded a part of the penalty which the officials had exacted from them. I may add that hon. gentlemen sometimes, in discussing this question, forget the facts connected with their own transactions and they forget also the difficulties that arise, not only in the investigation, but in coming to a correct conclusion as to the veracity of the parties who make the statements, whether they be officials or whether they be parties who have violated the law. There are many cases in which the officers do their duty to the letter, but there are circumstances attending the transaction which justify the head of the department in not imposing the penalties which are provided by the law. The very last case that I decided, in connection with a vessel which had paid a rather heavy penalty in the west, was one of those cases: it was one in which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was interested, and upon his representations, and upon the evidence of the captain, which was confirmed by the collector at Windsor, he had every dollar remitted to him except the expenses. And yet, in my absence, he declares to this House that in nine cases out of ten, whether right or wrong, the head of the department confirms the reports of his officers.

Now, I propose to call the attention of the House for a few moments to the moiety question, and will be as brief as possible. I must apologise to the House for occupying so much time, but I do so because this question has created a good deal of dissatisfaction, among those who had to pay penalties, more particularly; and I regret to say—perhaps I am wrong—but my impression is that politicians have taken it up in order to create a feeling, not against the officials particularly, but to injure the Government for enforcing the law. It has been in many directions of great advantage to Canadian legislators to avail themselves of the past experience of the United States. Notwithstanding our different systems of government, there are many subjects for legislation in respect of which the traditions and education of our own people tend to make the example of the United States of peculiar value, and in no direction can the experience of that country be more advantageously studied by Canadians, than in relation to revenue and tariff matters. I wish, therefore, to remind hon. gentlemen that in the year 1874, in consequence of pressure brought to bear upon Congress by prominent and interested business men, the provisions of their Customs law were repealed, under which moieties of fines, penalties or forfeitures were paid to officers of Customs. Up to the date of such repeal, United States Customs officers and informers were awarded one-half the proceeds of seizures and fines, the remaining one-half reverting to the Treasury. A great deal has been said in reference to the action of the United States Government in repealing what is termed the Moiety Act. This matter was fully investigated by Secretary Manning in 1885. He issued a circular to all his officials and to prominent merchants, asking their opinion as to the effect which the repeal of that Act had had upon the collection of the revenue and upon honest importers, and whether the result had been the diminishing of smuggling or its increase. In issuing this circular, he says:

"In order that I may have before me, in preparing my annual report to Congress, a correct appreciation of the results and the effects of our recent investigations of Custom house affairs, and in order that I may decide how much and what proportion, if any of the record shall be sent to Congress, I desire that careful and official replies to the following enquiries, with adequate completeness, of details of facts and figures be prepared for my use at the earliest practical day."

This is signed by Daniel Manning, Secretary of the United States Treasury It covers a great many subjects, but that to which I desire to refer is covered by the 17th question:

"Have the false reports by the appraisers been increased by the repeal, in 1874, of the moiety law, and by the Customs legislation of that date, modifying the existing law, and especially modifying that of 1863, respecting seizures of books and papers?"

Many answers are given to that question. I have them before me, and have made extracts which it may be interesting for me to read. Here is a joint memorandum placed before the secretary in 1884, and signed by the chief clerk, assistant clerk and the auditor of the New York Custom house. This memorandum will be found on page 596 of the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, of 1885, to which I call the attention of the House. It concludes as follows:—

"The solvency and the life of the Government are dependent upon the certainty of the collection of its revenues, and strict laws are an absolute necessity to ensure their payment into the national Treasury; and such statutes may be efficiently executed without injustice to the citizens who, having the welfare of this country at heart, would not knowingly commit a fraud upon it. Stringent laws are as essential to the honest taxpayers as to the Government, for smuggled and other fraudulent importations would not fail to destroy the business existence of loyal and conscientious merchants. No Government can afford laws that would be inimical to the interests of such citizens, and yet our Congress has a Bill before it, which, if it becomes law, will certainly encourage frauds upon the revenue and drive from trade and make bankrupt the honest importer, who, of course, could not compete in prices with those who might successfully evade the payment of the just impost."

Referring to Customs officers and the moiety system, they say:

"The Customs officer, of course, would execute the law; but deprive him of his just moiety, and he will and must avoid personal risk. The experiment of detecting frauds without moieties has been tried and found wanting (see the Act of 11th February, 1846) and in the absence of a proper equivalent to the seizing officer and with a high tariff in operation, smuggling and frauds upon the revenue will be encouraged and run riot in every port in the United States. * * *

"Moreover, he is under heavy bonds for the faithful collection of the revenue. Will any man in that office take the great responsibility of making seizures without a fair and equitable compensation? No. And it would be unreasonable and contrary to the laws of nature to expect it. An incentive or reward is a necessity to the sure punishment of offenders."

I may add that instances of that kind have come under my own knowledge. The one to which I called attention a few moments ago was an example, in which case the importer, having acknowledged that he had smuggled and paid the fine, then said that he had done so through coercion and had never been guilty of fraud. Quoting from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the Collection of Duties, 1885, we find on page 340, the joint opinions of Special Agents L. G. Martin and A. K. Tingle, to be as follows:—

"The consignment system as it now exists, has largely grown up since the enactment in 1874, of the law known as the Anti-Moiety Act. A careful examination of the provisions of this law will show to any unprejudiced mind that, if it was not designed for that object, its tendency is to create the very condition of affairs, as to values, which now exists. It practically ties the hands of the Government, and prevents the enforcement of the tariff laws, in that it prevents its officers from obtaining proofs necessary to establish a fraud by undervaluation. Proof of such frauds could be usually obtained under the old law by an examination of the books and papers of the importer, where such an examination was made without giving him an opportunity to sequester the papers. There is a provision of the Act of 1874 under which books and papers of an importer may be examined by the attorney of the Government after suit is commenced, but notice must be given to the importer of the particular books and papers desired, and this gives an opportunity to those who are dishonest to suppress proof of guilt.

"Under former laws, informers in Customs cases were assured of 25 per cent. of the sum realised by the Government for the information furnished. Under the present law their compensation is dependent upon many contingencies. If the fraud revealed consists of undervaluation, they are not sure of any reward, because of the difficulty of collecting even advanced duties, not to speak of the impossibility of securing forfeitures; and the amount in any case depends upon the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury and cannot exceed $5,000. When a great fraud has been successful, those having knowledge of it find it more profitable to treat with the guilty parties than with the Government."

The same officers in reply to the additional enquiries, on page 348 of the same report, say:—

"By the very condition of affairs as to values which now exists as stated in the second sentence of our reply to enquiry No. 17, we mean the prevalent practice of under-invoicing consigned goods, which has been for some years past and is now so general as to many lines of merchandise. We think that the comparative immunity from all risk of punishment either in pocket or in person enjoyed by importers since the passage of the Anti-Moiety Act has tended to encourage the fraudulent practices by which the revenue laws are so largely evaded."

It is under this consignment system the greatest frauds are perpetrated, as every merchant who pays his duty knows, and the instance of Bertin & Co., wine merchants, is a case in point, for, as I have shown, when they deducted the charges and duty on the consignment, there was left about 2 cents per gallon to send to the party from whom the wine was purchased in Bordeaux. On page 363 of the report, Special Agent A. M. Barney, of Galveston, Texas, says:

"* * * So far as my experience goes there has been no perceptible increase of false reports by appraisers, since the repeal of the so-called Moiety Law in 1874, although there has arisen since that time a distrust on the part of appraisers and others of their ability to force an increase in values honestly believed to be dutiable, as by the repeal of that Act the burden of proving intent has been thrown upon the Government, and the right to examine books, papers, invoices, &c., has been taken away from the Government, or so hedged about with difficulties as to render it inoperative and void. The repeal of the Moiety Act had also had the effect to decrease to a large extent the number and values of seizures for undervaluation and in smuggling cases. The United States seems to be the only civilised country on the globe that does not offer a premium for information in regard to an infraction of its laws.

On page 391 of the report Special Agent, N. W. Bingham, of Boston, Mass., says:

"I have already stated that, in my judgment, the repeal of the Moiety Law has resulted in largely increasing the undervaluation in invoices and entries, and has resulted, naturally, in the increase of incorrect reports by the appraisers, for the reason that the invoice, in the absence of contradictory evidence, would be taken as conclusive evidence of value. But the evils resulting from the repeal of the Moiety Law extend beyond this; they are not alone found in the encouragement given to illicit transactions whereby the appraising officers are deceived, but the encouragement to give information is withdrawn, except in matters of comparatively small importance, and with those who are willing to be published in the courts, and annually to Congress as informers, and the officers are deprived of the incentive to a special vigilance and the means of obtaining testimony from the books and papers of the importers."

On page 406 of the report, James B. Power, Special Agent at New York City, writes:

"The repeal of the Moiety law and the modification of the law authorising seizure of books and papers, restricted the power of Customs officers in the pursuit of fraud. While the Government still has the power to examine books and papers, this power can only be exercised under the sanction and authority of a justice of the United States Court, and the particular books and papers must be described before such sanction is given. Under the old law an officer could make an unexpected descent on a suspected importer, and having power to examine all books and papers, could discover fraud if any existed. While the power conferred by this law was arbitrary and liable to abuse, the honest merchant had nothing to apprehend from its operation. The repeal of the Moiety Law removed all incentive to the giving of information by clerks and other employés possessed of knowledge of fraudulent doings by their employers."

On page 504 of the report, Edmund D. White, Examiner in the Appraiser's Office at Boston, states:

"It would seem to be almost self-evident that the repeal of the Moiety Law removed a great and ever present stimulus to Customs officers, which added to the requirements of their oath and their sense of official obligations, to be not only true to their trusts but to exercise extra vigilance. I do not believe that its repeal made any difference with an honest appraiser like Mr. Rice at this port, but its general effect could be but in one direction, and that the wrong one."

On page 541 of the report B. B. Smalley, Collector of Customs at Burlington, Vt., says:

"In answer to interrogatory No. 17: In my opinion frauds on the revenue have been largely increased by the repeal of the Moiety Law. I think it would be for the interests of the Government to have it re-enacted with proper guards to prevent abuses under it."

On page 545, John Hitt, Special Deputy Collector at Chicago, Ill., says:

"The repeal of the Moiety Act, 22nd June, 1874, was a blunder of the first magnitude, so far as the revenue was concerned. The fact remains that public opinion did not sustain the methods adopted by Special Agent Jayne and other agents of the Treasury. The reaction resulted in the repeal of the Moiety Act. Since that repeal undervaluation has increased greatly at the great ports, if we may believe the testimony of the merchants here, who cannot import silks and many kinds of goods by reason of the system of agents of European manufacturers stationed in New York. * * * The conscience of the country is not sensitive in regard to frauds upon the Customs revenue. * * * The loss to the Revenue by this laxness of opinion is, in my opinion, many millions each year."

On page 557 of the report, Charles H. Ham, Appraiser at Chicago, Ill., states:

"Herewith I enclose a schedule covering the years from 1873 to 1877, inclusive. From the schedule it will be seen that, whereas in 1873 the seizures, &c., amounted to $773,370.09, in 1877 the total amount was only $120,131.09. I attribute this decrease to the discouraging effect of the legislation of 1874. The Civil Service Commission of 1871, known as the Curtis Commission, estimated that one-fourth of the revenue of the United States was lost in their collection."

"The Jay Commission (1877) quote this estimate; and they also say: Some facts submitted by the importers touching the offer of foreign manufacturers to deliver in New York goods at a lower rate than they can honestly be imported at, would not seem to indicate increasing strictness and success in protecting the revenue."

"Mr. Ham continues: The circumstances of this repeal of the Moiety Law show, I think, that it ought not to have been repealed, and go far to show that it ought to be re-enacted. 1st—It was repealed on the heels of a series of enormous frauds, which were discovered through its aid—the seizure of books and papers. 2nd—It was repealed against the protest of those Government officials who had found it an efficient means of punishing and detecting frauds. 3rd—It was repealed at the demand of the persons who had been proven guilty of its violation. At least I am informed and believe such to be the facts, and if these are facts the repeal legislation of 1874 was little less than infamous.

"I see no good reason why the Moiety Act covering power to seize books and papers should not be again made part of the machinery for collecting the Customs revenue, whether that revenue shall continue to be raised, as now, largely by *ad valorem* rates or, as I hope it will be, wholly by specific rates.

"I do not think that honest merchants ever have objected or ever would object to such a law as oppressive. It is to the interest of merchants that the revenue should be collected; not a part of it but all of it.

"A member of one of the large importing houses here said to me recently: 'I think the repeal of the Moieties Law under the circumstances (and he knew the circumstances as I have described them in this report) was a very iniquitous act.'

"To the question, 'Would you object to Government officials looking at your books?' he replied promptly: 'I am willing that Government agents should examine my books to the last detail.'"

On page 588 of the report, Edward L. Hedden, Collector of Customs, New York, says:

"I am of the opinion that the repeal of the Moiety Law has deprived the Government of millions of dollars of revenue, and has been one of the direct influences to cause undervaluations."

On page 675, N. G. Williams, Deputy Collector of Customs, New York, says:

"I believe that undervaluations of invoices greatly increased since the repeal of the Moiety Law. Although the law was denounced and made to appear as very unpopular, it is nevertheless true that it was beneficial to the best interests of the Government, and it afforded the honest importer appreciable protection against the dishonest practice of swindling importers. The sentiment against the law was stirred up and formulated by men inimical to the interests of the business men of the country. The practical effect of the repeal of the law has been to drive honest American importing houses out of the trade, so that to-day the vast bulk of the importing business is in the hands of foreign agents who have no respect for our revenue laws, and are mercenary to the last degree. I believe it is this class of men who are most guilty of corrupting officers in the revenue service. Congress should restore the law to the Statute-book."

On page 698, George N. Birdsall, Assistant Appraiser at New York, says:

"I am of the opinion that the repeal of the moiety provisions of the Act of 22nd June, 1874, has caused more undetected undervaluation, because it removed an extra incentive to work for their detection. This dishonest importers have availed themselves of, they knowing that, if the incentive is not there, the risk of detection is lessened."

Mr. BOWELL.

On page 861, T. B. Sanders, Deputy Commissioner of Navigation, Washington, says:

"The passage of the Anti-Moiety Act must necessarily have increased the temptation to defraud the revenue, and I have no doubt has actually led to violations of the revenue laws."

On page 426, George B. Church, Inspector of Customs, Ogdensburgh, N.Y., says:

"There seems to be no difference of opinion among those whose duty has brought them in contact with the operation of the Act of 22nd June, 1874. While this Act was passed as a reform measure, for the protection of the revenue, had it been enacted for the purpose of enabling dishonest people to evade the tariff laws, it could not have better accomplished that object."

It will be borne in mind that these various expressions of opinion, were given to the Secretary of the Treasury during the year 1885, and though some disposition was shown by the Government of the United States, the succeeding year, to move in the direction of re-enacting a Moiety Law, the matter is still unsettled there; therefore it is interesting to know the opinion of the present Supervising Special Agent of the United States Treasury, as to the difficulties which are at present being encountered in the collection of proper duties in that country. In his annual report to the Secretary of the Treasury, dated 26th November, 1887, he states:

"The faulty construction of the present tariff laws, the inadequate means prescribed for re-appraisements, and the restrictions upon prosecutions for forfeiture, imposed by the Act of 1874, known as the 'Anti-Moiety Act,' have made it impossible for the officers of the Government charged with the administration of the Tariff, to protect the revenue from fraud, or the honest merchant from unfair competition.

"From any point of view the present system is objectionable, and instead of securing uniform and fair appraisements, as the law contemplates, its effect is to obstruct the efforts of the local appraisers to secure that object, and it affords the means by which unscrupulous importers, combining together, are enabled to perpetuate a well established system of defrauding the revenue."

More recently, on 17th November, 1888, the same officer in his annual report states:

"While the chief officers of the Customs at the principal ports have generally co-operated heartily with the department in its efforts to enforce the laws and regulations, the unscrupulous still prosper at the expense of the public revenue and honest importers, and it is manifelt that justice and equality at the Custom houses cannot be secured to as. interested, without a radical revision of the Customs Revenue Laws and a reformation of existing administrative methods and machinery1

"All experience has shown that high *ad valorem* rates cannot be collected with fairness and uniformity under any system of administrative laws and regulations hitherto devised, much less under the present loose restrictive laws and inadequate and ineffective system of appraisement."

All the foregoing opinions have emanated from responsible officers of the United States Treasury Department, but I have before me replies addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury by three representative business corporations, which must be admitted to have great value as representing the probable views of the general business community, and I will ask the House to allow me to read the same. On page 295 of the Secretary of the Treasury's Report, on Revision of the Tariff, James Lees & Sons, woollen manufacturers, Bridgeport, Pa., state:

"We do say, however, the 'moiety' Act should not have been repealed. As the law now stands, you are compelled to show the intention on the part of an importer to defraud before you can convict. The court is even obliged to charge the jury—that the 'intention' to defraud must be shown. It is a very difficult matter to prove the intention of a person, so conviction is frequently impossible. We are large importers ourselves, and we find a great deal of very unfair competition on the part of those who have no regard for honest business methods and the sanctity of an oath"

On page 434, the manufacturers of Rhode Island, under date Providence R. I., 22nd October, 1885, say:

"As you kindly invite information as to the character and extent of current fraud by undervaluation, as well as concerning methods for its suppression, we would say that the conviction is very general among Rhode Island business men that this class of fraud prevails as to nearly all kinds of imports whereon *ad valorem* duties are assessed, and that its magnitude is heavy. Especially do the abuses prevail as to merchan-

dise imported as actual property of foreign owners and handled solely for their account and profit. In our opinion, the suppression of such frauds was greatly weakened by the action of the Forty-third Congress concerning the law known as the 'Moiety Law,' to which action we will take the liberty to make further reference."

"Referring again to the 'Moiety Law,' important provisions of which were repealed by the 43rd Congress, we by no means assume the perfectness of that law as originally drawn, nor do we forget the grave abuses under it, but inasmuch as its foundation principle seems sound and in harmony with the general experience of other nations, we cannot but think that the repeal of its vital features, however the law may have needed amendment in some details, was a serious impairment of facility for the honest collection of Government dues. We believe that laws similar in principle and purpose to the 'Moiety Law' are calculated to greatly advance the end you seek to promote, in furnishing machinery indispensable to successful combat with the frauds under consideration."

On page 321, The National Association of Wool Manufacturers, write as follows:—

"Proposed remedy for undervaluation.—While the present tariff, in our opinion, should not be changed, we think its efficacy for revenue purposes and the protection of manufacturers and honest importers may be increased by improved methods of administration, fortunately, as we think, within your special province, and by improved administrative legislation, which you, above all others, are powerful to induce. We recognise with gratitude the administrative reforms which you have already instituted for correcting the undervaluation of imported merchandise entered for Customs duties, and would respectfully urge you to exert your potent influence upon Congress for the repeal of the section of the 'anti-moieties' Act of 22nd June, 1874, whereby the burden of proof of intent to defraud in undervaluation is imposed upon the Government, and for the enactment of a law imposing effectual penalties for undervaluation.

"At the annual meeting of the National Association of wool manufacturers, in the city of New York, on the 7th October instant, the above paper was read at length, and by a resolution of the association was unanimously approved."

In 1886 a Bill was laid before the United States Senate dealing with tariff and revenue matters, and among other sections proposed for enactment we find the following:—

"Section 4. That one-half of all moneys which shall be hereafter paid into the Treasury of the United States from fines, penalties or forfeitures incurred for violation of the Customs revenue laws, shall constitute a fund from which may be paid from time to time, on the joint order of the Secretary of the Treasurery and the Secretary of State, who are hereby created a board for that purpose, such sums as they may in their discretion determine, to meritorious officers of the Customs or consular service who shall have been instrumental in the detection or punishment of frauds upon the Customs revenne, and the board thereby created shall annually make a report of their doings hereunder to Congress, stating in detail the names of parties to whom moneys have been paid, their positions in the public service, the nature of the services rendered, and amount paid to each."

In his report to Congress on 16th February, 1886, page 39, the Secretary of the Treasury, commenting upon the legislation on revenue subjects, then before, or to come before the House, wrote as follows, in opposition to the form in which section 4, above referred to, proposed to revert to the moiety system:—

"Section fourth: It is with some diffidence that I interpose any objection to the fourth section, which proposes that one-half of the proceeds of fines, penalties or forfeitures shall be deposited in the Treasury subject to the joint order of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State, who are authorised to distribute this fund in their discretion 'to meritorious officers of the Customs or Consular service, who shall have been instrumental in the detection or punishment of frauds upon the revenue.' If this section should become a law, there will, I fear, be a practical difficulty in the practical execution thereof at the distant ports by a tribunal sitting at Washington. No work could be more vexing for an executive officer than the distribution of such a fund. Any such law, if deemed necessary and enacted by Congress, should as did the law of 1789, define exactly what portion of the proceeds of a forfeiture shall be paid to a seizing officer, and what portion shall be paid to an informer, or to informers by whose information the seizure was made and the forfeiture accomplished. Under the law of 1799, such questions were judicial questions determined by the court when called upon to distribute the proceeds of the forfeiture paid into the registrar of the court. The facts, being local, should be judicially examined in the same place where they arose, and be disposed of, if need be, by contentious litigation. The Bill (S.B. No. 1153) proposes not only to revive the moiety system, but to revive it in a most objectionable form."

This did not pass, but an annual sum of about $150,000 was voted and placed at the disposal of the Secretary of the Treasury to reward officers in his own discretion. These are opinions from all portions of the United States bearing testimony to the ill-effects which followed the repeal of the Moiety Act, so far as honest traders and the protection of the revenue were concerned. I place these upon record in order that they may be read by those who desire to refer to them, and if anyone desires to verify the extracts, I would refer him to the official record; he will find it in Mr. Manning's report (Secretary of Treasury) "On Collection of Duties," in 1885. Hon. members may say, and with a good deal of force—if the consensus of opinion on behalf of the wholesale merchants and the manufacturers, and the special agents whose duty it is to carry out the law, is of the character which I have pointed out, and which Mr. Manning puts upon record in his report—how is it that they have not changed the law? The same reasons have prevailed which influence many politicians in this country. There is a certain class who can always raise hornets' nests about the ears of those who endeavor to enforce the laws of the land, and for political reasons there have not been re-enacted in the United States, those aids to the uniform and efficient collection of revenue which their officers, after many years' experience, have proved should be re-enacted. But in the United States they place in their estimates every year about $150,000 to be distributed among those whom they call "meritorious officers." I question very much the propriety of a system of that kind. If the head of a department had a large sum placed at his disposal to be distributed among those officers who do their duty properly, as he views it, others who might do the work infinitely better, but against whom the person distributing the money might have a prejudice, would be excluded from participating in benefits which their services deserved. It would be highly dangerous, not only to the honest man who is endeavoringto perform his duties, but also in this, that it would place temptations to which they should not be subjected in the way of those who had the disposal of the money. I have here also a letter written by Charles E. Folger, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, which I commend to the anti-moiety agitators. It is as follows:—

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT,

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

"WASHINGTON, D.C., 28th March, 1884.

"To the President:

"Respectfully referring to the resolution of the House of Representatives of 15th January, 1884, requesting the President to forward to the House information, including reports from consuls and others, concerning the undervaluation, false classification, and other irregular practices in the importation of foreign merchandise, and to recommend what legislation, if any, is needed to prevent such frauds on the revenue, I have the honor to submit copies of reports numbered 1 to 184, inclusive, taken from the files of this department, covering the information desired. To these should be added reports and decisions numbered 1 to 78, inclusive, relative to the undervaluation of wool and woollen yarns, contained in House Ex. Doc. 101, herewith submitted.

"These papers seem to furnish conclusive evidence of general and extensive undervaluation of imported merchandise subject to *ad valorem* duties. They show that this evil has been steadily growing since the passage of the law approved 22nd June, 1874, entitled: "An Act to amend the Customs revenue laws and to repeal moieties." This law, while providing for rewards to officers who may seize smuggled goods, withdrew the stimulus previously given to vigilant activity by Customs officers in detecting undervaluation and other fraudulent practices, and, at the same time, erected a barrier to the successful prosecution, in the courts, of this class of frauds.

"This was done by reversing the rule prescribed by section 909 of the Revised Statutes, under which the burden of proof, in case of seizure, rested upon the claimant of the goods, and requiring the Government to show affirmatively the fraudulent intent of the importer. The jury must bring in a distinct and separate finding upon this question. If no such intent on the part of the person entering the goods is found, no matter how great the undervaluation perpetrated by the foreign manufacturer, who is the owner of the goods, no fine, penalty, or forfeiture can be imposed.

"Since the passage of this Act, the Government has almost uniformly failed to obtain verdicts in litigated cases, however strong the evidence of fraud adduced upon the trial.

"Whatever may have been thought as to the need of protecting the rights of individuals by the enactment of this law, it is clear that its result has been to render the Government almost powerless to enforce the revenue laws in cases of fradulent undervaluation by foreign manu-

facturers or unscrupulous importers, and to work great injury to the interest of importers who refrain from engaging in this dishonest practice.

"Besides the serious loss to the revenue consequent upon undervaluation, as indicated in these reports, the practice has a demoralising influence upon our trade with foreign countries. The lack of safeguards against it offers a premium to dishonesty, and makes it impossible for an honorable manufacturer or dealer in Europe to compete with his less conscientious rival for the American trade, and the honest American merchant is precluded from importing lines of goods thus undervalued. When such practices go unpunished the foreign shipper is practically enabled to make his own tariff, subject only to the contingency of having the rate increased by the appraiser's advance upon his invoice valuation.

"It thus happens that when Congress enacts that the rate of duty on certain goods shall be 50 per cent. *ad valorem*, it is found that perhaps only 30 or 40 per cent. is actually paid, according to the boldness and skill of the shipper and his American agent in falsifying market values and deceiving the appraising officers.

"It is no reflection upon the integrity or ability of appraising officers to say that they are unable, unaided by penal laws, to cope with this evil. The most skilful expert cannot be depended upon to fix values with absolute correctness; and where, as is now the case with many classes of imported goods, the true market values are studiously concealed by European manufacturers, in order that no proper criterion for appraisements may be obtained, the difficulties confronting the appraisers are well nigh insuperable.

"Responsibility for a correct valuation should be placed upon the consignee who makes entry, and the fact that the invoice and entry are false should be deemed presumptive evidence of fraudulent intent, subjecting the goods to forfeiture unless innocence can be shown.

"So long as the *ad valorem* system exists, equality and uniformity in its administration can only be secured by providing adequate means to prevent undervaluations. Such means are not to be found in existing laws.

"I submit herewith a draft of a Bill, the passage of which would, in my opinion, go far towards remedying the evils complained of.

"Very respectfully,
"CHAS. J. FOLGER,
Secretary.

I propose now to deal with these enormous sums which my hon. friend says have been paid to our own officers, and while I am not surprised that he should have drawn the deductions which he did from the Auditor General's Report, I have to inform him that that is not a safe indication, either of the amount of the seizures or of the money paid for seizures made during the year for which they appear in the Public Accounts or Auditor General's Report. Before doing that it may be of interest for those who have paid any attention to this question to know what has been done in the way of seizures and the distribution of penalties since Confederation. I promised the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that I would point out to him that during the time he was assisting in administering the affairs of this country seizures were made and the moieties were distributed under the same system that has been carried out during the time I have been in office.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman also remark the fact that every time he has had a Customs Bill before this House I pointed out the evil of that system and tried to get it removed, but without success?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know that such fact has anything to do with the question.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it has.

Mr. BOWELL. It perhaps has this to do with it: that it the system is so iniquitous as the hon. member says it is, he should have remedied it when he was in office. If it is wrong now it was wrong from 1868 to 1873.

Mr. MITCHELL. Granted.

Mr. BOWELL. Then I take it for granted that the system being of the character which my hon. friend has represented it to be, he did not do his duty when he was a member of the Government in not insisting on its repeal. I have always inferred from the pertinacity which characterises the hon. gentleman, that with his determination to insist on the adoption of any policy which he believes to be right, and with the force of character which he possesses, he certainly could have convinced his colleagues at that time that they ought at least to give up a system which was so unjust in its character and so injurious to the honest importers of the country.

Mr. MITCHELL. The abuse did not exist to the same extent at that time, and I probably had my hands full in my own department.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no doubt you had; I can realise that fact, because I know myself, and I am quite willing to admit, that with a department like the one of which the hon. gentleman had charge, or a department like my own, if we attend to it we have about as much as any man can do. I have here a memo. showing Customs revenue collected, and Crown seizures, receipts and expenditure, annually, for the Dominion, from Confederation to the 30th June, 1888. This statement fulfils a triple purpose: first, it shows the effect of a gradually increasing tariff upon the revenue of the country; next, it portrays clearly that in far greater ratio than the revenue increase stands, have the frauds upon the revenue multiplied; and lastly it indicates in unmistakeable terms the valuable results which have followed the appointment of specially qualified officers for the detection and prevention of frauds. While the revenue in the past twenty years has increased about 280 per cent., the volume of frauds detected has reached 1,000 per cent. in the same period. In this connection it is worthy of notice that during the three years between 1883—when the Special Agent's Branch was established—and 1885, there was paid into the revenue as seizure receipts a total of $310,853, of which $62,841 was collected by the Special Agent's Branch, as against a total of $147,170 in the preceding three years; while during the three years between 1886—when the Financial Inspector's position was created—and 1888, the aggregate seizure receipts have swollen, as compared with the three years immediately preceding, from $310,853 to $454,393. Of this latter amount $123,013 was collected by the Special Agent's Branch, and $61,170 by the Financial Inspector. Taking the six years from 1883 to 1888 and comparing them with the six years preceding, it is found that the receipts from seizures mounted up from $208,855 to $765,250, and of this latter sum there was collected by the combined efforts of the Special Agent's Branch and the Financial Inspector a total sum of $247,024. No more satisfactory indication could be had of the unchecked existence of fraudulent transactions during the years antecedent to 1883, and of the necessity for detailing suitable officers to devote attention to the discovery and reporting of such frauds, in order that they might be stamped out as far as possible, so that the operations of law-abiding merchants should not be hampered. The statement is as follows:—

Year.	Total Customs Revenue Collected.	Seizure Receipts.	Expenditure for Awards to Officers, Expenses, Refunds, &c.
	$	$	$
1868	8,624,318	9,154	6,104
1869	8,370,754	10,180	7,340
1870	9,411,443	15,460	11,906
1871	11,870,553	25,169	14,364
1872	12,727,056	36,037	24,019
1873	13,044,941	16,863	11,915
1874	14,448,898	9,616	6,362
1875	15,386,113	17,380	11,455
1876	12,858,042	15,398	9,664
1877	12,576,935	13,804	7,482
1878	12,819,982	21,583	7,794
1879	12,962,342	26,298	16,896
1880	14,164 668	35,535	16,992
1881	18,529,798	57,525	29,547
1882	21,744,157	54,110	36,235

In 1883 the Special Agents' branch was instituted, and in 1886 the Financial Inspector was appointed, after which the figures are as follows:—

Year.	Total Customs Revenue Collected.	Seizure Receipts.	Reported by Financial Inspector.	Reported by Special Agents' Branch.	Expenditure for Awards to Officers, &c.
	$	$	$	$	$
1883	23,207,826	73,052	.....	3,180	47,276
1884	20,212,156	110,759	.....	21,728	74,494
1885	19,180,986	127,046	.....	37,933	84,156
1886	19,497,114	222,030	8,484	88,720	135,689
1887	22,523,587	134,002	25,636	16,388	115,602
1888	22,264,820	98,361	27,050	17,905	93,069

Now, it would appear that a much larger amount was paid to the officers for seizures during the past year than is really the fact. Some of the moneys resulting from seizures have been in the Treasury for years, sometimes one, sometimes two, sometimes three years, for this reason: When there is a contested case, the money cannot be distributed until the case is settled, and in many cases, after the decision of the department has been given, the parties upon whom the penalties have been inflicted, pay without going into court, but ask for time. Scores and scores of cases are reopened many months after the decisions have been rendered, and opportunities given to parties to put in a defense, and to show that the seizure was not justifiable. The result has been that money which has lain in the Treasury for one or two years, is not finally disposed of for two or three years longer. I will give some examples of this. The amount awarded to officers and informers, etc., appears by the Auditor General's Report to have been in 1886-87, $82,924.86. Of this amount $24.70 had been in the Treasury since 1879-80, $344.80 since 1881-82, $71.04 since 1882-83, $96.43 since 1883-84, $3,360.92, since 1884-85, $36,699.06 since 1885-86, and $42,329.91 only was received during 1886-87, in which year the cases were finally settled and the money disposed of. It will thus be seen that of the moneys expended this year, $40,596.95, or about 50 per cent., was placed in the Treasury during the six preceding years to 1886-87. Then I may call the attention of the House to the fact that out of the money which has been placed to the credit of seizures, large remissions are made in consequence of the penalties being largely reduced; and to this fact I would invite the consideration of the hon. member for North Norfolk, who said that the head of the department always sustained the actions of his officers, whether they were right or wrong. There was remitted in 1886-87 no less than $28,430.21. This money was actually received as follows: In 1883-84, $35; in 1885-86, $7,894.26; and in 1886-87, $20,500.95. I give you that as an illustration. I have a number of other illustrations of the same kind, as well as the details of the division of moneys which has been made during the period in which I have been in office. I might say that in like manner, when we turn to 1887-88, when hon. gentlemen opposite, taking the Public Accounts as their guide, have been so shocked at the large amounts that have been paid to the officers and apparently so little left in the Treasury, I find that instead of only $5,292 remaining in the Treasury out of a total of $98,391 received on account of seizures, the facts are as follows: The amount awarded to officers and informers was $58,683, or $24,241 less than the preceding year, and the money from which such awards were paid was actually received as follows: In 1882-83, $14; in 1883-84, $153; in 1884-85, $2,055, in 1885-86, $5,352, in 1886-87, $21,451, and in 1887-88, $29,658. In this year, as in 1886-87, it will be observed that about 50 per cent. of the sum distributed was received during the three preceding years. I must also point out that in 1887-88 the remissions amounted to $26,781, which was actually received as follows: In 1883-84, $400, in 1884-85, $1,969, in 1886-87, $9,539, and in 1887-88, $14,873. Here again, if we assume, as is fairly reasonable, that the $7,605, paid out in 1887-88 for expenses and law costs, were taken from the receipts of the year, we establish the fact that there remained at the credit of the Receiver General not $5,292 as hon. gentlemen opposite would make it appear, but there actually was still lodged in the Treasury at the end of that year, of the proper receipts of the year, no less a sum than $46,225. It is not necessary that I should weary the House by reading the details of the parties to whom this money was paid.

Mr. MITCHELL. That would be interesting too.

Mr. BOWELL. Then I will put it on record so that the hon. gentleman can read it at his leisure. As making clearer the varying results of the efforts of the seizing officers, I will now place the House in possession of the following statement, giving the annual incomes of the officers more prominently connected with seizures, and giving also the average actual income of such officers for the past three years:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT

Showing total annual, and average annual incomes of officers who made seizures in years 1885-86, 1886-87 and 1887-88, and who received from all sources more than $1,200 per annum.

—	1885-86.	1886-87.	1887-88.	Average Annual Income.
	$	$	$	$
Ambrose, J. D. L	5,696	3,007	3,061	3,921
Baker, C	1,324	1,300	1,987	1,537
Blackwood, T. F	1,593	2,784	1,805	2,061
Blackwood, D	1,291	1,272	2,272	1,278
Bonness, J. D	2,460	1,432	1,742	1,878
Benson, W	2,399	2,031	2,638	2,356
Brookfield, E. W	1,212	1,200	1,273	1,228
Clark, Thos	1,867	1,725	1,700	1,764
Douglass, Jno	2,010	2,836	2,321	2,389
Faulkner, G	1,392	1,200	1,223	1,272
Frye, Geo	1,916	3,559	3,329	3,268
Flynn, P	1,125	2,005	1,534	1,555
Gerow, S. E	1,500	1,594	1,560	1,551
Grose, J. A	8,256	1,861	3,102	4,406
Hatchette, J	1,431	1,400	1,576	1,469
Hamilton, C	2,280	1,700	1,772	1,917
Heffernan, T. A	1,200	1,248	1,708	1,385
Hilton, J. F	1,888	1,800	1,841	1,843
Hunter, R	1,885	1,624	2,057	1,855
Lanthier, A	1,377	1,284	1,234	1,298
Lewis, Jno	2,500	2,500	2,881	2,627
Moir, A	1,908	1,800	1,976	1,895
Matheson, G. N	1,969	1,444	1,492	1,635
Mackenzie, A. I	1,836	1,981	1,751	1,856
Murray, Hugh	1,000	2,266	1,228	1,498
Milne, A. R	1,972	3,682	7,556	4,303
MacLaren, J. S	8,496	2,117	2,179	4,264
McLean, Thos	1,400	1,861	1,852	1,704
McMichael, S. W	1,626	9,482	7,621	6,243
O'Keeffe, P. J	1,547	1,419	1,841	1,602
O'Hara, W. J	6,094	7,231	3,641	5,655
Patterson, Thos	1,257	1,363	1,300	1,307
Sargaut, Thos	1,505	1,602	2,413	1,840
Stephenson, J	1,992	1,800	1,846	1,879
Thompson, J	1,852	1,300	1,374	1,509
Van Ingen, W. H	1,285	1,653	2,481	1,806
Watters, A. L	7,131	2,228	1,286	3,548
Watters, T. J	5,417	7,840	2,050	5,102
Warren, R. G	900	1,827	1,505	1,411
Wolff, J. F	5,609	2,086	1,600	3,098
Wyllie, A. A	1,420	6,239	1,100	1,253

From the foregoing statement it is clear that during the past three years 13 seizing officers received an average income of over $1,600 and less than $2,000; that 4 others received in the same way over $2,000 and less than $3,000—while 7 officers realised between $3,000 and $4,500.

For reasons already given, it must be admitted by all who impartially consider the subject, that up to this latter limit the remuneration is only reasonable,—and we have then left for consideration only 3 officers, whose average receipts during the past three years have exceeded $4,500.

It is with reference to the apparent receipts of such officers that I should explain the fact, that while some particular officers appear to be, and really are the Seizing Officers,—and possibly the discoverers of the fraud--and those to whom, if successful, the award is paid,—it may nevertheless be the case that they have called in the assistance of other officers, to whom they would naturally have to pay such amount out of their award, as they might consider the aid to have been worth.

In this way, though such principal officers would appear in the Public Accounts as the recipients of the full amount for which they as Seizing Officers had signed,—the actual portion of such amount which they might have retained for their own share—supposing they required and utilised the assistance of other officers—would be considerably less than the amount actually paid over to them by the Department. For this reason the large payments to these three officers should in fairness be viewed as subject to considerable diminution. Judging by the outcry which has been raised by gentlemen opposite, one would suppose that all Customs officers were amassing wealth as the result of sharing in Customs seizures. I regret to be obliged to show that my hon. friends on the other side of the House, in their anxiety to make out a case, are striving to create in the public mind an impression which the facts do not in any way warrant. I will therefore briefly lay before the House a summary analysis of the seizure awards made during the past two years. It is as follows:—

ANALYSIS of Seizure Awards to Customs Officers in year 1886-87:

Total number of permanent Customs Officers employed in the Dominion	1,100
Total number who participated in seizure awards	101
Total amount awarded as Customs officers' shares	$47,956 99
Number of participants in receipt of salaries up to $600	39
Average receipts from seizures per officer in this class	$205 00
Total amount awarded in this class	$7,982 55
Number of participants in receipt of salaries over $600 and up to $1,000	27
Average receipts from seizures per officer in this class	$216 00
Total amount awarded in this class	$5,848 97
Number of participants in receipt of salaries over $1,000 and up to $1,400	15
Average receipts from seizures per officer in this class	$245 00
Total amount awarded in this class	$3,679 87
Number of participants in receipt of salaries over $1,400 and up to $1,600	10
Average receipts from seizures per officer in this class	$1,402 00
Total amount awarded in this class	$14,017 86
Number of participants in receipt of salaries over $1,600 and up to $1,800	7
Average receipts from seizures per officer in this class	$1,954 00
Total amount awarded in this class	$13,677 62
Number of participants in receipt of salaries over $1,800 and up to $2,000	3
Average receipts from seizures per officer in this class	$916 70
Total amount awarded in this class	$2,750 12

ANALYSIS of Seizure Awards to Customs Officers in year 1887-88:

Total number of permanent officers employed in the Dominion	1,100
Total number who participated in seizure awards	119
Total amount awarded as officers' shares	$39,427 47
Number of participants in receipt of salaries up to $600	43
Average receipts from seizures per officer in this class	$128 00
Total amount awarded in this class	$5,524 00
Number of participants in receipt of salaries over $600 and up to $1,000	30
Average receipts from seizures per officer in this class	$195 00
Total amount awarded in this class	$5,861 00
Number of participants in receipt of salaries over $1,000 and up to $1,400	24
Average receipts from seizures per officer in this class	$299 44
Total amount awarded in this class	$7,187 00
Number of participants in receipt of salaries over $1,400 and up to $1,600	11
Average receipts from seizures per officer in this class	$1,300 00
Total amount awarded in this class	$14,321 00
Number of participants in receipt of salaries over $1,600 and up to $1,800	7
Average receipts from seizures per officer in this class	$573 00
Total amount awarded in this class	$4,013 00
Number of participants in receipt of salaries ovor $1,800 and up to $2,000	3
Average receipts from seizures per officer in this class	$714 00
Total amount awarded in this class	$2,142 00
Number of participants in receipt of salaries over $2,000 and up to $2,500	1
(J. Lewis, Surveyor, Montreal.)	
Amount of his receipts from seizures	$381 00
Total amount awarded in this class	$381 00

These analyses are worthy of careful perusal, for the reason that they mirror very fairly the relative value to the country of the different grades of Customs officials. Taking the year 1886-87, it will be observed, primarily, that only 101 out of the total force of 1,100 permanant officials, derived any benefit from seizures. Then we trace with moderate accuracy, the preventive work of the lower grade officials who, in the regular course of events, come in direct contact with the ordinary smuggler. We find that one-third of the whole number of officers who shared in seizures were men whose salaries do not exceed $600 per annum, and to these men one-sixth of the whole awards to officers was paid,—the approximate average addition to their salaries being $205 each,—thus making their average annual incomes range from $600 to $805. We then come to the next higher grade,—men whose salaries are between $600 and $1,000—principally clerks and landing waiters, of whom possibly greater intelligence may be expected. We find that they number 27 out of the 62 officials who remain as participants after the lowest grade men have been disposed of. It appears that by this class one-eighth of the whole amount awarded has been secured, and the approximate average addition to their individual salaries has been $216,—thus making the smallest average salary among them $816, and the largest $1,216. Next in order come those officers whose salaries range from $1,000 to $1,400, and they number 15 out of the 35 participants yet unsatisfied. This grade of officers had divided among them one-thirteenth of the whole sum awarded, which increased their salaries, on an approximate average, by $245, thus making the minimum remuneration about $1,245, and the maximum $1,645. We have now only 20 officers left as participants, and of this number there are ten who form a group with salaries from $1,400 to $1,600. This group received $14,000 of the total of $47,957 awarded, which makes an average addition to their salaries of $1,402. Approximately this made the minimum salary among them $2,800 and the maximum $3,000. It should be remarked that this particular grade embraces nearly all the Appraisers in the service,—men who are supposed to be specially informed in their several lines of business, and capable of fixing the proper values of goods, and so checking frauds, which less well informed men would allow to pass. Most of them have been active business men,—and, granting that they possess the requisite qualifications for their positions, it cannot be argued that the maximum average sum received by this grade is anything but a fair remuneration for their services. In this group are also included the Supervising Special Agent, and the Financial Inspector, whose services in the correction of fraudulent practices have been especially valuable to the Dominion.

Next come 7 officers whose salaries range from $1,600 to $1,800, and among them was distributed slightly more than one-fourth of the total awards,—giving an approximate average addition to their salaries of $1,954, and thus raising the approximate average minimum and maximum remuneration to $3,554 and $3,754 respectively; in

this group is included the Departmental Accountant, who was mainly instrumental during this particular year, in bringing to light and correcting some most serious and long continued systems of defrauding the revenue. Finally, we have left three officers with salaries over $1,800 and up to $2,000. The result of their efforts in the prevention of fraud was not quite so advantageous to the country as in the two preceding groups; and the additional remuneration received by them was consequently smaller. Applying here the average of awards we find that the approximate average additions to salaries was $916.70, and consequently the approximate average minimum remuneration in this grade would be about $2,716, and the maximum $2,916. The analysis of year 1887-88 shows that the awards to officers were less than in 1886-87 by the sum of $8,529.52, and they were participated in by about the same number of men, and in nearly the same average ratio for the three lower grades of officers—as in year 1886-87—say those receiving up to $600 per annum, those over $600 and up to $1,000, and those over $1,000 and up to $1,400. Among those officers receiving over $1,400 and up to $1,600, the approximate average individual share of seizure awards was reduced by $102 as compared with 1886-87, and the number of officers participating was one greater in 1887-88. In the group receiving from $1,600 to $1,800, though the number participating in the two years was the same, the approximate average individual shares were reduced to $573 as against $1,954 in the year 1886-87; while in the grade whose salaries range from $1,800 to $2,000 with the same number of participants in both years—the individual average was $202 less than in 1886-87. There is a very important point in connection with the distribution of moieties, which appears to be lost sight of by those who condemn the system; and that is the fact that the sums paid to officers who detect frauds, as a reward for their vigilance, is not taken out of the public revenue of the Dominion, but from dishonest offenders against the laws of their country who are fined for their offences; so that if the reasoning of the gentlemen opposite mean anything, it is that no incentive should be given to Customs officials to detect frauds, punish the offenders, and thereby protect the honest importer and dealer. I have pointed out these facts in order that the House may not be misled in reading the Public Acounts or the Auditor General's reports in reference to the distribution of these moneys, as it might appear that officers received much larger amounts in one year, in comparison with the seizures made, than the law or the regulations would justify. The House will observe that where this apparently occurs, the facts are that, the seizures have been made some years before, but the cases have not been finally disposed of until much time has elapsed. I have very few more remarks to make on this question, which is a very important one to the commercial community. From experience, and, I think I can say without egotism, from close attention to the department over which I preside, and to the effects which have been produced by a strict enforcement of the law without respect to parties, I am positive that the present system has tended to increase the revenue enormously, and that it has protected the honest importer and resulted in putting a stop, to a very large extent, to the frauds committed on the revenue and the country. I know that those who have not been behind the scenes and watched closely the operations of smugglers and the devices to which dishonest importers resort, come to the conclusion that the law is wrong and its enforcement vexatious, and that those who administer it are guilty of offenses which in the old times would have been punished by transportation to Van Dieman's Land. I must also state that I find very few evidences in the newspapers to show that they deal with this question in other than a partisan manner. This is not a political question, but a moral one, which must be dealt with to a greater or less extent, no matter who is in power. If the public would endeavor to estimate in their own minds the difficulties which present themselves in the enforcement of a Customs Act, particularly under a high tariff, I am sure there would be less condemnation of the Department and its officers. The only journal that has dealt with this question, as I consider, properly, is the *Journal of Commerce*, whose editor seems to have grasped the difficulties that surround the enforcement of Customs laws under a high protective tariff. That paper has pointed out in a very forcible manner, not only the difficulties which present themselves in carrying out the law, but the leniency which should be exercised by the officers whose duty it is to enforce the law. I find in its issue of the 1st of February of this year, in reply to some statements made by the president of the Board of Trade of Toronto, the following remarks:

"There is one subject referred to in Mr. Darling's speech, in respect of which it would be very difficult to carry out his suggestion. It would, we fear, be next to impossible to prove any pre-existent knowledge on the part of a special officer of the Customs concerning fraudulent practices brought to light, however long he may have been cognisant of the facts. And let him be ever so zealous and faithful in the discharge of his duties, the evidence is often of a merely circumstantial nature, and, until he has completed the chain, it would be worse than useless to divulge it. The department is, doubtless, seldom or never without some information of this kind, as furnished by its special officers, and no action can be taken without its authority. At the time of the heavy dry goods seizures some two years ago, the officers had just completed the necessary evidence, and even then certain parties stood defiant, knowing that complete proof as concerning themselves personally could not be adduced. The knowledge in possession of the department of more extensive manipulations was not sufficiently complete The parties defied all attempts at proof, and the Government was obliged to content itself with administering a partial lesson at the time, with putting a damper for a while, at least, to further attempts in that line, and securing to honest importers a fair field for their business operations."

In a subsequent issue the editor deals with this question again:—

"There are a few in every community whose best efforts are in the direction of methods from which the ordinary business man naturally shrinks. Every town has one or two representatives of this class—men who almost invariably get the best of a bargain—who manage to make money in times when other men are eating into their capital—who always have some "pull" by which they are able to obtain their goods at a lower price than their neighbors and to undersell them at all seasons. In ports of entry the wits of these men are ever directed towards circumventing the Customs officers. In large cities no watchfulness is proof against them, for no sooner is one gap closed—one leak detected and stopped up—than a new one breaks out in some wholly unexpected quarter. These men will not be satisfied with fair profits in a straightforward way; "excelsior" is the point they aim at, and to reach it they are studying day and night, in the home circle, in the warehouse, in the house of prayer."

No doubt the editor had in his mind an individual who was, hypocritically, at the head of all the Christian institutions of Montreal, while perpetrating the greatest frauds on the revenue, and not only on the revenue, but on his own partner, his brother, who was ill at the time. The article continues:

"No law, no rule, no restriction, will avail against them. It is for the purpose of preventing these keen-witted traffickers from competing unfairly with the importer who honestly observes the law, and compelling them to contribute proportionately to the revenue of the country, that the Customs Department is obliged to maintain that portion of its force which is least understood and appreciated, even by some of those for whose benefit it is employed."

Hon. gentlemen may be sure that the disposition of that portion of the business community who are inclined to defraud the revenue, will not in any way be altered by the mere passage of laws of an inhibitive or even penal character. It is an axiom among legal men, and experience has taught mere laymen, that cruel and brutal punishment, imprisonment for long periods, and even the death penalty, have not deterred the commission of crimes in any measure proportionate to the severity of the sentence. It must, therefore, be conceded that unless the most effective machinery be adopted to enforce respect for and compliance

with the Customs law, it will perforce, and because of the popular prejudice to which reference has already been made, soon become an abortive measure. When proper weight is given to the arguments just advanced, and it is seen and understood that every consideration of public policy and regard for the commercial life of our most valuable business establishments and industries, demands the consistent and impartial, though severe, administration of the revenue laws, I am impelled to believe that the intelligent efforts of the Government to ensure that result will be heartily supported by all those who have the real good of our country at heart. These laws cannot be successfully enforced unless by the active co-operation of the various Customs officials throughout the country. A merely neutral or passive discharge of their duty would mean untold loss to the revenue and disaster to deserving and struggling business houses. Let us look to the schedule of salaries for Canadian Customs officials, which is appended to the Civil Service Act, and we shall find the salaries of the several grades of officers, who should be in a position to detect and prevent frauds, are as follows:—

	Scale of Salaries.
Inspectors	$1,600 to $2,500
Surveyors	1,200 to 2,500
Chief Clerks	1,200 to 2,500
Appraisers	800 to 2,000
Assistant Appraisers	600 to 1,500
Clerks	400 to 1,200
Tide Surveyors	800 to 1,000
Landing Waiters	400 to 1,000
Tide Waiters	400 to 600
Special Preventive Officers	600 to 1,200

Taking the ports of Montreal and New York as the respective examples, we find that in all the offices, except the very lowest, the salaries paid in New York are more than double those paid in the Customs service at Montreal. The most active officers in our service, holding the positions of appraisers, assistant appraisers and their immediate assistants, are men receiving from $1,000 to $1,800, while in New York the same class of officials receive from $1,800 to $4,000.

Taking the lower positions throughout the United States Customs service, it is found that generally the same disproportion in salaries exists; our men being paid in about the proportion of $600 to $1,000 received by corresponding officers on the other side of the border. This is notably the case at points where a river is the dividing line, as at Prescott and Sarnia.

The duties of officers on both sides are about alike, and the cost of living varies but little, but across the border there are generally twice the number of men, at salaries much larger, as already explained.

The right of Canadian officers to share in seizures is looked upon as being in some measure an offset to this inequality, but it frequently happens that officers do not, in several years, derive any additional income from this source. For reasons which must be apparent to hon. gentlemen, it is exceedingly difficult for any Minister of Customs, or Government, to ensure that men of proper value and intelligence shall hold in all cases the positions of responsibility and importance. It is the truest economy, in the Customs service especially, to try and secure for the really valuable and capable men, the highest possible remuneration; and as already explained, while the salaries now offered, coupled with the premium which is placed upon individual effort under our moiety system, enable us to secure and hold some good men, I am satisfied from intimate knowledge of the actual facts, that the withdrawal from such officers of the privilege of sharing in seizure awards would prove to be a signal misfortune to the country, and to honest men. Many of these hon. gentlemen who hold up their hands in deprecation of the sums paid to the most active and capable officers in the Customs service, think it only right and proper that much greater sums should be made annually by their ordinarily successful business or professional friends; and while I admit that the routine work of the Customs Department requires men of only average ability, it can safely be asserted that for the administrative duties, and for the proper appraisement of goods, and discovery and checking of frauds, you must imperatively have officers whose intelligence is equal to that of the business men with whom they have to deal. I have again to apologise to the House for the length of time I have taken, but I deemed it necessary to show as clearly as I could, that the charges made against the Customs Department and its officials are not justified, that in fact the enforcement of the law has been in the interest of the honest trader by punishing severely those who violate it; and if I deserve condemnation in any way it is for not having enforced more rigidly the penal provisions of the Customs Act. I have given to the House three or four instances of the result of going into the courts before magistrates to punish those who have violated the Act. In justice to one or two magistrates and judges, I must say that they have enforced the Act as it stands on the Statute-book, the foremost among those being the Chief Magistrate of the city of Windsor, in Ontario. For the benefit of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) who seems anxious to know, I will say that this gentleman is a Grit, but has evidently a sense of his duty and oath of office. I will not say anything against the others to whom I have referred. They may have taken a different view of the law. In the Eastern Townships, where cases have come before a gentleman who was formerly a member of this House, Judge Brooks, he did not hesitate to enforce the law strictly, as it was and is upon the Statute-book; and the result of the enforcement of these clauses there has been to deter, in a great measure, many of those who were carrying on the system of smuggling in the Eastern Townships, from pursuing their nefarious occupation. I have shown also, I think conclusively, that the repeal of the moiety system in the United States has not been productive of benefit to the morals of the importing community or to the revenue of that country. I have quoted a large number of statements—and I could have quadrupled them—from merchants and officials, showing that the repeal of the Moiety Act of 1874 resulted in an increase in the violations of the revenue law of the United States, and I have also shown that our merchants who are protected by the enforcement of the law are not dissatisfied, but are actually in favor of the law as it stands upon the Statute-book. One evidence of that is the fact that as soon as one of the Customs detectives had resigned his position on the staff, they petitioned to have another placed in his position in order that the laws might still be enforced. With these facts before the Government and before the House, I am of opinion, though I may be mistaken, that the honest merchants of this country, the manufacturers of the country who are interested in seeing the laws enforced, and more particularly the importers who contribute a large proportion of the revenue, would be injured by the abolition of the system which prevails at the present moment. Believing that to be the case, I have not deemed it advisable in the past to advise my colleagues to change the rules to any appreciable extent. I did go this far, at the instance of the Board of Trade of Montreal, in regard to whom my hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) said that their representations were treated with contempt and were never listened to. At their instance, I did prevent the distribution, among appraisers, of penalties which were imposed for undervaluations which were not necessarily fraudulent; as I believed it to be their duty under the law to examine goods, and, if they were undervalued, to carry out the rules and regulations enforced by my predecessor, without any other reward than their salaries. I put a stop to that, which they thought was a very important point, though I question the propriety of it myself after the experience of a year or two. I give that as an illustration

that the representations of boards of trade and merchants who are interested, have not been treated by the head of the department or the Government with the contempt which the hon. gentleman asserts. I shall deem it my duty in future, as long as I occupy this position, or any other position in the Government, whenever representations are made which I consider is in the interest of the public to carry out, to recommend my colleagues to adopt any policy which may meet the views of those gentlemen. But there are suggestions made very often which, when they are considered, and when you have the opportunity of a quiet conversation with those who suggest them, are seen by those gentlemen themselves to be improper or undersirable to carry out. I have shown that a return to the moiety system proper in the United States, is only a question of time, and that to abolish it in Canada would be to do away with the incentive now existing, and to lessen the anxiety of officials to discover and follow up the fraud, as they would not incur odium and ill-will in the discharge of their ordinary routine duty without being rewarded for it. Consequently, unchecked frauds would increase, and honest business men would suffer all the more. Instead of energetic and capable Customs officers paid by the dishonest portion of the community, as at present, for their successful efforts in discovering and punishing irregularities, the public Treasury would be depleted by the loss of revenue which the proposed system would undoubtedly entail. It is, therefore, manifest that a continuance of the present system is calculated in every way to conserve the interests both of honest business houses and of the revenue of the country. It is beyond doubt the system which experience has proved to be the best, and it should be maintained. Mr. Speaker, I shall leave this question with the House, asking hon. members if, with these facts before them, they deem it advisable to vote for the motion which has been placed in your hands, the most absurd portion of which, with all respect to my hon. friend (Mr. Holton), is that which declares that no condemnation of goods shall take place until there has been a public trial. If that were to be adopted, we would have to appoint an extra judge or two - one probably in each Province— o look after the seizures, unless you decide to abolish the moiety system and allow everyone to bring into the country what goods he pleases; because a judge would have to adjudicate upon 600 or 700 seizures per annum. That is about the number we have to deal with, and many of them are of the most trivial character possible. For instance, a five-gallon can of coal oil is brought across the border, and, according to the proposition now made, that must be held in durance vile, and I suppose we would have to put a special officer in charge of it to prevent evaporation taking place, or to prevent its being extracted and water put in until a judge could adjudicate upon it. That is the proposition which hon. members will be asked to vote for. However, this motion being one condemning the Government, I expect that the hon. gentlemen opposite would vote for it irrespective of the principle which it might involve or whether it declared that green was blue or black was white.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have had the pleasure of listening to the Minister of Customs to-day, and the House have been pleased to hear him, for he seldom speaks, and, the policy of his department having been attacked, it was fair that he should have time to reply. He has availed himself of the opportunity, however, to go into questions which are not under discussion at this time. He has sought to vindicate his department in some respects which have not been challenged. He has taken the opportunity to refer to such matters as the peach basket question and others which I shall not allude to at this time. There are two main propositions submitted in the resolution of the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton), one affirming that, in cases of seizures, instead of the matter being determined by the Minister of Customs, it shall be determined by a judge, by some person who is totally disinterested and unconnected with the department, and the other proposition that it is desirable in the public interest that the participation in seizures now permitted to the seizing officer should be abandoned. To these two propositions I shall confine my remarks. The Minister in reply to the member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) took occasion to make a remark. He said he did not desire to do it offensively, and yet it is one of the remarks that scarcely can be made without giving offence, when he characterised the speech that he had delivered as such a speech that might be made by a friend of all the smugglers and dishonest traders in the country. He may not desire to have given offence, but that is not an expression that you can use very well without giving offence. Now if that remark may apply to any one who may entertain much the same views as my hon. friend from Chateauguay, then it would embrace many more than himself, for, as the hon. member for Chateauguay thinks, and as I am inclined to think, notwithstanding the Minister believes to the contrary, a large majority of the mercantile community of this country are in favor of the changes that are advocated by the hon. member for Chateauguay; and, therefore, he will place the majority, if I be right in my conjecture, of the importers, the merchants, the business men of this country, in the position of those who are on the side of the smuggler and the dishonest dealer. Now I may say frankly at the outset that I do not believe in such a charge as is hurled against the merchants and the importers of this country. Why, Sir, our Customs law— I do not say by the Minister's design has been so worked, its operations are such, the continual restrictions that are imposed, the amendments that are suggested, the continual tinkering at the Customs law drawing it tighter and tighter every year—all this seems to carry the conviction of the Customs Department that the importers, instead of being a class in the country that are to be viewed with the same respect as other intelligent and honorable classes in the community, are as a class wholly lost to all that is honorable, and are entirely bent upon seeking their gain, whether in a legal or an illegal manner. Sir, I do not believe that, I do not think it is the case. The motion of the hon. member for Chateauguay recites that he is desirous of having every precaution taken, with due regard to the collection of the revenue, to prevent smuggling or illicit dealing in any shape or manner. There is no desire on his part, there is no desire on my part, I believe there is no desire on the part of the gentlemen who may vote for this proposition, to allow those who are engaged in an illegal traffic, those who are engaged in smuggling, those who are engaged in avoiding the Customs duties—there is no desire that they should escape the fair operation of the Customs laws. Possibly it might be charged against us that we do not care as much for the revenue as the Minister might care. The Government, it might be urged, care more particularly for securing the full revenue than the members of the Opposition; but if you grant that, still the members of the Government cannot be more anxious for the protection of the honest importer and the honest dealer than we are, and Sir, it is absolutely necessary in the interest of the honest importer and the honest dealer that you have stringent laws faithfully administered in order to protect them. Sir, we are not waging war, we are not speaking against such regulations or precautions as must necessarily be taken. The Minister has attempted to shield himself this afternoon by quoting that some of the regulations under which the Customs law worked at the present time, were in force when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was in power.

Mr. BOWELL. Not to shield myself.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Perhaps that is not a happy word, but he gave that as a reason why he did it.

Mr. BOWELL. No, not for any such reason. I meant to show that the same system prevailed while the hon. gentleman was in office as does now.

Mr. MITCHELL. It was clearly given as a case of "you are another."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I accept what the hon. Minister says; but as the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) says it meant this—I have a very weak case, and I am not acting as the Opposition did when they were in power. We would have been more pleased if he had acted in all matters on the line in which these hon. gentlemen acted when they were in the Government; but it appears that he only followed the example of that administration in matters that satisfied him. Now, if he had followed that administration in the matter of leaving us a simple tariff designed for revenue alone, if he had been content to administer this country with the economy that these gentlemen did, when it would only require him to raise some 25 millions of money instead of 36 millions, then we would not have complained of the operation of these clauses any more frequently than we did of the operation of these clauses when my hon. friends were in power. But the last statement he gave shows very clearly how the matter stood. In the matter of fines and seizures, and the distribution to seizing officers under the Mackenzie Administration, I think the amount averaged something like $15,000 a year; but under the tariff of 1879, where he departed from the example of the Mackenzie Administration, the seizures and the distribution to seizing officers have run up to over $100,000 per annum. As the hon. gentleman was proceeding with his remarks he was pertinently asked this question, how it was that there were not anything like as many complaints made at that time, anything like the murmurings heard then, that are heard at the present time? Sir, there was no occasion for them. I do not remember that there was anything like the feeling in the country, that there was anything like the complaints urged at that time, that are being urged at the present time. It can be readily seen why that is so. What we complain of is not the vigilance of the Customs Department in protecting the revenue and thus protecting the honest importer. That is what we desire. But we complain that he has led the people to believe that these officers, possessed of the same human nature that we have, when we leave it in their power, under such a complicated tariff as we have at the present time, that the Customs officers themselves cannot understand or interpret, that the importers cannot understand or interpret, and that any mistake made on the part—not dishonestly—but when any mistake is made by them, a seizing officer can go into your store, into your warehouse, and take possession of your goods, —yes, and go back three years to make a seizure amounting to thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of dollars, and that seizing officer, to make his case good, only has to be approved by the Minister of Customs, and to share in one-third of that amount—hon. gentlemen can see that that is a system that is liable to be abused under this condition of affairs. Sir, under a tariff simple in itself, there is less danger of an importer making a mistake; but now a merchant receives his invoice of a purchase of dry goods, for instance, in the old country, and he goes into the Custom house and asks how he is to enter these, and the officer tells him he thinks this article should come under that head and be subject to that duty; and I have heard instances where the appraiser has given his decision as to an article belonging to a certain class and coming under a certain line of duty; and when another article, another piece cut off precisely from the same article of goods, has been sent down to him, a few days intervening, it has been sent back with the declaration that it is another article, and is subject to another line of duty. Now, Sir, when a merchant makes an entry, the collector puts the article under some particular designation, to have it afterwards determined by the Customs Department, by the aid of the officer who makes this seizure, that it was not the right article, that it was not rightly classified, that it therefore had not paid the right amount of duty, and that was to be taken as a case of fraud, and the person to have his goods seized and to be fined, and one-third of the fine to go to the officer who makes the seizure. Sir, I think that both sides of this House will agree, and they ought to agree, when things have come to this pass, it is time at any rate seriously to consider this question. The hon. gentleman stated when the member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) pointed out that he had promised amendments on this line, reminding him that just before the last election he proceeded to Montreal where there was a great deal of dissatisfaction in regard to the operation of the Customs laws and endeavored to make matters smooth, the Minister of Customs said he remembered going to Montreal, but he had gone to a great many places, and he could not remember whether it was during election time or not. He did not know anything about it. Of course, we know the Minister of Customs is so absorbed in the duties of his office that if it were not for his colleagues he would not know when a general election came round. Of course he was in his office attending to his business. By looking at the public prints we find sometimes that they refresh our memories, and I have had placed in my hands one of the Montreal papers which alludes to the fact, and says that just before the last election, when there was a great deal of dissatisfaction among importers, that the Minister happened to go down to Montreal at that particular time. He has told us that he had a conference with the Boards of Trade of Halifax and Vancouver and Boards of Trade all over the country, and it was not strange that he should visit the Board of Trade of Montreal, and there as the happy coincidence that he was able to go there just prior to the general elections, by the merest chance in the world. But he was able to have a report circulated through the press which had a smoothing effect on the mercantile community at that time. But the mercantile community are not satisfied. They claim that promises made by the hon. gentleman have not been carried out. The Minister in his reply says he has carried out all he promised. We are forced to this conclusion that either members of the Board of Trade of Montreal who met the Minister gave out an inaccurate report to be circulated, or that the Minister has forgotten something of what occurred at that time. It is stated in one of the Montreal newspapers published in June, in an article referring to this event, as follows:—

"Complaint after complaint was made to Ottawa, but no satisfaction was forthcoming. Finally, the dissatisfaction of Montreal importers became so marked and emphatic that the Government had to take some notice of this, it is said more especially as the elections are coming shortly. Accordingly the Hon. Mr. Bowell, Minister of Customs, came down to Montreal and held a meeting with some members of the Board of Trade, of which meeting a report was prepared and given to the press. It was a cut and dried affair from the start. The following is a report of the meeting: 'The Hon. Mr. Bowell expressed himself as anxious to receive any suggestion from those present as to the amendments or improvements in the present Customs regulations.'"

We can readily understand that the Minister fairly hankered for amendements and suggestions to the Customs law. Session after Session he is going to amend it, and we can readily understand how anxious he was to receive suggestions. The report proceeds:

"He stated that he would give such suggestions as would be made his most serious consideration and would bring them under the notice of his colleagues. He said the Customs Department were willing and anxious to facilitate the importers, and with this object in view they would issue such rules as were most calculated to benefit merchants, while at the same time legitimate importers and the revenue were pro-

tected. The following suggestions were placed before the Minister: 1. That the Customs oath be dispensed with, the signature of the importer being affixed to the invoice being substituted. 2. That the system of allowing appraisers to share in the fines be abolished and that they be paid fixed and sufficient salaries."

The Minister knows whether that has been carried out or not.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not promise it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I thought I heard the Minister say that he had carried that out.

Mr. BOWELL. I understand the hon. gentleman to read that those were suggestions made to me. When he comes to that part in which he says I promised those changes, I will answer him.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he had prevented appraisers sharing seizures.

Mr. BOWELL. Except where there is fraud.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But it still continues in case of fraud.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). For I find cases in 1887-88.

Mr. BOWELL. They may have been cases where seizures may have been made a year or two before.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, quite so. The report continues:

"3. That when there is a difference of opinion between the importer and the Customs, the matter be referred to arbitrators, one to be chosen by the importer, one by the collector, and in case of disagreement the matter to be decided by a third arbitrator to be chosen by the two persons. Consideration and discussion ensued with the result that the Minister expressed a concurrence in the views and further suggested the propriety of removing the responsibility of decision from the head of the Customs Department to that of a judge or such officer as might be appointed for the purpose."

The Minister suggested that. Now he denies it. But that is the report given by the Board of Trade to the press of Montreal for circulation prior to the last general election; and the suggestion as to removing the decision from the Minister of Customs and placing it in the hands of a judge appears by this report to have been suggested by the Minister himself and not by the importers. With respect to the suggestion as to the arbitrators: has that been carried out? No. They suggest that the importer should appoint one arbitrator, the Customs Department another and that these two arbitrators should appoint another arbitrator. How does the law stand at the present time? If an importer objects to an appraisement he has the right to have arbitration. The local collector will notify him that he can appoint an arbitrator, the collector will appoint another and the appointment of the third rests with the Minister of Customs. The suggestion of the importers was that the importer should appoint one arbitrator, and the Customs Department another and that these two arbitrators should appoint a third. I, therefore, think the suggestions have not been carried out. I quote this to show that, if this be a correct report, had this proposition of the member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) that the final decision in matters of seizures should be removed from the head of the Customs Department and placed in one of the judges of the land, had not struck the Minister as being a ridiculous one at that particular time. The hon. gentleman professes to say to-night that it was a most ridiculous proposal, that a seizure could not be contracted until a legal decision was had in the matter, because he said it would result in practical ruin and injury to importers, especially in case of perishable articles. It is pointed out to me that the report from which I have been reading appeared in a Government paper. In the Customs law there is provision made for cases of that kind, and where perishable articles are seized the law allows the importer to deposit a sum of money in the hands of the collector equal to the value of the articles and they can then be used in any manner thought fit, and adjudications upon questions of seizure are frequently made after the articles have been consumed or disposed of. There could not, therefore, be any more difficulty in administering the law in the hands of a judge than under these circumstances; yet the Minister rested almost his whole case in trying to make this motion look ridiculous. I need not say more on this point than to point out that under the Customs regulations when an officer makes a seizure and that seizure has to be submitted to Ottawa, and the decision of the Minister of Customs has to be given in order to make it final, the importer is very much at the mercy of the department. But the Minister says that this does not make it final, that you can take the matter into court now, and he spoke as if it were an easy matter to take cases into court. He illustrated the fact that cases had been in court and he mentioned the Ayer case, the Grinnell case, and some others, but I can tell the hon. the Minister of Customs that it is not such an easy thing to get into court. As I understand the law, you cannot go into court until the Customs Department gives you permission to do so. That I think is provided for in section 182 of the Customs Act which says:

"If the owner or claimant of the thing seized or detained, or the person alleged to have incurred the penalty, within 30 days after being notified of the Minister's decision, gives him notice in writing that such decision will not be accepted, the Minister may refer the matter to the court."

The Minister "may refer," and, therefore, it is optional. I know a case in which a person was anxious to go into court, and he consulted several lawyers and experienced the greatest difficulty in knowing how he was to get into court until the time elapsed, and he never got his case into court at all. We do not plead here for men guilty of fraud, but if a man has his goods seized for what is termed undervaluation which, under this law is set down as a fraud, he being innocent of any intention to defraud, he having a receipt and invoice and entry showing correctly the price which he bought those goods for, yet with the arbitrary power placed in the hands of the Minister to raise that amount over and above the actual price; the importer can be adjudged by the Customs officer to have entered his goods below value, and those goods can be seized. Suppose he does go into court the department would plead, I suppose, that the value for duty for those goods had been fixed by the department under some departmental decision that had been given, but of which the importer was entirely ignorant.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no such rule and no such law.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What would be the law then?

Mr. BOWELL. I am speaking of what is the law.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the law?

Mr. BOWELL. If I understand you aright you say that the department can give a ruling and insist upon the duty being paid upon certain values, and that the importer would have no recourse; that he could not get into court, and if he did it would be on the values which had been fixed by the department. The department has no power except in particular cases which are provided for by a section which has been on the statute for years to absolutely declare or establish the value for duty. They can only be guided by the values in the market in which the goods are purchased.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not wish to misrepresent the Minister, but I certainly think they are doing this all the time.

Mr. BOWELL. No, no.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think it is being done continually and I know a case where seizures have been

made and where I have the utmost confidence that the party made an honest entry, at the value at which he bought the goods, but the department over-ruled the entry and put on a new value.

Mr. BOWELL. That is quite correct. Many a time a man buys goods in a foreign market for exportation altogether below the price for which they are sold for home consumption.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the Minister now agrees with what I stated before.

Mr. BOWELL. I am sorry you cannot draw the distinction.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose if a case like this goes into court the Minister would plead against the man that he had entered the goods at the price he paid for them, but that they had been entered below the price that the Minister thinks ought to be entered for duty. Then Sir, if the decision even on the technical point would go against the importer who had taken this case into court, he is liable for the full amount of the value on all the goods of a similar kind which he bought during the previous three years, although those goods may have passed the Customs entry, though the entry had been approved of, though the importer's money had been taken and although he sold those goods to his customers at the regular advance, he would be liable not for the extra amount of the duty, but for the full value of all the goods themselves. It would, therefore, be ruin to a man, and he could not afford to go into the court and take his chances in such an event. I believe I am correct in that.

Mr. BOWELL. No, you are not. The hon. gentleman says he does not desire to misrepresent me, and I may tell him there is no such provision in the Customs Act. It is only in cases where fraud has been established that the penalty to which the hon. gentleman refers can be enforced. In case of undervaluation the law provides that the penalty is in proportion to the percentage of the undervaluation, and not the total value of the goods.

Mr. LISTER. Who has to judge as of the fraud?

Mr. BOWELL. The law declares what is a fraud, and if that is proved I suppose the judge will decide on it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does not the Minister bring undervaluation under the head of fraud? Is not fraud assumed by the Customs Department for undervaluation?

Mr. BOWELL. Not in all cases.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No; but who is to judge on these matters? There again is the glorious uncertainty about those Customs laws.

Mr. BOWELL. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to explain the difference. If, after a seizure for undervaluation, correspondence is found between the importer and exporter showing that the exporter was asked to invoice the goods at certain prices below the price actually paid, or below the market price for which they are sold for home consumption, that would be evidence of fraud. If, on the contrary, a commercial agent comes to you and offers to sell you goods at a lower rate than they are sold for in the market from whence they are exported, and there is no evidence to show that you had any knowledge of this, then there is no fraud and you are not punished for fraud.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think I have known a case which I brought before the Minister himself and where he has been willing to admit that these parties were entirely innocent of the matter. He is the sole arbitrator who decides upon these matters, and let me point out that he has found fault with judgments rendered by our judges. He says that he candidly confessed that he will not agree to have these cases left to the courts, and he has given us instances in which he thinks the judges who adjudicate have given unjust decisions. In fact he thinks that the judges were all wrong. I think the case to which he refers were criminal prosecutions, but he did not cite any case as far as I remember where judgment was given by judges as to the value of the goods imported and as to whether there was fraud in the invoices that were submitted to the Customs Department. The Minister has so much confidence in his own integrity, his own uprightness, his own wisdom and his own judgment that he really prefers and thinks the interests of this country are much safer in his hands than they are in the hands of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada or of all the judges. I believe that in the Grinnell case in which he mentioned that Justice Gwynne had supported the contention of the Customs Department—if I am rightly informed in reference to the matter, and if I am wrong the Minister can set me right—there was an appeal taken from the decision of Mr. Justice Gwynne, sitting as judge of the Exchequer Court to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court reversed the decision of Mr. Justice Gwynne who was one of the judges, and did not dissent.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Perhaps I am wrong, but I was so instructed.

Mr. BOWELL. They reversed the decision, but it was not acquiesced in by Judge Gwynne. He did dissent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, he maintained his opinion, but the rest of the court were against him. Now, I think that the country, while it has all the confidence which might be desired in the Minister of Customs, would not hesitate to place confidence, perhaps not in some of the magistrates in some parts of the country, whose decisions the hon. Minister does not agree with, but in a judge hearing a case and determining it upon its merits. The hon. gentleman took occasion to tell us, in the case of a certain member of this House, that he had shown that gentleman more favor and more leniency than almost any other man in this country, and therefore it was very unjust to him to say that he always upheld the judgment of his officers, whether they were right or wrong. Well, that may be creditable to his mercy, but is that not a departure from the strict line of justice on the part of the Minister of Customs himself, who is superior to a judge of the Supreme Court? If he is there as a judge, he should not show leniency but only justice to those who come before him; but while I point out that the Minister himself is susceptible with his kind heart, to the appeals of those who come before him and plead their cases, I should judge from the tone and manner and temper in which he used those words, that if the individual in question, having made those remarks, should come before him on another occasion the leniency would be wanting, and the judge who was lenient in one case would not be lenient in another. Therefore, the hon. Minister of Customs is human, just as judges of the Supreme Court and others are, and if there is danger of their being in the wrong and giving a decision which is not in the best interest of the country or in the interest of justice, it is true that the Minister, with his large heart, open to impressions to be made upon it, may deal leniently with those who approach him, forgetting that he is acting as a judge, holding the scales with strict impartiality. With reference to the Ayer case, the rulings of the department are set forth by the chief justice of the highest court in Canada; and when you heard that judgment, with the comments on the way the Customs Department was administered, Sir, is it not time that this subject was brought before the Canadian Parliament, and the representatives of the Canadian people were asked whether

it was not time there should be a change made in the administration of our Customs law? I will not repeat the charge; the Minister did not attempt to deny it; but this he did say, that he did not approve of the judgment, that it was not to the credit of the chief justice to give the decision he did. Why, Sir, he would review the decision of a judge of the Supreme Court, and declare his decision to be wrong, unjust, and detrimental to the interests of this country; and he did not hesitate to say that he would be sorry to see the decision of these matters taken from the Customs Department and placed in the control of the courts. If he is correctly reported at that meeting in Montreal, he has changed his views very much since that time with reference to leaving these matters to be decided by the department. As to allowing the seizing officers to participate in the penalties imposed, I wish to say a few words.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Does the Minister get a share?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) No; I do not think any one but the seizing officers get a share; I would be the last to suggest anything of that kind against the Minister. The Minister rests his case solely on the fact that he has read from Secretary Manning's report, in which collectors of Customs throughout the different parts of the United States, speak of it having been a mistake on the part of the United States Government to repeal that provison of the law which enabled them to give certain amounts to officers making seizures. The Minister made the answer himself. He said, hon. gentlemen opposite will say, if the representations made are true, that the repeal of that provision has led to smuggling, is demoralising trade, is defrauding the revenue to the extent that these gentlemen say, a very natural and pertinent question to ask is, why have they not re-enacted it? I say if we are to judge that those dire results have followed from the repeal of that law in the United States, the question will arise, why have they not re-enacted the clause? The Minister was equal to the occasion, and he tells us the reason. Over there, he says, they are subject to political influences the same as we are in this country, and it is not so easy to place a clause in a statute when you have the people opposed to it. Does the hon. gentleman not see what that remark involves? If there be political influence enough in the United States to prevent Congress re enacting that clause in the Customs law to allow seizing officers to participate in the seizures from smugglers and those engaged in a demoralising trade, does he not see the accusation he hurls against the business community of the United States, that the vast majority of them must be men who are engaged in an illicit trade and in defrauding the revenue, whose personal influence prevents the enacting of a provision against these frauds? Does the hon. gentleman think that the citizens of Canada will believe as ill of the commercial men of the United States as that a majority of them wish to have a system of demoralising trade and defrauding the revenue continued? No, Sir; and I think the hon. gentleman was hard pressed with his argument when he was forced to give that as a reason in answer to the natural question that if the repeal of that law has worked so injuriously, why has it not been re-enacted? Sir, they abandoned it years ago, and they have not seen fit to re-enact it; and I think we may take for granted that they found that it was in the interest of the public that it should be repealed, and that they have not found since that it is in the interest of the Government or of any class in the community that it should be re-enacted. When you consider that in one year over $100,000 was distributed amongst some seizing officers, you can imagine the temptation that there is to those who have this power placed in their hands, with this tempting bait before them, to administer the laws, not with an eye single to the protection of the honest importer or the collection of the revenue, but with a double eye, one glance of which is directed towards the prospective profits which they themselves should derive from the seizures; and when you see cases—I will not mention names, for the fault is in the system more than in the men—in which these vast sums are made, it is our fault if we continue the law on the Statute-book. The fault is to be found with us more than with the men who administer the law, which gives them the advantages they avail themselves of. I find that one officer who receives a salary of $900 received as his share of the seizures in one year $832.12, and in another year $841.53. He received each year about as much as a salary as his share of seizures. I find another clerk with a salary of $-00, who received in one year as his share of the seizures, $772.74. I find another with a salary of $1,000, who made $861.30 by way of seizures, and the next year had his salary raised, I suppose on account of his ability, to $1,200. That year his share of the seizures amounted to $1,922.23. I find another one with a salary of $1,600, who, in one year, received as his share of seizures, $6,020.84, and the year before he received $7,881.85. I find another who, with a salary of $1,800, received in one year as his share of seizures, $1,758. I find another with a salary of $1,000, receiving by way of seizure, $1,227, and another with a salary of $1,800—which surely was sufficient to engage any officer to perform his duty without further incentive—who received $6,040.11 for Customs seizures. It would take too long to go through the list, and the Public Accounts are in the hands of hon. members, who can look for themselves Let them look into the Auditor General's accounts. Let them look at the officers of Customs participating in these seizures to the extent of, in the course of two or three years—$10,000 and then ask whether it is necessary, in order to have a faithful officer, that he should, besides receiving pay as high as $1,800, receive this greater inducement to perform his duty? Has it come to this, that while we pay officers from $1,000 to $1,800 a year, they will not do their duty without the extra inducement being thrown out to them of sharing in a third of the fines? Let us suppose a case which is not, perhaps, unlikely. Let us suppose that one of these seizing officers has his eye upon a certain merchant, knowing that a mistake has been made in the entry—not fraudulently but unwittingly, and in good faith—and yet a mistake that would bring him under the action of the Customs Department. Let us suppose that officer allowing the merchant to go on, making entry after entry in the same way until there has been a vast amount of goods passed through the Customs by that gentleman in all sincerity, and sold at a fair margin of profit to his customers all over the country, and then when the amount has reached a sum which makes it worth while, the officer makes a seizure. He has a right to seize the books, take all the invoices and obtain a third of any fine imposed. There may be reasons why we should continue the system, but the reasons given by the hon Minister of Customs were not sufficient. The hon. gentleman can see this is a subject worthy of investigation, and I would ask the members before they vote on the proposition of the hon. member for Chateauguay that it is desirable that the final decision should be taken from the Minister of Customs in the matter of seizures and placed before one of the judges of the land, and the other proposition that it is in the interests of the country that we should repeal the regulations under which seizing officers participate in a share of the seizures, to consider the whole facts of the case and the disclosures made.

Mr. LISTER. I will only take up the time of the House a few minutes while I bring up a matter for the attention of the House. With regard to the subject under debate, I have this to say: So far as I know, the administration of the Customs Department by the officers, outside of the chief

himself, has been scandalous in the extreme. In my town officers of the department have walked into the business places of the most respectable residents, seized their books, and in some cases imposed penalties for alleged infraction of revenue. I wish to bring before the attention of the House a case that only took place recently. In the department is a Mr. Watters, who, I believe, is a very respectable gentleman, who receives a very high salary indeed, and it appears that besides his salary he received last year something like $6,000 or $7,000 for his share of the seizures. Hon. gentlemen may question the propriety of a man occupying the position Mr. Watters holds participating at all in these seizures. Last year he came into the town and walked into the business places of half a dozen of our most reputable men. Amongst others he went into two places, whose proprietors deal largely in wall paper and furnishing, and demanded their invoices. Upon studying these invoices, he compelled one of these men to pay some $140, the full amount of one invoice, and another to pay something like $46, the full amount of another invoice. So far as these merchants are concerned, the amount collected from them in the first place was the full duty of wall paper purchased in the city of New York at the full market price, and brought into this country, and entered at the Customs at the price actually paid. They got the paper from the American Wall Paper Mills, 124-132 Pearl Street, Brooklyn, and they bought them on the following advertisement:—

"Gold papers, 4½ cents; embossed golds, 8½ cents.
"We offer the enclosed styles at above quotations. These prices are for single rolls, 8 yards long. All our goods are put up in double rolls, 16 yards long.
"Terms:—Immediate cash on receipt of goods, or five per cent. discount if cash accompanies order No deviation from this. If you want the discount, send money with first letter.
"These papers are positively not sold on regular wall paper terms.
"No freights allowed. Prices the same to all.
"Everything new, perfect, full length, and exactly same as samples.
"Please send in your order at once, as we are making a very limited stock of these goods.

"Very truly yours,
"ESTES & PROVOST,
"*Proprietors.*"

They purchased their wall paper from these people upon the same terms as anybody else. They entered it at the Customs upon the honest invoice which they had received, and paid duty at the Customs on their goods. Mr. Watters, however, seized the goods and exacted from the merchants duty on full prices fixed by the Government on such goods. Representation was made to Ottawa, and upon the strength of that representation, the department, after months' delay, returned to these gentlemen the sum Mr. Watters had taken from them. I say that this is an improper administration of the law. They are casting suspicion upon the most honest business men of this country. Within an hour after that seizure had taken place, it was all round the town that the property of these men had been seized, and it affected to a greater or less extent their business reputation in that town. It was a scandalous and wanton invasion of the rights of a citizen. In no other country in the wide world is there such a law on the Statute-book or a law administered as this is. I hold in my hand the wall papers referred to, and, when I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in New York the price of this wall paper is 4½ cents per roll, and that the duty here is 9½ cents per roll, or 212 per cent. on the original cost, you can understand how the people of this country are sweating under the policy of the present Government. As I said, the fine was returned, after months of waiting, after a gross wrong had been done to these men; and I protest here, in the name of the business men of this country, against such a law as this remaining on the Statute-book. I say it is a wrong and an injustice to all the honest business men of this country, and is it not monstrous to see that the horde of officers who are employed are participating in the seizures which are made throughout the country? There is a secret detective system going on which puts men in fear and trembling. No man, however honest he may be, has any security that some detective may not walk into his business place some day, destroy his reputation, and put him to trouble and expense; and, after all that is done, he may have an opportunity of vindicating his character. I repeat that there is no country in the wide world where such a system is in force. In the United States, the smallest article which is seized has to be condemned by the courts, and not in a private room, not in a Star Chamber in Washington or in Ottawa, but before the courts of the country. That is the way in which it is condemned, and, if the proof is sufficient to warrant that condemnation, the goods are sold for the benefit of the country. In no other country than this is the power placed in the hands of one man who happens to be at the head of a department to say that a fine shall be imposed. Protests have come from every quarter of this country, from Prince Edward Island to British Columbia, against the Customs law of this country, and it is time, in the interests of the public, that a law which is so obnoxious and so capable of injuring the business men of the country should no longer have a place on the Statute-book.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Holton:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Fisher,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Flynn,	Mitchell,
Barron,	Gauthier,	Neveu,
Beausoleil,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Godbout,	Perry,
Borden,	Guay,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Hale,	Préfontaine,
Bowman,	Holton,	Purcell,
Brien,	Innes,	Rinfret,
Campbell,	Jones (Halifax),	Robertson,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Kirk,	Rowand,
Casey,	Landerkin,	Ste. Marie,
Casgrain,	Lang,	Scriver,
Charlton,	Langelier (Montm'ency)	Semple,
Choquette,	Langelier (Quebec),	Somerville,
Colter,	Laurier,	Sutherland,
Couture,	Lister,	Trow,
Davies,	Livingston,	Turcot,
De St. Georges,	Lovitt,	Waldie,
Dessaint,	Macdonald (Huron),	Watson,
Doyon,	McIntyre,	Weldon (St. John)
Edwards,	McMillan (Huron).	Welsh, and
Ellis,	McMullen,	Wilson (Elgin).—71.
Fiset,	Meigs,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Audet,	Ferguson (Renfrew),	Masson,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Mills (Annapolis),
Baird,	Freeman,	Moffat,
Barnard,	Gigault,	Moncrieff,
Bell,	Girouard,	Montplaisir,
Bergeron,	Gordon,	O'Brien,
Bergin,	Grandbois,	Patterson (Essex),
Boisvert,	Guillet,	Perley,
Bowell,	Haggart,	Porter,
Boyle,	Hall,	Prior,
Bryson,	Hesson,	Riopel,
Burns,	Hickey,	Robillard,
Cameron,	Hudspeth,	Roome,
Cargill,	Jamieson,	Ross,
Carling,	Joncas,	Rykert,
Carpenter,	Jones (Digby)	Shanly,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kenny,	Skinner,
Cimon,	Kirkpatrick,	Small,
Cochrane,	Labelle,	Smith (Ontario),
Cockburn,	Landry,	Sproule,
Colby,	Langevin, (Sir Hector),	Stevenson,
Corby,	La Rivière,	Taylor,
Costigan,	Laurie,	Temple,
Coulombe,	Lépine,	Thompson (Sir John)
Curran,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tupper,
Daoust,	Macdowall,	Tyrwhitt,
Davin,	McCulla,	Vanasse,
Davis,	McDonald (Victoria),	Wallace,
Dawson,	McDougald (Pictou),	Ward,

Denison,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Weldon (Albert),
Desaulniers,	McGreevy,	White (Cardwell),
Desjardins,	McKay,	White (Renfrew),
Dewdney,	McKeen,	Wilmot,
Dickey,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Dickinson,	Madill,	Wilson (Lennox),
Dupont,	Mara,	Wood (Brockville), and
Ferguson(Leeds&Gren)	Marshall,	Wood(W'tmorel'd)—111.

Amendment negatived, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary. $89,514 79

Mr. LAURIER. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to this item. Shortly after, I believe, the Minister of Justice had taken possession of his department, it is within the remembrance of all of us that an outrage took place in the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary. I remember, and no doubt the Minister remembers, that he promised to make an investigation not only in regard to the facts which led to this outrage, but in regard to the management of this penitentiary. It is a matter of notoriety that for several years past the administration of the penitentiary has not been as satisfactory as might have been expected. Upon several occasions, investigations have been held, but I must say that these investigations have never been conducted in a manner to satisfy the public that the truth has been arrived at, and the Minister himself promised to make an investigation. Last year, I requested the Minister to put the report on the Table of the House, and he promised to bring the evidence before the House. He has not yet done so. Still, I find no fault with him for not bringing the evidence before the House, because, in my judgment, the evidence which was then taken would be of little account in arriving at a solution as to the administration of the penitentiary, because, if I am correctly informed, the investigation then made by the hon. gentleman was of a very superficial character. It could not be otherwise, because, as I am informed, the evidence was not taken under oath, and consisted simply of putting a few questions to parties who chose to come before him and make complaints. I am informed that the first person who was asked to come and give evidence was a Senator, residing in that locality, who has always taken a deep interest in the management of the institution. He thought that the witnesses should be sworn, so that the whole investigation should be held under oath, but the Minister did not choose to comply with his request, and, therefore, the hon. gentleman who was ready to give his evidence as to the causes of the insurrection and other matters which had been in the past a subject of critical references, declined, when he found he could not give his evidence under oath, to testify at all, and thereupon I am informed the investigation proceeded in the manner which I have described. I think it all the more regrettable that the hon. gentleman did not deem it his duty on that occasion to go more fully into the investigation of the penitentiary. Since that time a complaint has been made to me by a person who was connected with the penitentiary at that time, and who was dismissed on account of that outbreak, and justly dismissed. A man by the name of Lefaivre was an employé of the penitentiary at that time, and upon the report of Mr. McCarthy he was dismissed for cowardice. I have in my hand a report made by Mr. McCarthy, addressed to the acting warden:—

"In compliance with your order, I hereby submit for consideration, a report of the conduct of some of the officers during and since the late mutiny of the convicts here. Messenger Lefaivre, acted apparently in a cowardly manner, during a revolt of the convicts, on Saturday the 24th of April last, when given a rifle by the chief keeper, and told by him to go through the deputy warden's garden, to where the convicts were about scaling the wall. He took the rifle but went out of the chief keeper's sight. He hastily returned to the armory and went home and did not appear again at the prison until Monday morning following."

Upon that the Minister dismissed Lefaivre for cowardice. The following letter was addressed to Mr. Ouimet, the acting warden:

"Referring to your letter of the 16th of May last, transmitting a report of the acting deputy warden, Mr. McCarthy, regarding the conduct of messenger Adolphe Lefaivre, during the revolt of the convicts of the 24th April last, I am to inform you that the Minister of Justice directs that messenger Lefaivre be dismissed."

I have never seen this man Lafaivre, but he has applied to me and represented that on several occasions he has asked the privilege of defending himself, of having an investigation, and being allowed to present his own case. That certainly seems to me to be a fair demand on the part of an officer dismissed for such a grave offence as cowardice. I understand that he has sent to the Minister letters from different persons, from the late warden and others, which goes very far towards establishing his innocence of the charge. Under such circumstances it seems to me to be justice to this man that he should have the privilege, which certainly cannot be denied to any man charged with an offence, of being heard in his own defence and having an investigation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The outbreak in the St Vincent de Paul Penitentiary occurred in April, 1886, while Parliament was in Session. It was immediately followed by a full and careful investigation of the causes of the outbreak. The evidence elicited in that enquiry, conducted by the inspector of the penitentiaries, has been laid before the House, and I think it included all the details which could possibly be expected. At a subsequent period, when it was ascertained that the condition of the warden, from the injury which he had received during the outbreak, was such that his recovery was doubtful—when it was apparent that a reorganisation of the affairs of the prison would be necessary, I was asked in this House whether I would not make a thorough investigation by some other person than the inspector of penitentiaries as to the condition of the prison. It was undoubtedly called for because, as the hon. gentleman has said, complaints had been rife for a long period before the outbreak, and I felt I was only doing what my duty to the House required, when I said that another enquiry would take place by some other person than the inspector. With a view to redeeming that promise as fully as possible I went to the prison myself accompanied by one of my colleagues, the Secretary of State. We had then practically disposed of all the affairs connected with the reorganisation of the prison. It was apparent by that time that the late warden, Mr. Laviolette, would not recover sufficiently to undertake his duties again, and that it was a question whether we should retire him on the superannuation allowance which the law then provided, or whether we should make a special allowance for him in view of his service and his courageous conduct during the outbreak. By that time months had elapsed after the outbreak, all traces of it had disappeared, all matters relating to the cause of the outbreak had been investigated. Our visit took place in the summer of 1886, and the only matter in relation to which an enquiry could with profit be conducted, was as to how far the causes of the outbreak still existed, and what the condition of the prison was as regards discipline. It is a mistake to say that the enquiry was a superficial one. Every means at our disposal was resorted to, every officer of the prison, whether offering his testimony or not, was examined. He was not simply invited to give such testimony as he might think proper, but he was asked every question which we thought could possibly elicit any instructive information as to the condition of the prison past or present. In addition to that an opportunity was given to all the convicts who desired to make any statement in regard to the affairs of the prison in the past or as to

its then condition, and, in pursuance of that, at least forty convicts, I think eighty, but to be within the mark I will say forty, came forward and made statements. The investigation commenced by the examination of Mr. Bellerose. Mr. Bellerose was not summoned, nor did he volunteer to give evidence, but I thought it proper, inasmuch as he had taken a great deal of interest in the affairs of the prison, that we should inform him when the enquiry would begin, and give him an opportunity to make in our presence—really we received him with as much courtesy as could possibly be extended to anybody—as full a statement as he could make in regard to the affairs of the prison, and we hoped he would at least make as full a statement as he had been accustomed to make elsewhere with regard to the affairs of the prison. He said immediately, in answer to my invitation to him to make as full a statement as he could make, that he thought he should be put upon his oath. My reply to that was, that I saw no occasion for putting him under oath, and that I did not see any occasion for putting other persons on their oath until some definite charge against the institution as it was then or against the officers then in charge should be promulgated. We had at that time no charge against anybody; we were simply there for the purpose of making as full an enquiry as possible, and the view which my colleague and I entertained was that, after inviting Mr. Bellerose, who had stigmatised the management of that institution and the conduct of the Government in regard to it in very severe terms, if he were then in a position to make any charge whatever which could form a definite subject of enquiry, we would proceed to examine witnesses under oath; but that it would be altogether premature on the occasion of a visit in connection with which no charge existed to begin to swear the first gentleman who came forward, and who came there as a resident in the vicinity, and merely as a person who had taken an interest in the management of the institution. I assured Mr. Bellerose that any statement which he might make would be received with as much credence by my colleague and by myself as if it were made under the sanction of an oath; and I said to him further that, if in the course of his statement any charges appeared which ought to form the subject of enquiry, we would take into consideration immediately the question as to whether evidence in regard to those charges should be taken under oath or not, but that we were there to receive not only a statement as to anything he knew in connection with the institution but to receive his own opinions likewise; and in order to give the utmost latitude, we would prefer that he should make a statement altogether irrespective of the administration of any oath. The answer which Mr. Bellerose made was, that if he were not sworn he would make no statement whatever, and upon that he left the room. We felt that we would have to proceed further, and we examined every person connected with the administration of the prison from the highest officer to the lowest. We began with the evidence of the warden himself, disabled though he was, and we went down to the lowest officer, and after that we endeavored to ascertain from the convicts themselves whether there was any ground of complaint existing as regards the institution. I regret very much that I have been unable to present the verbatim report of the evidence then taken. While I admit that I ought to have presented it, if it were feasible to do so, I do not feel culpable in view of the reason why the evidence has not been presented. In order to have the evidence complete to lay before Parliament, we engaged the services of a shorthand writer in English to take the statements the witnesses might be pleased to make in that tongue, and a French shorthand writer to take the evidence of those who spoke in French, and the great majority of them made their statements in French. I have on many occasions applied to the gentleman who took the notes in French for a transcription of his notes, and I have offered to pay him the most liberal rates for their transcription; but he has declined, for reasons, I believe, in connection with some other office or employment which he holds in the Province of Quebec, in relation to which he has some suspicion that employment on the part of the Dominion Government might attach some disqualification. I have not, therefore, in my department any of the evidence taken in French, and that is by far the greater portion of the evidence, and it is only for the reasons I have stated that I am unable to lay the evidence on the Table. The evidence in English I shall be glad to lay on the Table at any time at the suggestion of any member of the House, but in the absence of the French transcript I can only state, as I stated last year, what the effect of the evidence was. We were called there to make an enquiry as to how far the administration of the prison at that time was affected by any of the incidents of the past. We examined fully the warden as to the events of the past. It is well known to this House, I presume, because I have no doubt it was a subject of enquiry before I took office, that the warden, Mr. Laviolette, was not on the most harmonious terms with the principal officers of the institution. I have the utmost respect for Mr. Laviolette as a gentleman of honor and of courage, but I have not much respect for him as an administrator of an institution like that of St. Vincent de Paul. I think he displayed, at a trying time, a disregard for his life in the discharge of his duty, and on that account I proposed to Parliament in 1887 the most generous vote Parliament could give, and we pensioned him at the full allowance he was receiving while in office; but I do think, and I say it with deference to his feelings on account of the respect I feel for him, that in the administration of the affairs of this prison for some years previous to the unfortunate revolt, he was too much guided by the advice of irresponsible persons outside of the prison, and too much prejudiced in the administration of the affairs of the institution by what he heard and by influences from outside against the officers who were entitled to share his confidence, and who, I believe, were very well deserving of his confidence. The statement which Mr. Laviolette then made, and he was unfortunately still in a disabled condition, was as kind as could well have been expected considering his past relations to his officers. It was not altogether free from blame for them as regards past management, but there was no definite charge or complaint, and when he approached to a definite charge or complaint or reproach against them I must say he endeavored to soften it as much as possible in order if possible to prevent ill-feeling being entertained or reproach being cast upon the men who, he felt, were then to be charged with the administration of the prison. Well, Sir, the conclusion at which my colleague and myself came was, and it was upon the unanimous testimony of all the witnesses we heard, that whatever discouragement and want of cordiality and confidence had existed among the officers, leading probably to the outbreak, those causes had entirely ceased to operate. Mr. Laviolette, as I said, was laid aside and although he was asked to testify, it is true, about the administration of the prison before the outbreak which occurred in 1886, there was impressed upon everybody connected with the institution the feeling that the calamity which had just taken place ought to put an end to the differences of opinion and want of harmony which had previously existed. We had then placed Mr. Ouimet, the deputy warden, in charge of the prison, and, in 1887, when the Pension Act passed by which Mr. Laviolette retired from the wardenship, we promoted Mr. Ouimet permanently to be warden and Mr. McCarthy, chief keeper, to be deputy warden. The unanimous testimony of the witnesses, however, as I have said, was that, in so far as the outbreak was to be attributed to any disagreements in the administration of the prison, it was traceable to the want of harmony which existed among the officers and to the disposition

on the part of the warden to encourage a system of spying upon the officers by each other and by the convicts. I need not say to the Committee that when the chief officer of a prison encourages prisoners to spy on the officers, and listens to their tales against officers, there is an end to all possibility of maintaining discipline, and the testimony, so far as we could gauge it, was that this result largely contributed to this unfortunate revolt. The testimony was unanimous that, under the administration of Mr. Ouimet, all the causes that could possibly lead to dissatisfaction and disagreement and want of harmony among officers or complaints on the parts of convicts had been removed; that Mr. Ouimet, while strict in the discharge of his duty, as he undoubtedly is, permitted no spying on the part of convicts, encouraged no tale-bearing, and at the same time administered the discipline of the prison and the justice of the prison, in so far as it lay in his hands, with great strictness and with great propriety. The officers nearly all stated that the prisoners had been encouraged in times past to insubordination by having their offences overlooked. If a prisoner was reported for breach of prison discipline the report was often disregarded. In some cases the report was disregarded because the prisoners were in the service of the warden to a certain extent for the purpose of making complaints against officers, and in some cases the breaches of discipline complained of by officers were breaches of discipline, it was alleged, at which the warden had connived. I forbear to say any more than I possibly can in the way of reproach against Mr. Laviolette, but I am bound to say that every officer and every prisoner whom he could examine on the subject indicated, that these were the primary causes of complaint and that they no longer existed. The best corroboration that we can possibly have of these statements is that from that period down to the present moment I have not heard of a single complaint against the mode in which that prison is administered. I leave out of the question altogether any criticisms which take place on the floor of Parliament, but I mean as regards such complaints as we had prior to the revolt; complaints coming from the officers and from the convicts and proved by the occasional outbreaks we had. Not a single incident of that kind has occurred since, and the fact that perfect peace and order have prevailed since Mr. Ouimet was installed as warden seems to me a satisfactory reason why the occurrences of the past should be forgotten, and why we should credit the statements made to my colleague and myself as to the causes which led to the outbreak, and as to the fact that these causes have been satisfactorily removed. I expressed a hope last year, if I could possibly do so, to lay the evidence on the Table, and as soon as I can I will do so. I did hope, and I do hope still, that the fact that these complaints have ceased with regard to the prison would be a reason why we should not enquire too closely into the affairs of the past, believing that an enquiry of that kind would only lead to recriminations against officers who have retired from their posts, and who, taking their whole conduct and whole career into consideration, deserve that any slight want of judgment on their part should be forgotten. As regards the particular complaint that the hon. gentleman has called to my notice about the messenger, it is this: when the enquiry was made as to the cause of the revolt and as to the particulars connected with it, we had not only the duty of ascertaining what the causes were, but we had to ascertain in what the culpability of any persons—officers or convicts—connected with the revolt was; and what conduct on the part of officers or convicts entitled them to some reward. In the case of a number of the convicts it was found that they had acted admirably; they had assisted in putting down the revolt; they had closed doors which prevented communication between different bodies of revolting prisoners, some of them had succored the officers, some of them had helped to give the alarm to the neighborhood and some of them had helped in the pursuit. It was felt that as regards some of the convicts we should be liberal in recommending them to His Excellency for commutation of sentence, and that was done. As regards some of the officers we thought they deserved liberal treatment for their conduct in helping to repress the revolt, and that was done. As regards some of the officers we felt they were culpable and deserved censure, and the censure was applied. With regard to the messenger, after the fullest investigation my officer could give to the matter, it was reported that he had been guilty of cowardice, inasmuch as instead of performing the duty assigned to him by his superior officer during the revolt he went to hide himself, and that action might have been attended with serious consequences indeed. That was the report of the warden and the deputy warden, and I felt we could not do less than to dismiss him, and I accordingly agreed in his dismissal. The hon. gentleman, it is true, has forwarded to me, and the ex-messenger himself has forwarded to me, a statement denying that he was guilty of cowardice, and demanding another investigation, but I think the Committee will see that I am in no position to accede to that request. What would be the result of an investigation of that kind? Even supposing that the messenger came before me and made it appear that his culpability was doubtful, and that is all that could be possibly expected in the face of the evidence against him, could I possibly restore him in violation of the discipline of the prison and against the authority of the officers who are there? I think I could not. In fact the officer himself seems to recognise that, because, in the complaint which he has made regarding his dismissal and the request for a further investigation, what he asks is: that he shall have the investigation in order that being retired he shall receive the gratuity which retiring officers receive under the Act. I am not in a position to give an officer a retiring gratuity unless he is retired on the ground of permanent disability to perform his duties, and the mere fact that he had been dismissed on even a doubtful complaint is no ground for giving him a gratuity. I feel that with regard to that officer (even if I thought the case doubtful) I could not in justice to the discipline of the prison restore him to his position, nor have I the power under the law to give him a gratuity. I have dispensed with the services of this messenger feeling that it was a case in which, to say the least, his usefulness in the prison was of a very doubtful character.

Mr LAURIER. The country no doubt would be glad to hear that order and peace now prevail in the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, for it is but too true that for several years after the dismissal of Mr. Duchesneau, in 1879 or 1880, up to two years ago the administration of the penitentiary for one reason or another, which I need not mention, was of the most unsatisfactory character. I am not disposed to find fault at all with what the hon. gentleman now says, that upon whomsoever they have rested the blame of the state of things which formerly prevailed, there would be no interest to serve now by going back into recrimination. I must say, however, that if at present under the management of Mr. Ouimet order and peace prevail it is very largely due to the fact that the present incumbent of the office has the cordial support of the inspector, and I believe of the department. As far as I am concerned, after having read the evidence taken at the investigation on different occasions by Mr. Moylan, I have come to the conclusion and I believe it is correct, that if under the management of Mr. Laviolette a different state of things prevailed—if the administration then was unsatisfactory, it is largely due to the fact that Mr. Laviolette was not supported at headquarters as he might have expected to be supported in fairness to himself. The hon. gentleman has borne testimony to the character of Mr. Laviolette for courage and for

manliness, and those who are acquainted with the facts will accept this testimony readily, but unfortunately the Minister cannot extend the same encomium to Mr. Laviolette's administrative ability. The hon. gentleman will agree with me I am sure, that if an investigation such as Mr. Laviolette believes himself entitled to, and such as the public in the Province demand, had taken place, if it had done nothing else but to vindicate the character of Mr Laviolette for administrative abilities, as his own conduct at the outbreak vindicated his character for bravery, the investigation would have been proper. If the character of Mr. Laviolette has been and still remains under a shadow, and if investigation could have cleared that shadow, it would have been a simple act of justice to him that this investigation should have taken place. The hon. gentleman said they would not take the investigation under oath, as was demanded by Senator Bellerose, and the hon. gentleman said, incidentally, that he thought Mr. Bellerose had taken too much interest in the administration of the penitentiary. As to that I will not say anything, because Mr. Bellerose is quite able to take care of himself, and will do so if he thinks fit. But if Mr. Bellerose would not consent to be examined except under oath, it was not simply because his own evidence was not as creditable in the estimation of the hon. gentleman himself; but Mr. Bellerose wanted the investigation to have that sacred character which would have more fully ensured its efficiency. He was not alone to be examined. There were several parties interested whose character was doubtful, or bad, and Mr. Bellerose believed it would have been more conducive to justice that the evidence should be taken under oath. The hon. gentleman thought proper not to have that done, because there were no charges of that kind before him. That is no doubt true, but at the same time the hon. gentleman has just stated that, after the investigation had been held, it was deemed advisable to go still further into the matter, and probe it further. If so, the probing should be as ample and deep as possible, and for this reason it seems to me that it would have been more satisfactory to the public at large to have the investigation held under the sanction of an oath, and if so the hon. gentleman would have been in a position to-day to speak with perhaps still more accuracy upon the affairs of the penitentiary. I have no disposition to criticise the administration of the penitentiary since the hon. gentleman has taken office, because it is only fair to him to say that since he has been in office the character of the penitentiary seems to have been changed. I do not know how it is internally, now, but this I say, and I give the hon. gentleman full credit for it, that the same complaints which circulated formerly do not exist now, and to that extent at all events the administration seems to have been reformed. Coming to the particular claim, of messenger Lefaivre, it strikes me that the hon. gentleman must himself admit that he has not done full justice to this man. A report has been made to him, it is true, but the simple rules of justice required that when this man demanded to be heard, an opportunity should have been given him to present what evidence he could in his own behalf. To be discharged, as he was under the charge of cowardice, was a very serious matter to him, and it is very natural that he should ask the privilege of clearing his character, not only for that purpose itself, but also for the laudable purpose of being restored to the position he formerly held, or, if he could not, being admitted to the consequence of good conduct to which he had been entitled. The hon. gentleman did not think proper to grant this man that privilege. Well, of course he is the master, and can do as his own sense dictates; but it seems to me he would admit that this man has not received at his hands the full justice to which he was entitled.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not going to discuss the question which has occupied the attention of the Committee for the last half hour, but I am going to call the attention of the Minister to an incident connected with this penitentiary which I called to his attention on a former occasion. I shall give a brief résumé of the facts which led to the incarceration in that building of an unfortunate negro boy. He was a waiter at the Windsor Hotel in Montreal, where he got into a quarrel with another colored man very much larger than himself. The next night he went and got an old pistol to take satisfaction out of the other negro. He got into a squabble again, and, unfortunately, in taking the pistol out of his pocket, the lock was defective and in place of shooting the other negro he shot a poor unfortunate man who lay on the settee in the saloon. When the boy was put on his trial, he had not a friend in the world, at any rate in this country, he was from the Southern States. But his case attracted the attention of several guests of the house, as well as of the proprietor, Mr. Sweet, who testified to the prompt way he performed his duties as a bell boy. Another guest of the House, Mr. Robert Kane, of Quebec, and myself, in company with Mr. Sweet, went to the court to give evidence as to the character and conduct of the boy while he was about the Windsor Hotel, as a well meaning, smart, diligent and attentive lad. Of course he had shot the man—there is no doubt about that—a man who was dying of consumption, and probably would not have lived very many weeks. The jury brought in a verdict of manslaughter, and he got the extraordinary heavy sentence from the late Judge Ramsay of 20 years in the penitentiary; and although I do not want to say anything disrespectful of the judge, as he has passed away, the universal feeling among those who heard the evidence was that it was a tremendous sentence. The boy went to the penitentiary, and I sent him a message that if he behaved himself, in the course of a few years I would take upon myself to bring his case under the notice of the Government, with a view of getting some remission of the extraordinarily heavy sentenced imposed. In the penitentiary he was put in the barber's shop, and given a good deal of latitude. But liberty is sweet to the whole of us, and, unfortunately for him, an opportunity presented to escape, which he took advantage of. He was pursued and overtaken within a mile of Montreal by the warden, Mr. Ouimet, and two keepers and, as most men would do under such circumstances, he tried to defend himself, and did some little injury to Mr. Ouimet and some to one of the keepers. The boy was taken back and had to suffer punishment and the loss of his good service marks. When the *émeute* occurred in the penitentiary, in which the warden was shot down and the convicts endeavored in vain to break through the walls, that boy, who saw the whole affair, closed the door and put the bar on before the prisoners could reach it, and had it not been for his doing so all the prisoners would probably have escaped. I felt it my duty to bring to the notice of the Minister of Justice the circumstances connected with this boy's imprisonment and what he did to restore order. The hon. gentleman said he would take the matter into consideration, and the result was that one-half of the term, ten years, was taken off. I get a letter from the boy about once a year, telling me he is behaving himself well, and the reports of the boy's conduct are such that I have asked the Minister of Justice to see whether he can give him his liberty. I think the time has arrived when the Government might favorably consider all the circumstances, and I brought this matter before the Committee with a view that we might have some share in the responsibility for the course the Minister of Justice may decide to pursue after he has taken it into consideration.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice an increase in the extent of the vote.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is an increase as to salaries, but they are all statutory increases. In the mis

cellaneous there is an increase. We are asked for a shed and stables, for the warden's quarters, $1,500. Tools, &c., for shop, $1,100. Stone waggons, $80. Sleigh, $40, and some allowance to an organist. The stable is to be built by convict labor.

Mr. McMULLEN. A close investigation of the expenditure of the penitentiaries should be had every year. This year there is an increase in every one of the penitentiaries with the exception of Manitoba. In the one under discussion there are $41,430 paid for salaries to officers. That is a very large amount for a penitentiary containing 265 inmates. There are two chaplains, at $1,200 each. Some arrangement should be made that a certain *per capita* allowance should be allowed for each prisoner. Year by year there is an increased demand for expenditure. Then again there are many items of expenditure such as those which have been referred to by the hon. member for Oxford which, to my mind, are quite absurd.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There has been no increase in the salaries of the chaplains since I took office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the number of Protestants there?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Speaking from memory, I think about 200 out of 266 are Catholics. The Catholic chaplain is paid $1,200 a year, and my predecessors considered that the Protestant chaplain should receive no less. It is true that his charge is much smaller, but the charge of both chaplains occupies their whole time. The Protestant chaplain has no other charge, neither has the Roman Catholic chaplain. It is true that the number of convicts at Kingston, where the same salaries are paid, is much larger, but the prisoners occupy the same time of the chaplains at St. Vincent de Paul. I think there has been no increase in the salaries of officers at St. Vincent de Paul since I took office three or four years ago, or, if there has been any, it has been in exchange for certain perquisites. It is true that, from year to year, we have asked for additional amounts for all these penitentiaries, but that is because the buildings are incomplete, and it has been thought desirable to use the prison labor in completing them. For that reason we have taken votes from year to year in order to perform the works which are necessary, but there has been no increase in the salaries, except in the way of perquisites, as I have already stated.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I believe the old Halifax penitentiary has been sold.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I see in the Public Accounts an item of expenditure on the Halifax penitentiary of $1,931. It is only put in the accounts of the present year, although in the Public Accounts Committee I found that the expenditure was made in February, 1887. That was at the time when an election was about to be held. It was in the dead of winter, and people were sent to that penitentiary to whitewash it and paint it, and to put in putty, and glue, and spouting, and masonry work, and carpenter work, and all for the sake of giving employment to people during the election time. I think the House should be aware that the Government spent nearly $2,000 at that time on a property which they subsequently sold, I believe, for about $10,000, merely in order to give employment to their own political friends, and to assist the election in Halifax. That was quite unnecessary and a complete waste of the public money.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The expenditure on the penitentiary works at Halifax are not, in any way, under my department.

Towards Immigration and Immigration Expenses... $48,610

Mr. McMULLEN. When this item was before the House on a previous occasion, considerable discussion took place in regard to immigration. There has been a great deal of looseness in the expenditure in that department. Anyone who will carefully go over the items will see that we have been spending a large amount of money under that head for which we have received no corresponding return. We have undoubtedly been making an extra effort to bring people to this country, but the evidence we have is that, when we have brought them here, they have not staid with us wherever they may have gone. We should persistently cut down our expenses in connection with immigration. Anyone who will carefully read the Auditor General's Report, and see the manner in which money is squandered in connection with this department, will come to the conclusion that we should almost wipe this out altogether, and adopt some more economical system. It may be necessary to have an agent in Liverpool, and possibly one in London to give information to those persons who desire to come to this country, but to have men dancing up and down through the British Islands and through the countries of Europe, at $4 or $5 a day for expenses, Sundays and every other day, appears to be absurd, and it is unreasonable to expect the people of this country to put up with such a system. Every year we have evidences of extravagance in connection with our expenditure, here in this country and across the water. On the other side, you find large sums paid out in very frivolous ways. For instance, Mr. John Dyke, of Liverpool, has drawn for travelling expenses alone $1,463,40 for himself, and $763 in addition. In all, for travelling expenses and rent for his office he has drawn $4,241,15 in addition to his salary. I cannot understand how one man in the city of Liverpool, discharging the duty of immigration agent, can possibly spend such an enormous amount of money as Mr. Dyke spent in travelling expenses. You can go through this account, and find the same thing from place to place. Then, on this side, we find that Mr. H. H. Smith of Winnipeg received payment for 500 Icelandic papers, $1,500; and so it goes on through the whole accounts. There appears to be a looseness and a recklessness through the whole thing which shows clearly, to my mind, that our expenditure for immigration is far beyond what is necessary. We have had some exhibitions before the Public Accounts Committee this year. We had Mr. Henry Smyth examined there, and it appeared that he got instructions to go to the north-western States, but, instead of that, we find him in Kansas and in Omaha, and in the South, and we do not know why he was there. Then there was Mr. Webster, who was paid $1,800 for services of that kind, when he was assisting in an election. I say it is absurd to expect the people to continue year after year paying out such an enormous amount of money virtually for nothing. Our immigration system is an absurdity, it is wrong, it exhibits gross extravagance, and, instead of getting better, it is fast getting worse. It is the duty of the members of this House to strongly urge upon the Minister of Agriculture the necessity of cutting down the items of this expense. If you want to keep one man on the other side of the Atlantic as a general agent, it should be stipulated that he should not go dancing round Europe and charging expenses in the way to which I have referred. The idea of one man in his office drawing an ample allowance in the way of salary, to spend $4,500 in the way of travelling expenses is absurd. There are too many items of that kind, and I hope this item of expense in connection with immigration, will be well criticised, because I am of opinion that it is money thrown away.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend is right in saying that there is a great deal in this vote that deserves criticism. I was also present in the Public Accounts Committee and I heard Mr. Smyth testify that there was not a single item in his account which was right. There is no use talking to a man of business about an ac-

count being presented as a correct account, when the man who made it testifies himself that there was not a single item of it correct. Large items were entered by which it was clearly shown that the man was not in Kansas, but was in Chatham attending to election business. That kind of a thing reflects discredit on the department, and it utterly discredits any statement made by the person who presented the account. For one I am not satisfied at all that Mr. Smythe did the work attributed to him, or that he was away during more than one of the two or three trips for which he rendered an account. I think it is in the highest degree undesirable that this department should be used for the purpose of supplying men with situations who have rendered services of a very different kind to immigration services, to the Government of the day. I have no doubt whatever that Mr. Smyth got that appointment, not for the sake of the services he was to render to the department as immigration agent, but because he was a friend of the Government and had been unfortunate in his campaign. As for Mr. Webster, I think it is an entirely disreputable proceeding, that a man who was receiving pay from the department of immigration, should, to my knowledge, and to the knowledge of other members of this House, be constantly employed in by-elections. Wherever there is a by-election Mr. Webster is there. What services Mr. Webster performed there, I do not know. I suppose they are services that will not bear the light at all. I know that in half a dozen elections—and apparently the man seems to glory in the matter—during the time that he was in the employ of the Government, he is found to have taken part in those elections. Now, that is decidedly improper, and it reflects discredit upon the department which employs him as well as on Mr. Webster. Men who are being paid by the whole mass of the voters of this country, have no right to be working in favor of one political party or the other. When they become Government employés they should, in common decency, remember that they are servants of the whole people, and that they are not entitled to take part in election proceedings.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has made a charge against the department of employing of Mr. Smyth and Mr. Webster. I heard the hon. gentleman say the other day that Mr. Smyth was a "hanger-on." Now, I do not think that hon. gentleman was justified in making that statement. Mr. Smyth, as I said before in this House, has held all the prominent positions that a man could hold in his own constituency, having been town councillor, mayor of the town and member for that county for a number of years. He had sat in this House, and I think was respected by his colleagues who knew him. Mr. Smyth was engaged for six months only, although his time did extend for two or three weeks after that engagement; and he has not been in the employ of the Government since the autumn of 1887. I think that the charge that Mr. Smyth was a hanger-on, when he had only been in the employment of the Government six or seven months, is not warranted by the facts. I believe that he rendered good service to his country. He was not asked to go away to the United States and remain there, but to work in his own riding, and to checkmate the influences that were being brought to bear by the agents or runners of American railway and land companies to induce our people to go to the United States instead of going to our great North-West. I am satisfied that Mr. Smyth did render good service to the country, and that he prevented thousands of people from going to Dakota and induced them to go to our own North-West. Then, with regard to Mr. Webster, the hon. member says he was employed for political purposes. Mr. Webster is a well known farmer in the eastern part of Canada, and I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman knows him, because I believe he comes from the city of Kingston. I believe Mr. Webster has induced hundreds and thousands of people, who would otherwise have gone to the United States, to go to our own North-West. We have evidences of that, within the last few months, hundreds of people having left Toronto for the North-West, who had the idea of going to the United States. The hon. gentleman said something about a by-election. Well, I advised Mr. Webster to go to all public gatherings, wherever a large number of people were gathered together——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CARLING. Do hon. gentlemen mean to say that parties in Ontario, who are paid by the Local Government, are not canvassing and working for that Government?

Mr. McMULLEN. Name them.

Mr. CARLING. I can say myself that an officer of the Local Government——

Mr. McMULLEN. Name one.

Mr. CARLING. In the city of London, Mr. Hutchinson, County Attorney for the County of Middlesex.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CARLING. I thought you wanted me to name some one. I can say that Mr. Hutchinson, the County Attorney of the County of Middlesex, took the platform in the city of London and addressed the electors against Sir John A. Macdonald and myself. I am told that an officer of the Central Prison in Toronto was one of the scrutineers in the County of Haldimand in the last election. We know that all the license inspectors all over Ontario are election agents working in opposition to this Government, and in favor of the candidates of the Local Government. Mr. Webster was not instructed to take any part in the elections. He was not in the employment of the Government when he attended some of the elections. The hon. gentleman stated in the House a few nights ago that Mr. Webster was in the employment of the Government at the last Haldimand election. I stated that was not correct. The hon. gentleman said he could prove it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did prove it before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. CARLING. I would ask the hon. gentlemen that were in this House on that occasion if the hon. gentleman for North Wellington did not say that Mr. Webster was at the last Haldimand election.

Mr. McMULLEN. You can take advantage of the statement.

Mr. CARLING. I will read from *Hansard* what took place. The report is as follows:—

"Mr. CARLING. Do you know he was in Haldimand during the time he was employed by the Government?

"Mr. MULOCK. I am told he was.

"Mr. McMULLEN. We know he was by the Public Accounts, by the accounts that he sent in himself, and we will prove it by the Public Accounts Committee to-morrow. By an order of this House he sent in the return of his services and the different places where he had been, and in that return there is a charge for expenses from Kingston to Haldimand, and Haldimand back again to Kingston, during the election campaign.

"Mr. CARLING. What year was that in?

"Mr. McMULLEN. During the last election that took place in Haldimand.

"Mr. CARLING. I can only say to the hon. gentleman that he is quite mistaken. I say there is no account in the department for Mr. Webster for over a year. I state to this House that the hon. gentleman is making a statement that is totally untrue. Mr. Webster did not receive a dollar from the Government during the time of the last election in Haldimand."

I only stated that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), had made that statement, and I have quoted the report from *Hansard*. I think I have proved to the House

that the statement made by the hon. gentleman a few moments ago was incorrect. Mr. Webster, I contend, has rendered good service to the country, and I am continuing him in the Government's employ, and it is my intention to do so, because I know he has been the cause of sending hundreds of our young men——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Out of the country.

Mr. CARLING. Not out of the country, because they have gone to our own country, but they would possibly have been induced by American land and railway agents to go to the United States.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then you are employing agents to send men from one Province to another.

Mr. CARLING. No, I am not. The American Government have consular agents in nearly every city and town in the Dominion. Their land and railway companies have flooded this country with literature, to induce our young people to go to their country, and I thought it was high time we should take steps to check the action of American agents and induce our people to go to our own North-West, and show them it is equal and even a superior country to the Western States. I am satisfied that the Immigration Department has been conducted with due economy, notwithstanding what has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite. The member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) held the position of Finance Minister for five years, from 1874 to 1878. In 1874, $251,000 were expended by the Government of the hon. gentleman for immigration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What if it was?

Mr. CARLING. In 1875 they expended $296,000; in 1876, $284,000; in 1887, $183,000; in 1878, $185,000, and the cost per immigrant per head during those years was $8 40, while during the next five years we brought it down to $3.52. We brought in 373,000 people,——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many did you keep in the country?

Mr. CARLING—as against 149,000 brought in by hon. gentlemen opposite, and the cost in our case was $3.52 as against $8.40 during the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. During the last five years we have brought in 425,000 at a cost of $3.62 per head. Hon. gentlemen opposite need not, therefore, talk of extravagance since the present administration have been in power. Statements have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite with respect to the employment of Mr. Webster and Mr. Smyth, but I find during the five years they were in power from 35 to 30 gentlemen were employed as travelling agents. They included, E. Simays, J. Korman, J. H. Simonson, Gustave Bossange, James Wallace, G. R. Kingsmill, John Talbot, C. J. Beckman, M. de la Mothe, H. Matheson, H. J. Richards, Madam Von Koerber, W. W. Madden, Edw. Farrer, Paul de Cazes, A. Walmsley, H. Taylor, C. Lalime, R. Whiteford, Peter O'Leary, A. L. Borsen, S Johnasson, A. G. Nicholson, G. J. Whellams. The Government found it necessary to give employment to that large number of gentlemen in order to further immigration, and I think they were perfectly justified in doing so, and the expenditure amounted to no less than $1,250,000 for immigration purposes while hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, or a cost of $8.40 per head per immigrant, as compared with $3.50 or $3.60 since that time. I assure the Committee, that every economy has been used in the administration of my department, and that every reduction has been made that could consistently be made in order to keep down the expenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under what possibility can the hon. gentleman contend that the accounts connected with his department and the facts he presents are worthy of a single instant's consideration. We had the opportunity of testing his statements by his own return as to immigration. His department was sifted most thoroughly in the Public Accounts Committee in regard to the statement that 166,000 people had been placed in the North-West during the period from 1881 to 1886. How then does it occur that of that number only 40,000 remained there? If there was a particle of truth in that statement, such was the maladministration of the Government and the Immigration Department that out of every batch of four people they pretended to have settled, they have driven three out of the country, and these three in every case become immigration agents of a most mischievous character, because when you bring men into the country and cannot keep them there, out they go to another country, and they invariably give a very bad account of the country to which they went and where they were unable to stay. There is no getting over this one fact, which is worth a thousand other facts as to the reliability of the hon. gentleman's statements. I showed when the Budget discussion was up that if the hon. gentleman's statement had any foundation in fact, if it were true that he brought 630,000 people into this country, I showed that he was instrumental in driving 700,000 people out of it. Here are the hon. gentleman's estimates of the population. The hon. gentleman declared, in answer to a question of mine, that there were 4,936,000 people in Canada; he declared that he had brought in according to his own estimate over 630,000 people, and as we had 4,324,000 by the census returns of 1881, it follows as clearly as anything can follow that adding the immigrants which he alleges were brought in, we have 5,000 less than we had in 1881, and if these immigrants were actual settlers we have lost 700,000 people. That is the result of the hon. gentleman's policy and of the enormous expenditure which he incurred for the purpose, as he alleges, of promoting immigration. I say that, under these circumstances, every penny of this vote is worse than wasted. If the hon. gentleman does succeed in bringing people in here, he brings them to turn out our own people, according to his own statement.

Mr. CARLING. You said you brought in 149,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Aye, and the most of them stayed that we brought in. There is another fact that has been ascertained that the exodus attained huge proportions after the hon. gentlemen came into power, and initiated their policy. There is not to-day, in all probability, one single rural district in Ontario (except two or three of the new settled counties) in which the rural population have not diminished. At any rate they have failed to retain their natural increase under the policy of hon. gentlemen.

Mr. HESSON. What evidence have you?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The evidence of the municipal statistics.

Mr. HESSON. What about the city of Toronto?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In a few cities no doubt there has been an increase, and probably Toronto has absorbed the population of a considerable portion of the district around.

Mr. HESSON. Every farm is occupied in Ontario to-day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; but it is not occupied as well as it was. In a great number of the rural constituencies the rural population is diminishing at the present moment. The returns show distinctly that the rural population has not increased in the space of seven or eight years, and in Ontario according to the statistics the rural population has not increased 10,000 souls. The fact is that the hon. gentleman's policy may have gathered together a certain number of people in our towns and cities, but a very considerable number of them are not desirable immigrants to come to this country; a very considerable number of them

are a burthen on our resources and a tax on the charity of the people of Canada—the last kind of people whom it is desirable we should bring into this country to replace our own yeomanry. I make the statement, and I would call attention of the hon. members from Toronto to it, that 8,000 persons had received relief in Toronto in the last month or two of 1888. I have received from a gentleman who knows thoroughly the details of these matters, more than confirmation of the statements I made. I find that the Toronto Relief Society relieved 807 families, representing 4,035 souls and the details will be found in the *Mail* newspaper of the 12th November, 1888. I find that the Irish Protestant Benevolent Society relieved 100 families, representing 500 souls, and that the St. George's Society relieved more than 3,500 persons. If hon. gentlemen have sufficient arithmetical powers to add these figures together they will see that they exceed 8,000 souls. The truth of the matter is that the hon. gentlemen have been using this immigration money for political purposes, and the greater part of it has gone to pay their newspaper hacks, and to pay hacks like Mr. Webster and Mr. Smyth. The Minister of Agriculture had not one word to say in defence of the outrageous statements we heard in the Public Accounts Committee when Mr. Smyth, on being examined before us, was obliged to state that not one single date in his account was correct, and that at the date when he alleged he had paid out considerable sums of money, for all of which he was paid by the department, it was clearly proved that Smyth was in Chatham. What has the Minister of Agriculture to say in defence of this? What does he say in the face of his own letters of instruction to this patriot; this deserving servant of the public; this man who is an honor to his party and to his country—what does the Minister say when his own letter shows that was part of Mr. Smyth's duty, to preserve dates and vouchers, while the evidence in the Public Accounts Committee showed that not one single date was correct. I say that it is an outrage that the public money should go to men who cannot even present a decent account of the expenses they have incurred. I do not care what the officers of the Government of Ontario may do; that is no answer, that is no excuse, that is no defense for the hon. gentleman paying the public money to agents employed in by-elections throughout this country as is the case with Mr. Webster. I say that it is a dishonest abuse of the public money and that the hon. gentleman has no business to pay Mr. Webster or to employ such men to act as immigrant agents.

Mr. DENISON. I would ask the member for South Oxford where he got the fact that 8,000 families were relieved in Toronto; whether the calculations are from the official returns or whether they are made up by himself?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I received the account from one of the parties concerned. He gave me a total number of 4,035.

Mr. DENISON. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is aware that a number of tramps go to the House of Industry.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is wholly apart from that. I received a number of small details having reference to the House of Industry and other places, but I did not think it worth while to include them. I only gave three items out of about a score.

Mr. DENISON. Of course if the hon. member counted as families paupers and those receiving aid as tramps that would increase the number.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My calculation was wholly apart from that.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to settle this question with regard to Mr. Webster. The statement I made in the House some time ago was that I could prove by the Public Accounts that Mr. Webster was at the last election in Haldimand; that is, the last election of which we had an account in the Public Accounts.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no; you have said the last election.

Mr. McMULLEN. I said the last election for which we have a return in the Public Accounts and the Minister understood me in that way.

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. He now tries to shield himself behind the fact that there were several elections in Haldimand and he tries to pin me down to the "last election." I said distinctly in my statement, and he has read my words, that I could prove from the Public Accounts that Mr. Webster was in Haldimand at the expense of this country as shown by the Public Accounts, and here is the proof from a certified copy of the account. On the 28th day of October when he was in the employ of this country——

Some hon. MEMBERS. What year?

Mr. McMULLEN. 1887-88, he bought a railroad ticket.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What year did you say?

Mr. McMULLEN. Hon. gentlemen should keep quiet. I know the point is a sore one and I know they do not like it, but I will give it to them. On the 28th October he bought a railroad ticket from Kingston, where he lives, to Ottawa for $4.10. On the 29th he bought another railway ticket from Ottawa to Drumbo for $10, and a sleeping car ticket from Ottawa to Toronto for $2; he bought a railway ticket on the same date from Drumbo to Dunnville for $2.25; then, on the 30th he bought a ticket from Dunnville to Cayuga, where he remained from the 28th of October until the 14th of November, and the election was on the 12th of November; on the 14th of November, he bought a return ticket from Cayuga to Kingston for $7, and the country paid the whole bill. The hon. gentleman would try to shield himself behind the statement that this was not at the last election, but I have stated distinctly that it was at the last election, and it was proved before the Public Accounts Committee. I must say that this business of Webster is a positive disgrace.

Mr. HESSON. He was not there at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. He was there, and he was there at the expense of this country, while we were paying him $2 a day and his travelling expenses, and the hon. gentleman and the Minister of Immigration dare to say that he was not there. The hon. Minister used to be known in western Canada as "Honest John," but I think we will have to change that and call him Boodling Jack, which will suit him better. There is no man in the opposite party who would do the boodling that he does, and would brazen it out and face the country as he does. There is no other man who would dare to come here and try to shield himself behind the fact that there were four elections held in Haldimand, when I have distinctly stated that I am referring to the last election as shown by the Public Accounts. I say that it is shameful for the Minister to stand up in this House and try to cram such a statement down our throats when the Public Accounts show that he secretly, intentionally and with forethought paid out the money of this country to Webster to go to Haldimand to canvass and work in the election there. We do not know how much more he carried there. When he came to Ottawa he got instructions from the hon. gentleman. There is no doubt he filled his pockets and paid him for going there and coming back. These accounts show clearly that a great deal of money is paid out to men for work in this way for which we get no value. Here is an item of $400 paid to Mr. McMillan for lectures on Canada. Then there is an item, J. H. Hubbard, disseminating infor-

mation at exhibition, $243.35. Will the hon. gentleman tell me who he is?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. McMillan is now an agent of the Manitoba Government, a very respectable man, who went from Manitoba to the old country and rendered very good service there.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many lectures were delivered?

Mr. CARLING. I am not prepared to say how many lectures.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to know where J. B. Brooks lectures, who received $250?

Mr. CARLING. He lectured in England, and he was sent from Manitoba. I cannot say the number of times he lectured. He was under direction of the High Commissioner's office, and I dare say I could ascertain the number of times he lectured.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. Minister tell me who Captain Clarke is, who received $920, and what has he been doing?

Mr. CARLING. Captain Clarke is a highly respectable gentleman from the city of Winnipeg, who went over to assist at the Indian and Colonial Exhibition, and was afterwards employed by the Government to attend the Glasgow exhibition, and rendered excellent service to the Government there.

Mr. DAVIN. I happened to be in England at the time this Mr. Brooks was lecturing, and I know he lectured in London, and I saw a notice of his lecture in one of the London papers.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that T. Skinner has been paid $1,740 for 550 copies of the *Canadian Gazette*. What is that?

Mr. CARLING. The *Canadian Gazette* is a paper published in London, England, which advocates the cause of Canada as well as any paper in London could, and the High Commissioner thinks it necessary that a large number of copies of this paper should be sent to different prominent men in Europe, and distributed for the benefit of the Dominion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see we pay him in addition $946.50 for advertising. I see that G. Vekeman has received $500 for distributing Flemish pamphlets. What were these?

Mr. CARLING. These were immigration pamphlets.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to ask the Minister where these Flemish pamphlets were distributed? Does the hon. gentleman know where the Flemish language is spoken and the pamphlet distributed, how much will pay for the special puffs given the High Commissioner in the *Canadian Gazette*, and what are the relations between the *Canadian Gazette* and the Government? The hon. gentleman has not shown much knowledge about the working of his department, but perhaps he does know what are the relations between it and the *Canadian Gazette*. I do not say that the High Commissioner does not deserve these enconiums. He is a man of great ability and intelligence, and has left his traces in the Government since he left it himself.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. Last year we had over 300 Flemish emigrants who came to Winnipeg and settled in the Province of Manitoba, and not later than a week ago 150 more came from the same country, and settled in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. McMULLEN. What has Professor Tanner done?

Mr. CARLING. He visited this country at the recommendation of influential people in England, and wrote an excellent pamphlet describing the advantages of the country for emigration, for the consideration of writing which we paid him the amount mentioned towards his travelling expenses.

Mr. CASEY. What are the relations between the Government and the *Gazette*? Is it a private enterprise or a Government enterprise?

Mr. CARLING. The paper is altogether a private enterprise. We pay this money as a subvention, the object being to advocate Canada as a field for emigration.

Mr. CASEY. We find $1,700 paid apart from the advertising, and a large amount paid for copies of the *Gazette*.

Mr. CARLING. We take a large number of the papers for distribution.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. Does the *Gazette* publish any advertisement, such as "Rough on Rats?" We might get a few "rats" for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McMULLEN. With regard to the statement of the hon. member for Manitoba (Mr. LaRivière) that three hundred Belgians went to the North-West last year, only 255 came according to the immigration returns. Either the hon. gentleman's statement is not true, or the report is not true. Mr. John Dyke draws a large amount of money for the Newcastle show.

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Dyke attended at the request of the Government the exhibition, where he might have an opportunity of lecturing, and distributing literature among the people. Mr. Dyke has rendered excellent service to the country.

Mr. CASEY. As reference has been made to Mr. Hector Fabre, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how many immigrants have come to Canada as the consequence of this service. We pay Mr. Fabre $3,000 for services in Paris, and $1,700 for services in London. It is well known that that gentleman was the editor of a newspaper which supported my hon. friend from East York when he was in power, and that he wished to be made a Senator.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, if you will allow me——

Mr. CASEY. No, I will not allow you.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. Mr. Hector Fabre is not paid out of this vote, and consequently has no connection with it. I think we had better wait till we come to the vote with which he is connected.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Auditor Genral's Report, he will find that Mr. Fabre was paid $1,900 out of this vote for a variety of things.

Mr. McMULLEN. He was paid $1,700.

Mr. RYKERT. Which is right?

Mr. CASEY. As my hon. friend has shown that Mr. Hector Fabre has been paid out of this vote, I think I am quite in order. As I said, that gentleman wished to be made a Senator when my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was in power. That is well known to everyone on this side and on the other side, except to those who have come in since. When the present Government came into power, he was made a Senator, and just afterwards they sent him on a sinecure mission to Paris, where he had $3,000 a year to draw and nothing to do. I think he sent out three immigrants. For $12,000 which he received in four years, he sent out three immigrants. Of course, a gentleman who worked so hard must be recompensed in every way possible, and, as my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has pointed out, he has had pickings out of this vote for the London office to the extent of $1,700. By this time, I fancy the Minister of Agriculture has been posted as to the page in the Auditor General's Report which he ought to look at, and I will give him a chance to explain.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that John Sumner of Carleton Place received $1,200 for services, and a living allowance of $1.50 a day, amounting to $549 more, or $1,749 in all. What was he doing?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Sumner is employed on the Grand Trunk Railway to go with immigrants from Montreal to Toronto, and he has been so employed for a number of years. He has been employed since 1872.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does he pass up and down on the railway?

Mr. CARLING. He was employed from 1872, and during the time the hon. gentleman's friends were in power, to go to Toronto with the immigrants to see that they were properly cared for, and were properly handled when they got to Toronto.

Mr. McMULLEN. On the same page of the Auditor General's Report, C-156, I find the name of A. O. Kellam, Compton, Que.

Mr. CARLING. That gentleman was employed on the road between Halifax and Quebec and between Quebec and Montreal. He is not in the service now. He is dead.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was he attending by-elections?

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). There is an item which I would like the Minister to explain in reference to the duties and the results of Mr. Metcalfe's operations. He is, I believe, the local representative in the Conservative interest for Kingston. He is employed, as I understand, during the greater part of the summer, but he gets permission to leave his duties, which no doubt are very arduous, during the Session of the Local Legislature. I would like the Minister to explain to me what he has been doing and whether he has reported to him, and, if so, where I will be able to find his report?

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman has stated that Mr. Metcalfe received permission to attend the Local Legislature. Mr. Metcalfe was employed from the 1st April until the 1st January. He has not been employed from the 1st January to the 1st April. He has been employed as an intelligence officer in the City of Winnipeg to assist in giving information to the large number of immigrants who go there each year. Some 20,000 or 30,000 immigrants arrive in Winnipeg, and we have an intelligence office near the station, of which Mr. Metcalfe has charge. He has done excellent work, and all parties who have been there from this part of the country can testify to the excellent work he has done.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would like to have some evidence besides the bald assertion of the Minister as to the work he has performed. The Minister may have been told by parties who have been there that he was performing excellent service, but we have no report from Mr. Metcalfe. Has he reported officially to the Minister? Has he given the Minister any evidence that he has been performing this service? I had no doubt that the Minister would say he was a very excellent officer, and a very, very respectable man. All the representatives in the Conservative ranks, according to their own estimation, are such, but I want a little more than that. I see that the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Larivière) made a statement as to rats. Perhaps he may have a just appreciation of something of that kind. Perhaps he may have had an opportunity of illustrating the benefit of ratting. Perhaps he may remember some of his former actions in relation to ratting.

Mr. RYKERT. I rise to a point of order. There is nothing of that kind in the Estimates.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Rats.

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am pleased to see the sudden change which pervades the face of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) when a reference is made to ratting. I see that his hair is standing on end. That might represent that he is frightened, and that he is going to rat too. Perhaps, if he goes to his own constituency, he may find some people there ratting, and that is not very agreeable to that hon. gentleman. What I was desirous to know, when I was interrupted, was what are the duties of this man Metcalfe, and whether he has made any report to the Minister, and how much he has received from the Government up to the present time for his services during the last year. I really think that we are entitled to have the information.

Mr. DAVIN. I happen to know something about Mr. Metcalfe. If my hon. friend were to go to Winnipeg while immigrants were coming in there, he would see that Mr. Metcalfe is probably one of the most active officers in the employ of the Government. He is indefatigable in directing immigrants where they should go, all over Manitoba and the North-West Territories, according to the best of his judgment. If Mr. Metcalfe were not employed, somebody else would have to be employed in that position.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). In my simplicity I supposed the Minister who had charge of the department would be able to give us the information, otherwise I would have asked the hon. member for East Assiniboia, whom we all know is ready to give information to every one who desires it in this House. I hope the hon. member will not feel in any way hurt because I neglected to ask him before asking the Minister.

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Metcalfe, as I have already explained, had charge of the intelligence office during the summer season. His duty was to advise immigrants and to send them to proper sections for settlement, in a word, to give all the information possible. He is only employed from spring until autumn.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Has he made a report?

Mr. CARLING. I do not know that it is necessary. He is not an agent.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Has he made a report? The hon. gentleman can say, yes or no.

Mr. CARLING. He has written a number of letters to the department, which were not published in the reports, explaining what he has done.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. I owe a word of explanation to the hon. member for East Elgin. I did not think, when I referred to this advertisement as a joke, that there would be an applicant so soon for the position. I am sorry that in referring to that advertisement I have offended the hon. member. I did not expect to raise his ambition so soon.

Mr. WATSON. There is one item mentioned here that I highly approve of, Mr. A. McMillan, lecturer, $400. I believe, knowing that gentleman, that the money was well expended. Mr. McMillan is employed by the Local Government, and has been a very efficient immigration agent, and has delivered lectures in the old country. As long as money is judiciously spent on immigration to Manitoba and the North-West, I will support any vote in this House for that purpose. At the same time I believe that large sums of money are practically thrown away under our present system of assisting immigration. I have no better proof of this fact than the report of Mr. Grahame, the immigration agent in the city of Winnipeg. I have always contended that a great number of people that were reported to have gone to Manitoba and the North-West by the Minister of Agriculture in his annual report, did not go there, or if they did go, they did not remain there. On this point I may remark that in looking over the *Hansard* I find that while I was absent

from my seat a few moments the other night, the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) made a statement that we had a most iniquitous——

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to a point of order. The hon. member cannot refer to a previous debate.

Mr. WATSON. It has been stated in this House that the Government of Manitoba had not the confidence of the people. It is not necessary for me to take up the time of the House to prove that they have the confidence of the people. I will just say that the administration of the Local Government that preceded them was objectionable to the people, from the fact that, whether from the fault of that Government or of the Ottawa Government, the immigrants who went into that Province did not remain there, and the people, when the local elections occurred, almost unanimously recorded their votes against the administration preceding the present one. Only four Conservatives were left in the Local Legislature in Manitoba; in two of the constituencies, two Liberals were running against one Conservative. There could not be better evidence furnished to show the unpopularity of the administration of this Government and the administration of the previous Conservative Government of the Province of Manitoba The report of Mr. Grahame contains statements which I have always held to be correct in this House, and probably the Minister will believe them now that they are to be found in a report of his own officer, and a very good officer Mr. Grahame is. He says:

"SIR,—I have the honor to submit to you my immigration report on Manitoba and the Canadian North-West Territories, during the present year

"Many will be surprised to learn, that the number of actual settlers in our Province and Territories, has not been as large as expected, neither has the amount of wealth brought in by those who have come, been as considerable as that of former years. This may appear strange when we consider the many efforts that were put forth by the different organisations to induce immigration to the Province and neighboring Territories, but it is nevertheless a fact, that, out of the many thousands who left the Mother Country, ostensibly for the North-West, a large number of them found occupation and homes on the Pacific coast, and, I regret to say, a large majority of these are on the American side.

"Strenuous efforts have been made both by myself and staff as well as others who are interested in immigraton, to cause these people to remain but they preferred to follow out their own plans.

"I merely mention this as an illustration of the fast increasing difficulties attending the efforts of your agents to aid in the successful settlement of the large area of vacant lands in this Province and adjoining Territories."

Efforts no doubt should be made to keep immigrants in Manitoba and the North-West, for on the Pacific coast there is no great field for them, as there are not there the same advantages offered by the North-West and Manitoba for settlement in the shape of vast tracts of arable land, and these advantages should be pointed out to immigrants. No doubt the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will induce immigrants to go as far west as possible for the purpose of collecting fares from them. The Local Government of Manitoba are doing much to encourage immigration there at present, not from foreign countries but from other Provinces of the Dominion. Some may object to this, but I, as a Manitoban, want to see the people come and fill up the country. I believe people in Manitoba are worth more than in any other Province because their lands will produce better results. The Local Government has an agent Mr. McMillan, and Mr. Clarke who, although not an immigration agent proper, has charge of the exhibits, both good officers, and when the Minister of Immigration learns that the Local Government of Manitoba are prepared to furnish men of the stamp of Mr. McMillan to go to the old country and deliver lectures there, I hope they will aid the Province more liberally than in the past. This year they propose to expend $10,000 for immigration purposes, and if they were assisted by the Dominion Government much could be done to encourage immigration to Manitoba and the North-West. They have adopted a system which is preferable to sending out immigration pamphlets and that is sending samples of the products of the Province, and good results have followed this system. Immigration pamphlets are distributed by the thousands throughout this country, especially to the constituents of hon. gentlemen which are intended for distribution in foreign countries, and a display of the exhibits illustrating the products of the country has more effect in inducing immigration than any other system.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) Is there any report from Mr. Smith?

Mr. CARLING. There is no report except that which appeared last year; he has not been employed this year.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think all his letters and reports should be laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. CARLING. He was required to attend with all his correspondence before the Public Accounts Committee, and he did so.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Has Mr. Metcalfe reported?

Mr. CARLING. I have already stated that Mr. Metcalfe had correspondence with the department, but made no official report. He was employed as an intelligence officer. We had an immigration agent in Winnipeg. He was temporarily employed during the summer months.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). We are entitled to more information than we have recived. Mr. Metcalfe has received $1,400 or $1,500 and the whole office has cost between $4,000 or $5,000.

Mr. CARLING. Does the hon. gentleman mean that the Intelligence Office, of which Mr. Metcalfe is chief, cost $4,000 or $5,000 a year?

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The expenses of the office as shown by the Auditor General's Report were $4,519. I am not complaining of the lack of knowledge of items which the Minister should have at his fingers' end so much as that we have no means of knowing what services are performed by officers such as Mr. Metcalfe. We are called upon to vote large sums of money for Mr. Smythe, but we have no reports of the duties performed by him further than the evidence he gives before the Public Accounts Committee, and a more pitiable and a more unfortunate examination in the interest of the Government, never took place before any committee. It is an outrage that this man should draw money from the Government and yet that he does not comply in any respect with the instructions which the Minister sent him. He makes no report, he gives no dates or no information further than that he knew that he had been employed a certain number of days and that he had expended a certain sum of money. I was surprised this afternoon to hear my friend the Minister state that he had ordered Mr. Webster to go to places where there were gatherings of people. I have no doubt that this was true and that the chief part of his duty was to go to places where there were gatherings and especially where those gatherings took place about election times. I say that from the evidence of Mr. Webster himself, his principal duty is to go from one county to another during an election campaign to do the dirty work of the Government of the day.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh no, not dirty work.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I say it advisedly. I hold, Sir, that the money paid to Mr. Metcalfe, Mr. Webster and Mr. Smythe instead of being used for immigration purposes is systematically used for election purposes in the interest of the Tory party.

Mr. HESSON. It is not true and you know it.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). That assertion of the hon. member for Perth has no weight with me. I am perfectly well

aware that I could assert the strongest truth that possibly could be and he would say it was an untruth if it did not suit the Conservative party. Can we expect impartiality from that source? No, Sir, we have known the man too long. We know the reason why he dare not raise his voice against that which the Government does. This appropriation for immigration purposes as has been correctly stated to-night is an appropriation to a very great extent to debauch the country at election times, and the sooner that the system is done away with the better it will be. While I am in favor of a proper system of immigration, I hold that we should not advise men to immigrate from one Province to another Province. I am in favor of a proper system of immigration that will bring the proper kind of men to this country but this money voted by us for immigration purposes has been squandered and we have no beneficial results from it. The evidence of Mr. Smythe and Mr. Webster proved that they were not employed for immigration purposes but that during election times they go into localities where the election is being held, not for the purpose of inducing people to change from Ontario into the North-West, but for the purpose of inducing them to leave the Reform ranks and join the Conservative fold.

An hon. MEMBER. Time.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). My hon. friend cries "time." He has a son that I will not refer to. I feel that this money voted for immigration purposes is being improperly used and I think when the proper time comes we should move a resolution asking to do away with this appropriation altogether on account of the manner in which it is has been applied in the past.

Mr. CARLING. If the hon. gentleman will look at page 25 of my report, he will find that 255 arrived at Quebec, and 1,014 at Halifax.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The point I allude to is this: A letter of instructions given to Mr. Smythe by the Minister said among other things that he was to go to Manitoba and the North-Western States, and institute a comparison as to settlement, the conditions that prevailed, the soil, the climate, the railways and the land regulations, and he was instructed that the facts ascertained should be reported to the department for the information of the Minister, and that it was the desire of the Minister that he should make monthly reports of his operations or more frequently. I thought we ought before concurrence to have these monthly reports laid on the Table of the House. I think under the peculiar circumstances of this case they ought to be produced, and my simple question was whether the Minister would bring them down.

Mr. CARLING. I can only say that any reports made by Mr. Smythe will be brought down as requested.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think my hon. friend was right in saying that there were no reports. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what he means to do with regard to repatriation. I see that last year he expended nearly $6,000 for that purpose. That appears to be too little or too large. My impression is that spasmodic efforts in that direction are of no use at all. If the Minister has a scheme to submit to the House, it will deserve serious consideration, but the sending of a few hundred or thousand dollars for such a purpose is of no service.

Mr. FISHER. There are some points on which I wish information, and a few remarks which I have to make before this item passes. In the first place, in the Estimates we have before us, the Minister is only asking $48,000 for the coming year. In the Estimates for the current year he asked $50,000, so that this is about the same vote that was taken last year for this service; but I find that in the Supplementary Estimates, the hon. Minister, having, I suppose, spent that $50,000, asks us to endorse payments under Governor General's warrants, amounting to $48,000, almost as much more. I think we must have some explanation of this extraordinary state of affairs. The hon. Minister comes down to this House, and in seriousness, with due deliberation and careful preparation, announces to the House and the country that he is prepared to carry on the immigration of this country for $50,000, and then we find that he has been obliged practically to expend $100,000. This does not give us any encouragement to look on this $48,000, which he now asks for next year as being a final or well considered estimate, and I would like to ask the Minister on what he has based his expectation that instead of spending $100,000, as he did last year, he will get off with less than half the amount. I find that there are a number of items under this expenditure in years past connected with bonuses or commissions on immigration. Two dollars a head is allowed for bringing out and placing immigrant children, and I want to know from the Minister whether he intends to continue those commissions. I know something about this immigration of children. I am thinking of a home located in my own county when I say in a general way that these children are fairly healthy and succeed fairly well in the country, and I do not wish to be understood as casting any slur upon them. The work, I believe, is done in a practical way and is as successful as any work of that kind could be expected to be; but that does not lead me to believe that it is wise or right for the Government of Canada to pay for bringing these children out. I know that in the country from which they come one of the greatest problems is what to do with them and the people there are prepared to spend anything necessary to send these children out. They do that for their own benefit, and I do not think the people of Canada ought to be called upon to pay one cent for that work. I find that a certain Mr. Watelet received a commission of $5 a head on 80 children, and I would like to know why he gets $5 a head while others only get $2 a head. I also find a bonus on European immigrants put under the expenditure in the London office, and I would like the Minister to explain how it is that this money is spent in the London office, and in what way this bonus is given? I find that this expenditure for immigration has not decreased as the Government promised last year that it should. I was surprised to hear the Minister talk about a gentleman who, I believe was employed to prevent the people of Ontario going to the United States. It seems to me an extraordinary position for the Minister to be forced to prevent immigration from our own country. If ever I heard a condemnation of the policy of the Government opposite, I heard it to-night from the Minister of Agriculture, in the admission that it was necessary to have one of our employees go about the richest and finest Province in the Dominion to prevent the people going out of the country, which can only be because the hon. gentleman's policy failed, and because he has proved this country not to be a good country for our people to live in. I am surprised to find that a Minister has spent the money of the people in such work. I do not believe the people in Ontario want to go to the United States, and if they go it is because hon. gentlemen opposite have laid such grievous burdens on the people that they are driven to seek for a living in another country. If the hon. gentleman finds it is necessary in Ontario, I would like to find what he finds necessary in the Province of Quebec. He has here an item for repatriation; I grant you it is necessary to keep the people in the Province of Quebec, as the hon. gentleman thinks it is necessary to keep the people in Ontario. A large number of people leave the Province of Quebec to find employment in the factories of the United States which they cannot find at home, and I find, on examining the municipal statistics of the Province of Quebec, that as in Ontario, the rural population is not increasing. Since 1881,

the rural constituencies have not increased in population, and that in face of the well known fact that the people of the Province of Quebec are the most prolific people in the world. This is a striking commentary on a policy of the Government. These people have not gone to the Western Provinces, for, if we examine the statistics of the Province of Manitoba, we do not find any great number of French-Canadians there. I must say that this vote upon immigration does not appear to accomplish the object we had in view, and the hon. gentleman had better curtail the vote still more. If he wishes to economise, here is a vote in which he can do so largely without any deteriment to the service of the country, for we will have just as many suitable immigrants as we had in years past, without spending any of this money.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman has repeated things that has been said over and over again. He has spoken about the $48,000 voted by for Governor General's warrant. I may state to the hon. gentleman that that amount closed up the assisted passage arrangement in the steamers; last April, when we got in all the accounts, we found that we required some $48,000 more to pay them off. We will have nothing more to do with steamboat companies for assisted passages.

Mr. FISHER. Does the hon. gentleman intend still to give any bonus for children immigration?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. Will the hon. gentleman explain with regard to what bonus is given to European immigrants?

Mr. CARLING. That system was adopted years ago of giving a bonus to immigrants, on arriving at Winnipeg, of $5 each. This was paid to the steamboat agents. Instructions have been given to discontinue that system.

Mr. FISHER. How is it that M. Paul Watelet received $5 a head for children?

Mr. CARLING. It is this $5 bonus we have just spoken of.

Mr. FISHER. The item is "commission on 80 children at $5."

Mr. CARLING. That is not correct. We have not paid $5 a head for children, but only for continental immigrants who are brought to Winnipeg.

Mr. MITCHELL. I move that the item pass and the Committee rise and report, seconded by Mr. Davin.

Mr. FISHER. I find in the Report of the Auditor General that Mr. Watelet is paid $5 a head for children.

Mr. CARLING. I have explained that.

Mr. FISHER. It seems extraordinary that the Minister should allow a statement which he says is incorrect to appear in a report from his department.

Mr. CARLING. That is not from my department, but from the Auditor General's Department. I have explained it to the hon. gentleman, and I think he ought to be satisfied.

Mr. FISHER. The Auditor General is the check on the different departments, and I do not believe this would be put in his report without a reason for it.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would suggest to the acting leader of the Government that it would facilitate the business of the House if he would insert in the Supplementary Estimates some trifling matters which I have called attention to before.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2:30 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 17th April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PAYMENTS FOR NORTH-WEST SURVEYS.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario) (for Mr. MADILL) asked, What amount was paid to Ludger Miville Deschenes, of St. Roch des Aulnaies, Province of Quebec, for surveys in the North-West and Manitoba, from 1878 to 1887?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The amount paid to Mr. Deschenes for surveys from 1878 to 1887 was $12,895.28.

9TH BATTALION.

Mr. VANASSE (translation) asked, Whether the Government have been informed that several officers and men of the 9th Battalion are at the present moment in the woods around Lake Megantic, with their arms and other stores belonging to the said battalion? Whether these officers and men have been granted permission by the military authorities to proceed on this expedition?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to my hon. friend, I must say that the Government have not been informed that several officers and men of the 9th Battalion are now in the forests around Lake Megantic; but I must say that ten carbines have been served out to the constables sent by the Local Government on the authority of Major Roy and without the authority of the Militia Department. I have drawn the attention of the Major General who is responsible for the discipline of the force to the fact that arms have been loaned without the sanction of the department.

CAPE BRETON RAILWAY.

Mr. FLYNN asked, Has a contract been entered into by the Minister of Railways and Canals for the erection of stations and other buildings on the line of the Cape Breton Railroad from Sydney and North Sydney to the Grand Narrows? If so, to whom was the contract given? What was the amount of the contract? Were tenders invited for the work? How many tenders were received? Was the lowest tender accepted?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The answer to the first question is, yes; to the second, to Sims & Slater; to the third, it was a schedule price contract; to the fourth, yes; to the fifth, 18; to the sixth, yes. The work from Sydney and North Sydney to the Grand Narrows is being carried on by the Government at the contractors' expense.

JESUITS' ESTATES ACT.

Mr. BARRON asked, Is it the intention of the Government to cause legal proceedings to be instituted, in order to test the legality in a court of law of the Act of the Province of Quebec, 51-52 Victoria, chapter 13, intituled, "An Act respecting the settlement of the Jesuits' Estates." If not, then does the Government propose to bear the cost, or any proportion of the costs, which may be incurred by properly testing, in a court of law, the constitutionality of

the said Act? Did the Government not bear and pay a proportion of the costs incurred in the suit of The Queen *vs.* The St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Company, and if so, how much has thus far been paid by the Government in this suit?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As to the first part of the question, I would say that, as the Government is still of opinion that the Act referred to was within the competence of the Provincial Legislature, and as this House has unmistakeably concurred in that opinion, it rests with persons who, like the hon. gentleman, believe the Act is *ultra vires*, to take the responsibility of initiating any legal proceedings to test its validity. As to the latter part of the question, the hon. gentleman must move.

JOSEPH CARBONNEAU.

Mr. DESAULNIERS asked, Whether the Government are aware that Joseph Carbonneau, of Three Rivers, performed work in the apartments of the Post Office Inspector at that place, and that he has never been paid either by the Government or by Inspector Bourgeois, notwithstanding that the latter passed the account of the said Carbonneau? Is it the intention of the Government to settle the said account, or to compel the inspector to pay the said Carbonneau?

Mr. HAGGART. The question has not yet come up before the department, but I have ordered enquiry to be made of the inspector.

THREE PER CENT. LOAN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Have Government demended from the High Commissioner, and from the Financial Agents, explanations of the reasons why they inserted in the prospectus of the last 3 per cent. loan a clause appropriating the entire sinking fund to the purchase of stock of the said loan, without any words of limitation? If not, do Government intend to demand explanations from said parties?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government is in communication with the High Commissioner, who is now on his way to Ottawa, and I will see him personally in a few days.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Have Government demanded from the Financial Agents of Canada a list showing the names of the various applicants for the late 3 per cent. loan, together with the amounts for which they respectively applied? Also, the names of the parties to whom the stock of the said loan was finally allotted, and of the amounts held by each of such parties respectively? If not, do the Government intend to make such demand?

Mr. FOSTER. According to the usual custom, which I think was carried out by my hon. friend when in office, I am obliged to answer these three questions in the negative.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR—CLERKS.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) asked, How many regular clerks are at present employed by the Department of the Interior, both inside and outside service? How many extra clerks are at present in the employ of the department in the same service?

Mr. DEWDNEY. If the hon. gentleman will move for that return without notice, I will bring it down to-morrow, or the day after.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I move for a return embodying the information asked for in my question.

Motion agreed to.

S. L. BEDSON.

Mr. WATSON asked, Whether the S. L. Bedson who was appointed to the command of the 91st Battalion some months ago, and more recently appointed an extra A.D.C. to His Excellency the Governor General, is the same S. L. Bedson who is Warden of the Manitoba Provincial Penitentiary? If so, upon whose recommendation was he chosen as A.D.C. to His Excellency, and why selected instead of senior officers of long standing and faithful service in the Province of Manitoba? Was the Minister of Justice aware of those appointments, and was his sanction obtained?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Lieutenant-Colonel S. L. Bedson of the 91st Battalion, extra A.D.C. to His Excellency, is the Warden of the Manitoba Penitentiary. The regulations for the promotion of officers do not apply to the appointments of A.D.C.'s, who are appointed by His Excellency without any recommendation on the part of the department.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was aware of the appointment, and stated that I saw no objections.

Mr. WATSON. On whose recommendation was he appointed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There was no recommendation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not of any Minister.

COMBINATIONS IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that Bill (No. 11) for the prevention and suppression of combinations in restraint of trade, be removed from Public Bills and Orders and transferred to Government Orders.

Motion agreed to.

STEAMSHIP SERVICE—AUSTRALIA AND B. C.

Mr. FOSTER moved that, to-morrow, the House go into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may give to any individual or company a subsidy not exceeding the sum of twenty-five thousand pounds sterling per annum, to assist in establishing an effective fortnightly steamship service between British Columbia and the Australian Colonies and New Zealand, such subsidy to be given for such term of years and on such conditions as the Governor in Council may consider expedient.

Mr. LAURIER. I rise to renew the demand I made yesterday to the hon. gentleman, to lay before the House all the correspondence and papers in relation to these different subsidies. Although I have but faint hopes, after the answer given yesterday, that my demand will be complied with, still, I do not altogether despair, trusting that better counsels may come to prevail with the hon. gentleman. Be this as it may, if the hon. gentleman does not see fit to bring down the papers, when he moves the House to consider this resolution, I shall deem it my duty to take the sense of the House as to whether the House will be in a position to discuss this question without these papers.

Mr. FOSTER. I have to repeat what I said yesterday, that the negotiations are in such a state that it will be impossible to bring down the papers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If negotiations are in such a state, the Government should not ask us for these huge sums of money. Before we are asked for huge sums of money involving a charge of many millions on the public service, we ought at least to know what state the negotiations with the several parties are in.

Mr. FOSTER. As I said yesterday, as full explanations as can be given, and I think they will be satisfactory to the House, will be given when I move the resolution to-morrow.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister says that negotiations are pending in relation to this important service. I suppose we might draw the inference that no final arrangement has yet been arrived at.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has been a good deal of unofficial correspondence and verbal communication between the Agents General of the various colonies and the High Commissioner in England. There are no specific propositions made by the different Australian colonies, but there has been a general expression of a desire to join in forming this communication, and there is a statement that they will be quite willing to pay liberally, according to their various means, in establishing this line, and they desire Canada to take the initiative. We ask for the sum of £25,000 sterling to be appropriated as an offer on the part of Canada to establish this communication. There has been a good many letters written, as anyone can understand—written unofficially by persons holding office in the different colonies. Canada being the larger, and, as they say, the wealthier and the more important of all the colonies, she should take the first step. That is exactly the position in which the matter stands. We ask Parliament to vote this sum as an offer to the Australian colonies. They will answer, I believe, in the affirmative.

Motion agreed to.

STEAMSHIP SERVICE—CHINA, JAPAN AND B. C.

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

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may give to any individual or company, to whom may be given by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland the aid hereinafter mentioned, a subsidy not exceeding the sum of fifteen thousand pounds sterling per annum, for a monthly steamship service, or a subsidy not exceeding the sum of twenty-five thousand pounds sterling per annum, for a fortnightly steamship service between British Columbia and China and Japan, such subsidy to be given for such term of years as may be considered expedient by the Governor in Council: Provided always, that during such term the Government of the United Kingdon of Great Britain and Ireland gives to such individual or company a subsidy of not less than forty-five thousand pounds sterling per annum for the monthly service, or of not less than seventy-five thousand pounds sterling per annum for the fortnightly service above mentioned.

Motion agreed to.

STEAMSHIP SERVICE—CANADA AND UNITED KINGDOM.

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

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may enter into a contract, for a term not exceeding ten years, with any individual or company, for the performance of a fast weekly steamship service between Canada and the United Kingdom, making connection with a French port, on such terms and conditions as to the carriage of mails and otherwise as the Governor in Council deems expedient, for a subsidy not exceeding the sum of five hundred thousand dollars a year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As Australia is not to be consulted in this case, may we expect that the papers will be brought down?

Mr. FOSTER. Such papers as we can bring will be brought down.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the Minister of Finance should, at a subsequent stage, inform the House as to the position of the appropriation and whether he has arrived at an arrangement, or whether correspondence is still going on.

Mr. FOSTER. I will do so.

Motion agreed to.

BOUNDARIES OF ONTARIO.

On the Order that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That a humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that she may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be submitted to the Parliament of the United Kingdom, declaring and providing the following to be the westerly, northerly and easterly boundaries of the Province of Ontario, that is to say,—

So much of a line drawn to the Lake of the Woods through the waters eastward of that lake and west of Long Lake which divide British North America from the territory of the United States, and thence through the Lake of the Woods to the most north-western point of that lake as runs northward from the United States boundary and from the most north-western point of the Lake of the Woods, a line drawn due north until it strikes the middle line of the course of the river discharging the waters of the lake called Lake Seul or the Lonely Lake, whether above or below its confluence with the stream flowing from the Lake of the Woods towards Lake Winnipeg, and thence proceeding eastward from the point at which the before-mentioned line strikes the middle line of the course of the river last aforesaid, along the middle line of the course of the same river (whether called by the name of the English River or as to the part below the confluence by the name of the River Winnipeg) up to Lake Seul or the Lonely Lake, and thence along the middle line of Lake Seul or Lonely Lake to the head of that lake, and thence by a straight line to the nearest point of the middle line of the waters of Lake St. Joseph, and thence along that middle line until it reaches the foot or outlet of that lake, and thence along the middle line of the river by which the waters of Lake St. Joseph discharge themselves to the shore of the part of Hudson's Bay commonly known as James' Bay, and thence south-easterly, following upon the said shore to the point where a line drawn due north from the head of Lake Temiscamingue would strike it, and thence due south along the said line to the head of the said lake, and thence into the said lake to descend the Ottawa River until the latter is struck by the north-western boundary of the Seigneurie of Vaudreuil, and thence along the said north-western boundary running south twenty-five degrees west, to the westernmost angle of the Seigneurie of New Longueuil, and thence running along the limit between the Township of Lancaster and the said Seigneurie of New Longueuil in the direction of south thirty-four degrees east, to a stone boundary on the north bank of the Lake St. Francis, at the cove west of the Pointe-au-Baudet, in the said limit between the Township of Lancaster and the Seigneurie of New Longueuil.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This resolution is in accordance with an understanding arrived at with the Premier of Ontario. I sent him a copy of the resolution as it appeared in print, lest any verbal inaccuracies should occur, and I expect to receive it to-morrow, when I will move it, instead of moving it to day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This matter, I suppose, to a certain extent affects the Province of Quebec. Are all the parties concerned agreed to this—the Province of Quebec, as well as the Dominion and Ontario? I think this touches the Province of Quebec.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It defines the eastern boundary of Ontario. There is no difficulty in regard to that, because it is a statutory provision.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought the decision touched the northern boundary as well.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not in the least.

Mr. LAURIER. The Province of Quebec is also interested, as the eastern limit of Ontario will be the western limit of Quebec. I suppose the Quebec Government have been consulted with respect to the matter?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We had a conversation with the present Premier of the Province of Quebec, and the hope was entertained that we would have an Act defining the boundaries of both Provinces, but we could not quite come to a conclusion as to the northern boundary of the Province of Quebec. There is no question as to the western boundary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The only point I notice in the description which the hon. gentleman proposes is with respect to the southern boundary of Ontario, west of Lake Superior, a question which was never brought before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which had to deal with the western and a portion of the northern boundary. At the beginning of the sentence of the hon. gentleman's

description there is a clause which is somewhat ambiguous, and it appears to me that it is more important to be perfectly clear than to follow the particular words found in the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. If the hon. gentleman were to say that the international boundary west of Lake Superior, that is, the boundary between British North America and the United States, was the southern boundary of Ontario west as far as of the North West angle, the matter would be clear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As the hon. gentleman is aware, the first portion of the resolution is framed in the exact words of the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. If Mr. Mowat, after reading the copy I sent him the day before yesterday, sees any indistinctness in the description no doubt he will suggest a change. I may say further that in consequence of the delays which were caused by the attempt to bring in the Province of Quebec as well, the matter was postponed a little later, and therefore the opinion of the Legislature of Ontario could not be taken on the matter, but the Government of Ontario will take the responsibility, knowing what the Ontario Legislature has always claimed, of recommending, by a despatch through the Governor General, the adoption of the line mentioned in the Address of the Dominion Parliament.

ADJOURNMENT—GOOD FRIDAY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said I would bring up the subject of the Easter recess on Thursday, but as so many hon. gentlemen desire to know what the arrangement is to be, whether the House will sit on Saturday or not, I desire to ask the opinion of hon. members as to whether we should meet on Saturday or whether we should adjourn from Thursday to Monday.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does the right hon. gentleman propose to get through the business of the House by next Saturday week? If he does, it will be a very material reason to the leader of the Independent party to adopt the course generally pursued by the right hon. gentleman, in courteously giving way to the strong pressure brought upon him by his supporters. My supporters are rather the other way, but, notwithstanding that, I am inclined to yield to what appears to be the very decided opinion among the members, to sit on Saturday. Although I would prefer not to sit on Saturday, yet, like the right hon. gentleman, I courteously yield to what is the public sentiment on this side of the House.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am glad that the leader of the Government has announced his intention to sit on Saturday, because, if we did not sit on Saturday, it would be rather inconvenient and unfair to those members who come a long distance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In order to settle the matter I move:

That when the House adjourns on Thursday night, it shall stand adjourned until Saturday at three o'clock, and that Government Orders shall have precedence on Saturday.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—SUMMER FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister, who is acting as Minister of Railways, to a matter connected with the Intercolonial Railway. I understand that the Prime Minister has received a communication from the Board of Trade of Quebec, representing that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway are now carrying flour to the Maritime Provinces at summer rates, and asking that the same rates should now be applied on the Intercolonial Railway from Quebec.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I received a telegraphic communication in that direction and I have sent it to the Department of Railways for a report, which report I have no doubt I shall get during the day.

DIVISION LIST—CORRECTION.

Mr. MARA. I wish to call the attention of the House to two mistakes which appear in the division lists of *Hansard* on Monday evening last. On the third reading of the Franchise Bill and on the amendment of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), the names of Mr. Prior and myself appear among the "nays," whereas we voted with the "yeas." Then, on the amendment of the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), Mr. Prior and I voted "nay," whereas we are recorded as having voted "yea." I wish particularly to set myself right in the latter division, as I do not wish to appear as having voted for an amendment which, if carried, would cut off at least 30 per cent. of the voters on the Dominion list.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BOWELL moved:

That the order for the third reading of Bill (No. 117) to further amend the Customs Act, chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending the same by striking out that portion of section 4, amending clause 61, on the 25th line to the 38th line, both inclusive.

Mr. MITCHELL. What is the meaning of this?

Mr. BOWELL. It is to strike out the clause relating more particularly to the inland transportation and leaving the second section of the clause intact which provides for the levying of the duty upon parts of machinery brought into the country. That part of the clause referring to duties upon parts of any manufactured articles shall remain as a substantive clause.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I congratulate the hon. gentleman that he has reconsidered this matter, and I think his decision will be very satisfactory to the trade generally.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think so, too. I am very glad the Minister has come to the conclusion he has. It is one instance in which he has yielded to the mercantile interests, and I think they will appreciate it.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. SCRIVER. I regret very much that while the Minister was considering the question of amending the Bill in this very important particular, he did not reconsider his decision as to the regulation referring to frontier ports, requiring entries to be made at certain hours during the day. I can assure him, from my personal experience, that such a regulation will be impossible of enforcement, and you, Sir (Mr. Colby) know just as well as I do, because you live on the frontier, that it will be an exceedingly vexatious regulation, and, so far as I can see, will not result in any practical protection to the revenue or any good whatever.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 126) to amend "The Summary Convictions Act," chapter 178 of the Revised Statutes, and the Act amending the same.—(Sir John Thompson.)

INTEREST IN THE NORTH-WEST.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 132) to amend the Revised Statutes respecting Interest.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Bill applies only to the North-West Territories, and its object is to provide that judgment shall bear 6 per cent. interest to the day it is recovered, unless the court otherwise orders.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

EXPROPRIATION OF LANDS.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 131) respecting Expropriation of Lands.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose that section 16, in regard to which some question was raised as to its effect on civil rights, shall be dropped.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—INTOXICANTS IN THE N.W.T.

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

Mr. FISHER. Before that motion is put, I desire to call the attention of the House to a matter which, I think, is of great importance not only to the people of the North-West Territories but to all the people of Canada. I do not think I can do better, by way of explaining this matter, than to read to the House the motion which I intend to place in your hands:

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved, That this House regrets that the Government has allowed, through its officer, the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, the issue of permits for the sale of intoxicants within those Territories, thereby endorsing and assisting the violation of the spirit of the sections 92 and following, under the heading "Prohibition of Intoxicants" in the North-West Territories Act: And, also, that the Minister of the Interior has allowed, in the Rocky Mountains Park, the sale of intoxicants without any authorisation from him, and has taken no steps to punish this violation of the Rocky Mountains Park Act, by the provisions of which all trade and commerce in the Park is under his control and management.

This motion, as you will see, is divided into two parts, and I propose to take up the second part first, as being more particular, and not of such general application. No doubt it will be in the memory of most members of this House, that, a short time ago, the Minister of the Interior laid upon the Table of the House, a return, in response to an order of the House, for all papers and correspondence in connection with the issue of licenses in the North-West Territories. We had hoped that we would find in that return some explanation of the facts which have occurred, to the knowledge of everybody in this House and the country, in regard to the issuing of permits for the sale of intoxicants in the North-West Territories. But, after examination of the return, which I now have under my hand, I find that the correspondence is almost altogether in connection with the issuing of licenses to sell wine and beer within the limits covered by the Rocky Mountains Park Act. At the time that return was ordered, the Minister of the Interior informed us that when the return came before us we would know where the responsibility lay for the allowance of the sale of intoxicants in the Rocky Mountains Park. But, Sir, I do not find in that return any explanation of where that responsibility rests. On the contrary, after examining carefully the correspondence between those who have licenses to sell liquor there, and the Minister of the Interior on the one hand, and the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories on the other, I find that there is really no definite conclusion come to as to where this responsibility rests. I will take up one or two of the letters, just to explain to the House the position of affairs. I find a letter addressed by the Secretary of the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories to the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, in regard to a demand made on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway for permission to import wines and beer into the North-West Territories for the purposes of their hotel at Banff. The letter reads as follows:—

"LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
"REGINA, July 20th, 1888.

"SIR,—I am directed to acquaint you, for the information of a Minister, that His Honor the Lieutenant Governor, on the 12th inst, granted permission to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to import wines and beers into the North-West Territories for the use of their hotel at Banff and to keep and sell the same therein until said permission is withdrawn. As the Canadian Pacific Railway hotel at Banff is situated in the Rocky Mountain Park which has been placed by statute under the control and management of the Minister of Interior, His Honor has informed the company that this permission is only provisional until concurrent authority to a similar effect has been obtained from the Department.

"His Honor has had a conversation with the Deputy Minister of the Interior and of the Department of Justice upon the subject of federal jurisdiction over the Park, which has largely influenced him in the course he has adopted."

We see here what was the opinion of the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories in respect to the issuing of permits or licenses to sell wines and beer within the boundaries of the Rocky Mountain Park. The reply of the Minister of Interior to this letter, which sets forth the views of the Minister on this question, is as follows:—

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
"OTTAWA, 14th September, 1888.

"SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 20th July last, stating for the information of the Minister of Interior, that His Honor the Lieutenant Governor had granted permission to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to import wines and beer into the North-West Territories for the use of their hotel at Banff and to keep and sell the same therein, until such permission is withdrawn, and further that His Honor had informed the company that this permission was only provisional until concurrent authority to a similar effect should be obtained from this Department.

"I must apologise for not having more promptly acknowledged receipt of this communication, but at the same time I may say that, at the time of its receipt, I did not think its contents called for any comment from me.

"I am, however, now in receipt of instructions from the Minister of Interior to transfer to His Honor the Lieutenant Governor all applications for permission to sell liquors in the National Park, as he does not think this matter comes within his province. I have, therefore, transferred to the Lieutenant Governor, under separate enclosures, all pending applications for liquor permits from residents of the National Park.

"(Signed) JOHN R. HALL,
"*Acting Deputy Minister of Interior.*"

I find also that the Lieutenant Governor wrote to the Minister of the Interior, acknowledging the receipt of this letter, in the following words:—

"LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
"REGINA, Oct. 2nd, 1888.

"SIR,—I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 14th September last, in reference to permission granted by His Honor the Lieutenant Governor to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the sale of wines and beer in their hotel at Banff, and also regarding applications for a similar permission from various other persons resident in the National Park, and which have been transmitted by the Department to His Honor. His Honor desires me to state that, in view of the conclusion which he arrived at upon this question after consultation with the Deputy Ministers of Justice and of the Interior, he will still be obliged if the Minister would kindly cause the opinion of the Minister of Justice to be taken as to the respective jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior and of the Lieutenant Governor within the National Park under the Rocky Mountains Park Act, so that His Honor may have for his future guidance the views of the highest legal authority upon the subject.

"(Signed) R. B. GORDON,
"*Secretary to the Lieutenant Governor.*"

One would suppose that this was a very natural request on the part of the Lieutenant Governor, and that it would be complied with. Up to the date of this return, the Minister of the Interior did not deem it necessary to obtain the opinion of the Minister of Justice; at all events, no such opinion seems to have been given, and so far as I can find out from this return, the Lieutenant Governor had not, so far, obtained any such opinion from the Minister of Justice. There were several other applications, which were granted

in very much the same way. Two of these were made by Mr. Wright and Mr. Moulton, and their applications, in both cases, were referred by the Minister of the Interior to the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories. I shall not detain the House by reading them, but the reply of the Lieutenant Governor to Mr. Moulton is worth reading. The Lieutenant Governor said:

"REGINA, July 24th, 1888.

"SIR,—I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your letter applying for His Honor the Lieutenant Governor's permission to sell wines and beer in your hotel at Banff In reply, I am to state that, as the Rocky Mountain Park, within which the hotel is situated, has been placed under the control and management of the Minister of the Interior, His Honor will be pleased, as soon as you have obtained the necessary authority from the department, to grant his own permission to the same effect.

"(Signed) R. B. GORDON,
"*Sec. of the Lieut.-Governor.*"

The Lieutenant Governor here clearly indicates that, in his opinion, the Rocky Mountain Park was entirely under the control and management of the Minister of the Interior. Mr. Moulton enclosed this letter to the Minister of the Interior, and asked the hon. gentleman, practically, what he was to do. The Minister, in his reply to Mr. Moulton, said that Mr. Royal had had a discussion with the Government upon this matter, on 20th September, and probably he would deal with the application accordingly. I do not think it is necessary to read that letter, but it shows how the difficulties surrounding this matter have been caused by the action, or rather the inaction, of the Minister of the Interior. Dr. Brett also applied for a permit similar to the one granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for their hotel at Banff. His letter is as follows:—

"BANFF, September 14th, 1888.

"DEAR SIR,—I am this day in receipt of a communication from Lieutenant Governor Royal granting permission to the Sanitarium Company to sell wine and beer, subject to your concurrent authority to the same effect, and I would most respectfully ask that you grant that permission. I need scarcely again refer to the necessity for the Sanitarium to be allowed that privilege, as the majority of the guests are invalids, and consequently require both wine and beer. Will you kindly give this your immediate attention, as this matter has been delayed for some time past to the great detriment to the patients of this place.

"H. G. BRETT."

The Minister replied:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
"OTTAWA, 28th September, 1888.

"DEAR DR. BRETT,—In reply to your letter of 15th inst., addressed to the Minister of the Interior, asking him to concur in the permission granted to the Sanitarium Company by the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories to sell wine and beer, I have to say that Mr. Dewdney has decided not to take any action with reference to the granting of such permits, and that, therefore, it will be for you to decide whether or not to avail yourself of the permission given to you by His Honor the Lieutenant Governor.

"(Signed) JOHN R. HALL,
"*Acting Deputy of the Minister of the Interior.*"

In other words, when a gentleman applies to the Minister, to the authority which he has been told by the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories is the proper authority, he is told that he must judge for himself, and, practically, take his risk as to what he should do in regard to this matter, when he had already been told by the Lieutenant Governor that a permit given by him was only half a permit. Now, Sir, this is a most extraordinary state of affairs. We find that in this park the Minister of Interior chooses to assert that a certain kind of trade and commerce must be carried on under the permit of the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories; we find the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories distinctly and clearly saying that he has not authority to give that permission, but that concurrent authority must be obtained from the Minister of Interior. These gentlemen are in a very difficult position apparently in making this publication, and personally I do not sympathise with their difficulties, because I do not wish to see the sale of wine and beer intoxicants within the limits of the Rocky Mountain Park; but what I want to point out to the House and to the country is this: That there is this conflict of opinion between two of the officers of the Government and that they have not taken upon themselves to obtain the opinion of the Minister of Justice, which certainly ought to be competent authority to guide the Government on a question of this kind; that in consequence of this conflict there is a difference of opinion as to what they should do, and those individuals, in consequence of this difficulty, may be, and I believe have been, tempted to violate the law of the land affecting this Rocky Mountain Park, and are liable to prosecution and punishment in consequence of this state of affairs. The Minister of Interior, I think, if he chose to read the Act constituting the Rocky Mountain Park, cannot have any difficulty as to what the law is. Under statutes 50-51 Vic. we find that Act, and we find it laid down distinctly and clearly that the land within the boundaries of that park is withdrawn from the provisions of any other Act except this one. Section 2 says:

"The said tract of land is hereby reserved and set apart as a public park and pleasure ground for the benefit and advantage and enjoyment of the people of Canada, subject to the provisions of this Act and to the regulations hereinafter mentioned, and shall be known as The Rocky Mountains Park Act of Canada."

This clearly shows that the park is to be dealt with under this Act, and this Act alone. The Act says further:

"The park shall be under the control and management of the Minister of the Interior, and the Governor in Council shall make regulations for the following purposes."

It goes on to state what shall come under that provision, and amongst other things in sub-section *e* we find:

"Trade and traffic of every description."

I do not think that the Minister of Justice or the Minister of Interior will pretend to say that liquor selling or keeping an hotel is not "trade or traffic" or that it would not come under this definition of "trade and traffic of every description." There is no question whatever in my mind but that this Act applies to the sale of liquor and to the keeping of hotels within that park. I venture to say that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the other gentlemen who have hotels in that park, have had to obtain the authorisation of the Minister of Interior to keep those hotels, to obtain the ground which they occupy in that park, and also that they had to obtain his authorisation for the sale of liquor within its limits. Under section 4 we find that sub-section 2 regulates the penalty for any violation of the regulations. It says:

"The Governor in Council may by the said regulations impose penalties for any violations thereof, not exceeding in each case the sum of $50, or in default of payment and costs, imprisonment for not more than three months."

I think it is very clear, therefore, that this Act, and this Act alone, applies to the sale of liquor within the Rocky Mountain Park. I think it would be very greatly to the detriment of that park and to the uses for which that park is intended that the sale of liquor should be allowed within its bounds. I believe, Sir, that the principle which actuated the passage of the North-West Territories Act, viz.: that there should be prohibition of intoxicating in these territories, should be maintained inviolate, and that in this portion of these territories the same principle should be applied. Especially is this necessary in a park which is to be kept for the enjoyment and pleasure and advantage of the people of Canada. As I understand the present condition of affairs it is this: the hon. the Minister of Interior not daring to take upon himself, or the Government of which he is a member not daring to take the responsibility of issuing permits to sell liquor in a territory which is wholly and entirely under their control, is shirking that responsibility and is leaving that responsibility to an officer in the North-

West Territories who seems to be bold enough to take that responsibility upon himself. I will not say that he takes the responsibility upon himself; because the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, in taking responsibility upon himself in connection with the territories under his control, will not and does not, in the face of this law which I have read, undertake to give that authority to sell liquors within the Rocky Mountain Park, without the sanction of the Minister of the Interior. I am glad to say the Minister of the Interior has not exercised the power to grant permission to sell liquors within the park, for I do not wish him to do so, but when I find that, in consequence of his dereliction of duty, liquor is sold within the bounds of the Rocky Mountain Park without his authority, I believe it to be the duty of the Government of which he is a member to see that that violation of the terms of the Rocky Mountain Park Act is punished and is put an end to. I believe that these gentlemen who without the authorisation of the Minister of Interior (by whose authorisation alone they have a right to sell liquor) should be punished for the sale of liquor which they are now carrying on in the Rocky Mountains Park. It is the duty of the Minister of the Interior under whose control the management of this park is to see that that punishment is inflicted and to cause the discontinuance of that state of affairs. It seems to me that the Minister of Interior is prepared either to put his own legal judgment against the judgment of the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, backed up as it is shown to be from the letter which I read a few minutes ago, by the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice and the Deputy Minister of Interior, and to say that he is right and they are wrong, or, that he has not the courage to take up this question and deal with it on his own responsibility as it is his duty to do. I believe, were he to undertake the responsibility, he would not dare, in the face of the temperance opinion of this country, to issue a permit to sell liquor in that park. I will now come to the other portion of my resolution as to the issuing of the new style of permits for the sale of liquor in the North-West Territories. The hon. the Minister knows perfectly well that so long that he was the incumbent of the office of Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, permits to sell liquor there were not given as they are now given. He knows perfectly well that according to the interpretation, which his actions show that he has given to the North-West Territories Act, that he did not consider that it was wise or right—I cannot say that he did not consider that it was legal—but, at all events, that he did not consider that it was wise or right to issue permits for the sale of liquor within the territories under his control. Within the past year another gentleman has been appointed to this office, and this gentleman has inaugurated an entirely new state of affairs. I consider, Sir, that this is a much more important point than the one to which I have just alluded to in reference to the sale of liquor in the Rocky Mountain Park I consider that it is a much more important fact in the government of those territories that an officer of the Government here should, so far as we know, without any consultation with anybody, have inaugurated a system which seems to have been conceived in his own mind, and to have been put into force by him on his own authority and responsibility, without any authorisation from anybody responsible either to the people of those territories, or the people of Canada. This, Sir, I believe not only to be an offence against the temperance sentiment of this country; I believe it also to be an offence against the principles of our constitutional government. It is true, under certain acts, the Government, by Order in Council, have power and authority given to them to make certain innovations, within certain limits, upon the regulations regarding certain things; but so far as I can see, in reading the Acts relating to the North-West Territories, such an innovation as this which has been made by Lieutenant Governor Royal is not within his competence, or within the competence of the Government, without a direct change in the law which guides them in the rule of the North-West Territories. In my motion I aim at the Government here, because Mr. Royal is simply an officer of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. He does not occupy the position which Lieutenant Governors of the Provinces of Canada do; he does not, so to speak, hold the position of the Queen; he is simply there as the representative of this Government, the officer and servant of this Government, and as such, the officer and servant of this Parliament and the people of Canada; under section 4 of the North West Territories Act, I find:

"There shall be for the Territories an officer called the Lieutenant Governor, appointed by the Governor in Council by instrument under the Great Seal of Canada, who shall hold office during pleasure. The Lieutenant Governor shall administer the Government, under instructions from time to time given by the Governor in Council, or by the Secretary of State of Canada."

Now, Sir, this shows very clearly that while the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories is the official directly in charge of the Government of those territories, he is to carry out that Government under instructions given him by the Governor in Council, or the Secretary of State of Canada. Have any instructions been given to Lieutenant Governor Royal by the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches regarding the issue of these permits? If there have been, how is it that the return which has been laid on the Table of this House, in response to an order for all papers, documents, and correspondence in connection with this matter, contains no such instructions? There are no such instructions; but, unfortunately for the gentlemen on the Treasury benches, we find, from what appears in the newspapers, and in the letters in this return, that the Lieutenant Governor did consult the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, and the gentlemen in the departments, before he issued this new style of permit for the North-West Territories. Therefore, I believe it is the hon. gentlemen opposite who are responsible for this new interpretation of the North-West Territories Act; they must bear the responsibility before the people, and it is through them, against their officer, that I propose to aim in this motion. Now, Sir, in the North-West Territories Act there are certain sections under the heading of "Prohibition of Intoxicants." What has always been the interpretation of those sections? I do not think it is necessary to dwell on them, because every one knows perfectly well that on numerous occasions the prohibitory sections of that Act have been dealt with, and spoken of as prohibitory. We only need to know what the interpretation of that word in the English language is, to know that the word prohibition is used all over this continent, and amongst the English speaking people, as the absolute forbidding of the sale, and dealing in, and trading in everything of an intoxicating nature. We know perfectly well that prohibition is often held up in direct opposition to the system of licensing, and that it is incompatible with any system of licensing. I do not think I need to dwell upon this; and when I find, as I do, in the North-West Territories Act, a number of sections under the head of "Prohibition of Intoxicants," it seems to me absurd to try to interpret these sections so that their heading may become nothing but mockery, and in effect absolutely untrue. We know that up to the time of the appointment of the present Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, such was the constant interpretation of those sections. But we find to-day that this gentleman has chosen to take upon himself to inaugurate a new system, and what is that system? I say, without fear of contradiction, that it is practically a complete licensing system—I will not say law,

because a law is constituted by the proper authority. But this is a license system, such as might have been inaugurated by a change in the law, and is almost as complete as the licensing systems of the various older Provinces of this Dominion. I have only to show you what are the terms under which this gentleman chose to issue these permits, to prove this fact. And I may say here, that I am surprised to find that in this return which the hon. Minister laid before Parliament, there is no description of the kind of permits the Lieutenant Governor has chosen to issue. I do not find here the rules and regulations under which that hon. gentleman published that he would issue those permits, and I have the authority of a gentleman from the North-West to say that there were such regulations and proclamations issued by the Lieutenant Governor of those territories. An hon. senator who was appointed a short time ago by the Government, told me, at a meeting held in this building, that in the North-West Territories he had seen a printed copy, issued by the Lieutenant Governor, of the conditions under which he would issue the permits for the sale of certain kinds of liquors in those territories, and the return laid on the Table in response to the order for copies of any such conditions, contains no copies of those conditions or regulations. I was, therefore, obliged to have reference to the newspapers published in the North-West Territories to find under what conditions those permits were issued. On consulting the file of the Regina *Leader*, I find that these are the principal conditions:

"Licenses to sell beer containing not more than 4 per cent. of alcohol shall be issued under the payment of a fee of 10 cents per gallon. These licenses are only to be given to hotels with accommodation for twelve persons and five horses. They are only to be given on the recommendation of the Board of Assembly for the district in which the hotels are situated. The hours of sale are regulated. Liquor is not to be sold on Sundays, and it is not to be sold to anybody under 14 years of age, nor to any drunken or dissolute person. The total quantity of liquor is to be brought in under one permit, and to be inspected by the police."

Will anybody tell me that such regulations do not practically amount to a license system? So much is this a license system that I find, on consulting the records of the Assembly at Regina last year, that in the budget brought down and adopted by that Assembly, amongst the items of revenue is an item of $3,500 expected to be obtained in consequence of the fees exacted for these licenses. In other words, it is evident that the Lieutenant Governor issued these licenses in the full expectation that liquor to the extent of 35,000 gallons would be sold under these permits in the North-West Territories during the coming year. Evidently the intention was to make a complete license system and to exact from the individuals who obtained these licenses a fee sufficient to amount in the whole to the sum of $3,500. As far as we know, the Lieutenant Governor conceived in his own mind and carried into execution this license system, but is it possible that it may have been conceived in the Council Chamber at Ottawa? Is it possible that instructions were given from Ottawa to the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories to frame this system and put it in force? If so, we want to know, the people of this Dominion, above all the temperance people want to know, where we are to place the responsibility for this violation of the prohibitory sections of the North-West Territories Act, and with this object I am moving this resolution. If hon. gentlemen opposite do not consider they are responsible for this, I would ask them to consult the North-West Territories Act, and explain how they are going to escape responsibility. If they wish to escape responsibility, let the Government at once issue instructions to the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories to put an end to this system of licenses, to cease issuing these permits, and withdraw the permits he has already issued. It may be said that this system is a harmless one. I do not consider it is. I believe that under the cover of 4 per cent. beer, a great deal of much stronger liquor will

be sold. I believe that there, as elsewhere, where men get permission to sell mildly intoxicating drinks, they will, under cover of that permission, sell the most intoxicating liquors. If the principle which underlies this introduction of the system of licensing is to be accepted as correct, there is nothing whatever to hinder the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories changing the regulations and issuing permits to sell whiskey; there is nothing to hinder him giving unlimited licenses to sell intoxicating liquors to anybody, even minors and dissolute persons, and on every day in the week, including Sundays. There is nothing to hinder the Lieutenant Governor making such a system as he chooses. From our experience in times past, we have no very great confidence that the hon. gentleman will have much regard for the temperance sentiment of the people. The Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, encouraged by the supineness of the Government and this House, should his present action not be checked, may next year issue permits for the sale of whiskey and other drinks more injurious than 4 per cent. beer. I will say further, that the system which the Lieutenant Governor has inaugurated is not in accordance with the desire of the people of the North-West Territories. It may be asked why I, a representative of eastern Canada, should interfere in this matter. Well, I interfere, first of all, because I represent a temperance county, and speak here more or less on behalf of the temperance people of this country, who, I know, view with alarm and indignation the action of the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, and who are astonished at the non-interference of the Government of the day. What do the people of the North-West Territories want? They did not ask for any such license as this. True, some of them demanded that the manufacture of beer might be allowed in the North-West Territories; but such a hybrid system as this, such an unlawful system as this, no man in the North-West Territories ever asked for. What do we find that they did ask for? We find that a petition was sent from Calgary asking for a license system; we find that a petition was sent from Alberta, stating that the present law was distasteful, because the people had not given their sanction to it, and asking for permission to manufacture and sell beer; we find a resolution in 1887 asking that the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act should be extended to the North-West Territories—in other words asking for local option. As a temperance man, I thoroughly endorse that petition, and would be glad to see the people of the North-West Territories allowed to decide for themselves as to whether liquor should be sold in their midst or not. I find there is also a petition of the Temperance Convention of a totally different character to the one I have just referred to. This petition reads as follows:—

"*To His Excellency the Most Honorable the Marquis of Lansdowne, G.C.M.G., in Council.*

"The memorial of your petitioners humbly sheweth, that:

"Whereas the North-West Territories Act prohibits the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquor, except by the special permission of the Lieutenant Governor; and

"Whereas such prohibition was widely advertised both in the older Provinces of Canada, and in Europe, and many settlers have located here because of such prohibition; and

"Whereas it has been found that such provisions have greatly limited the use, and therefore the injurious effects of liquor; and

"Whereas the North-West Council at its last Session adopted a certain memorial to be laid before Your Honorable Council, praying that the said clauses be repealed, and that the power of licensing the manufacture and sale of liquors be placed in the hands of the future legislative body for the Territories; and

"Whereas it was the unanimous opinion of a Temperance Convention held at Regina on November 22 last, and composed of representative men from Broadview to Calgary, that such memorial did not express the sentiments of the majority of the people of the territories, especially as such projected action would expunge the prohibitory clauses of the North-West Territories Act, without first taking the votes of the settlers who came here well knowing that such clauses were in force, and

"Whereas, at such Temperance Convention, resolutions were passed recognising the difficult position in which His Honor the Lieutenant Governor was placed, in having the responsibility of issuing permits,

and holding that the time had now come when the Lieutenant Governor of the Territories should be relieved of such onerous and trying duties and that a Commissioner should be appointed whose duty it would be to license responsible parties at central points to sell liquor and spirits and in small quantities, for medicinal and sacramental purposes only, to parties on production of such certificate as you may see fit to specify, the parties so licensed to have authority to sell only in sealed packages bearing a Government stamp, and to be required to keep for public inspection a register of all sales, the liquors and spirits so sold to be furnished and the price fixed by the Government through the aforesaid commissioner, and none of the parties named to be allowed a profit from the sales, but to be paid by salary; and

"Whereas, at such Convention, resolutions were also passed praying that Your Excellency in Council may see fit to appoint a special detective force to co-operate with the North-West Mounted Police in regulating and restricting the sale and use of liquor, and appointing a committee to embody all such resolutions in a memorial for the consideration of Your Excellency in Council: now,

"Therefore, we, the said committee, would humbly pray that no action whatever be taken with a view to relaxing the prohibitory nature of the North-West Territories Act, and that the suggestions, as set forth in the resolutions of the Regina Temperance Convention of November 22nd last, should have your careful attention."

Here is an important memorial sent to the Government by the temperance people of the North-West Territories, the wording of which is such as to show that they, at all events, did not wish to see the prohibitory clauses of the North-West Territories Act relaxed. It has been somewhat a subject of astonishment to me, and I have seen references to the same effect in the public press, that an hon. gentleman sitting on the Treasury benches, who has been known in times past as the representative of the temperance sentiment of the Conservative party, who is supposed to represent the temperance element in the Government and whom we believe to have been placed in the Government largely because he was supposed to represent the temperance element in the Conservative party, should have remained without protest on the Government benches, apparently concurring in this violation of the law to which reference has been made. It may be that the hon. gentleman has of late seen fit to change his views on these matters. It may be that he has desired to cease to represent the temperance people of the Conservative party, or the temperance people of this country, in the Government. I confess that, after a vote which I saw him give a short time ago, I was inclined to think that that was the course which the hon. gentleman had chosen to pursue, but I was hardly prepared to find in this return a confirmation of that view. I find that this memorial, which was sent to this Minister, was handed over by him to the tender mercies of the Secretary of State for Canada to be dealt with; and apparently the hon. Minister himself had no voice of encouragement, no word of assistance or of congratulation to give to the temperance people who presented this memorial to the Government, and he not shown that he does not represent their sentiments and opinions in the Government. I find in this return a letter headed "Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Canada," but dated "The Arlington, Washington, D. C., 2nd February, 1888," at which time the hon. gentleman was in Washington assisting his colleagues in the negotiation of the Fishery Treaty. The letter is as follows:—

"My Dear Chapleau,—I have the honor to transmit to you, to be laid before His Excellency the Governor General in Council, a petition from G. H. V. Bulyea and others, praying that no action be taken with a view to relaxing the prohibitory nature of the North-West Territories Act.

"Yours truly,
"G. E. FOSTER.

"Hon. J. A Chapleau,
"Secretary of State,
"Ottawa."

Of course I can understand and appreciate the fact that a petition of this kind must be referred to the Secretary of State, but at the same time I had hoped, when I found that this had passed through the hands of the gentleman who is supposed to represent the temperance element in the Government, that amongst the correspondence here we might have found some little encouragement to the temperance people of the North-West Territories from the hon. gentleman, that we might have found some little recognition amongst these letters of this memorial from the temperance people, that we might have found some recommendation as to what should be done with this memorial, instead of a note simply transferring it to the tender mercies of the Secretary of State, whose views and whose votes on temperance questions are too well known to the House and to the Minister of Finance, to permit him to believe that a temperance memorial would receive anything but very scant courtesy from the Secretary of State. What is the result of this innovation? The license system has been introduced, but it is not such a system as the people of the North-West Territories who are in favor of a license system want. It does not allow anything but the sale of 4 per cent. beer. The Calgary *Herald* and its *clientèle* demand a much wider system. The hon. member for Assiniboia also demands that power should be given to manufacture and sell all sorts of liquor there. We know that the temperance people do not wish to have liquor sold there at all. There is one point which we find from this return and which we know to be the fact, and that is that the people of the North-West Territories desire to be put in a position to be able to express their own opinions on this question. They believe that they are as competent to decide upon the question of prohibition as any other people in Canada, and they desire to have the power of voting upon the question of a license system *vs.* prohibition. The Minister of Interior has stated that he was going to give that permission to the people of the North-West Territories in the Bill which he has introduced to amend the law. I think it comes a little late from the Ministry who have made this innovation. I think the Minister should have waited until the people had expressed their opinion before authorising the issue of these licenses. What is the law to-day? Some people say that these permits are perfectly legal. I am not a lawyer, but I cannot understand the words of this Act to show the legality of the permit issued by Lieutenant Governor Royal. The first section says:

"No intoxicating liquor or intoxicant shall be manufactured, compounded or made in the Territories, except by special permission of the Governor in Council; nor shall any intoxicating liquor or intoxicant be imported or brought into the Territories from any Province of Canada or elsewhere, or be sold, exchanged, traded or bartered, or had in possession therein, except by special permission, in writing, of the Lieutenant Governor."

Now, it is a very well known interpretation of parts of that law that, wherever any liquor is held in the North-West Territories or brought in there, special permission has been required, prescribing the amount of liquor and giving special permission for such an amount of liquor and for such an importation or such a possession. The permits issued by the present Minister of Interior covered that ground, and that only. Every different kind of permit that may be issued under this clause comes under the same terms and conditions, and, if a special permit is required for special importation, I contend that the law applies equally in regard to every special sale. In other words, the former permission for importation or possession of liquor in the North-West Territories never gave anyone permission to import as much liquor as he liked. If he got a permit to import liquor, you might say that he was to have permission to sell liquor, but, up to the present time, every permit to import liquor has been a special permit in respect to the particular importation, giving all the details as to the importation and as to the time and place. I contend, that just the same reason should be applied *pari passu* to the sale of liquor, and if the permit is to be for the sale of liquor, it should be given for a special transaction, for a special amount, and at a special time and place; but you have no right to give a man unrestricted permission to sell liquor whenever and wherever he chooses, and in what-

ever quantity he chooses. You might just as well give a man permission to import liquor whenever, wherever, and in whatever quantities he chooses, a power which was never taken, which was never thought of, and which it will never be contended belongs to the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories. I say that is the common sense view of this paragraph, and I am upheld in this view by others who are better qualified to speak from a legal position, and I believe there is no question that such an interpretation alone is in accordance with the spirit of this law. I could quote over and over again, from Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Leonard Tilley, gentlemen whose word is generally accepted as law upon the Treasury benches, that such is the spirit of the Act in question. I find this was the intention of the law when it was first placed upon our Statute-book, and it is only within the last year, it is only in consequence of the appointment of a new Lieutenant Governor, that a new view is taken of the meaning of that law.

An hon. MEMBER. Give us the quotations.

Mr. FISHER. I am asked to quote the utterances of Sir Leonard Tilley and Sir Charles Tupper. Speaking from memory, in consequence of a former quotation which I made on the floor of this House, I would refer to a great meeting which was held in London at a time when Sir Leonard Tilley was Finance Minister of this country, and at which both of those distinguished gentlemen were present. Sir Leonard Tilley, in speaking about prohibition in this country, quoted our prohibitory enactment in regard to the North-West Territories, and Sir Charles Tupper, in endorsing that view, went so far as to say that if they wished to drink to the health of the Governor General of Canada in the North-West Territories, they would be obliged to get Pain Killer or some other patent medicine to do it with, because they could by no possibility obtain the drink ordinarily used for such purposes. Sir, I believe that the Act of the Lieutenant Governor in this respect is a dangerous innovation upon our system of constitutional government. I believe he has made such a change in what has commonly been regarded as the intention and scope of the law, as no private individual irresponsible to the people, should be allowed to make. If a Lieutenant Governor is allowed to arrogate this power, it would be a direct encouragement to other officers of the country throughout the land, to think that their private opinion was sufficient to override the law of the land. I regret to say that that opinion seems already to prevail in many instances, where the officials of this country think they are autocrats, that their word is law, that the people are here to Minister unto their wills and needs, to pay their salaries and to listen to their behests. Sir, it is time that a protest should be made against that assumption of authority, and I think this occasion is a fitting one to do so. I desire to record my protest, not simply because I am a temperance man, but because I hold that those who govern should obey the laws of the land as well as those who are governed. If this system which I am denouncing is allowed to prevail in our land, there is a poor future for us, a poor future for constitutional government in this country. We have always understood that Canada is governed by the will of the people, that we are a democratic country, that we are a people who desire to see our will obeyed. The people have expressed their will in these prohibition clauses of the North-West Territories Act, that will has never been changed, those sections still stand on our Statute-book, and those who are above all bound to carry out that will and to obey that law, are the officials tn whom the enforcement of that law is entrusted. It is, therefore, not only as a temperance man, but as an upholder of the constitutional rights of the people, that I move this motion which I have placed in your hands.

Mr. FISHER.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman who has made the motion has referred to me and to my department as either having been consulted upon this question, or as being the authority who should have been consulted; and he has inferred from that fact that the proceedings which have been taken in relation to the sale of liquor in the North-West Territories and the Rocky Mountain Park, have been taken with the connivance of the members of the Government and of myself. Now, the hon. gentleman has presented, in the first place, in the remarks which he has just made to the House, the case which he desires to make against the Minister of the Interior, and the hon. gentleman has stated that case to be this: That the Rocky Mountain Park is for all purposes under the control of the Minister of the Interior, that it is withdrawn from the North-West Territories Acts, and is wholly under the Government's control. All the complaint which he makes against the Minister of the Interior is based upon that proposition, not one word of which, I contend, has any foundation in fact or in law. Now, the position of the Rocky Mountain Park is simply this: It is a part of the North-West Territories for all purposes whatever, except in so far as the use of the lands there is concerned, and subject to certain powers of the Governor General in Council, which I shall presently mention. The House will remember that when the Rocky Mountain Park Act was passed, all the lands in the North-West Territories were open for sale or pre-emption, except in so far as they had been withdrawn from sale or pre-emption under the authority of this Parliament, and the Rocky Mountain Park Act simply established by the second section that the tract of land described in the first section should be reserved and set apart as a public park and pleasure ground for the benefit, and advantage, and enjoyment of the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman, I think, is completely mistaken in supposing that the language exempts the Rocky Mountain Park from the laws in force in the North-West Territories. It no more exempts the Rocky Mountain Park from the laws in force, for the time being, in the North-West Territories than a provincial statute, preserving a piece of land as a pleasure ground for the inhabitants of any city, would by those words, which simply set it apart for these uses, exempt it from the operation of the laws of the country in force for the time being. Every portion of the Rocky Mountain Park, and every person in it, is subject, to-day, to all the laws in force in the North-West Territories. The hon. gentleman will see how obvious that is when he considers the question as to what laws would be in force for the punishment of any other offences than the violation of the prohibitory sections of the North-West Territories Act. Let him suppose that any offence is committed. If the view he takes of this section be correct, that the park is exempt from the operation of the North-West Territories laws, there is no law of Canada in force there by which crime can be punished, or anybody's rights secured. The operation of the second section then is simply to say that this land shall be set apart as a pleasure ground, but the laws of the Territories apply to the Rocky Mountain Park just as much as they do to Regina. The only qualification to that is the liberty which is given in the next section to the Governor in Council to make regulations for trade and traffic of every description in the park. I so far concede the hon. gentleman's argument on that point as to admit that under the provisions of that section, we have power to say there shall be no liquor sold, even under permit, in the Rocky Mountain Park, or at any of the hotels in the park; but that does not withdraw the statement I have already made, namely, that the park is subject to all the laws in force in the North West Territories, and to-day, and until regulations are made by the Governor in Council for the prevention of the sale of intoxicating liquors absolutely in the park, the Governor at Regina has as much power to give a permit for the introduction of

liquor into the Rocky Mountain Park as into Regina. When, therefore, the hon. gentleman asserts, and when in his resolution he asks this House to affirm that the Minister of the Interior has been culpable, because the Act places the matter entirely under his control, and that he is personally conniving at the sale of liquors there, because he has power to prevent it under the Act, the hon. gentleman will see that his personal attack on the Minister and the personal censure which he asks this House to pass on the Minister, are altogether unfounded, because the Minister has not the power to interfere with a single permit which the Governor of the North-West Territories may grant in regard to the park until, in the exercise of his power under the statute, the Governor in Council pass some regulations exempting that portion of the North-West Territories from the operations of those permits. So, if I am right in this contention, and I think the hon. gentleman will hardly, on reflection, dispute it, he will see that that portion of his resolution and argument in which he censured and proposed to censure the Minister, as if the Minister were at fault, and that portion of his speech in which he spoke of direct dereliction of duty on the part of the Minister as proved by liquor being permitted to be sold there, is altogether based on a mistaken theory as to the position of the Rocky Mountain Park. In so far as these permits are in force in the North-West Territories, and in so far as they are in force in the Rocky Mountain Park, the responsibility rests with the Governor of the North-West Territories, and it only rests upon the Governor in Council in so far as the Government may, if the House took that view, be censured for not having made regulations of a more stringent character than those which at present prevail respecting the sale of liquor in the Territories. As to that the hon. gentleman's resolution is silent, because he censures the Government, if I recollect the resolution rightly, first, for allowing the Governor of the North-West Territories to grant licenses outside of the park and to give general permits, and, secondly, he censured the Minister of the Interior for what has taken place inside the park. I repeat, then, that every one of the colleagues of the Minister of the Interior is as much responsible as he, in so far as they may be responsible for not having adopted regulations more stringent than those which now exist in relation to the Rocky Mountain Park, and until some such regulations were adopted the Minister was powerless to interfere. In so far as the permit system is concerned in the park, the Governor of the North-West Territories and he alone, is responsible. The hon. gentleman read a portion of the return for the purpose of showing the House that the Department of Justice had been consulted by the officers of the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories. I gather from that correspondence and from the information which I have from my department, that some of the staff or officers of the Lieutenant Governor did consult the Deputy Minister of Justice as to the powers of the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories to issue permits which would have force within the park. It is true the correspondence states, as the hon. gentleman has read it, that the persons who consulted the deputy were advised to apply to the Department of the Interior. The reason for that was, not that the Department of the Interior had control over the subject, but because my department, the Department of Justice, gives no advice to persons outside the departments of the Government in respect to these questions. The position taken with respect to that application for advice was, that if the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories chose to act or not to act, he must act upon his own responsibility and upon advice he might obtain elsewhere, and that if he desired advice and the opinion of my department, he must go to the Minister of the Interior and ask him to obtain it. The Lieutenant Governor of the North-West has never personally, or by letter, or by any of his officers, asked my opinion upon this question, and I express my opinion on this question, in so far as the public are concerned, or anybody outside of the Government is concerned, for the first time this evening. So much for the observations of the hon. gentleman with respect to the operation of the Act as to the Rocky Mountain Park. I come now to say a few words as to what my view is in reference to permits to sell alcoholic liquors in the North-West Territories, or parts of it, the Rocky Mountain Park and elsewhere. I contend, and I contend it in spite of the argument which was addressed to the House when this question was under discussion a few evenings ago, that the right and the responsibility as well, rest with the Governor of the North-West Territories, and with him alone. The resolution affirms the singular statement that the Government are in fault, they having permitted, by one of their officers, namely, the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, to license the sale of intoxicating liquors in the North-West Territories. In a certain qualified and most restricted sense the Lieutenant Governor of the North West Territories is an officer of the Government, but only in this sense, that he receives his appointment from the Government of Canada. In no other respect is he an officer of the Government of Canada, and certainly not in the sense covered by the resolution, which certainly implies that he is acting under our instructions and subject to our opinion, and that we are responsible from day to day for his acts. The strongest argument made on a previous occasion, when the matter was under discussion in this House, was that the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories stands in relation to the Government of Canada like the Governor of a colony did in days before representative institutions were granted to the colony to the Imperial Government, when instructions from the Government were received by him from day to day, and action was taken by him as enunciated from the Colonial Office. The Governor of the North-West Territories holds no such position in regard to this Government or in relation to this Parliament. We have the power to appoint him; we have the power to dismiss him for misconduct; but he is vested by the law (which binds us as well as him) with certain statutory powers, one of which is to grant permits for the introduction of intoxicating liquors into the Territories which he governs. I may differ from the Lieutenant Governor as to the extent of authority which that enactment confers. If it be true, as has been asserted more than once in this House, that the Lieutenant Governor conceives that he is thereby authorised to set up a license system in the North-West Territories; that all comers, recommended in a certain way, are to receive permits which will authorise them to sell liquor, and that that system is to be universally established throughout the North-West Territories irrespective of the exercise of the discretion which the law expects him to exercise; I do differ from him as to the extent of the authority conferred upon him by the Act. I do think that if he has set up a license system of that description—and I know the facts only from what has been stated here—that he must have departed from the spirit of the Act. But the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories is not under my control; he is not in any sense under the control of the Government in the exercise of these statutory powers which are conferred upon him. We have, as I have said, the power to appoint the Lieutenant Governor, we have the power to recommend to His Excellency his removal from office; but certainly it is not a power which would be exercised because he chooses, in the exercise of his authority, to differ from us as to the construction of the law under which he acts, and under which he is bound to act, in the administration of his duties in the North-West Territories. If the Lieutenant Governor issues these permits, and if he believes he has the right to

issue them, he has the right to say that he will do so—notwithstanding that I differ from him as to the extent of his authority or as to the way in which it should be exercised—just as fully as he has the right to differ from the Minister of Finance as to the propriety of giving any permits in the North-West Territories at all. It is true that the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories receives instruction from the Government of Canada just as every Lieutenant Governor receives instruction at his appointment, but can it be supposed that these instructions are to follow him from day to day and control his action in relation to the discharge of his statutory powers? If so, then the office of Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories is a mere sham, and the North-West Territories are under the administrative control of the Government of Canada;—a theory which will be somewhat new to the people of those territories, and which, I venture to say, is utterly inconsistent with the constitutional theory of having a Lieutenant Governor and a Legislative Assembly in these Territories. As proof of the alleged fact that a regular and systematic regulation with regard to licenses had been established in the North-West Territories, the hon. gentleman states that in the estimates of the income of the North-West Legislative Assembly, a certain income had been estimated as derivable from the permits. That has been done ever since the North-West Territories Act has been adopted.

Mr. FISHER. Will the hon. Minister excuse me a moment. In the estimates of the last Session of the North-West Territories Legislature there are two items—one such as has always been the case, and another special item for four per cent. beer permits which is estimated at $3,500.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was answering the hon. gentleman as to a statement he made in the first part of his case, but, now, as I understand his present explanation, it is that, instead of estimating a certain number of thousands of dollars as has always been done, as likely to be received for the price of permits, they have divided the estimate into two classes and estimated so much for beer permits and so much for spirit permits. I conceive that this makes no difference in principle, and I humbly think that it does not establish the hon. gentleman's charge with regard to there being an organised system of licensing in the Territories. With reference to the hon. gentleman's contention that there was evidence in this file of papers that the Lieutenant Governor in Council did consult the Government of Canada, or did advise with them, and that the Government of Canada was responsible for the practice which he set on foot as regards permits; I have only to add that the hon. gentleman is mistaken in supposing that the papers furnished contain any evidence that any such state of facts exist. Right or wrong, the Lieutenant Governor has acted on his own responsibility and on his own view of the law, or upon the view of the law which was given him by the counsel who advised him, and, certainly, not upon any suggestion, or with any connivance, or by any advice from the Government of Canada. With regard to the contention which the hon. gentleman made that the Government in Council ought to be censured for not having adopted more restrictive provisions with regard to intoxicating liquors under the powers given them in the Park Act, I have only to say that the hon. gentleman's resolution does not point to that result. The hon. gentleman's resolution holds the Minister of the Interior indirectly responsible for all that has been done in the park itself on the mistaken theory that the park is absolutely under his control, and when the hon. gentleman goes a step further and asserts that it must be so because the very hotel in which those permits for liquor are used could not be erected without the assent or approval of the Minister of the Interior, he is surely forgetting the fact that when the Park Act was passed both the hotels there had actually been erected. I am very much mistaken, if I am not right in the statement that no hotel has been established or erected in the park since the Park Act was passed. At any rate I am well aware then when the Park Act was passed the two hotels to which he refers—the Canadian Pacific Hotel and Dr. Brett's Hotel—were established and erected, although the Canadian Pacific Railway hotel was not entirely completed. When he would expect the House to come to the conclusion that the Government is worthy of censure for not having prevented the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories from having given a permit for the introduction of liquors at all into the Rocky Mountain Park—when he demands that the law should be stricter in that reserve than it is anywhere else in the North-West Territories, I think the hon. gentleman should have put forward some statement for the purpose of showing that the permit system had been abused within the limits of the park; or that the use of intoxicating liquors is wholly unnecessary and more attendant with evil there than it would be elsewhere. He ought at least have put forward some case of abuse of this system in connection with the park itself before he should ask the House to come to this conclusion.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I should like to say a few words on the question raised by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher). The first question that occurs to me is, what was the object of the hon. gentleman in moving the amendment? and after hearing what he said I came to the conclusion that his object was not in the least in the interest of the people of the North-West, but it was to make a point against the Minister of the Interior, or the Minister of Justice, or the Government, with respect to this liquor question, because he did not seem to take in the least the point of view of the people of the North-West. The people of the North-West are always very glad when hon. members from the eastern Provinces take an interest in their country, and I think the more those hon. members turn their attention to that country the better it will be for the Dominion at large. We find it often said by the members on your left, Sir, that the North-West has been made by the Conservative party a dumping ground for political hacks, but I think that we in the North-West may with much greater reason, say that the North-West has been made by the Liberal party a dumping ground for unfortunate resolutions and amendments. I must say that resolutions such as this, introduced strictly from a party point of view, are very injurious to the best interests of the North-West. Everyone who regards that great country, from a statesmanlike point of view, must know that in the North-West the great future of Canada lies as a nation, and the sooner hon. members cease making the North-West a football for political exigencies, the better it will be for that country and the whole Dominion. I am naturally interested in the question raised by the hon. member for Brome, and since some six weeks ago, when the Minister of the Interior laid the papers asked for in reference to this question, before the House I have been endeavoring frequently to get them. I only got them to-day, very shortly before the House opened, and the hon. member for Brome then came to me and said he would give them to me, but expected me to deliver them up to him again immediately. Well, I thought these papers were brought down for the benefit of the whole House, but the hon. member for Brome kept them five or six weeks himself, and prevented those who are very deeply interested in the question from having an opportunity of seeing them. We cannot always be in the House at the same time as the hon. member for Brome, and if we had known that he was going to adopt this plan, of course we should

have watched him as the cat does a mouse, so that we might be able to obtain the papers from him. As it was I had only a short time to look over them. I notice that all the petitions seem to take a very different point of view from that which the hon. gentleman would lead this House to believe they did take. The first petition was from the mayor and corporation of Calgary in favor of the license system. The second is from Dr. Kennedy and residents of Alberta, asking that the manufacture of liquor should be allowed in the North-West. The corporation urged that the use of permits was really very immoral, because these permits, although issued with the best intentions, were often used to cover the illegal sale of liquor, and it was impossible, consequently, to put down the traffic. The extensive area of the country also added to the difficulty. The citizens of Alberta in their petition represent that the present system was distasteful to the majority of the inhabitants of the North-West. It is very curious that in this petition from the citizens of Alberta there are 15 pages of signatures, which is a marked contrast with another petition that I find in this return. It appears that there were two petitions sent from temperance associations—one from the temperance body of Regina, and these people did not ask that the license system should be put down, but asked for the appointment of commissioners who would give licenses to responsible parties for the sale of liquor. They also asked that there should be proper restrictions to the sale of liquor, and that men of the detective force in connection with the Mounted Police should be appointed to ensure the carrying out of the law. The other petition in favor of prohibition in the North-West was from Mr. Vidal, of Sarnia, Ontario, on behalf of Mr. McLaren and Mr. Spence, officers of the council of the Dominion Alliance. I would simply contrast the petitions of the inhabitants of Alberta with the petitions of these temperance people. The Regina people asked that the license system should be introduced in the North-West, and the Dominion Alliance asked that prohibition should be enforced throughout the North-West. In the Alberta petition there are no less than fifteen pages of foolscap of signatures of people actually in the North-West, and to the Ontario petition there are only three such signatures. I mention this to show that the people of the North-West should be consulted in some measure concerning their own affairs. I do not believe that in any matters of legislation which come before this House and directly affect the people of the North-West, there should be any attention given to the prejudices of a small section of the community in the older parts of Canada. I, myself, am averse to liquor circulating freely all over the land. I believe we ought to have strong, self-reliant, temperate people in the North-West, but I do not believe that by restricting the liberties of the people you will make them moral. You must first educate them up to a state of morality, and then you will have a strong, self-reliant and moral people. The next memorial was from the North-West Council in 1887, when the present Minister of the Interior was Lieutenant Governor. In this memorial the representatives of the people of the North-West showed that the present system was immoral and detrimental to the best interests of the North-West, and they urged that powers similar to those enjoyed by the older Provinces under the British North America Act should be granted to the North-West Territories, and that the provisional districts of the North-West should be districts under the said Act. When I first spoke on this subject in this House I believed at that time that the system I refer to was the best system. I believe nothing could be better than to place the people of the North-West in exactly the same position as the people in the rest of Canada. They know what is good for themselves. The people go out there to improve their condition and not to drink, for if they wanted to drink they could drink a great deal cheaper down here; but they do not want their liberties restricted. The next petition is from the North-West Assembly, presented during the time of the present Lieutenant Governor. This petition asked either for a plebiscite, or that the powers granted to other Provinces should be granted to the North-West. I think it would be better that this should be done rather than that a plebiscite, should be taken. At the time of my election the liquor question was a live one in the North-West, and I explained to my constituents the stand that I would take. I said I did not believe in local option; I did not believe in a small minority, through sentimental motives, being allowed to dictate to the majority, but that, as there appeared to be throughout Canada, a certain wave in favor of local option, I did not think that anyone who desired to represent the feelings of the people should go against that wave, which plainly indicated the public opinion of the country. Since then another wave has passed over the country, and swept away the Canada Temperance Act; so that now I feel rather at variance with the opinion I expressed before. I believe I can return to my first love, and again hold the opinion that it is not right to allow a minority, through sentimental motives, to dictate to the majority; but as I believe myself to a certain extent committed to the local option principle, I feel that I must stick to it and, therefore, I am in favor of giving to the North-West the powers that are given to the other Provinces. There is another petition from the Regina Board of Trade, signed by Rev. J. Steele. Mr. Steele says that the law now in force causes a waste of public money in the supplying of liquor. He pointed out the immense amount of money which has been spent in liquor imported into the North-West under the present law. The Regina Board of Trade suggests that, until the law is altered, such liquors should be made some use of—should be used for hospitals, and other such institutions, for the benefit of the sick. In referring to these questions, I shall quote from some local papers in the North-West to show what the feeling is there, and throughout the country. Commissioner Herchmer, I know, is not in favor of liquor being sold everywhere throughout the North-West; he is rather inclined to temperance than otherwise—I shall quote from the Prince Albert *Times* the suggestion of Commissioner Herchmer that the manufacture and sale of beer be allowed in the Territories under very stringent regulations The Prince Albert *Times*, commenting on this suggestion, says:

"We long since advocated the course suggested by the commissioner, and still believe it is the proper course to be adopted. We hope that the Government will at once act on the advice of the commissioner in this matter."

I think the commissioner might have gone a little further than he did go. I will quote from the Calgary *Herald*, which says editorially:

"A large majority of the representatives of the people announced themselves fairly and squarely in favor of high license, while a fair portion of the small minority, while not supporting high license, did not actually oppose it."

The Edmonton *Bulletin*, which is edited by a gentleman whose inclinations are decidedly towards temperance, says of the question:

"The second resolution passed, re-affirmed the desire of the assembly to have a vote taken, and asked that the Federal Government, as having the right to do so, take the vote; and afterwards asked, if it were not the pleasure of the Federal authorities to grant that request, that provincial powers be granted to the assembly in the matter. This resolution was carried by a vote of 13 to 7."

That shows that the liquor question is in a very unsatisfactory state in the North-West, and the people there feel that they ought to be treated in this matter in the same way as the people throughout the rest of Canada. One of the great privileges of being a British subject is that a man can do just as he likes in any part of the British realms, so long as he does not transgress the law of those realms. We in the

North-West are not in this position. We have a different measure of freedom just now from the majority of the people of the older Provinces and Manitoba, and we simply desire, now that we have representation in this House, to be placed in this matter, as in others, in the same free position as the people of the rest of the Dominion. I believe myself that this law, as it at present stands, is most unconstitutional in every way, because, as I have stated in this House in almost every Session that I have been here, and I will repeat it for the benefit of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) and others, if we are living under constitutional government, we should have some say in regard to the law that governs us. But this law which prevails in the North-West was passed by a Parliament in which that part of the country was not represented. It was a most arbitrary law, and now that we have representation here, I maintain that it is unconstitutional in spirit, if it is not in law. There is just one other point which I wish to refer to. I am sure there are a great many hon. members in this House who believe in strict prohibition, but at the same time if they believe in the constitution under which we live, they must allow that the opinions of the representatives of the North-West, when they are all in accord on one subject, should be respected by this House. We know that the representatives of the North-West are very few in number. I myself am one who represents a district larger than the Province of Ontario, with a population of some 20,000 people scattered through it; the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Davis) represents an enormous district too; Assiniboia is represented by two members; but these four districts cover an area nearly, if not quite as large as the rest of Canada put together. Although we are only four in number, and on that account it may be said that we do not represent the opinions of the people in this matter in a House of 215 members, still this House has another very sure guide to follow, that is, the petitions of the people; and in saying this, I will simply refer to what is a matter of English history, which has been laid down by some of our greatest parliamentarians, that although the opinions of the representatives of the people may be a sure guide as to the inclinations of the people as to what is public opinion, there still is another way which must not be disregarded, and that other way is by petitions. I have already referred to some of the petitions which have been sent down, but I will go a little further and will say that there has never been a year, since the people of the North-West were given representation in their Local Parliament, when petitions have not been passed and sent down to the Government of this country, asking that the law be altered with regard to this question. I would urge most strongly that the Government should alter the law, and put the people of the North-West in the same position as the other people of Canada, that they should acknowledge that they are a temperate and intelligent people by so doing, and that they should give them the same freedom in regard to this matter which is accorded to others. They know that they are backed up in doing that, not only by the whole force of the representatives of the North-West in this House, but they can go back to the time when the North-West was first given representation in the Local Assembly, and they will find that every year petitions have come down in favor of this course. On these two grounds, I think I am entitled to say that the people of the North-West are very strongly in favor of this freedom being accorded to them, and that, if it is accorded to them, they will not abuse it.

Mr. LAURIER. This is not a question of temperance in the sense which is usually attached to that word. It is not only those who are devoted to prohibition as a principle, who are interested in this matter, but no one, whether a prohibitionist at heart or not, can view with indifference, the motion which has been proposed by my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. Fisher). It has always been the unanimous consensus of opinion in this country, shared in by all parties alike, that the use of liquor in the North-West Territories should not be treated in the same manner as it is in the other Provinces, that it has to be treated in a very different way. It has been the unanimous consensus of opinion, that the traffic could not be as free in the North-West Territories as in the other Provinces, but that it had to be checked. This has been held, not only by prohibitionists, but by all parties, even by those parties in this House, whether on the other side or on this side, who are not prepared to enact at the present moment a prohibitory law for this Dominion. Still, they upheld the view that a prohibitory law had to be enforced in the North-West Territory for some years at all events. What is the reason that a different treatment has been adopted in that territory from that which is adopted in other parts of the country? What is the reason that, as soon as we acquired those territories and commenced to legislate for them, one of the first provisions inserted in the law was that the liquor traffic should be checked and regulated and prohibited until the matter was otherwise disposed of? The reason is obvious and is well known. It is the same reason which has prevailed in the United States, where they have practically the same law in the North-West. The reason is that those territories are partly inhabited by a race upon whom the use of alcoholic liquors—dangereous as it is to most men—has a most injurious effect beyond expression. It has been admitted by all parties that, if liquor were allowed to circulate freely in that country, where we have such a large Indian population, the consequence might be to injure—perhaps not permanently but for a long time to come—the possibilities of the development of the country, to produce possibly destruction of life and property, to produce perhaps horrors from which the imagination itself recoils. This was the motive which induced Parliament at that time unanimously, without a word of dissent from any party, to put that law on the Statute-book. It is only some few days ago when the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), who is a prohibitionist but also a Conservative, claimed for his party the glory of having first put this provision in the law. The hon. gentleman took credit for the party to which he belongs that they were entitled to the honor of having first introduced prohibition into the North-West Territories. Be that as it may—and I am not here to grudge to the Conservative party whatever glory they may have on that score—if to them belongs the glory of putting the law on the Statute-book, to them also belongs the glory of at this moment pandering to the liquor passion in the North-West Territories. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) said just now that it was time that the North-West Territories should be put on the same footing as the rest of the Dominion. That may be. I will not discuss that question. That is not the question at issue. It may be that the exceptional laws which have prevailed in the North-West Territories should be done away with and that the Territories should be put on the same footing as the rest of the Dominion. I have no opinion to express upon this question now. If the question were before the House, I would state my views upon it; but, as long as the law is upon the Statute-book, it has to be respected; and, when the hon. gentleman says that to-day the law has become obsolete, the course which he should take is not to oppose this motion of my hon. friend, but to make an amendment to the law. It is so well understood that this is the law which rules in the Territories, and that prohibition is still the law of the country there, that the defence of the Government is not that the law is not in existence, but that the Government simply wash their hands in regard to what is being done in the North-West Territories. They say, it is not we who are the guilty

ones, it is not we who have permitted the sale of liquor throughout the Territories, it is not we who have given a license to the Banff Hotel and others, but it is the Lieutenant Governor; he is responsible, and he alone is responsible to the country. The Government cannot escape with such a plea as this. The Government are responsible for this, and, whether they have the manliness to stand up in defence of their act or not, they are responsible to the country for what is being done in the North-West Territories. The Lieutenant Governor has assumed a right to issue the power to the Banff Hotel to sell liquor in the same manner as it might be sold in any other part of the Dominion. He has also assumed the power of organising a license system whereby a certain kind of beer can be sold as freely as it can in any other part of the country. The Government says this is the act of the Lieutenant Governor, and the Government is not responsible for it. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Fisher) laid the responsibility on the Minister of Interior, and, as far as I read the law, the charge is well founded. The law says:

"That the Rocky Mountains Park shall be under the control and management of the Minister of Interior, but the Governor in Council may make regulations for the following purposes."

Amongst others, for trade and traffic of every description. If the Governor in Council made any regulations as to trade and traffic of this description, the responsibility of the Minister of Interior, individually, might perhaps be set aside, but his responsibility will exist as an adviser of His Excellency, and I do not see much difference in that. This is not the plea which was put forward by the Minister of Justice this afternoon. His plea is that the Minister of Interior has no power over the Rocky Mountain Park, but that the power of administration rests altogether in the Lieutenant Governor. Let it be so, let us take the proposition of the Minister of Justice, and let us say that the responsibility of the administration of the Rocky Mountain Park belongs altogether to the Lieutenant Governor. As to the other system of license which has been carried out by the Lieutenant Governor, certainly this is an act for which he is responsible. But the Minister of Justice says: Oh, we are not responsible for that, that is the act of the Lieutenant Governor himself. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we have no statute on that question, viewing it simply upon general principles, would it not be extraordinary to see the Government claiming that they were not responsible for the officer whom they have appointed, and whose salary they pay? Here is the language of the statute itself:

"The Lieutenant Governor shall administer the Government under instructions from time to time given him by the Governor in Council, or by the Secretary of State of Canada."

"He shall administer under instructions." So that the hon. gentleman, speaking for the Government, cannot shield himself behind the Lieutenant Governor and say they are not responsible. The law says that the Lieutenant Governor shall administer under instructions from the Government, and if the Lieutenant Governor does anything outside of this very act which he has power to perform, certainly it must be presumed that he has acted under instructions from the Government, and if he has no instructions from the Government, the moment the Government allow his action to take effect, certainly they connive at it, they adopt it, and they give it the sanction of their authority. But there is more. The hon. gentleman says: We are not responsible because the Lieutenant Governor has acted under the authority which is vested in him by the Act, and under the Act he has power to issue permits for the sale of liquor. Sir, there is a vast difference between a permit given to an individual to buy a certain quantity of liquor, be it great or small, and the vast system of licenses which has been authorised here whereby anybody who applies—and this comes within the rules fixed by the Governor himself —may purchase liquor. But, take the very case put by the Minister of Justice himself: let us suppose that the Lieutenant Governor had done nothing more than to use the power which is given him by the Act, to issue permits for the sale of liquor. Is the Lieutenant Governor responsible to nobody for his act?—because we know he is not responsible to the people whom he has to administer. A year or two ago, when he had under the consideration of this House a Bill to give electoral representation to the people of the North-West Territories in this House and in the North-West Council, the right hon. gentleman who presides over the Government was asked whether he would make the Lieutenant Governor responsible to the people, whether he would introduce responsible government. The hon. gentleman said he would not; he thought that the time had not yet come when the Lieutenant Governor should be responsible to the people to whom he had to administer. He, therefore, kept the responsibility in his own hands, and yet, we are told to-day, on the floor of this House, that the Lieutenant Governor, who is not responsible to the people to whom he has to administer, is neither responsible to the Government who appointed him. This is in effect what we were told to-day by the Minister of Justice, that the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories is as potent in the Territories as the Emperor of all the Russias, and that he is no more responsible to the people nor to anybody else, than is that potentate. The Lieutenant Governor is not responsible to the people, and the Government says: Well, he is not responsible to us. The language of the Minister of Justice is simply this: We cannot help it. He did not say, he did not dare to say, whether Mr. Royal had acted wisely or unwisely, whether he had acted judiciously or injudiciously, he simply said: Well, he acted within the sphere of his authority; whether it was wise or not, we cannot help it. Sir, is such language as this to be tolerated in this House? Are we to be told that the Lieutenant Governor can do anything that he pleases, and that the Government who appoints him has nothing to say, but must tamely submit to his actions? They will not even take the consequence of those actions, but allow them to fall upon the people to whom the Lieutenant Governor is not responsible. Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is simply this, and I arraign the Government upon this proposition: the Lieutenant Governor has acted with the sanction of the Government, but the Government have not the courage to say so. If the Lieutenant Governor has not acted with the sanction of the Government, why do not the Government do as they did formely, and tell him that his usefulness is gone? Not many years ago when the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec took upon himself to do an act, constitutional or not, wise or unwise—I do not say—but it was an act for which he was responsible to the people of the Province, and which the people of the Province sanctioned. But that act did not meet the views of the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches and they told His Excellency the Governor General that the usefulness of the Lieutenant Governor was gone, and he was removed. If the Governor did not sanction the action of the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West, they would say to Mr. Royal: Sir, your usefulness has gone, you have performed an act which is contrary to the policy of the Government, either recall that act, to-morrow, or the day after to-morrow you are dismissed. But that is not the language which is held by the Government. The Government simply was in their hands like Pilate, and say: We cannot help it. Sir, I denounce the action of the Government. The law is on the Statute-book. If the time has come to alter that law, if the Territories are no longer in the condition that they were 14 years ago, let it be amended or repealed. But as long as the law is there, I hold that the Government are responsible for what is going on in the North-West Territories.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have listened with a good deal of regret to the remarks of an hon. gentleman with whom I am generally in accord in any action he may take against the Government of the day. This House knows that I have no great sympathy for the Administration, and I regret when it becomes my duty, from convictions which I entertain upon public questions which come before the House, to differ with the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, whose opinions I so much respect, and with whom I generally act in concert, as an independent supporter of what I believe to be the rights of the people. I do not agree with the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) in the motion he has submitted to the House condemning the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West for pursuing the course which he believed himself authorised to pursue under the statute. Sir, everybody in this House knows that on every question connected with the advance in this country, I have always been a consistent supporter, not a fanatical one. The county that I represent has for 10 years been a Scott Act county. I have never taken the first step to influence or to control, or to affect any action to prevent a thorough execution of the law in that county. It has had my moral support and my material support in every step. But, Sir, I am not one of those who believe that because a few men choose to dictate to us what we shall eat or what we shall drink, I shall necessarily follow every fad they may introduce, every attempt they may make to limit the rights of the people of this country. In regard to the particular point which has been raised in this case, in respect to the issue of authority to the Banff Hotel to sell wines and liquors, I may say this: I appeal to the leader of the Government as to whether I was not the first man who called attention to the importance of that great institution at Banff Springs remaining a national institution to this country, urging that it should not be allowed to pass into private hands, but be turned into a Government trust as the great sanitary institution of this country. I am proud to say that the right hon. gentleman, I will not say through my representations, did retain that great institution, and when a grant of $40,000 towards it came before this House, I rose and defended the expenditure against the accusations of my hon. friends on this side of the House, with whom I generally act, and I did so because I thought that the Government, in so acting, deserved the commendation instead of the condemnation of this House. I think the matter stands now very much as it did then. I believe that the men who have gone on and improved this country as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have done, who have spent their thousands and millions of dollars, risked their estates and their property, their independence and their all, to carry out works that are a credit to the Dominion, when these men found it was necessary to build hotels along the line, to create homes in the wilderness that should be frequented by people from all lands, it is the duty of the House and of every independent member in it, who frees himself from the fanaticism of "fadism" whether temperance, religious or anything else, to stand by the men who have invested their money in building attractive hotels and sanitariums, and presenting attractions to foreigners to come to this country and make it their home. In regard to the Banff Hotel, anyone who has visited it and heard of the cures that are effected there, knows how desirable it is that it should be made attractive to people who visit it. And we must admit that if, with the narrow fanaticism which pervades many of those who insist on the carrying out of strictly temperance principles, we do not allow the German to have his beer, or the Englishman his ale, or the Canadian, like myself, his champagne and sherry—we injure the country. It is an outrage that we should attempt to restrict the conveniences and comforts provided at a great sanitary institution, as is suggested by the mover of the resolution. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, for whom I have the greatest respect and esteem, whose ability no man can doubt, whose eloquence in this House and throughout the country stamps him as a man amongst the first in the land, has chosen to assail the Government for the course they have pursued on this matter. God forgive me, if I am going to be a defender of the Government—I do not like to do it, but a sense of justice, notwithstanding the fact that the right hon. gentleman does not always look upon me with smiling approbation, compels me to say that in this case they are perfectly right in the course they have adopted. If the hon. gentleman will read the 92nd section of the Act, he will be satisfied that the position assumed by the Minister of Justice is perfectly in accordance with the law. The section reads as follows:—

"No intoxicating liquor or intoxicant shall be manufactured, compounded or made in the Territories, except by special permission of the Governor in Council; nor shall any intoxicating liquor or intoxicant be imported or brought into the Territories from any Province of Canada or elsewhere, or be sold, exchanged, traded or bartered, or had in possession therein, except by special permission, in writing of the Lieutenant Governor; intoxicating liquors or intoxicants, imported or brought from any place out of Canada, into the Territories, by special permission, in writing of the Lieutenant Governor, shall be subject to the Customs and Excise laws of Canada."

Does not that give the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories absolute power to grant permits for the manufacture, sale and use of alcoholic liquors in the country? Moreover, is there any reason why the people in the North-West should not have the same right and control at to what they will eat, drink and wherewithal they shall be clothed, as those in any other portion of the Dominion? I am a temperance man, and I believe in temperance.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad that that meets with the approbation of both sides of the House. The Government of the day have commended themselves to my judgment, by the stand they have taken, that the Lieutenant Governor has acted rightly in permitting the Banff Hotel to provide what is necessary for the comfort of their customers. It is possible, with regard to an institution such as that, which is under the control of one of the greatest corporations of the country, and under strict regulations, and conducted in a manner which reflects credit on all connected with it, that we should wish to place them in a position that they cannot provide for customers, who are staying there one week or three months for their health, convenience or comfort, all those comforts and luxuries which are necessary to such an institution, to which these visitors come to seek rest and the advantage of a health-giving climate. I say it would be an outrage on public sentiment if we attempted to restrain them.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). But they go there to drink the water.

Mr. MITCHELL. Some may do so, some who are too mean, probably, to spend a couple of dollars. But I want it understood when I go there, that if I desire it and can afford it, I shall be able to obtain a bottle of champagne, call for it and drink it. It tends to prevent people coming into the country when narrow laws exist which prevent men calling for such comforts and indulgences as they desire and are prepared to pay for. I repeat that I am a temperance man, and that I believe in temperance. I believe in the enactment of such laws as are necessary and are likely to promote temperance throughout the land, and I believe when they are enacted they should be enforced. The Scott Act has been in force in my county ten years; but during the several elections I have had the misfortune to run during that period, I have never been asked what my views were on temperance. The people all know them. I deprecate the idea of forcing temperance upon people who do not believe in it. I believe in moral suasion, in setting

an example and thus promoting temperance throughout the land. When men endeavor to coerce public sentiment or individual opinion by legislation for the limitation of these enjoyments which men are able to pay for and have a right to ask for, it detracts from the moral effect of promoting temperance throughout the country, and, therefore, I am opposed to it. On these principles I am opposed to the motion of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher). In the report of the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, as embodied in the report of the Interior Department for the year ended 30th June, 1888, I find the following paragraph:—

"The result of this action on my part was alluded to by the Auditor of the North-West Government in his report for the past year, wherein he stated that there was a marked decrease in the demand for liquor permits since the issue of 'sale permits for beer,' and, at the same time, an increase in the revenue."

It is very well known that no German will emigrate to a country where he cannot get his beer, and there are very few Englishmen who would like to emigrate to a country where that beverage is denied them. I say that it is a narrow course, and it is a mistaken view for the advocates of temperance to attempt to prevent men from enjoying their glass of beer, if they are able to pay for it and wish to have it. I do think that men, who in the cause of temperance and in the name of temperance, attempt to enforce these strict regulations and those strict opinions upon persons who differ with them, are entirely mistaken, and I believe it is a mistake for them to bring before this Parliament any resolution the effect of which will be to limit the enjoyment of travellers who come to this country from abroad. What is the object of the millions of money we have expended in the North-West? It is to open up and develop that country; one of the fairest countries of the globe. It is to promote the welfare of that country, with its teeming prairies, its boundless wealth, and which only needs the people to go in there; that country with a railway connection from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and communication thence to the rich eastern countries of the world. Does anyone believe that if we limit the enjoyment which people have been in the custom of enjoying in their own countries, that they will come to this country or avail themselves of our great system of communication with all parts of the world to travel through this country? No, Sir; the effect of such a law would be to keep them away from Canada. Does any man believe that the granting of a license to the Banff Hotel—second on this continent, only to the great Windsor Hotel in Montreal, which in its turn is second to perhaps no hotel in the world—does any man believe that the granting of a permit to an institution such as that, or such as the Summit Hotel or the Vancouver Hotel, would demoralise the people of this country? Every one knows that the object of their restriction of the sale of liquor in the North-West was to prevent the Indians from feeling the effects of the liquor traffic in that country. Does the granting of a license to the Banff Hotel affect the Indians? No; there is no whiskey sold at the Banff Hotel. I am informed that the sale of whiskey is discountenanced there, and it, therefore, cannot affect the Indians. The object of the prohibition law in the North-West Territories, as I said before, was to protect the Indians, and it is a law that I am not going to impugn the principle of. If the sale of liquor generally througout the Territories would tend to the demoralisation of the tribes which occupied that country before white men came in there, I say that prohibition is in the cause of morality. I had a conversation with a gentleman who represents a North-West constituency, and he told me that 18 years ago when he went to that country there were some 22,000 souls in the Blood and Blackfeet tribes, but only 2,000 remain to day. He enumerated a number of the other tribes in that section where the reduction of the members was comparatively the same as among the Blackfeet. That decrease has not been caused by liquor, because there has been no liquor introduced into those Territories since the law was passed. This prohibition law in the North-West Territories was specially intended to protect the Indians before white men went in there; but is this Parliament to say now that the white men living in that North-West are to be limited in their rights and their privileges, and that they will be put on a different footing from the people of the older Provinces? If we adopt any such principle as that, we will adopt a principle which will be unjust to the people of the North-West Territories and a principle which we should not countenance in this Parliament. I believe in temperance, I believe in the maintenance of law and, where temperance laws are enacted, I believe in the enforcement of these laws; but, Sir, the result of recent elections has shown us that the neglect of the enforcement of these temperance laws has demoralised public sentiment, and has led to the repeal of that temperance law in some fifteen counties where it was forced upon the people and forced upon them prematurely. I do not believe in this forcing of personal opinions upon the public unless you have a large majority of the public in support of it, and this question of enforced temperance I believe the public is not prepared to adopt. If I want to travel in the North-West, or if a gentleman from England wants to come to that country, or if 1,000 immigrants from Germany want to come to that country, why should they be deprived of that enjoyment which they obtain at home, and which they think it is lawful for them to indulge in? I am prepared to justify and defend the Lieutenant Governor of that Territory for the course he has pursued in granting licenses where it was judicious to do so and we have had no case placed before this Parliament in which abuses have arisen because Governor Royal granted those licenses. Will any man say that the granting of a license to the Banff Hotel has been an abuse? On the contrary, every person who has visited that hotel speaks of it in the highest terms, as an institution conducted in the best possible manner and worthy of being associated with one of the greatest corporations in the world—the Canadian Pacific Railway. I say it would be an outrage if we should attempt in any way to retard the progress of the great corporation who have an uphill task to perform, who have all they can do to make the institution pay, and who are doing everything they can to develop the resources of the country. It would be an outrage for us to prevent the growth of that great sanitary institution on which the Government have expended such a large amount of money, and it would be an outrage for us to condemn the Government for countenancing an act of the Lieutenant Governor, who is within the limits of the jurisdiction granted him by this Parliament. I believe the Minister of Justice was quite right in saying, no matter what might be the opinions of the administration of the day on that point, that as the Parliament of Canada has vested the Lieutenant Governor with power to grant these licenses, that the Lieutenant Governor alone is responsible and not the Government of the day. In conclusion let me say that I entirely approve of the granting of these licenses.

Mr. DAVIN. The question before the House is whether the Government should be condemned for the action of Governor Royal in issuing permits for the sale of 4 per cent. beer and whether the Minister of the Interior should be condemned because permits have been issued to the Banff Hotel. The latter question has been sufficiently discussed, and the Minister of Justice has in a conclusive and forcible manner put the matter before the House. But, in regard to the first question, there is a word to be said, I think, in justice to Lieutenant Governor Royal. When Mr. Royal became Lieutenant Governor, what did he find in the Terri-

tories? He found, by the report of the officers of the Mounted Police, by the report of everybody who visited the western towns, that a large amount of strong liquor was being sold surreptitiously; and it occurred to him that under the 92nd section of the Act he had power to issue permits for the sale of 4 per cent. beer. Mr. Bliss, who is the G. W. Patriarch of the Sons of Temperance in Manitoba, towards the close of last year, visited the various towns of the North-West Territories, and he wrote a letter to the papers in which he declared that the only hope for temperance in the Territories was a good license system, so rampant was the surreptitious sale of strong drinks in all the towns along the line. That being so, may it not have occurred to Mr. Royal to issue permits for the sale of 4 per cent. beer—the smallest percentage of alcohol with which beer can be made—with the view of promoting temperance? The Minister of Justice, who speaks as a high authority on the subject, has declared in Parliament, not, probably, in so many words, that the Governor acted within his power. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition gets up, and he takes the clause providing for the appointment of the Governor, and quotes the latter part of it, which declares that he shall govern the Territories under instruction. Of course he must do that; but when you have that stated in an Act of Parliament, and have certain rules laid down in the same Act for the guidance of the Governor, it is perfectly clear that this clause, in which it is stated that he shall govern the Territories under instruction, cannot mean that, in regard to anything provided for in the Act, he is to perpetually to refer to Ottawa to know what he is to do. The two things are perfectly distinct, and I was greatly surprised to hear a man who is usually so logical as my hon. friend who leads the Opposition, try to make out from that clause in the Act, that Mr. Royal, in order to ascertain the scope of his conduct under the 92nd clause, should refer to Ottawa. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition has also declared—and he endorsed what the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) stated in that respect—that the great object of these prohibitory clauses was to prevent the liquor getting to the Indians. Why, Sir, the 4 per cent. beer cannot get to the Indians. In the towns along the line where it is sold there are very few Indians; the Indians are on their reserves. Any Indians who are to be seen in those towns stray into them from the reserves; but if any of these men went to a hotel where the 4 per cent. beer is sold, they would not get it. I may say that, if I had anything to say in the matter, I should not have issued the permits for the sale of the 4 per cent beer. I have always contended that if you have a probibitory law at all, it should be entirely prohibitory; and I have said that there was a weakness in the Act as it existed under the administration of both parties, in having the qualification in the prohibitory clauses that the Lieutenant-Governor could issue permits. By the Public Accounts I find that the amount received last year for permits for strong drinks was $3,704, whereas the permits for the sale of 4 per cent. beer only returned $1,171; so that it does not look as if Mr. Royal's policy had been disastrous to temperance in the North-West. As a fact, it has not. As a fact, it has, I believe, diminished the consumption of strong drinks in the Territories; and if it has done that, it has fulfilled the object in view, and has done good work. I can also say, with some authority, that the statement indicated by the Minister of Justice is literally correct. When Mr. Royal issued those permits for the sale of 4 per cent. beer, I made a point of enquiring closely as to who was responsible for that course, and I have it on the highest authority that the Governor himself was responsible for the issue of those permits; and, Sir, as I contended before, when this matter was before the House, I contend now, that Mr. Royal acted within the four corners of the 92nd section. The wording of that section leaves no doubt on my mind that he has the power to issue permits for the sale of beer, and although I differ from the policy, although so long as you have prohibition at all I am in favor of entire prohibition, although I hold that as people went in there, knowing the country to be a prohibitory country, no change should take place until the people themselves express their views on the subject, nevertheless it would be most unjust to sit here and hear the argument that has been made, without saying something of the circumstances under which Governor Royal issued those permits. Now, Sir, the course of this discussion shows how necessary is the legislation which my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior introduced a few evenings ago, and which, I have no doubt, will become law. I have no doubt that after the next election in the Territories, the Legislative Assembly will have the power of dealing with this question. During the election it will be before the public, and they can decide it for themselves, and you will then have the question of liquor or no liquor, license or no license, prohibition or no prohibition, placed on a satisfactory footing.

Sir DONALD A. SMITH. As one who had something to do with the initiation of the Act prohibiting the introduction of intoxicating drinks into the North-West, I wish to say a few words, and only a few, on this subject. It was at the last Council of the Hudson Bay Company, held in 1870, at which I presided, that the first resolution was passed prohibiting such drinks in the North-West. It was at the first meeting of the North-West Council, under the Dominion, in October of the same year, that that resolution was confirmed, and it was confirmed by a resolution proposed by myself, when my respected friend, Sir Adams Archibald, was the Governor of that country. The circumstances of the country were then entirely different from what they are at present. Then there were thousands and tens of thousands of Indians in the North-West; there were not 1,000 white people in the whole of that great Territory, outside of Manitoba. It was with the express purpose of preventing intoxicating drinks being supplied to the Indians that that resolution was introduced on both of those occasions. It was felt that it was a great evil that those drinks should be furnished to them, as it had been before that time, and most of what was given was brought across the border from the United States. There was no middle way of dealing with the subject; it would have been of no use then to impose a high duty upon liquors. There were at that time just one Custom house and two Customs officers in the North-West, including Manitoba; those were at Winnipeg; and you had a frontier of some 1,200 miles stretching to the Rocky Mountains, every portion of which could be passed just as easily as any high road in this country. Any quantity of liquor could have been brought across the border, and it would have been impossible, no matter what duty you could have imposed, to prevent it. The only thing that could be done was not to allow it to be introduced into the country at all; and when it was found on any occasion, it was to be spilled on the ground, which I think was the letter of the Act. Now the circumstances are very different. I do not wish to discuss the propriety or impropriety of giving a license to the Banff Hotel or any other particular hotel; but I do think that now there should be some more licenses than formerly, with regard to the introduction of spirituous liquors into this country. You have now a large population there; they are drawn from all parts of Europe and this country; they have been accustomed to have their wine and their beer, and it is a very very difficult thing indeed to change the habits of the people; and perhaps the very fact of forbidding them having any such drinks would have in itself a very great effect

in deterring others from coming to the country. That, I think, is one very good reason why we should now allow the sale of liquor. At the same time, while unfortunately the number of Indians in the North-West is very small compared with what it was some years ago, I think, without preventing the white population having wine and beer, as they may desire, or at any rate in moderation, the conditions permitting it to be given to the Indians should be made as strict as possible. I merely wished to show the circumstances under which the Act of prohibition was introduced, and how very different the circumstances of the country were then than now. I do consider that we ought to act in this measure, and that we ought to act with regard to it as we find the country to be at present, and not to continue it as it was when this Act was passed some eighteen or nineteen years ago.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A stranger listening to the debate which has taken place the last hour or two would come to the conclusion that we are discussing the nature of a prohibitory law, which should be applicable to the North-West Territories; and the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down were entirely in that direction. The remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) were directed against the imposition of any sumptuary law in the North-West prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquor within certain limits; but the House will understand that we are not discussing any question of that kind. My hon. friend, in his resolution, did not propose to change the law. He did not discuss the condition of affairs in the North-West, he did not discuss whether it was desirable that this Parliament should prohibit the sale of liquors, or whether we should concede to the North-West Council the power to legislate in the matter. This debate may do very well as an educative process, but it is entirely foreign to the subject before the House. Parliament has, in its wisdom, passed a law and declared that this law shall exist in the North-West Territories. We find to-day that that law, in the opinion of the hon. member for Brome, has been distinctly violated. The debate has gained certain importance through some constitutional principles which the Minister of Justice laid down, and from which I venture most respectfully to differ. If the hon. gentleman's law is correct, we have a curious official in this country, known as the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West, holding important powers and being responsible for the exercise of those powers to no one. There is no such individual in the country. The Lieutenant Governor must either be responsible for the exercise of his powers to his Council, or this Parliament. The law of the land is that the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West shall administer the Government of that country subject to and under instructions from the Governor in Council of Canada. It may be right and proper that we should grant responsible government to the North-West, but that question we are not discussing now, and it will come up in its proper place. We must discuss this resolution, and the law as it stands, and we find that the law declares that the Lieutenant Governor shall administer, under instructions to be given him from time to time by the Governor in Council. The meaning of that is that the laws of Canada, as passed by this Parliament, shall be administered by the Lieutenant Governor under instructions from the Government here. There must, therefore, be somebody responsible to the people for the administration of these laws. This Government being responsible to Parliament, and we being responsible to the people, in that way responsibility is thrown on the proper shoulders. What is the law? The hon. gentleman attempted to argue that it was perfectly proper for Mr. Royal of his own authority and motion to grant licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) argued this was all right, because the liquor was only of a certain strength.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He argued it was desirable that 4 per cent. beer should be allowed, and, therefore, Lieutenant Governor Royal might grant the license for the sale of this beer, and that he ought to be supported by us in so doing. Does the hon. Minister of Finance assent to that argument advanced by the hon. members for West Montreal, Northumberland and East Assiniboia? The action of Lieutenant Governor Royal can be defended only on the ground that it is in the interests of the North-West Territories that he should grant licenses to sell any quantities the licensees please and when and to whom they please, throughout those Territories. What says the Statute? That Statute may be good or it may be bad. If it is good, the Minister is responsible for its being executed. The Minister of Finance, who specially sits in the Cabinet as the representative of the temperance people of this country, should see to that, or, if he has come to the conclusion that the Statute is bad, the responsibility rests upon him and upon his colleagues of proposing a change. The 92nd section of the Act says that: No intoxicating liquors shall be sold in the Territories except by special permission in writing of the Lieutenant Governor. Special permission—it is not a general license or a general permission—it is not a license given to John Smith to import as much liquor as he likes, or to sell as much as he likes during the year.

Mr. DAVIN. No such thing is done.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) General licenses are given. Special licenses are not given in every case.

Mr. DAVIN. In every case.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The returns show the contrary. The hon. gentleman could not have listened to the argument of the Minister of Justice this afternoon. He laid it down, and I entirely assent to that view, that, as far as the Banff Park is concerned, the Governor in Council not having acted upon the powers vested in them, it remains in the same position as any other part of the North-West Territories. Therefore, the sale of liquor at Banff must be under the same rules as these which govern any other part of the North-West Territories until the Governor in Council choose to exercise the power vested in them by the Act. Does the hon. gentleman say that special licenses or general licenses are granted to the Banff Park Hotel? We know that general license has been granted, and that is the complaint to-night. To prove that only special licenses are to be granted, the 93rd section of the Act declares that a return shall be made to this Parliament, the ultimate court of appeal, the body which is ultimately responsible, annually up to the 31st December in each year, of the number of such permissions so given by the Lieutenant Governor, and the quantity and the nature of the intoxicating liquors in each case. Sir, that law is being distinctly violated to-day, and by whom? By the appointee of the Minister of Finance. The law says that the Lieutenant Governor, the appointee of the Minister of Finance, is to administer that law under instructions which the Minister of Finance and his colleagues send him, and I presume that to-day, if Lieutenant Governor Royal is acting in this way in defiance of the law, and is authorising the sale of liquor in the Banff Park Hotel, he is doing it under instructions sanctioned, if not expressly given, by hon. gentlemen opposite. The Government cannot escape the responsibility of the action of the Lieutenant Governor. He is administering his Government under instructions which are to be given to him by the Governor in Council. If he violates the law it is their duty to instruct him to con-

form to the law, and the Ministers here are responsible, and the Minister of Finance is specially responsible to the House and to the country for the fact that the law regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors in the North-West Territories is being distinctly violated. That hon. gentleman takes credit throughout the country for the fact that the Administration with which he is connected have passed a law regulating, if not altogether prohibiting, the sale of liquors in that territory. He says to the temperance people: See what we have done; and yet he allows his appointee to violate that law. The returns have been read here to-day, and I say that this Parliament will be derelict in its duty if it does not do one of two things: either call to account the Government which sanctions the violation of the law, or repeal the law itself. There can be nothing more immoral than the retention of a sumptuary law of this kind on the Statute-book which the authorities wink at the breach of. The public are led to believe that the laws are made not to be obeyed, but in order to deceive the people, leading them to believe that we have a temperance law on the Statute-book when we have not, and that liquor cannot be sold when it is being sold. I charge upon the Government to-day, as my hon. friend did before, that they are responsible for what I conceive to be flagrant violations of the law by their appointee, with their knowledge, by an officer appointed by them and carrying on the Government of that country under instructions from them. What conclusion can be drawn from that? The Lieutenant Governor authorises this traffic; it is illegal; he does it under his instructions. Can anyone doubt that the responsibility lies upon the Government here? There cannot be a doubt of it, and I say that this motion should be supported by hon. members on both sides of the House irrespective of their views on the temperance question. It is not a question whether there should be a prohibitory law or not. That question has been determined by Parliament. If it should be repealed, let the Government, who are responsible, bring in a Bill with that purpose, and then that question can be discussed; but, if the law is there, we have to see that it is enforced, and we have to condemn these breaches of it, particularly when they are the result, as we are bound to believe, of instructions to the Lieutenant Governor from this Government.

Mr. KIRK. The hon. the Minister of Justice, in speaking to-night, laid the whole responsibility of granting these permits upon Lieutenant Governor Royal, and said that his department was not consulted at all in the matter. In looking over the correspondence which was laid on the Table of the House the other day, I made this note in reference to the matter. I find, in reference to the application of the Canadian Pacific Railway to import and sell wines and beers in the hotel at Banff, a letter appears from Mr. A. E. Forget, the secretary to the Lieutenant Governor, to the secretary of the Department of the Interior, informing him that the Lieutenant Governor has granted the permission sought in the letter of the 12th July, 1888, and stating that His Honor had informed the company that the permission was only provisional until concurrent authority was obtained from the department at Ottawa. The Lieutenant Governor is influenced to act in this way, it appears, after a consultation with the Deputy Minister of the Interior and with the Department of Justice. After reading that, I thought it rather strange that the Minister of Justice should state that his department was not consulted in the matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My department was not consulted.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) says he represents a temperance county and speaks generally on the floor of this House for the temperance people of this country. I ask him, then, why he brings t his double barrelled resolution before the House, as a vote of want of confidence if his intention is to promote the cause of temperance. I call it a double barrelled resolution because he not only moves a vote of censure on the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West, but also on the Minister of the Interior, and, if we take, as we should take, the opinion of the Minister of Justice on that point, the Minister of the Interior has nothing at all to do with the question. I take it that the member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) has brought this question before the House so that he and the press supporting him may say, here is a temperance resolution moved in the House, and the hon. member for Brome spoke on the question. They will never state that it was brought up as a vote of want of confidence, but simply in order to promote temperance. That is the only object, in my opinion, why this motion is brought before the House, so that its supporters may go to the country and make political capital out of it. On a former occasion I stated that when temperance resolutions were brought up in this House mixed with politics, I generally stood by my politics. This motion I consider is mixed with politics, and, therefore, I feel it my duty on this occasion to stand by my politics. The hon. gentleman knows that if this motion is carried the Government would simply have to resign; the passage of this motion would have the effect of turning the Government out, and turning the hon. member for Brome and his friends into the Treasury benches. I may say that a meeting of the Dominion Alliance was held in the earlier part of this Session at which it was decided to have a motion brought up in this House declaring in favor of prohibition. The advisability was discussed of bringing forward a motion of this kind, although the name of the Minister of the Interior was not then associated with it. Before a decision was arrived the temperance men on both sides of the House were invited to meet and discuss the question. I was also present, and after we had discussed the question some time we saw that the drift of the resolution was not so much to pass a vote of censure upon the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, as upon this Government generally, and I made the statement then that if we wanted to censure any one, we had better commence nearer home and pass a vote of censure upon the Ontario Government for having violated a statute of this Dominion, the Scott Act, which was passed by this Government, and every person knew that it was violated in its enforcement. After we had discussed the question fully and had read the statute referring to the duties of the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West, it was finally decided that this motion should not be put upon the notice paper, but simply a motion calling for returns. It was decided, as I understood at that meeting by the temperance men, that no such motion should be brought up at this Session, but simply a motion calling for the return of papers, as it was fully decided there that the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West had acted within his powers. I do not think the hon. member for Brome consulted the temperance men on either side of the House in reference to bringing up this motion at the close of the Session. But as I said before, I believe he has brought it up for political effect in order that he may go to the country and say: Here is a resolution that I brought before the House and spoke on it, but the Minister of Finance who poses as a temperance man, and other temperance men who sit on the Government side, opposed it. Sir, we were elected to stand by the Government, we are pledged to our constituents to support the present Government, and we are not going to allow ourselves to be deceived by a motion of this kind, for I believe that the hon. member for Brome has brought this question forward, not in the interest of temperance, but in the interest of his party.

Mr. FREEMAN. I would like to say a word or two on this question before I vote on it. I must confess that I have

very little sympathy with those hon. gentlemen who are so very earnest in their temperance sentiments to-night. I was at the meeting which the last speaker referred to, and we had this Statute before us, and while we were very earnest in our denunciation of the conduct of the authorities of the North-West when we began the discussion, we eased off considerably before we closed. After reading the law, and getting our minds disabused of the opinion we had before entertained, that the use of liquor, the importation of liquor, or the sale of liquor, was prohibited in the North-West Territories, when we read this law we found that that was not the case. We found this language:

"Nor shall any intoxicating liquor or intoxicant be imported or brought into the Territories from any Province of Canada or elsewhere, or be sold, exchanged, traded, bartered, or be had in possession therein, except by special permission in writing of the Lieutenant Governor."

We found then that liquor could be imported, sold, exchanged, and bartered if the Lieutenant Governor thought proper to give a permission to that effect, and when the Lieutenant Governor thought it advisable to do so, we concluded that it was not within our province to condemn him for doing so. This statute was passed in a former Parliament, and I presume that some of those gentlemen who are so aggressive this afternoon, had a voice in passing it. If they were prohibitionists, as I am, why did they allow such a law to pass at all? Why did they not, in clear and unmistakable language, prohibit the importation, and the sale of liquor in the North-West Territories? Why did they tamper with the thing as they have done here? Simply to get rid of prohibition, no other reason in the world. They were like the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). He wants the people to have an opportunity to enjoy themselves in that country—not get drunk, not to make fools of themselves, but just to enjoy themselves. So these hon. gentlemen supposed that by giving the Lieutenant Governor power to grant permission to certain people, they could have their wine and their brandy on special occasions, but the poor man who wants to drink beer, could get no permission, and could get no drink. Now, Sir, I do not believe in that kind of temperance. I may say here that I would care very little who sits on this side of the House if we could get a prohibitory law in this country; and if these hon. gentlemen opposite will move a prohibitory measure for the whole Dominion, I will not stop to consider what my politics are, I will support such a measure. But I feel that even my strong feelings in favor of prohibition, what some people call my extreme temperance views, do not warrant me in supporting a measure of the kind that is before the House to-night. If the hon. gentleman opposite will propose a measure denouncing the manufacture, importation and sale of liquor throughout the Dominion, I will support it, but I will not support a measure censuring the Lieutenant Governor for doing just exactly what they gave him permission to do. We may criticise these words "special permission." I do not care to draw the line very closely between special and general permission. It is certainly permission to sell, permission to import into the North-West Territories, permission to barter, and consequently permission to drink. I care not whether this is called special or general, but power is certainly given to the Lieutenant Governor to act in the manner he has done, and in so acting I believe he did not exceed the letter of the law, whatever may have been the spirit of it. In regard to the statement made by the Minister of Justice, I find it was contradicted by the member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies). I have to choose between the interpretation of the law as given by these two hon. gentlemen. I choose to take the interpretation of the former, and if I am wrong in doing that I am conscientious in doing so, for I believe the Minister of Justice gave the House what he believes to be the law without any political prejudice connected with it. I thought I saw in the countenance and in the speech of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) that he had some other motive in giving his construction of the law; he had some sinister motive, and I think it was a very natural one. No doubt when hon. gentlemen have sat in Opposition for a long time, and they thought that a certain construction of the law would place them on this side of the House, they would all take that view of the law, and while I am willing to make allowance for his failings, I cannot accuse him for doing that which perhaps I would be quite willing to do myself if similarly situated. Under all the circumstances I take the law as given by the Minister of Justice, and acting in accordance with my own feelings and convictions with respect to temperance and prohibition, I will vote against the amendment.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The argument of the hon. member for Queen's, Nova Scotia (Mr. Freeman) is certainly amusing. He and the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) are temperance men, but they are politicians first. The hon. member for Queen's, Nova Scotia, has just told us that his views underwent considerable change at the time he was attending the Dominion Alliance meeting. He at first favored censuring that scapegoat the Lieutenant Governor, but after a time, when he had looked into the matter, he found that the Lieutenant Governor had to govern the country in accordance with instructions from the Governor in Council at Ottawa. That fact led him to change his mind. It was all right to make a scapegoat of the Lieutenant Governor, but when you came through him to censure the Governor in Council at Ottawa, it was carrying the joke just a little too far. He had not the honesty which the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) possessed, to state that he was for party first and temperance afterwards, that when he came to consider a question as between temperance and party, temperance had to go to the wall and party come to the front. The hon. gentleman's position reminded me of a story of a Dutchman and his cow. The cow had strayed away, and he sent his boy to look after it and told him to follow up the tracks on this side of the river. He said: "You follow up and find her, and I will go to the other side and look across." But the Dutchman found tracks there also, and he therefore called to the boy to come back, for he said it was no use to look for a cow that made tracks on both sides of the river. There has been a great deal said to-night that is utterly beside the question. Much has been said to show the expediency and utility of allowing the sale of liquors in the North-West Territories. That is a question, I submit, which is not brought up in the resolution. The question is simply whether the law, as we find it, should be carried out? I do not say that it is inexpedient that liquor should be sold in the North-West Territories. That is a matter we are not now considering. I do not say it is inexpedient that licenses should be granted. That question is not before us. The question is simply this: We have a certain law, and shall that law be carried out or not? There is nothing more damaging to the community than to allow any law to be systematically and constantly violated, and violated with the sanction of the body which pretends to carry it out, namely, the Governor in Council. That is the only question to be decided to-night. I do not mean to say that a prohibitory law shall always prevail in the North-West Territories. I believe entirely in self-government. When the people of the North-West Territories say to us that they want a license law, we shall be ready to repeal this law and allow them to pass it; but until they do so intimate their wish, it is the duty of the Government to see that the law as it stands on the Statute-book is carried out; and this resolution before the House affirms that the law is there and that it should be observed.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Before a vote is taken on this motion, I desire to say a word or two, and my words will be very few in regard to this matter. I quite agree with the hon.

member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who spoke in regard to the manner in which this resolution has been introduced by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher). I also think that he took a very cowardly way of bringing this matter before the House. It would have been much fairer if he had taken another opportunity of obtaining a vote, yea or nay, with respect to the temperance question pure and simple, because I believe the hon. gentleman has adopted this course for the purpose of placing certain hon. members who are as good temperance men as he is in a false position. That is one of the principal objects of the hon. gentleman in bringing this motion forward in the way he has done. I am quite sure, when the hon. gentleman read the papers which I laid on the Table a few days ago in regard to this matter, he was very much disappointed. He expected to find that the Government had instructed Lieutenant Governor Royal, or given instructions themselves to issue licenses to those hotels. The hon. gentleman did not find that in the papers, and consequently he had to find some other excuse on which to frame a motion to bring before the House at this unfortunate time. He prepared his motion, censuring the Lieutenant Governor for granting permission to sell liquor in the Territory, when I think the Lieutenant Governor had a perfect right to do it. The hon. gentleman, in his resolution, also censures me for not courageously coming forward and granting the applications myself, or, on the other hand, refusing. With respect to my own position, I think the Minister of Justice has placed it very clearly before the House. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) says he is not a lawyer, and he was not prepared to express an opinion as to the legal aspect of the case, and I think that after hearing the Minister of Justice he must have come to the conclusion that he certainly has been quite wrong, at least so far as I am concerned. Looking back over the short period of time during which these licenses have been granted I am quite sure that if I were in the same position again I should act as I have hitherto done because my impression was that I had no right and no power to interfere. When these permits were first granted for the sale of beer in the Territories I was not confirmed in my position of Minister of the Interior, but when I came down here, as several applications had been made to me and as the Lieutenant Governor held the view that we had concurrent jurisdiction in the matter, I looked into the question myself and I came to the conclusion that I had not concurrent jurisdiction nor did I care to take the responsibility. I had issued permits for seven or eight years in the North-West, and I was glad to get rid of the responsibility. After consultation with gentlemen who ought to be able to give an opinion on the matter, I came to the conclusion that the Act did not sufficiently specify what the jurisdiction of the Lieutenant Governor was over that Park. That is the reason why, within the last few days, I have introduced a Bill which will make clear what the jurisdiction of the Lieutenant Governor is there, and after that I propose to prepare such regulations as I think are necessary for the conduct of the park, and they will then be submitted to my colleagues. When the time arrives that I consider I am in a position to take action in the matter, I shall be prepared to make a recommendation in that regard, and if the question arises whether I shall recommend that permission be given to the Banff Park hotel to sell beer and wine, under restrictions, I shall feel justified in giving that permission. The hon. gentleman also stated during his remarks that this was the first time that any permission had been given to sell whiskey in the North-West Territories. Probably the hon. gentleman will be astonished to find that when I took over the administration of the affairs of the North-West, some seven or eight years ago, among the papers and books handed over to me was a printed book with some three or four hundred blanks, a number of which had been used, and these blanks were specially printed for the purpose of giving authority for the sale of whiskey in the North-West Territories. I found that out of that book some forty or fifty of these license forms had been issued by my predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Laird, and the quantities permitted ran from 2 up to 15 gallons. My secretary informed me that it had been customary to issue those permits and I myself issued one or two of these sale permits. I found that Governor Laird had insisted, when the quantity of the liquor in the permit had been exhausted, that the party applying for the second permit should send a statement of how the first quantity had been disposed of. A gentleman who had rather a large permit applied to me for another, and I wrote to him to send the return of how he had disposed of the liquor previously allowed him. To my astonishment and amusement I found that everything a man could think of had been given as an excuse for obtaining the whiskey. Among other excuses I recollect that one man got a pint of brandy for sore eyes, another got a pint of brandy for cracked heels on his horse, and a child of two years old with some ailment was set down for another pint of brandy. It would appear that every man who lived in the district had a colic or some kind of ailment and got a pint of brandy to cure it. I came to the conclusion that that privilege had been abused and consequently from that time out I refused to grant those permits, and I was able to confine myself to my resolution, except in one or two cases. I mention this to show the hon. gentleman that this system had been in vogue during my predecessor's term as Lieutenant Governor, and that Mr. Laird believed he had authority under the Act to grant a permit to sell. I thought so myself and Governor Royal has thought so. In reference to the issue of permits generally I may say that it was a very disagreeable duty for anyone to have the administering, if each man in the country thought he was just as much entitled to a permit as another, and every possible excuse that could be given for the issue of the permit was given. I exercised the best discretion I could in the matter, and I believe Governor Royal is doing the same. The Act which hon. gentlemen here seem anxious to take the credit of putting on the Statute-book has done its work well in its day, and as the hon. member for Montreal (Sir Donald A. Smith) has stated it was passed at a time when the country was crowded with Indians. I myself consider that now the time for its greatest necessity has passed, and I do not consider that there would be the least danger of whiskey getting into the hands of these Indians now if a properly supervised license system was adopted in the Territories. My experience of the Indians shows me that they are adverse to liquor, and the chiefs and the headmen of the reserve do everything they possibly can to keep their Indians from getting liquor. I do not believe that any bad result would follow if a system similar to other parts of the country were extended to the North-West. During the time that I had the administering of the affairs of the North-West I was accused of having issued too many permits. It was stated and believed by a great number that the system had been abused, but there were no means taken to make the Act more stringent. It left the whole matter in the hands of the Lieutenant Governor and he was able to do as he pleased. I think that it is a pity that when this Act was passed gentleman who took some interest in prohibition did not make it stricter than it was and prevent the granting of permits to any one at all except for medicinal purposes and that alone. I shall not trouble the House any longer except to say that I feel quite sure that the members of this House, by their vote, will decide that if they stood in my shoes they would act just as I have done.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). In dealing with this question this evening, I do not propose to take up the time of the

House at any great length. I agree with the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, in saying that the exercise of the power which was given to him as Lieutenant Governor of the North-West by the statute which originally constituted a Government there, to issue permits for the introduction of liquor, was one of the most unpleasant duties which he found imposed upon him. We can easily understand that, because when you put a power of that kind into the hands of one individual, all sorts of pressure is brought to bear upon him to secure the end in view. But I must say, in respect to the original constitution of the North-West Territories, that if the law meant anything at all when it was first enacted, it meant that some attempt should be made to see how prohibition, pure and simple, from the beginning, would work. Perhaps I had better turn for one moment to the statement of the Minister at that time leading the House, who introduced that Act, as to the object he had in view. The Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, on the 12th of March, 1875, in explaining the provisions of this constitution, spoke thus:

"Section 71 and the sub-sections 1 to 6 inclusive contain provisions for excluding all intoxicating liquors, prohibiting their introduction and their sale in the Territories. This would give the Dominion a fair opportunity to commence with a clean slate in this enormous Territory, and test practically the operation of a prohibitory liquor law where there had been no law of that or any other subject before."

I would like to ask any man in the House whether any more unequivocal language could be used. And yet, Sir, to-night we find gentlemen rising up one after another in this House, and telling us that it was not the intention of the original promoters of the constitution of the Territories that prohibition should exist there, but that this law was intended to give power to the Lieutenant Governor not to issue permits as the hon. Minister of the Interior did, who, I believe, considering the pressure brought to bear upon him, discharged his duty fairly well; but we find gentlemen who profess to be advocates of temperance in this House, getting up and justifying not the issue of permits, but the issue of actual licenses to retail 4 per cent. beer and wine in any quantities which parties may wish to purchase. It simply goes to prove what one of them said openly to-night, that they are supporters of the Government first and temperance men afterwards. I tell them that is what has led to the ruin of the temperance cause in this country, and to the ignominious defeat of the Scott Act in various counties where it was submitted; and just so long as that kind of principle animates these temperance men, just so long will temperance legislation be kept in the background, and just so long will there be a Government which is covertly hostile to anything like temperance legislation. My hon. friend said he found a book with three or four hundred blanks in it for permits. Perhaps, somebody had a printing contract, who thought he would get a big book printed and obtain good rates for it in order to supply the Governor of the Territories with ample means of granting permits, so that there would not be any occasion for a Governor to get these permits printed in future. But we will all agree that when this Act was passed, it was intended to prohibit the introduction of liquor into that country. A few years ago, when the boundaries of Manitoba were extended, the people in the added territory asked that the law prohibiting the issue of licenses should continue to prevail in that portion of Manitoba; showing that so far as the people were concerned they were not anxious that licenses or permits should be issued or that the sale of liquor should be introduced into their midst, but that they wanted that at least a fair trial should be given to the operation of prohibition pure and simple. What I complain of to day is this: that the Government stands on one side and throws the responsibility on the Lieutenant Governor of issuing the license for the Banff Hotel, while their own return shows that he only issued it subject to the confirmation of the authorities at Ottawa; and yet the Minister of Justice stands up to-night and states that the Lieutenant Governor is an autocrat in the Territories as much as the Czar of all the Russias, and that we are unable to do anything to prevent his action. This argument is too thin to satisfy honest supporters of temperance in this country. If the law is wrong, why not have the courage to come down to this House and amend it or at least give the people the opportunity of saying whether they will have it or not? But the Government will not do that; they will not allow the people of the North West the right of free British citizens; but they say to them: we hold that you are nominally under a law that forbids you to bring liquor into this country, but we will give licenses to certain parties to sell liquor in defiance of the intention of the statute. And where do we find the men who profess to be friends of temperance to-day? My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) says that if this motion had been intended to accomplish anything, it would not have been introduced as a want of confidence motion. What did my hon. friend think when the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) introduced a resolution as to which he at any rate felt that the opinion of this House should be put upon record? Did he introduce an independent motion for fear of showing hostility to the Government? I venture to say that there is not a more honest supporter of the Government in this House than that hon. gentleman; and yet he felt himself constrained to place himself in apparent hostility to the Government, and why? Just because he knew, as the hon. member for Leeds knows, that if he had not put his resolution in a way which would render it impossible for some understrapper of the Government to introduce an amendment, which any man who did not want to vote for the resolution would vote for, his resolution would be left in the background. When I first came into political life, we had a burning question here, and I remember that time and again that question was shunted off by amendments until at last my hon. friend who is now the Minister of Inland Revenue, felt that although a friend of the Government he had no alternative but to put his resolution where no man could go behind him and move an amendment, for the simple reason that an amendment would have left him stranded and helpless and he found himself in such a position that he had to place it there. I say that the action of representatives on this side of the House, who cannot be accused of any special friendly feeling for the Government, on the motion of my hon. friend for Muskoka, ought to be a standing rebuke to temperance men such as the hon. member for Leeds. What did we do on that occasion? We said we believed the Government were right and supported the Government. My hon. friend has not the courage of his temperance convictions, but he says: if you will put it some other way, so that it will not reflect on the Government, I will vote differently. I am a good solid temperance man, but, oh, my, I do not like to vote against the Government. Out upon that kind of temperance sentiment. That kind of temperance sentiment will never make headway. The only kind of sentiment that will make headway is that of the man who says: I believe these sentiments are right, and I will stand by them, be the consequences what they may. That is not the kind of sentiment that animates the hon. gentleman for Leeds. I listened to the hon. member for Queen's County, Nova Scotia, as he told us: Oh, if you will only introduce an abstract resolution respecting temperance, how glad I will be to support you, but I really cannot support this motion because I do not think you are in earnest. Now, that kind of temperance will never bring any friends to the cause in this country. If temperance principles are to prevail, you must have men who will stand up on behalf of temperance, in season and out of season, and in spite of all consequences. But my hon. friends are not built that way, and to-night we have the beautiful spectacle of a series of temperance men, from the Minister of Finance, who has posed time and again as the champion of

temperance, all the way down to the hon. member for Leeds, saying, in fact, that temperance is a good thing, but when it interferes with political association it is very bad. What I complain of is that the whole matter shows that the action of the Government has been hostile to an attempt to work this Act fairly in the North-West Territories. If the Government had been disposed to put that Act in operation fairly, as it was originally enacted, they would never have been found issuing licenses to sell either 4 per cent. beer, or wine, or other liquor in that country unless they first changed the Act. What I complain of in connection with the temperance movement is that the Government have been tacitly opposed to efficiently executing that scheme, which was to give temperance principles a fair trial. Until such time as something different is found in high places, it is utterly in vain for the temperance people to expect satisfactory results from temperance legislation. The people of the North-West either should have this Act amended, or be given an opportunity to say whether they should have licenses issued in their midst, and liquor sold; or whether its sale should be prohibited. I say that the treatment the Government have meted out to the people of the North-West Territories to-day is not the treatment they had a right to expect at the hands of the Government as British subjects. They are being treated as this Government attempted to treat Manitoba in former years, with the result that when the people of Manitoba would not endure that treatment any longer, but were driven first to rebellion, and then to the verge of rebellion, the Government withdrew their hand and meted out to them the first principles of British justice. This mode of doing business is very unsatisfactory. It is evident that the Government is hostile to this kind of legislation, or there would not be such systematic tampering with the enforcement of the law. I think either that the law should be amended or those licenses withdrawn. It is useless for the temperance sentiment of this country to expect to make any progress while thus treated by its representative men. If men have not the courage of their convictions it shows they are only temperance men for political advancement, and the sooner people realise that and change these men for men who have deeper, stronger and firmer convictions, the better it will be for the country. In this connection I feel there has been a systematic attempt to ignore the popular sentiment and feeling of the North-West Territories. It is deeply to be regretted if the law is now through the circumstances obsolete. Either let the people of the Territories say, whether they shall retain it or not, or assume the responsibility of amending it. But the best evidence that the Government feel that they are not in accord with the temperance sentiment of the country is, that they endeavor as the Minister of Justice did just now, to lead the House to believe that the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories is vested with absolute power to do as he pleased without let or hindrance. On another occasion, referred to by the leader of the Opposition, the Government did not hold that doctrine. They soon brought the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Quebec to book, and told him his usefulness was gone, and I venture to say that if the Government here had intimated to Mr. Royal that if he did not stop this thing his usefulness would be gone very soon, he would have ceased to issue licenses, and the people would have had an opportunity of testing honestly the working of prohibition.

Mr. JAMIESON. I have but a very few sentences to utter upon this question. Those who have been in the House any length of time will recollect that I have, as a rule, so far as my connection with temperance is concerned, endeavored to support it free of party politics, as far as possible. Did I believe that the present resolution or motion could have been made at an earlier period of the Session, I should feel disposed, under such circumstances, to have treated it differently, from the way in which I purpose to treat the amendment of the hon. member for Brome. So far as the remarks of the hon. member for Wentworth are concerned, I would simply say, as a temperance man, that the temperance people of this Dominion are under no special obligation, so far as I am aware, to either political party of this country for any great encouragement in reference to prohibitory legislation or the advancement of temperance sentiment in the country. When I made a motion a few weeks ago for the papers which have been brought down, and which have since been in the hands of the hon. member for Brome, I expressed, as a professional man, my opinion in reference to the question now under discussion. I do not, consequently, deem it advisable at this stage of the discussion, and at this late hour, to enter upon a discussion of that question again. Reference has been made to what took place at the meeting of the Dominion Alliance. And I must say, with all due respect to my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and hon. friend from Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Freeman), that they have fallen into an error with reference to what took place there. I am not aware that any conclusion was come to as to allowing this question to drop. At the time it was brought up in the Dominion Alliance, I was responsible for an amendment to the report of the committee to whom the question was referred, relegating that question to what is known as the legislative committee of the Dominion Alliance. It was contended at the meeting of the Alliance that it would be advisable to introduce a resolution condemning the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories for the state of things which existed there in reference to the prohibitory provisions of the North-West Territories Act. In my judgment, and I think in the judgment of the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) and some others, it was deemed advisable, in the first instance, to ask for a return of the papers or the regulations in reference to the issue of licenses, or of these general permits, before any action was taken in the House upon the question. At the request of the legislative committee, I moved in this House for that return, and the Minister of the Interior stated that the papers, would be brought down as speedily as possible. Owing to the delay which has thus occurred, I am satisfied that it was not possible to reach this question and dispose of it in a different manner from that in which it has now been brought before the House. If I could possibly come to the conclusion that it could have been reached in any other way, I would take every reasonable means in my power to discourage any effort in the direction of putting these questions in the form of votes of want of confidence. On two or three former occasions, I deemed it my duty as a temperance man to vote against resolutions which took that form, and which ostensibly had in view the advancement of temperance principles. I do not feel disposed to discuss this question much further, but, as a professional man, having carefully examined the Statute, and endeavored to place the most reasonable construction upon it in the light of all the surrounding circumstances and the light of what was said at the time the Statute was enacted, in the light of the action of previous Lieutenant Governors of the North-West Territories, and taking into account all the circumstances in connection with the enactment and the administration of the law, I could not arrive at any other conclusion than this: that there had been a serious violation of the prohibitory clauses of the North-West Territories Act under the administration of the present Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories. I am quite prepared to admit that other lawyers—perhaps better lawyers than I am—may take a different view of the law, and perhaps would be justified in taking a different view of the law; but, as far as I am individually concerned, holding the view I do of that Statute, and knowing what has been stated in

this House and what I have seen in the public press of the country in reference to the administration of the law in the North-West, I cannot pursue any other course under the present circumstances than to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher). I am quite prepared, however, to concede that hon. gentlemen reading the law may possibly take an opposite view, but I cannot hold any view other than the one I have expressed on the present occasion, and I believe that it is the duty of Parliament, which is called the Great Inquest of the country, to express its opinion on a question of this kind.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain), as one of the Puritans of this House, thought it his duty to read to hon. gentlemen on this side a lecture upon their consistency and their conduct in reference to this question. He impugns the sincerity of hon. gentlemen because they will not agree with him in condemning the Lieutenant Governor for his interpretation of the law. As I understand the Statute which gives that authority to the Lieutenant Governor, there appears to be even amongst eminent legal gentleman a difference of opinion. In a meeting which we held in the Tower Room in the early part of the Session, to consider how far the Lieutenant Governor had or had not honestly discharged the important duty devolving upon him, we were unable to decide, and we did not come to the conclusion that he had not fairly interpreted that law. Not only lawyers, but laymen, in considering the Statute under which Lieutenant Governor Royal acted, came to the conclusion that the law did give him the right not only to grant these permits, but also to give a species of license to sell liquor in that country. We have very high legal authority in favor of the opinion thus expressed, and why should we condemn a man who is sincere to his interpretation of the law, quite as sincere, I am sure, as the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) when he condemns hon. gentlemen who do not agree with him. He says that hon. gentlemen on this side put their political principles first, and their temperance principles afterwards, and that, therefore, temperance always suffers at their hands. He would ask the country to infer from that, that it is different on his side of the House, that there they put their temperance principles first, and their political principles afterwards. I should like to ask if that was the case with Mr. Manning of Toronto, the Chief License inspector, and the chief official under Mr. Mowat, who, when a request was made that the Scott Act should be better enforced, replied that he did not like to do it, because it would hurt Mr. Mowat and that party. That is the party of the hon. gentleman who reads us a lecture as to consistency or inconsistency in connection with temperance legislation. From a knowledge of the working of the License Act, and from a knowledge of the license inspectors, who are simply in Ontario a brigade of political agents of Mr. Mowat and his right hand supporters, I say that it was never intended honestly to enforce the Scott Act in the counties were it was found to conflict with Mr. Mowat's interests. We find that men who were hauled up not once or twice, but for the third, fourth and even the fifth time, were let off with a fine, though the law permitted the magistrate to imprison them. Why was that? It was because the Government wanted to get money to replenish their treasury, but did not wish to impose too large a fine, because it might interfere with a business which was very important to them. When it was proposed to repeal the Scott Act in the counties where it had been adopted, the Ontario Government desired the repeal, because in that case they could appoint their board of license commissioners, who are the right hand men of Mr. Mowat, and who could work their nefarious plans in Mr. Mowat's interests. The reason for their course was not consistency, but only the expediency of the party. Now, we are asked to condemn the Lieutenant Governor because he honestly and conscientiously interprets the law in this way. Is it fair that we should do so? Must we condemn a man because he is conscientiously doing what the law allows him to do? Because we happen to differ from him in our interpretation of the law, should we be so unfair as to impute to him improper motives because he does not see eye to eye with us in the interpretation of that law? The hon. gentleman goes further and he says: If the law is a bad one why not amend it? Now, we hear from hon. gentlemen who live in that part of the country the most conflicting evidence as to the working of the law, not only from gentlemen who are in favor of temperance, but from those who hold the opposite view. Men of the most sterling integrity, men who would go any length to promote temperance principles, say that they believe, from their experience of several years in that country, that the people of the North-West Territories would be better with a license law than they are to-day with this law on the statutes. When we find this conflict of opinion, it is not unreasonable that we should scarcely be prepared to go as far as hon. gentlemen are asking us to go, and not only to condemn the Lieutenant Governor because he does not interpret the law with them, because he does not carry out that law according to their wishes, but to pass a vote of censure upon the Government here because they will not condemn him for interpreting the law differently from what he conscientiously believes it to mean. I understand that we intend before long to give the power into the hands of that quasi-legislature there to deal with this question. Why? Because they are living in that country, because they see the operations of the law under their eyes every day, and, therefore, are better judges of what that country needs than we can possibly be. If we allow them to legislate upon it, to make a law to suit themselves, I think we are doing no great injustice to the people who inhabit those great North-West Territories. Therefore, I say, it is not for us to condemn the Lieutenant Governor, nor to condemn the Government here for what has been done, but we should allow that gentleman, who is a man of high legal attainments, who is a man, I believe, of integrity, who is a man of good intentions, to put his own conscientious interpretation on the law, and to carry it out according to his own convictions in the way that he believes best.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Fisher:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Flynn,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Gauthier,	Neven,
Barron,	Guay,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Hale,	Perry,
Bourassa,	Holton,	Platt,
Brien,	Jamieson,	Rinfret,
Campbell,	Jones (Halifax),	Robertson,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Kirk,	Ste. Marie,
Casey,	Lang,	Scriver,
Casgrain,	Langelier (Montmor'cy),	Semple,
Choquette,	Langelier (Quebec),	Somerville,
Colter,	Laurier,	Sutherland,
Davies,	Livingston,	Turcot,
De St. Georges,	Lovitt,	Waldie,
Dessaint,	Macdonald (Huron)	Watson,
Doyon,	McMillan (Huron),	Weldon (St. John),
Ellis,	McMullen,	Wilson (Elgin)—53.
Fisher,	Meigs,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Audet,	Ferguson (Renfrew),	Montplaisir,
Bain (Soulanges),	Freeman,	O'Brien,
Baird,	Gigault,	Patterson (Essex),
Barnard,	Gordon,	Perley,
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Porter,
Bergin,	Guillet,	Prior,
Boisvert,	Haggart,	Purcell,
Bowell,	Hall,	Riopel,
Boyle,	Hesson,	Roome,

Bryson,	Hudspeth,	Ross,
Burns,	Jones (Digby),	Shanly,
Cameron,	Kenny,	Skinner,
Cargill,	Kirkpatrick,	Small,
Carling,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Smith (Sir Donald),
Carpenter,	La Rivière,	Smith (Ontario),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Laurie,	Sproule,
Cimon,	Lépine,	Stevenson,
Cochrane,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Temple,
Cockburn,	Macdowall,	Therien,
Corby	McCulla,	Thompson (Sir John),
Costigan,	McDonald (Victoria),	Tisdale,
Coulombe,	McDougald (Pictou),	Tupper,
Curran,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Tyrwhitt,
Daoust,	McKeen,	Vanasse,
Davin,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wallace,
Davis,	McNeill,	Ward,
Dawson,	Mara,	Weldon (Albert),
Denison,	Marshall,	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers,	Masson,	Wilmot,
Dewdney,	Mills (Annapolis),	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Dickey,	Mitchell,	Wilson (Lennox),
Dickinson,	Moffat,	Wood (Brockville),
Dupont,	Moncrieff,	Wood (Westm'l'd)—100.
Ferguson(Leeds&Gren),		

Amendment negatived.

M. GRANDBOIS. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has not voted.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have paired with the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow).

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I notice that the hon. gentleman who moved the main motion is not in the House and it does seem most disrespectful to him on the part of the House, that the motion should be put in his absence. I suppose the hon. gentleman would certainly not have left the House while an amendment to his motion was being voted upon, if he had not been taken ill. It does seem disrespectful to the Minister of Finance that this motion should be put in his absence, and I submit, that under the circumstances, that the House should adjourn.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is very facetious, but he will not be so facetious when I tell him that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was really very unwell and, therefore, paired with Mr. Charlton.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Ammunition, including artillery ammunition, and manufacture of small arm ammunition at the cartridge factory at Quebec, $50,000; clothing and great coats, $90,000; military stores, $60,000.....$200,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The return presented by the Minister of Militia yesterday shows that the cost of manufacturing cartridges in our factory at Quebec, is about $3 per thousand in excess of the price of the article when imported from England. I admit there may be some advantage in a country having a manufacture of this kind within its borders in the event of its ever being necessary for it to depend upon its own resources. But under the present circumstances there does not seem to be any immediate prospect of our being deprived of the opportunity of obtaining our ammunition as heretofore from the old country. I have been informed that the manufacture of the ammunition at Quebec is carried on in a very expensive manner. I am led to believe by those who seem to possess sources of information, that the expense is very much in excess of what is actually required, that is to say, that there are a great many more people employed about the cartridge factory at Quebec than is actually required under the circumstance, and the excessive cost which the country is called upon to pay would indicate that there is something in that view. Of course, we have not before us the details of the number of persons employed at that cartridge factory on which to base a sound conclusion, but I think we have evidence enough to show, in the cost of the article itself, that there must be some mismanagement and some leaks in that regard which add so much to the cost of the ammunition. I hope the Minister will be prepared to show the House another Session full details respecting this matter. With respect to clothing and great-coats, as the House is aware, there has already been an inquiry before the Public Accounts Committee on this subject. I do not propose to go into that branch of the subject now, because there is an hon. gentleman who has taken very great interest in investigating the dissatisfaction which was proved before the Committee to exist, and when it is shown, as it was shown in the Committee, that some five or six companies of the Queen's Own of Toronto had sent to England for their own uniforms and clothing, in preference to taking the Government uniforms free, I think it is pretty strong evidence that there is something very unsatisfactory in the present arrangement. Independent of that, the increased cost of the article manufactured in our own country is, I think, such that it will be shown that we are paying an unnecessary price for those articles, when the quality and length of time they will wear are considered. That, however, will be discussed at a later stage, and on that point I will not further dwell as I do not wish to anticipate the observations which will, no doubt, be made by the hon. gentleman to whom I have referred. With respect to ammunition. I think the hon. gentleman must see that the item requires some explanation, and while I admit that there are certain advantages in having a factory in this country, we should be able to manufacture the cartridges as cheaply as we could import them, which does not appear to be the case under present circumstances.

Mr. SUTHERLAND In granting this large sum of money for clothing, me must regret that the volunteers are not provided with helmets. The officers and men of the volunteer force feel very sorely on this point, and, while I have brought it to the attention of the department very frequently, I have not been able to convince the Minister that they should supply what is really necessary for the equipment of the volunteers. It is only by the generosity of the officers or by the men buying these articles out of the small amount received as pay, that they are provided. The Government should see that out of this appropriation of money full equipment should be provided. I am satisfied, after looking into the detailed accounts, that if anything like fair business management prevailed, the men could be better provided than they are at the present time. The Minister says that the country does not vote a sufficient amount to provide the clothing required. I do not agree with that view, and I feel that it is owing to negligence on the part of the management of the department that helmets are not supplied. Where the men have to purchase them themselves they cost much more than if the department furnished them to the force. I have given attention to this subject for several years, and I may state something more regarding it at another stage, because I feel there is a grievance, that it is one which should not exist and one which the Government could relieve.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The hon. gentleman has just stated what was in my mind before he rose. It is very unsatisfactory, to say the least, that members of a regiment should be called on to provide a very essential portion of their own uniform. In my own regiment we were able to do this simply because we had the assistance of the county council. Why the county council of my county, or of any other county, should be called upon to contribute towards providing an essential portion of the uniform of the men, it will be difficult for the Minister to explain. There is one other point with respect to the uniform which I desire to mention, and it is the very great extravagance of the Government in furnishing the men with one set of uniform only. It would be very much more economical if the men were supplied with a fatigue suit which they could use in

camp. As it is now, each man is furnished with a full dress uniform, which appears excellent on parade, but it is not useful if he is obliged to use it for ordinary purposes If the Minister would supply some of those uniforms which are in the stores, and the uniforms would not cost more than about $3 each, he would find that the scarlet clothing would last almost a lifetime, for it is not worn out, but when used in camp it becomes so discolored that the men will not wear it. If the Minister will take that into consideration and obtain an annual grant for supplying a fatigue dress, he would find that a very great economy had been effected. Another point is that we are going on from year to year without any proper equipment for the force. Not a single company in the whole country is in a position to turn out for actual service, because they have no proper equipment. It would be a serious matter to supply equipment for the whole force, but if the Minister could set apart about $5,000 each year, in the course of a few years the whole force would be properly and easily equipped. It seems ridiculous to keep up an active force, and yet, for the sake of a few thousand dollars, keep it out of the most necessary articles of equipment, if called upon to perform active service.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I should like to say a few words in support of the suggestion of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), with respect to helmets. I do not see why volunteers should not be supplied with headgear; helmets are as much a part of the uniform as are trousers, and perhaps it would be as well to supply them with helmets and let the trousers go. If the Department undertake to supply the men with uniforms, they should supply them with helmets as well as with trousers and the usual clothing. I think that with regard to the uniforms a good deal of money might be saved if there was a little more inspection exercised and greater care taken in the issuing of them. It is absurd to say that this fine good cloth which we hear so much about, when made into tunics will last for only twenty four days, and yet that is all that is given as the life of a tunic. These tunics are issued for five years, and rural battalions are only called out twice in five years, so that the tunic is only used for twenty-four days in camp, and a new issue of clothing is then made.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Not always.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes, always. As soon as the five years have elapsed the commanding officer makes a demand on the Militia Department for a complete set of uniform, and he gets a suit for every man in the regiment, no matter whether the uniform is worn out or not. I believe that a tunic wears as long as two pairs of trousers and I hold that if a proper inspection were made by an officer who would go around the armories, half the tunics now discarded would be found serviceable and in this way a great deal of money would be saved to the department.

Mr. CASEY. I quite agree with the remarks of my hon. friends from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) with regard to the issue of helmets. I remember when I was a volunteer in the old Queen's Own we had to go out in a Glengarry cap in all kinds of weather and the result was that I and many others had our faces sunburnt and our eyes closed up and that we were rendered practically unfit for duty. It is not fair to ask a man who has been accustomed to indoor work, as most of the members of the city battalions are, to go out in the fierce sun wearing only a forage cap or a Glengarry. Even the farmer although out in the open air is accustomed to wear a big hat which protects his face. Neither is it fair to ask men to buy helmets when they are out in the public service. I have been asked to call the attention of the Minister to the report of the Executive Commitee of the Ontario Artillery Association, which says:

"This committee again recommends as necessary for the proper maintenance and efficiency of the Artillery:

"(1.) An increase in the annual grant to the Dominion Artillery Association (2.) As Provincial and other Rifle Associations receive grants from the Dominion Government, that this Association should be placed upon a similar footing. (3.) An issue of extra clothing to drivers and gunners; this has been asked for time and again."

I find on referring to the *Hansard* of 1888 that the Minister promised in the early part of last year to make an issue of this clothing, but I do not think it has been done. The report continues:—

"(4.) Payment for 6 days' preliminary drill before proceeding to camp (5) Payment to non-commissioned officers and men of the pay of their rank with allowances and transport, during time allowed for target practice."

This seems a reasonable request because when the men are out for target practice they are practically on active service. The other recommendations in the report are:

"(6.) The establishment of a School for Field Artillery at Kingston; there being only one Garrison Battery in the Province a semi-Field and Garrison School is not necessary. (7) That pay for four spare horses be allowed during annual drill in order to provide for casualties as the experience of the past 14 years show that this is really requisite for any pretence to any true efficiency (8) That the Militia Department be requested to have an inspection made by the Inspector and Assistant Inspector of Artillery of all stores at Battery headquarters at some time other than during annual drill, when only a partial inspection of such harness, stores, &c, as exist, is possible, it being a well known fact that very few of the Ontario Batteries have more than eight sets of harness, and that most of the waggons are useless for any service."

These were recommended at a representative meeting of officers from all parts of Ontario at the Artillery Association meeting held in Toronto in January last. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to those recommendations and although I have no personal knowledge of them all, as I never was connected with the artillery branch, yet they seem to be based on common sense and I hope the Minister will give due attention to the matter. Perhaps he will give his opinion now as to how many of these recommendations he can see his way to adopt.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has spoken of the extra expense incurred by manufacturing the cartridges in Canada instead of importing them from England. I cannot exactly understand how the hon. gentleman arrives at the conclusion that the Canadian cartridges cost $3 per thousand more than the cartridges which are manufactured in England. The reports which have been handed to me by the officers of my department show that the cartridges manufactured in Canada cost $18.84 a thousand. The Snider ball cartridges manufactured in England cost $14.92 a thousand, and the Martini-Henry's $18.75. Let me draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that the cartridges for the Snider-Enfield rifle are no longer manufactured in England, and hence it would be impossible to get any supply from England, and unless we change the arm used by our forces in Canada it is necessary for us to manufacture our own ammunition here instead of importing it from England. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the cartridge factory is conducted under the superintendence of a gentleman who is known to all those who take an interest in militia matters to be a great authority on this matter, and that not only in Canada alone, but also in England, because of the great success which has attended his efforts in manufacturing the cartridge.

Mr. CASEY. Who is that?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Major Prévost. The manufacture of cartridges was like many other things which were introduced into a country like this. The beginnings were rather difficult, and we felt at one time that we were not obtaining that great success which those who are administering the department as well as the members of the force desired to obtain. However, I am proud to tell you, not only from the opinion expressed by Canadians, but also by men abroad who have been following the different

steps we have taken in the development of the manufacture of cartridges, that Canada is to-day manufacturing cartridges which are superior to any cartridges which we have ever been able to obtain from England or any other country. Now, I wish to lay before the House the statements which have been sent to me from different parts of the Dominion with regard to the ammunition manufactured in Canada. These letters, I may say, have been sent to me without my asking for them. I read a letter signed by Lieutenant Colonel Bedson, the President of the Rifle Association of Manitoba:

"I have the honor to state that the Snider ball ammunition manufactured in the Cartridge Factory of Quebec, of 1888 issue, was used by the Manitoba Rifle Association during their recent matches, and was universally commended by the marksmen. It is undoubtedly the best ammunition of this kind ever used by this association."

I read also a letter which was sent to me by Captain Walter Macdonald, in which speaking of the Canadian ammunition of 1888 issue, he says:

"I think its present standard, if kept up, will stand the test of the Provincial and Dominion matches, and prove to be as good as No 9 English, if not better."

I also read a letter from Lieutenant Colonel Bond, of the Provincial Rifle Association of Montreal, stating:

"I did not find a single complaint regarding the shooting qualities of the ammunition. They are looked on as quite equal to the best English ever made or ever sent out here."

Major Weston, of the 66th Princess Louise Fusiliers, Halifax, in a letter, says:

"The make of this year, so far as used here, has given the utmost satisfaction, and the scores made with it are equal to those made when the English make was used. I have not had an opportunity to test it personally, but our shooting men have given me their opinion strongly upon this point. I take this opportunity of giving you the opinion here, and after our Provincial matches I will give you the opinion of the competitors also of that match."

Here is a letter also from Lieutenant-Colonel Holmes, who is the commandant of "C" Battery, B.C., and who is known among riflemen as one who has always taken a deep interest in rifle practice, and as one of the best shots:

"I must say that what we have just used is really as good and reliable as any I have ever seen anywhere, and I should be a judge, as I stood fifth in the Wimbledon team of 1873, and have always been a fair average shot. Peters also concurs with me as to its good quality, and speaks highly of it, and says that all the tests have shown that it is superior to any which we have had so far."

Remembering what hon. members of this House who are also members of the force, and who have taken a great deal of interest in our rifle practice, have said on a former occasion, I think these letters dispose at once and forever of the question of the success of the cartridge factory at Quebec. Like everything else, the manufacture of cartridges there at first was possibly not as cheaply carried on as it might have been, but the factory is conducted as economically as it is possible to have it conducted. During the troubles in the North-West we had to put on extra hands, and these could not be disposed of at a moment's notice; but the staff is being reduced every day, and is being reduced so rapidly that with the exception of very few hands who could not be dispensed with just at present, I think it will be found that the factory cannot be carried on more economically than it is. We must remember that we have within the boundaries of the Dominion a factory which makes us practically independent of any other market, and we can at a moment's notice, by putting on extra hands—we have the machinery ready—manufacture in case of emergency so as to meet the requirements of the situation. In reading those letters, I have not read some articles of the *Militia Gazette*, which refer also to the question, and which contain expressions of opinion coming from England; but if I may be permitted I shall hand over the short passages of those different articles to *Hansard*, so that it may complete the statement which I thought it my duty to lay before the House in reference to this matter:

SIR ADOLPHE CARON.

"The wonderful improvement in our shooting at 600 yards this season warrants the statement that the 1888 issue of Snider ammunition is fully equal to the best English, the mark IX. Bull's eye after bull's eye is now 'plugged' in at 600 yards with our old Sniders, and the hideous drop shot is a thing of the past.

"It is at 600 yards especially that this year's ammunition shows its superiority over the Canadian make of all former years. There now appears to be absolutely no ground of complaint; and in the opinion of many the Dominion product is even superior to the English ammunition formerly used. Examination of several packages made by an expert at Ottawa, has shown that there is not more than one grain variation in the powder charge, whilst four grains were allowed in the English. And the riflemen's expostulations and advice having at last been heeded, the desired alteration has now been made in the shape of the bullet, enabling it to travel in conformity with the rule for riflemen: 'head to the target.'

"Our present good fortune in the matter of the excellence of our Snider ammunition, has attracted some attention in the mother country, as witness the following from the *Volunteer Record*: 'The Canadians seem to be greatly in advance of us in the art of manufacturing small-arm ammunition; the riflemen of that dependency being particularly fortunate in the 1888 issue, a 'make' with which most satisfactory results are being obtained. It quite makes an old country shootist's mouth water to hear that an examination of several packages made at Ottawa has shown that there is not more than one grain variation in the powder charge, whilst four or five grains were allowed in the English cartridges, as demonstrated by the experiments made by an expert two or three years ago."

With regard to clothing, I fully concur with what has been said by the hon. gentleman. I believe it would be a very great economy if we could serve out fatigue uniforms to the force. The expensive uniforms which are served out, as hon. gentlemen who are intimately connected with the force know, it is almost impossible to wear out; but after a certain number of years they get disfigured, not so much from their usage on parade or drill, but from the usage to which they are put in camp. Very often the men sleep in their uniforms, and very often they go through their heavy drill in them. We have uniforms in the stores, tweed uniforms, of excellent material, the cost of which amounts to $3.25. These would save our other uniforms to a great extent. I am not making any promise, but I believe I can see my way clear to issue a certain number of these uniforms. The force cannot all be served, because, even with the liberality of Parliament in Militia expenditure, I have not the money necessary to meet the expenditure involved, though in the long run it would be a real economy to serve those tweed uniforms out. The manufacture of uniforms has had this year an opportunity of being more thoroughly discussed than ever before. The matter was brought before the Public Accounts Committee, where every possible latitude was given for a thorough examination, and it was proved beyond a possibility of discussion that the policy followed by the Government was the best policy in the interests of Canada and her Militia Force. I shall not discuss this matter at this late hour, I will simply say that hon. gentlemen who have taken the trouble to follow the meetings of the Committee cannot fail to arrive at the conclusion that the uniforms served out to the Militia Force are as good as they can possibly be made.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not find fault with the quality of the cartridges now manufactured in Quebec. I am glad to hear that in the last two years the quality has improved. Nor do I find fault with the establishment of the cartridge factory at Quebec. But what I do call the attention of the House to is the fact that these cartridges are costing much more than they would if imported. The hon. gentleman said that the Snider cartridges were no longer manufactured in England. That is a good reason for their being manufactured here; but, apart from that, it is a good policy to have a manufactory of this kind within our own border. The figures given by the hon. gentleman prove that I rather understated my case. I gave the cost of the Snider-Enfield cartridges at $14.50. The hon. gentleman says they cost $18.50. If they can be manufactured in England at that price, I cannot see why they should not be manufactured in Canada for nearly the same price. This

corroborates the impression I have that the Minister employs too many people about the factory. With reference to the clothing, the hon. gentleman will not be able to sustain the position he has taken to-night, He will find that his clothing has been condemned by the military boards in the various Provinces as unsatisfactory and far below the Imperial in every respect—in quality, fit and duration. The hon. gentleman must have been drawing on his imagination for he certainly did not draw on the result of the investigation which took place before the Public Accounts Committee. The reports will be submitted to the members of the House, who will be able to judge whether they bear out the statements of the Minister of Militia or not.

Mr. DENISON. As to the cartridges I believe there is little doubt about that, although they were bad at one time, they are good now. The consensus of opinion at the meeting of the Ontario Rifle Association was that the cartridges now used are excellent. The hon. the Minister referred to the *Militia Gazette* as having endorsed the cartridges. I might also refer to the *Militia Gazette* as having endorsed the suggestion I made with reference to the management of the schools. The *Gazette* declared that it will be quite possible to have a cadet corps organised in connection with the schools. Since then I have received a long letter from a prominent officer in the west, giving me some facts in connection with the idea I brought forward, and endorsing it. He represents to me that out of some 79 officers and 526 non-commissioned officers and men, who went through the school, only 64 officers qualified, and 184 non-commissioned officers and men. I take it, the object of the school is to have a number of non-commissioned officers and men who will be able to instruct our militia in their drill. We find that some 342 have been in the schools two or three months, and, possibly, longer, and left without having obtained certificates, having failed to qualify. It seems to me that is a great waste. The Government have clothed, paid and fed these men for two or three months at the schools, though, on leaving them, they may not get a certificate. Whether that is the fault of the officers commanding corps, who send men there who are unsuitable, or the fault of the manner in which the schools are conducted, I will not say. Probably it is as much the fault of the officers who send the men there as it is of the schools, because, if an officer does not select carefully the men who are to go to the schools, the chances are that they will not make such a good showing when they come to be examined. Under the old system, only those who passed or qualified got their certificates and received their money. The result was that they had to be industrious and attentive, and the discipline was good because they knew that, if they did not get their certificate, they did not get any pay. Under the present regulation, it does not matter whether they do much or little work. In either case they get their pay. I, therefore, think it would be well for the Minister of Militia to consider this question before next Session, and see if a cadet corps could not be formed in connection with these schools. I believe that would meet the approbation not only of the House but of all the militia in the country.

Gen. LAURIE. I was one of those who brought before the notice of the Government a few years ago the inferiority of the cartridges which were then made at the Quebec factory. I feel now that it is my duty to speak as to their excellence. I was the umpire at the matches at Bedford last year, and during all those matches not only was there no complaint about the cartridges, but the competitors all agreed in saying that this was the best ammunition they had ever been supplied with.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to hear, and to believe, that the ammunition made at Quebec is now up to the standard for Snider ammunition, but, as the Minister of Militia has pointed out, they are working with only a few hands, only sufficient to supply the volunteers with that ammunition. I am afraid, if we were to have another such trouble as we had in 1885, and new and inexperienced workmen had to be taken on, the character of the ammunition might revert to what it was then. When the Minister was questioned as to the character of the ammunition used during the trouble in the North-West, he stated that it was not good enough for practice at the target, but it was good enough for use in the field. The hon. gentleman might have to make a similar statement if another case arose. I hope such an emergency will not arise. The Minister made one statement which startled me a good deal, that Snider ammunition was not now made in England. To the best of my knowledge the Snider rifle is still the arm of the British volunteers.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No; the Martini.

Mr. CASEY. Then we are making, at much greater expense then it used to cost to get them from England, the cartridges for an arm which is practically out of date. That brings me back to a point I have often urged upon the Minister, and that is the propriety of gradually introducing an improved arm amongst our volunteers There is no use in having volunteers at all unless we expect them to fight somebody at sometime; and, if they were to meet anyone on the field of battle, as they did four years ago in the North-West, they should be provided with an arm as good as that possessed by their opponents. The hon. gentleman knows that the Snider is not a modern arm, that it is not equal to the arms possessed by the Indians in the North-West, whom I have met in numbers carrying their Winchesters and with cartridge belts around their waists. I think our volunteers should have as good an arm as any enemy whom they might be called upon to meet. There might be a gradual introduction of some new arm—either the Martini Henry or some more modern arm than that. The hon. gentleman is in a position to find out what is the best military arm of the present day, and I do not think the country would grumble if a reasonable amount were put in the Estimates to gradually supply this new arm. It might be made a matter of competition among the different corps, and those who came out best in their annual drill or in shooting might first be supplied. Of course, it would be too large a contract to re-arm the whole force at once.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It would cost a great deal of money.

Mr. CASEY. Yes; but it might be done gradually. Most of the rifles we now have were muzzle-loading Enfields, and they were converted into Sniders by cutting off a part of the breech and putting on the breech-loading attachment. Many of them must be 30 years old, and I would not say that it is unsafe to fire the ordinary rifle which is found in a country regiment, but at all events the experiment is somewhat unpleasant Our volunteers would be at a great disadvantage in meeting an equal force well armed, and I do not think it is treating them well, when they sacrifice so much time and money for the benefit of the country, to send them into the field with a weapon which puts them at a disadvantage. The Snider was not a bad weapon 15 or 20 years ago, but it is not equal to the more modern arms. Either the force should be kept in a state of efficiency or it should be done away with. I believe that, if the Minister would reduce the number of volunteers, and would properly arm and equip them, it would be better. We have now a force of which we may well be proud, but they are not equipped in such a way as to enable them to take the field against any enemy at all on short notice, and certainly not against a civilised and well armed enemy. We should either drop them altogether or equip them properly, and I again call upon the Minister to consider the question of a new arm, and to see if he cannot introduce it gradually.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I cannot allow this item to pass without protesting against the manner in which the hon. Minister treats matters of this kind when they are brought to his attention. I do think that when a matter of importance to the volunteers of this country is brought in a proper manner before the notice of the Minister, it is his duty at least to refer to the matter so that the volunteers may know whether there is any good reason why their interests should not be attended to. It is a very poor excuse for the Minister to say that because the House is in a hurry to adjourn, he cannot take a minute or two to give some explanations. This is not a new question. I have personally brought it to his attention and I think other officers have done so for several years. I have been willing to hear any reasonable explanation that he had to give, I certainly do not wish to press the matter unduly upon him. I know the difficulties Ministers have in meeting the demands from various quarters. The Minister will see by the remarks made this afternoon that this is not a party question; other hon. members, supporters of the Government, also think that this matter might receive more attention from the department than it has had. I think the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) pointed out to the Minister in a practical way, he having had some experience himself how this complaint could be remedied; he suggested a better system of inspection by which a saving with regard to the militia clothing might be effected. I can endorse what he said, and I believe that enough money could be saved, without increasing the amount asked for in the Estimates, to supply helmets two or three times over. I quite endorse the statement of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) in regard to the issue of another suit of clothing. The Minister himself acknowledged there would be a saving. I am satisfied from my experience that if the matter was conducted on a business like basis, the volunteer force would have a great deal more comfort, and that the money now appropriated to supply clothing would supply all the equipments necessary, and in a manner a great deal more satisfactory to the force. It is not only the helmets that have to be supplied by the officers or friends of the volunteers, but many other articles besides, and it becomes a heavy expense for the majority of the officers of the battalion who desire to maintain the force. At present the force is maintained through the patriotism of the men and the officers and their willingness to put their hands in their pockets and subscribe liberally to put the men in a position to appear at all as they ought to appear in the field. It is all very well for the Minister and his General, who no doubt is a very gallant officer, and a very able soldier, and all that sort of thing, to sit down in the office and make new orders. The battalion to which I belong have a special grievance in this regard. Formerly the black helmet was required for a full dress, but recently the department has seen fit—I dare say it is quite right—to change the order, and to say that another kind of helmet shall be required. Now, how are these to be supplied? Some of these men may not have the practical experience of the officers of the force in Canada, but when they pass orders like that, I think the least they can do is to look to the efficiency of the force, and see how these regulations are to be carried out. In this case I see that they have issued an order that the white helmet shall be the full dress for rifle brigade, and the only way we can keep up our battalion is to put our hands into our pockets and supply these helmets. The Minister may say that straw hats or anything else is good enough, but that does not meet the feelings or the patriotism of the young men, who lose their time and sacrifice their wages in order to maintain the force. I want the members of the force themselves and the officers to know whether there is any good reason why the Minister of Militia should not take the matters into consideration and deal with them in a practical and business like way, so that they may know whether these things can be provided or whether there is any desire on the part of the department to keep up the efficiency of the force. I hope the Minister will consider the suggestions that have been made, by which helmets could be supplied for the force at one-third the amount that is now paid. I hope that when matters of this kind are brought to his notice he will think it worth while to deal with them, or to instruct the officers of his department to deal with them, and if common sense and business principles are applied to the management of these matters, I think it would be very much to the satisfaction of the force in this country.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There is no hon. gentleman in the House that I would be more sorry to treat with discourtesy than my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. I must apologise to him for having overlooked his suggestion in reference to cartridges and to clothing. I must admit that I overlooked a very excellent suggestion which my hon. friend made in reference to helmets. The hon. gentleman spoke as if I believed that straw hats or any other kind of headgear would be good enough for the volunteers. Sir, I am glad to know that a feeling of pride and patriotism exists among the volunteers, and that they desire to turn out as perfectly equipped as possible. As far as the means placed at my disposal will permit, I am prepared in every possible way to meet the wishes and the interest of the force, to help the officers who are put to the greatest expense to keep their battalions in the state of efficiency in which they are to-day. The hon. gentleman knows that we allow a forage cap, and the practice has been to pay the value of the forage caps to the battalions who choose to import helmets. I fully agree with the hon. gentleman that the helmets, the head gear, should be collected and paid by the department, but on the other hand military critics and those who take an interest in the force, state that they could not well get along without the forage cap. Well, I am not disposed to pay for both; I do not believe that it would be in the interest of the force, upon the present vote of Parliament, to go into that expenditure. I should like to do so, but in this case as in every other, we have to cut our coat according to our cloth. However, I can tell my hon. friend that the matter is going to be considered. The suggestion made by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), who is a well known friend of the militia force and who has taken a prominent position in that force, is certainly one which should call for the attention of the department. I believe that if we could furnish a fatigue uniform the scarlet tunic and other tunics which are used could be used without any reference to the period of five years, and then it would be quite proper for the department to leave the question of replacing those uniforms to the inspecting officer, who would declare that the uniforms were worn out, or were not in a condition to be worn any longer, and then a further issue might be made. I believe that would be an economical method to adopt. But at present—I am going to make the attempt this year—we can use only a very small number of fatigue uniforms, cheap as they may be, for the force as at present constituted. If the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) will permit me to refer to the question of ammunition in England, I desire to say that the ammunition for the Snider-Enfield costs $14.50; if to that you add the amount of freight the cost is $16.00, and in Canada that ammunition was issued at $16 00, that being considered the cost price.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. From the remark made by the Minister, members of the Committee might be led to suppose that in allowing the cost of the forage cap a small amount was allowed towards purchasing helmets. The men want something in place of the forage cap, and in allowing that amount it was only that the men might replace them

with the Glengarry. The point I wish to make to the Committee is this: that in the allowance made for the forage cap, it is simply done that the officers might provide the Glengarry, which has been allowed under the regulations, in preference to the forage cap, which is altogether unsuitable to men in camp in hot weather. I do not agree with the Minister that the department is not able to furnish helmets. With a little effort, it could be easily done, and, as the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has pointed out, $5,000 a year would in a short time make full provision. If the Minister would carry out this plan it would assist the volunteer force and would at the same time make them more efficient.

Royal Military College..... $77,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to know why the hon. gentleman has retired or dispensed with the services of the officer who was in charge last year, General Oliver?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. General Oliver's time in Canada had expired. The commandant who is sent out from England is loaned to us, so to speak, for 5 years, and we consider it not to be in the interests of the institution to extend that period. We know how rapidly military science is advancing and how important it is that the military college should keep as efficient as it is acknowledged to be outside of Canada and especially in England, and that we should procure the best man that can be obtained. It is in the interests of the college that this change should take place every 5 years. Major General Oliver, I believe, has now been here from 18 months to 2 years over the time which he could expect to remain in Canada. He has been replaced by a gentleman who is known as quite a scientist in his profession, and is doing remarkably well at the head of the college and who will, I have no doubt, retain that college in the high position it has occupied up to the present time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman state whether he applied as heretofore to the British authorities to recommend an officer in this case?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I should not like to mislead the hon. gentleman, but I am not quite certain whether the application is made first or whether the name was suggested by the department to the Home authorities, but the Home authorities fully concurred in it. If the recommendation did not come first from the Home authorities, when the suggestion was made they fully concurred and declared that no man could be sent out to Canada, who could, with more efficiency, take charge of the Royal Military College than could Major General Cameron who is now at the head of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it within the knowledge of the hon. gentleman that the British authorities did not recommend him, but someone else in the first instance?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman had better, I think, look at his records. If I am not greatly misinformed, the British authorities did recommend someone else in the first instance, and this recommendation was at the suggestion of the hon. gentleman.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My officers confirm me in expressing the opinion I have stated. I am not aware that such is the case, but as the hon. gentleman has brought the matter up and as it is very easily verified, I will make it my duty to ascertain the fact. So far as I can recollect no name now presents itself to my memory which would lead me to suppose that any name was suggested.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Heretofore our practice, as the hon. gentleman knows, has been made to apply to the Imperial authorities, and it seems to me there has been good reason for that. All the officers actually engaged in the education of the cadets of the Royal Military College, Kingston, are actually in the Imperial service and General Oliver up to the time that he was retired was in the British service. That is correct is it not?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, sir.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. He left the service before he retired.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He practically continued in the British service up to the date that the Minister retired him.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. He was retired from the English service when he got the appointment of Major General.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The statement made to me by the General himself, and he ought to know, was that he was in the British service practically up to the time he was retired, but Major General Cameron who is now appointed is a retired officer, is he not?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When was he retired?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I cannot say; but I think it is about 18 months.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The point is this: We have the right most undoubtedly to appoint our own commandant, but the principle in the time of my hon. friend (Mr. Jones) was that the officer placed at the head of the college should be in the active service, and it appears to me there were good reasons for that. In the first place the gentlemen who are under his command are in the Imperial service, and I think none of them are on the retired list. The Minister knows that an officer who is on the retired list is to all intents and purposes out of the Imperial service. Technically he may be brought back again, but as a matter of fact he never is. It appears to me that this appointment is a departure from the custom, and for the reason which the hon. Minister gave just now I think the officer in command ought to be an officer in active service as Col. Hewett was, and as General Oliver was up to the time he was retired. I believe that we should have gentlemen in the active service at the head of this college so long as we continue to import Imperial officers as we now do for the purpose of instructing our cadets.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. As a rule I think the hon. gentleman is quite right that we should get Imperial officers from England to take charge of our college, but I should not like to lay it down as an iron rule which could never be put aside under circumstances which I can foresee would allow the setting aside of such a rule to the advantage of Canada. I can tell the hon. gentleman that there was no recommendation made from England, but if there is any official recommendation which has escaped my memory it can easily be ascertained.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No recommendation could be made in the face of the hon. gentleman's own determination not to accept it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am merely treating the point from my recollection of the fact, but I shall verify it when I can refer to the official record. In the case of Major General Cameron I can state that his appointment was endorsed, and that I received letters from officers of the Imperial service who take an interest in the Royal Military College stating that we could not have made a better selection than we did make. I can tell the hon. gentleman that since the present commandant has been in charge he has given the most ample satisfaction. He has proved himself to be economical, and it is a well known fact to most people that while he was in the Imperial service he was engaged

upon matters which required a great deal of knowledge, a great deal of study, and a great deal of tact. I may say, Sir, that Major General Cameron has displayed all the qualities that we believe are indispensable in the commandant of the Royal Military College and so far he has been doing very well indeed. I believe, as I have already stated, that we should employ gentlemen who are in the active military service, but the fact of his being retired does not exclude him from the Imperial service at all. The hon. gentleman knows well that Major General Cameron can be called out at any moment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But, practically, they are never called out.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Some are, and especially in the scientific branches of the service. The hon. gentleman will find that there are several instances where retired officers were recalled into active service at a time when their experience was considered to be of some value to the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We know that the half pay was given originally as a sort of retaining fee, but that was long, long ago, and the Minister knows that a man who retires is completely out of the service. The objection here is that a man who is put in command should be a man who has something to look to; should be a man who is in the hands of the Imperial authorities, and who expects to receive, it may be promotion from them as has been the case in one or two of the commandants of the college. I doubt if it is a prudent thing to introduce the principle that we will take men from the retired list, whether they prove competent or not. I have heard from English officers of high standing very strong expressions of opinion on that point, and particularly so, as the men who are employed in the Royal Military College are in the active service, that they should be commanded by a man who is in the active service himself. The Minister of Militia knows very well that there is not the remotest chance, humanly speaking, that Major General Cameron will return to the service again.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is not enough of him to go back again.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have nothing to say against the Major General himself, but I think the principle of putting a retired officer in the position is decidedly objectionable. I believe that it is of the utmost importance that the commandant of a college like that should be fully acquainted with all the improvements of modern war, and with all the changes that may take place and which would be known to a man on the active list. I have been informed —of course I will not put my statement against the hon. gentleman's—that that was the opinion expressed by the highest British military authorities, and that it was only under considerable pressure that they were induced to alter their opinion. Of course they would accept the recommendation of the Government of Canada in a matter that belongs to them; but bearing in mind that we have borrowed all the other officers who have any important posts in the college from the British military service, and that they were actively engaged in it, I think the departure from our previous custom is a very doubtful one.

Mr. LISTER. Has there been any addition to the annual fees payable by cadets in the college, and if so, how much?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am very glad to be given the opportunity of explaining to the House the changes which have taken place in regard to increasing the annual fee for board and instruction from $100 to $200. As it was considered that the instructions for the increase were issued at a time when 24 new cadets, who joined the college this year, might suppose they would be charged only $100, the increase will not apply to those cadets who joined this year. But I not only think that the increase is a fair one, but that by proper handling the Royal Military College can be made self-supporting, as it should be. If hon. gentlemen will refer to the military schools similar to this in France, Germany and England, they will find that a military education given in them, except in the case of those colleges which are maintained by the Government for the express purpose of training their own men, costs four or five times the amount that it costs in the Royal Military College of Canada. The cadets have very great advantages from being trained in that school. If they carry the highest points in their examination they are immediately entitled to a commission in the Imperial service, and if they do not choose to join it they can immediately find employment in the different great railway corporations and industrial establishments of Canada. Considering these advantages I think the charges are really smaller than they should be. But the increase will only be applied after the 1st of September next.

Mr. LISTER. Is the fee of $100 to be for this year only, or will it continue for the whole time of their study?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It will not apply to the twenty-four cadets.

Mr. LISTER. So that they will go through the whole course without being charged the extra fee?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the hon. the Minister of Militia was not very consistent in his explanations with regard to the appointment of the commandant. At the commencement of his observations the hon. gentleman stated very properly that it was desirable, if not necessary, that the commandant of the college should be in the active service of the Imperial Government—that owing to the constant changes which were going on from year to year, any person who had been out of the service or had been placed on half pay for any length of time, would not be up to the improvements of the day. That is a view which I think will be very generally entertained in this House. The hon. gentleman is no doubt aware that there are constant changes going on in the technical branch of the Imperial Service, which require a person taking charge of a large institution like the Royal Military College, to be *au fait* of all the last discoveries or improvements that have been made. I think the hon. gentleman will admit that if a man were to be appointed as commandant of the Military College at Woolwich, the Imperial authorities would not take a retired officer, but one in the active service. Instead of doing that, the hon. gentleman took an officer, a very valuable one I have no doubt, but one who had retired from the service eighteen months or two years previous to his appointment. The hon. gentleman departed from the principle laid down when the military college was established. It was desired by the Government of which I was a member—and for a time I was the head of that department myself—to keep that college free from political interests or considerations of all kinds, and the only way that could be done was by applying direct to the British Government to send out to us as commandants and professors men who were specially qualified for that work, and who had been assigned similar duties in the Imperial service. Under application from our Government Colonel Hewitt was sent out, and subsequently the other professors, and they were all eminently satisfactory. But it remained for the Government, under the direction of the hon. Minister of Militia, to introduce the political question into this matter, and to throw into the Royal Military College an element which I fear may impair its efficiency and the confidence of the public in it. I do not say that Major General Cameron is unsuited for his position; it would not be right for me to make such a statement. I

have no doubt he took his position from the highest rank to which he was entitled as a valuable officer of his corps, and when he arrived at a certain time he was retired. There, according to my judgment, he should have been allowed to remain, and not have been imported into this country to have been placed at the head of an institution such as the Military College. There is another reason why he should not have been placed there, and that is because he did not belong to the scientific branch of the service. As a rule, engineer officers are generally placed in that position, and on that ground alone he would have been in a measure disqualified. It is quite true that Gen. Oliver belonged to the artillery, but he had been in the college a long time under Col. Hewitt, who belonged to the engineers, and from the experience he gained under him he became competent to manage the college most satisfactorily. It is most unfortunate that the Government should have imported a man into the college whose appointment may go very far to impair the general confidence which has heretofore been felt in that very valuable institution. When that college was established, it was established for two objects: One was to educate our young men for the military service at as cheap a rate as possible, and the other was to endeavor to retain those cadets in the service of the country. I myself, during the time I was Minister of Militia, recommended the application to the Imperial Government for the grant of one commission in each branch of the services to our cadets who passed with the highest honors. It was thought that if the British Government would grant that, it would place our college on a par with Imperial institutions; but I do not think it was ever contemplated that we should educate our young men to look forward to Imperial service. A great many of these young men who went into the Imperial service in the earlier stages of the college have reflected great credit on the institution, but, from what I have heard, a good many commissions have of late years been granted to cadets who did not pass their full term of four years, some have only passed a two years' term, and in one case a cadet having passed only a one year term. If that be the case, I am afraid the reputation of our college will be seriously impaired. Again it must be observed that our object was to retain the men in the country, and we had proposed, had we remained in power, to endeavor to place them in the Civil Service, in the Department of Railways and Canals or telegraph lines or in the Inside Service here. By that means we should have had the benefit of their services here, and the advantage of being able to call on them in the event of their services ever being required. I regret the Government did not follow that course. If these cadets after passing their full term in college, take service in England it is all very well so far as they are concerned, but it is not realising the object which we had in view when that college was established. The result of the college has been satisfactory, and the college has been gaining confidence in the public from year to year; but if the Government propose to depart from the well regulated and understood system, and place there, for political considerations, their friends, they must not be surprised if they find public criticism awakened and public confidence in the usefulness of the institution impaired. It is much to be deprecated that a retired officer, who could not have taken a similar position in England, should have been appointed to the Royal Military College. It is very much to be regretted that a very serious mistake was made in that appointment. The point made by the Minister of Militia with reference to the annual increase is, I think, fair enough; but if, at the same time, the college can be made to about meet its expenses, it is what the country has a right to expect, and the country has no right to expect any more. What I am most anxious to see is that the college shall retain the position that it had eight or ten years ago, and I am afraid that it has lost this in some respects with regard to cadets who have passed out in late years. I am afraid also with respect to recent appointments its usefulness will not be increased.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken stated that I had not been quite consistent in the views I expressed. I may reciprocate that statement. The hon. gentleman tells us that he is simply objecting to the appointment of the Major General because he is a retired officer; but a moment before he stated that the appointment was altogether a political one. The hon. gentleman is such a bitter partisan himself that he sees politics everywhere, even where there is not the slightest ground for them. There were no politics in the appointment of Major General Cameron that I can understand. Major General Cameron was selected because of his reputation as an officer, and he belonged, not as the hon. gentleman stated, to an ordinary corps, but to one of the scientific corps of the Imperial Service; and when his name was suggested, it was declared by all those who knew what was required in the commandant of the Royal Military College, that we could not have possibly selected a better man. Where the politics came in, I cannot understand. Major General Cameron was in England. He did not exercise any political influence in Canada, that I am aware of, and I think the hon. gentleman will admit that my department, being a non-political one, I would not allow any consideration of that kind to have any weight in determining the selection of an officer to be put in charge of the Royal Military College. I can say that the selection has been approved by all those who are competent authorities in the matter. And Major General Cameron has been a great success ever since he has been in charge of the Royal Millitary College. I can say so from the fact that, in consequence of his having been here only for a very short time, it was necessary that his methods should be looked into as closely as possible. They have been looked into, and he fully comes up to all our expectations. The hon. gentleman tries to cast opprobrium upon the college and states that the last cadets have not been a success. With that modesty which we know characterises him, he says that the college is not so successful now as it was at the commencement. Of course, at that time the hon. gentleman was the Minister of Militia, and it is a great misfortune for Canada that he is not so still. However, we have tried to survive his loss, and we hope to keep up the college even though we are deprived of the hon. gentleman's services as Minister of Militia. He says the cadets who have left the college lately have not been a success.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I did not state that.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think the hon. gentleman has so stated.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I said that some of the cadets who had taken commissions in the Imperial service had not passed through their full terms at the college; that some had been only two years, and some only one year, and that I had information which led me to believe that they were not qualified to the same extent as those who had passed through the college before.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If the hon. gentleman had looked into the matter, he would have found why those cadets were given commissions. It was not on any application made by Canada, but, when England expected certain complications in the East, England applied to Canada for a certain number of young men to accept commissions in the Imperial service, outside of the four commissions which are annually granted to the successful cadets of the Royal Military College. England, when she expected possible complications in regard to India, applied to us for the names of, I think, ten, whom we could recommend for these commissions, and we did what was asked. Some of these have been through the Royal Military

College and others had not. It is clear that a man who had been in the college only one year could not be as efficient as one who was there for four years and had graduated from the college. It was not on the application of Canada and it was not with reference to the Military College that these commissions were given, but England applied for the names of those who would accept service, as at the time of the Crimean war when she drew upon the colonies for officers and men. Some of these have been very successful, and, when I was in England, I heard of some who had proved as successful as we could expect and had done honor to Canada and are doing very good work in the Imperial service. I think, so far as the commandant is concerned, from my experience and I speak from no other standpoint—he has been a great success, and I hope his successor will be as competent as we have found him to be.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister dwelt very little on the point of a retired officer being placed at the head of the Military College. I had nothing to say against General Cameron, and it was not from any feeling of that kind that I spoke, but I referred to the fact that he was a retired officer, and that the Minister had stated that of course it was desirable to have a person there who was in the service at the time of his appointment. Well, General Cameron was not, and in that respect the Minister was not consistent with the position he took at the commencement. Then again, he says that this name was suggested by the department and was not suggested by the Imperial Government. That was an entire departure from the system which was adopted when the college was established and which made it such a success. Of course the Imperial Government was not aware that this distinguished officer had such influential friends here, but when the suggestion was made, no doubt they readily agreed to it, it being a Canadian appointment. The Government here departed from the proper manner of appointing the head of that college, and notably in taking a person from the retired list, and that is what I object to more than anything else.

Gen. LAURIE. I wish to refer to a subject which has been touched upon, though not pursued, by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), and that is the employment of cadets after they leave the college. The returns show that 190 have gone through the college. Of that number 69 have gone into the Imperial Service, 10 into the Canadian Permanent Corps, 20 into the Civil Service or the North-West Mounted Police Force, 79 have entered civil life in Canada or out of it, besides 12 who have died. Now, it seems to me that as the college has cost the country a great deal of money, it is very desirable that the young men should be where we can lay our hands upon them, that they should not be lost in civil life, or out of the country altogether. I have taken considerable pains to find out what is done under similar circumstances in the United States. I hold in my hand a list of the engineers of the United States Army, and I have analysed that list. I have also a letter from General Deane, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, Washington, stating how the graduates are employed. He says:

"The officers are selected from the highest men each year graduated from the United States Military Academy. Upon the recommendation of the Academic Board these officers are commissioned as second lieutenants in the Corps of Engineers, and sent to the Engineers' School of Application at Willet's Point, near New York city, where they remain for two years on duty as officers of the engineers troops (sappers and miners), and under instruction as to their general duties as engineer officers. The engineering curriculum at both West Point and Willet's Point, includes a full course in civil engineering. Upon completion of the course at the Engineers' School of Application, the young officer is subject to detail as assistant on any of the works under the supervision of the Engineer Corps, and in the routine of his services as a lieutenant, he may have practical experience in all branches of civil and military engineering. By the time he reaches the grade of captain and often before, he is fitted for the charge of a district, and as the exigencies of the service permit, he is assigned to the command of a district consisting of such military and civil works as it may be advisable to group together under one officer. In the discharge of his duties as said district officer, he is entirely independent of the general officer of the line of the army, such as department and division commanders, and reports directly to the Chief Engineer; in making his disbursement whether civil or military, he is accountable to the Treasury Department through the War Department, and is not required to give bonds, no matter how large his disbursements. The officers of the Corps of Engineers have charge of (1) permanent and field defences and fortifications, torpedo defences, military maps, pontoon trains, military bridges, mining, &c., and the command of the engineer troops. (2) Improvement of rivers and harbors, for which appropriations are made annually by Congress. (3) Construction and repairs of lighthouses, light keepers' dwelling, beacons, fog signals, &c. (4) Instructors and assistant professors at the United States Military Academy. The first, second and fourth functions are exercised under the direction of the Secretary of War, and the third under that of the Secretary of the Treasury. The same officer may, and often does, exercise several of those functions at once."

By examining the list, out of 106 officers of the Engineer Corps, I find that 20 only are employed solely in military duties, 21 partially in military and partially in civil duties, 8 as instructors in Military Colleges, and no less than 57 in purely civil duties. I think it would be quite possible that these young men, after leaving college, when they can only be considered as half trained soldiers, might be attached to our permanent corps, and when they have had further training as officers they might then be passed on into the public service, I do not mean in civil branches of the service, but they might be employed under the Railway Department and under the Public Works Department. I am not finding fault with the Minister of Militia that he does not propose this, because it would cost money, and I know how difficult it is for him to obtain money; nor do I find fault with the Government, but perhaps I might find fault with the members of the House as a whole, because this would divest them of some patronage. I cannot help that. Although the members of this House may be deprived of some patronage, the public would benefit by getting a superior class of engineers for any work in which engineering is required, and at the same time these men would be under the control of the Government and would be available for active service, and be from time to time employed with our militia, giving strength to it, and making themselves useful as staff officers. I would throw out this suggestion to the House. I do think that some steps might be taken by which these young men might be retained permanently in the public service, so that the expense we have made on them should not be thrown away.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to the remarks made by the Minister of Militia as to this appointment, I do not think it is wise in him to have declared that this was not a political appointment, when every man here knows perfectly well that it was. However, that is in a Parliamentary sense, and we well understand that it was in a Parliamentary sense that the hon. gentleman is obliged to say that it was not a political appointment. My own conviction is, and has been from the time this college was established, that the only way in which we could prevent it from being used for political purposes, at any rate as regards the chief official, was to have requested the English Government to send us an officer of their own selection and in the active service, and unless this is done I have no hesitation in declaring my conviction, from a pretty ample experience of both sides of politics, that it will be made a political appointment. However, although this was a political appointment, I hope that the gentleman will discharge his duties in a satisfactory manner. I think it is a serious mistake, although I hope no evil consequence will follow. I know the British Government have, up to the present time, had a very high opinion of many of the young men who have gone from this college. I know in the particular case to which reference was made, that the British Government applied for a larger number than we could supply, of engineer officers. I think in the future interest of the college, it is rather unfortunate that so large a number were taken,

some of whom, I believe, had barely had two years service; they would have done us more credit if they had been four year men or three year men. It was a great compliment to the education that these men had received in the college, that the British Government should be willing to take them out after so short a term as two or three years. I may remark to my hon. friend beside me, that not once or twice, but at least half a score of times, I have called on the Government to do what the founders of the college intended that they should do, to put a few appointments such as he described at the disposal of the most promising of the young cadets, and I am very glad indeed to find that some other gentlemen are desirous of seeing that carried out. Now, I want to know what the hon. gentleman is going to do with this $18,000 more which he is asking for.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is merely a different way of keeping accounts. There is an increase of $18,000. The vote for 1889-90 represents a portion of the annual subscriptions and payments by cadets to the credit of the Receiver General for entrance fees, education and board, which hitherto have been credited against expenses for the Royal Military College, but which it is intended to credit in the future to the revenue of the Dominion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman state how much he receives from graduates?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The amount is $18,000, when the $200 fee applies, it will be $36,000. In coming in under the recent regulations they pay an entrance fee of $200. That is deposited in the hands of the college to meet the expense incurred by the cadets for clothing and boots.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely the hon. gentleman is in error about that.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I spoke of the increased fee which is going to be charged after this year. The additional or increased fee is $100. The present charge is $250, making the total charge $350 for the future.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt there is a great deal of force in what the hon. gentleman has said, that it is desirable we should make the college as nearly self-supporting as possible. But he will remember that in the early stages of the college, admission was fairly open to competition, and a considerable number of the best pupils were the sons of men in comparatively poor circumstances. There is this circumstance which must be remembered, namely, that by raising the fee you practically put it out of the power of any man who is not in tolerably good circumstances to send his sons there. I do not know whether, on a balance of the advantages, that may not be wise, but some of the very best graduates of the college and some of the very best officers now in the Imperial service were sons of men who certainly could not have paid $350 a year for each of them, the sum which the hon. gentleman proposes to charge.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention of the Minister to allow the 95th Battalion, Manitoba, to go into camp this season?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The matter of camping and training has not yet been considered, and I am not in a position to give an answer to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WATSON. It is very important that this battalion should go into camp as it has not been in camp since 1885, and permission has been given for the formation of another battalion in Manitoba. I do not know for what purpose that is being done. I am afraid it is for political purposes, and in order to give Major Bedson a commission. He has only got four companies yet, I believe. It would be much more in the interest of the militia force that those now enrolled should be annually drilled. It is much better to have an efficient body of 20,000 men than the present force of 37,000. This battalion was supposed to drill last summer, but unfortunately the order was countermanded and the battalion has not drilled since the year I have stated.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In regard to the subscription to the college, I would like to give the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) the exact figures as taken from the reports of the department. Annually paid for each cadet for board, clothing, books, &c., first year, $300; namely, $100 board and instruction, and $200 for clothing, &c. Each subsequent year $250, namely, $100 board and instruction, and $150 clothing, &c.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Which it is now proposed to raise to $350.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Lighthouses..... $30,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the Minister give any rough statement as to the amount required for the erection of lighthouses deemed necessary for the purpose of properly lighting our Atlantic coast, including the St. Lawrence? As regards the British Columbia coast, we cannot expect this information at present.

Mr. TUPPER. I am not in a position to make a detailed statement on that point, although, of late years, the department has not been making very heavy expenses on lights on the Atlantic coast, which coast is at present very fairly lighted. The expense in past years has been tolerably large there. With the development of commerce and changes made in the style of navigation new questions arise, such, for example, as the lighting of Halifax Harbor. That harbor has been lighted on the old style, and if a proposition, which is being actually discussed, to light the harbor so that vessels may enter any time of day or night or during a fog, were carried out a very large expense would be involved. This could be done by the introduction of electric lights, gas buoys, a series of fog alarms and so on. The hon. gentleman will see that the largest expenditure are in connection with the comparatively new districts in Algoma and British Columbia. There is an expenditures for perfecting the channel at Vancouver so as to enable the larger steamers which are expected in a short time to come there in greater numbers. The former practice was to take a vote of $48,000 a year, but last year $30,000 was taken and I propose to ask $30,000 this year. It is to be hoped that in a few years this item will not be so large.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are these several expenditures to complete in all cases, or are they renewals?

Mr. TUPPER. Some of these are revotes.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent). Can the hon. the Minister give me some information as to the amount and nature of the work on Rondeau lighthouse, in the County of Kent?

Mr. TUPPER. No extensive work is being done there, such as which necessitate calling for tenders or anything of that kind. There are only some small repairs which are suggested by Mr. Noble, the inspector.

Superintendent of Insurance..... $6,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no objection to the item itself, but I trust the Minister of Customs will inform the First Minister, whom I do not see in his place, that very possibly on Concurrence I may raise a question as to the expediency of any Minister of State being connected with insurance companies which are under the supervision of Government officers. As the First Minister is not here, I shall not say anything further about the matter now.

Mr. BOWELL. I will inform the First Minister.

Salary of Mr. Fabre and contingencies of office..... $3,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We were to have some reports on this matter?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have enquired about the reports and I am afraid we cannot lay our hands on them now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do they exist?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They exist. The Secretary of State had them, but we cannot find them now. Probably they were put under lock and key.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should think that is so.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot get them now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there any chance of enjoying the pleasure of seeing the Secretary of State in time to get the valuable documents?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think we may have the Secretary of State and the documents in the last days of the Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It will give us considerable pleasure to see him, and still more so to find that this money has been expended in the best interests of the country, and of Monsieur Fabre.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sure there will be a reciprocity of pleasure.

Mr. BOWELL moved, That item No. 196 be struck from the Estimates, and the following substituted:—

For salaries, fees, gratuities and contingencies to cullers, at Montreal, Quebec and Three Rivers, $20,000.

He said: This is in view of the reconstruction of the whole service. Last year we took a vote of $55,000, and this year we propose to ask for $54,000, but it is proposed to remodel and reconstruct the whole service, and it is anticipated that a sum of $20,000 will be sufficient.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is highly desirable it should be so. Shall we be called upon to settle any superannuation in connection with this matter?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not positive, but I think it is very likely that there will be some, particularly as this affects the older officers. I see, however, that the item says for "gratuities," which would imply that the intention was to give them certain allowances without putting them on the superannuation list.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is not in a position to state whether or not this $20,000 would cover all expenses?

Mr. BOWELL. That is the amount suggested by the Minister of Inland Revenue, who has this branch of the service in charge. He has a scheme to submit to the House and he has come to the conclusion that he will be able to cover the whole expenditure for $20,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When will you lay that scheme on the Table?

Mr. BOWELL. On Saturday or Monday next.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It should be laid on the Table before Concurrence.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is quite correct in that.

Refund of moneys paid in error on account of Judges' pensions—Judge Boswell, $688.60; Judge Gowan, $579.74 ..... $1,268.34

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How do they come to have been paid in error?

Mr. BOWELL. In the superannuation there was a miscalculation. They had been paid this amount too much, and it was deemed advisable, on representations made, that they should not be asked to refund it, and we ask the House to concur in the decision we came to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They were pretty good judges, but this is really a queer precedent you are establishing.

Mr. DENISON. Judge Boswell is a very old man, and after the judges commenced to collect this money, I suppose the Government thought it rather hard to ask them to repay it.

Mr. BOWELL. That is the fact.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is that the gentleman who was a county judge, but was too infirm for his work, and was superannuated and then placed in the Senate?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; that was Judge Gowan.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are we to understand that when a man becomes unfit for anything else, it is the policy of the Government to put him in the Senate? I must say for Mr. Gowan, however, that since he has been in the Senate, he has done some good work and made some very sensible remarks.

Elections—to pay Major J. Wilson, Collector of Customs at Sault Ste. Marie, for services as returning officer..... $50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When you turn collectors into returning officers, I think some explanation is required.

Mr. BOWELL. Major Wilson has been a returning officer in a number of elections there in the past. I understand that he acted as such previously to our coming into office, and there never has been any objection to his conduct.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It certainly is contrary to the rules of the Minister's department that a man should occupy that position.

Mr. BOWELL If the work were that of a political or municipal office. This is neither one nor the other, as he ought to be strictly impartial.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The hon. Minister does not allow any of his collectors to do any other work, and this man is charging for other work done. I think it is certainly an imprudent act on the part of the department.

Public Buildings, Quebec..... $57,288.50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this item, which includes a considerable amount of items—although I do not object to its passage just now—if any hon. gentleman who is not here desires to discuss this on Concurrence it must be fully understood that all liberties are reserved.

Mr. BOWELL. That is perfectly understood, and I will take a note of it.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2:05 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 18th April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 141) to amend the Act respecting the Rocky Mountains Park of Canada.—(Mr. Dewdney.)

Bill (No. 140) to amend the Revised Statute respecting Escapes and Rescues.—(Sir John Thompson.)

WHARF AT ST. ALPHONSE.

Mr. COUTURE (translation) asked, Whether the Government intend to use, in the next coming repairs to be done to the wharf at St. Alphonse, the timber prepared by Benjamin Simard, in accordance with the request of the Government agent in 1886? If not, why not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I must tell him that there is no proof that the timber was ordered from Benjamin Simard. Consequently, the Government think that they are free to secure what timber they may require from the quarter where they can get it most cheaply.

ST. LAWRENCE TELEGRAPH SERVICE.

Mr. COUTURE (translation) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to extend the line of telegraph on the North Shore of the River St. Lawrence? What sum will be voted this Session for that purpose?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) If the hon. member will refer to the Estimates which are before the House, he will discover the intention of the Government. As to acquainting him with the designs of the Government beyond that I cannot do so at present.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What is the total amount of goods entered for consumption in the nine months ending the 1st April, 1889, and 1888, respectively?

Mr. BOWELL. The total amount of goods entered for consumption for the nine months ending 31st March, 1888, was $73,054,443; do. for the nine months ending the 31st March, 1889, $78,246,111, which does not include, however, the importations in British Columbia or the North-West Territories, the full statement of which we have not yet received.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What is the total amount of exports, being the produce of Canada, up to the 1st day of April, 1889; also for the nine months ending 1st April, 1888?

Mr. BOWELL. The total amount of exports, the produce of Canada, for the nine months ending 31st March, 1888, was $59,790,398; for the nine months ending 31st March, 1889, $59,308,785.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Any allowance to be made for British Columbia in that?

Mr. BOWELL. No. I made that enquiry, and they said these were full.

INTEREST AND SINKING FUND—EXPENDITURE.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, In the published statement of expenditure in the *Canada Gazette* to date of 1st April, how much is charged for interest paid to said date, and how much for sinking fund account, respectively?

Mr. FOSTER. $4,676,283.40 for interest on public debt, $768,199.46 for sinking fund.

MANUSCRIPTS RESPECTING CANADA.

Mr. VANASSE asked, Whether the Government intend to order the continuance, this year, of the copying of the manuscripts respecting Canada, now lodged among the public archives of England and France?

Mr. CARLING. The matter is engaging the attention of the Government.

PRINTING BUREAU—COST.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, The entire cost of the new Printing Bureau, as follows:—1. The cost of building, including excavation, and everything connected therewith? 2. The cost of printing plant, including all machinery, printing material, fitting up, and material of every kind, freight, cartage, and every item of expenditure connected therewith, up to the 1st of April inst.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. 1. $138,586.77, down to date. 2. $165,863.95.

C. P. R CO.—SALE OF MORTGAGE BONDS.

Mr. STE. MARIE asked, When will the Government produce the report ordered on the 4th March last, by this honorable House, on the motion of Mr. Ste. Marie, concerning the sale of fifteen million dollars of mortgage bonds by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government will produce the report so soon as it has been forwarded to them by the company, who now have it in course of preparation.

BOUNDARIES OF ONTARIO.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not propose to move to-day the resolution of which I have given notice with respect to the boundaries of Ontario. I received last night a telegram from Mr. Mowat saying that the resolution is all right. My hon. friend (Mr. Mills) suggested some verbal alterations the other day, and perhaps some verbal changes may be necessary.

Mr. LAURIER. I have received a telegram from Mr. Mercier saying that he has some objections to the boundaries as proposed. Would the hon. gentleman have any objection to lay on the Table the memorial of Mr. Mercier on the subject?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have the memorial of the Committee.

CULLERS' ACT AMENDMENT.

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

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Cullers' Act and to provide that the rates and dues payable thereunder and the classification therein set forth may be changed by Order of the Governor in Council, and to make better provision respecting the reduction of the number of cullers and the annuities payable in consequence; and further, to provide that culling and measuring under the said Act shall be compulsory only in respect of square and waney timber.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would ask the Minister whether the trade has been consulted as to the proposed changes indicated in this resolution?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think I have, and the House has a pretty good idea of the feeling of the trade generally upon

this question. I have been induced to move in the direction indicated by the Bill just introduced for the inspection of timber by what I supposed to be the unanimous opinion of both sides of the House on this question, expressed very strongly during the last two Sessions, from which expression I deemed it to be my duty to consider the matter with a view to wiping out, as far as possible, the large deficiency now accruing against this branch of the service. From the petitions received and from the expressions of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House interested in the lumber trade, when the subject was before the House for discussion, I came to the conclusion that it was desirable to retain the machinery for the inspection and measurement of all classes of lumber, but to relieve the country from the charge by providing that these services may be performed and paid by fees. Hon. gentlemen will remember that when the discussion took place there was an unanimous expression of opinion on the part of hon. gentlemen, supplemented by petitions from gentlemen representing the same branch of trade in the country—I speak now of manufacturers of lumber, and those interested in saw mills—directly opposed to the proposition I made. That expression of opinion was to the effect, that the trade did not want such culling and measurement performed, and did not want to be taxed for maintaining such machinery, and did not desire to pay fees in order that the work might be done without charge to the public revenue. The delegation from the Province of Quebec were in favor of maintaining the culling of square and waney timber alone. The expression of opinion in this House by hon. gentlemen, who may be accepted as representing the lumber manufacturing interests, was in favor of culling square timber, but against the necessity of culling or measuring deals, and that class of lumber, and was strongly against any taxation on their industry for that service. The House will remember, that last night the Minister of Customs, in dealing with the question of the Estimates for this service, took a reduced vote, from $54,000 to $28,000. The intention is, to provide for the culling of square timber at Quebec, which will be very nearly self-sustaining. We provide for the retaining of the deal culler at Three Rivers, and the culler there will remain in his present condition, because the receipts of the office fully cover the expenses, and will involve no expense to the country. At Montreal and Sorel, there are two cullers, and we do not propose to remove them, because the revenue covers the expenses. The reduction will be made up in this way: At the present time, the total expense, including the cullers who have been retired under both Governments years ago, was $55,000. The charge proposed, including contingencies, salaries and retiring allowances or gratuities to those cullers for whom we must provide, will not exceed $27,000 or $28,000, and $28,000 is all I ask to pay salaries, gratuities and contingencies under the present system. There are thirty cullers on the present staff. I propose to reduce that number by eighteen, retiring that number. There is a large staff of officers in the culler's office at Quebec; where the total salaries reached $13,700. In the reorganization, I propose to cut that amount down to $6,050. I further propose to make a reduction on the contingent account, also in what are known as cullers' expenses, because the number of cullers being so largely reduced, that item will be largely reduced this year, and I think next year it will entirely disappear. So far as regards the reduction of the total expenditure, hon. members, I hope, will be satisfied that I have done my best to meet the wishes of the House, when it is remembered that the running expenses, being contingencies, salaries and rent, amounted to $48,500 out of the $54,000 asked in the estimate, and the running expenses under the readjustment will amount to only $18,000, or a reduction of $30,000, which very large reduction will, I trust, be satisfactory to hon. members.

Mr. COSTIGAN.

Mr. MITCHELL. Has this resolution any connection with the Bill which the hon. gentleman has introduced into this House in connection with the survey and measurement of timber?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think I omitted to state that that Bill would be dropped. The resolution, when adopted, will be followed by a short Bill amending the Cullers' Act, so as to give the necessary power to carry out the proposed reorganization.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is very satisfactory, because the Bill introduced was deemed in the Province from which I come, to be very objectionable, and our people were entirely against it. I am glad the hon. gentleman is about to drop it, and adopt the system of reducing the number of cullers in Quebec with a view to effecting economy.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no comment whatever to offer at this moment on the proposition of the hon. gentleman. The motive is one which will commend itself, I am sure, to the House, as it is an attempt to economise. I have only to regret that the hon. gentleman has introduced such a measure, which will surely incite a good deal of discussion at such a late period of the Session. I do not object that we should now proceed with this resolution and place the details of it before the public, but when the hon. gentleman has introduced his Bill perhaps he would consider that it would be fitting that the cullers who are interested should have an opportunity of being heard in this matter. The trade has to be considered no doubt, but persons who have been for some thirty or forty years in an office which afforded them their daily bread are sure to have some remonstrances to make if their calling is to be taken away from them.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I hope the hon. gentleman will consider that Parliament has now placed at my disposal only $28,000 to meet the expenses of this department. The hon. gentleman knows very well that if we were to consult the cullers, and the parties interested, we could never make a reduction. This is the third time that an effort has been made in this direction; once when the Government of which he was a member was in power, and since by the present Government.

Mr. LAURIER. Does not the hon. gentleman think that this would be a good reason why this measure should have been brought down earlier in the Session?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The measure was brought down, and it is now brought in response to a call that a reduction of the deficit, which existed, should be made. The cullers do not come under the Superannuation Act, but the Government thinks that these men have some claim on the country in being retired. They can earn their bread in any way they please when they have retired; and in addition to that they have $200 a year as long as they live. I think that for that class of men the allowance is as liberal as could be made by the country.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). What plan is to be followed in regard to the superannuation of the deal cullers, whom I understand are to be largely reduced in number? Are some to be selected for superannuation, and others to be left to discharge the duties of their office as at present? What is the basis of the superannuation to the deal cullers? As the leader of the Opposition has stated, these are very vital questions to the men who are to be superannuated. They have been living on the salaries which they earned, and they are not prepared for such a step as has been taken just now, at the commencement of the working season. Is it proposed to adopt a general system which will work impartially towards all the cullers? I will object most strenuously to the measure if it is intended to adopt such a system as will leave the cullers at the mercy, not of the

Government only, but of the understrappers of the Government in Quebec. I know that if this were done some would be made victims of at once, and it is of the greatest interest to know what system is to be followed as to the selection of those who are to be superannuated.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The understrappers of the Government will have nothing to do with the manner in which those cullers will be retired, as the principle has been fixed once before by his own political friends, as well as by the present Government. These men are to retire, getting for the remainder of their lives $200 a year. I will ask the hon. gentleman to consult his friends upon that side of the House as to how the selection was made when a reduction was put in force some years ago.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). That is not an answer.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think it is the best answer I can give.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I want to know what system is to be followed? Are the cullers who are to be retired to be selected at random by the Government, or is a system to be adopted which will work impartially and without unfairness to anybody?

Mr. COSTIGAN. $200 a year will be given to those who are retired.

Mr. LAURIER. Who will be retired?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Every deal culler in Quebec who is not wanted by the trade. Therefore, there will be no choice or selection, and there cannot be any favoritism.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Will there be any deal cullers kept?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not in Quebec. There will be one stave culler and eight timber cullers in Quebec, and the reduction will be made by the Government without doing injustice to any culler on account of his religion, nationality or politics. I think the hon. gentleman will say that when I made a reduction before there was no injustice done to anyone in that respect.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of the Minister to the fact that he has not given an answer to my hon. friend from Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier). As I understand, all the deal cullers are to be superannuated in Quebec, as well as five of the timber cullers. What my hon. friend wanted to know was, and I think it is a very fair question, according to what system are these five cullers to be superannuated? Are they to be selected by the Minister himself or by some system, such as their seniority, for instance. The hon. gentleman stated a moment ago, in answer to this question, that they would be dealt with fairly and that he would not take into consideration their nationality, religion, or politics.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I said they would not suffer on that account.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman is well meaning, but he will not be offended if I say that with all the confidence I have in him, I would still have greater confidence in a fixed and general rule which could be applied. Notwithstanding all the confidence which I may have in him, after all, I know very well that he will be subjected to a good deal of influence and a good deal of lobbying. Some parties will come and whisper in his ear that this one should be allowed to retire and that one to remain. If some rule were adopted on the basis of seniority, or some other basis, whereby they would all be treated impartially, the hon. gentleman would relieve himself of a good deal of difficulty.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There can be no system of selection with regard to the deal cullers at Quebec, because they all go. There will be five timber cullers retired, and we propose to make the selection of those who will remain on representation of the dealers in square timber. The men who are most competent to do the work on a small staff are the men who will be retained.

Mr. LAURIER. Who are those men?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman has a pretty good idea. I have letters from a good many of them, and shall have no difficulty in making the selection.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Who will do the culling at Quebec after this Bill passes? Is there to be no culling of deals?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There will be no culling of deals this year, as an experiment, and if after that the trade think they ought to have deal culling, then it is provided that any one of these cullers who have been retired may go and do the work for fees from the trade.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). When I was in Quebec a week ago, I met some of the cullers, and they seemed to know all about the measure now before the House, and the black sheep were already marked for superannuation. One of the cullers, who is known to be one of the best square timber cullers in Quebec, told me that his name was on the black list.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the cullers in the office at Quebec had this information, they must have extraordinary means of obtaining it, because that information was not given out of the department. There has been no action taken as to those who are to be selected for superannuation, and those to be retained. I do not think it is possible that those men could have any information at all, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that I would regret very much if I could be seriously charged with dismissing a good officer on account of his politics.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). The man I am speaking of told me that this Bill was to be introduced, and he said that there were rumors of another measure of a more sweeping character. One of the cullers gave me all the details, some of which are not in the Bill, and he told me that his name was in the black list of those to be superannuated—why, I do not know, because he is a first-rate culler.

Mr. LAURIER. By this measure I see the hon. gentleman takes preliminary steps to cut off the heads of five cullers. What does he intend to do with the rest of the staff?

Mr. COSTIGAN. When a man's office is abolished his case comes under the Superannuation Act. If the hon. gentleman followed the discussions of the last two or three Sessions, he will remember that many complaints were made of the expenditure of this branch being about $50,000 and the revenue only $15,000; and when I propose to reduce the expenses from $48,000 to $18,000, I should hope the hon. gentleman would give me his assistance in perfecting the measure.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman knows that I said I expressed no opinion on the measure. I recognise the principle of economy, but I desired to know on what principle the superannuation of the cullers would take place. At this moment I make no comment on that subject; I will wait to see the Bill.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Of the eighteen cullers whom I propose to retire, fifteen are Conservatives, and, I am informed

there are only three possible Liberals, so that there can surely be no injustice done to the Liberal element.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I see that the Minister of Inland Revenue proposes by this resolution to make the culling and measuring of square and waney timber compulsory. I do not see any objection to making the measuring of timber at Quebec compulsory; but when the timber is sold, the custom is to measure it in the raft without culling it, and then it is sold to the shippers. The shippers take it into their own booms, prepare it, classify it, and ship it under their classification to the old country. I hope the Minister does not intend by this measure to interfere in any way with the mode in which the shippers of Quebec have done their business for the last thirty or forty years. By that mode the timber, which was measured under the authority of this Act, was not required to be culled, under the same authority, for the purposes of shipping.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think the hon. gentleman need have any fear on that score. I do not understand that the culling is compulsory under the law, because the law provides that the timber shall either be measured or culled by a Government culler. It does not provide that it shall be both measured and culled.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I hope the hon. gentleman will make it perfectly clear that the timber, having been measured under the authority of this Act, for the purposes of selling, it will not be compulsory to have it assorted and classified by the Government cullers. The custom is to have the timber sorted and classified by the shippers' cullers, and each shipper has a certain classification which is known in the old country, and upon which the timber is sold. It will, therefore, be detrimental to the interests of the trade to require that the timber should be classified for shipment by the Government cullers.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I agree perfectly with the hon. gentleman, and if the Bill should bear the construction the hon. gentleman fears, it can be altered in Committee.

Mr. GILLMOR. How many cullers will be superannuated?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Eighteen, at $200 a year each.

Mr. GILLMOR. I believe the motive of the hon. the Minister to be correct, but I do not quite understand why the public should be taxed $3,600 a year to pay an indemnity to those men, for whom there is no longer any use. My own impression is that there has not been use for many of them for a good while back. I know that the cullers of timber and surveyors of lumber in the Lower Provinces consider, many of them, $200 as a good year's salary, and these men, having had a good fat berth for a long time, should not now be pensioned for life, unless the Minister can give some good reason for it. We are getting to have an army of superannuated officers in this country, and now it seems we are to recruit that army from the outside service. These men should be allowed to go as others have gone, since they have been getting a good living out of the public long enough, and their services are no longer required.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The charge on the country now for these men is $12,600, and I propose to make it $3,600, which will be reduced every year, according as these men die. The principle is not a new one. It was adopted by Parliament on three former occasions in dealing with the same class of public servants.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Have these men contributed to the superannuation fund?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No, there is no such fund in their case.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, the superannuation fund is based on the principle of contribution. Whether a good one or not, that is an intelligent principle, but in this case it is proposed to give these men so much a year simply to get rid of them.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The principle I am continuing was adopted by this Parliament on three former occasions. It was found that the staff was more than sufficient for the work, and the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite retired quite a number of cullers on a retiring allowance of $200. That principle has been recognised by both sides of the House. The whole charge to-day for the service is $54,000. Under the proposed change, the whole charge, including the running expenses of office and all other expenses, including gratuities, will be under $28,000, making a saving of $26,000, which is a very considerable economy with regard to one branch of the service.

Mr. LAURIER. No doubt the hon. gentleman is not introducing a new principle. The principle, whether right or wrong, was admitted for the first or second time in 1876, under the Mackenzie Administration.

Mr. COSTIGAN. For the second time.

Mr. LAURIER. At all events, the principle has been recognised that the timber cullers of Quebec were entitled to special treatment. In former times the lumber trade of Quebec was the principal export trade of the country. That trade gradually fell off, and it was felt that these men, some of whom were old and had no other occupation during their lifetime—it was felt that it would not be fair to them to take away their sole means of livelihood without giving them some compensation. It was decided to give them the small annuity of $200. This trade growing smaller every year, so far as I can see, the reduction now proposed is judicious, but if we are to make a reduction we should make it in the same way as we did on previous occasions.

Resolution reported.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 142) to amend the Cullers Act, chapter 103 of the Revised Statutes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE—PRINTING OF EVIDENCE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it was understood the other day across the House, that the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee was to have been printed in our Journals. I am now informed, that there is some doubt about it. My understanding was, that it was arranged across the House with the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, that that evidence should be printed in the Journals. My hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) tells me that there is some dispute in regard to that, and I think it is desirable that we should know what is to be done.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It was stated in the Printing Committee to-day, that the House would have to pass an order to have the printing done, if the House desires it. The Committee decided to print the report, but not to print the evidence until the order was given by the House to that effect.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I remember that, a few years ago, the hon. member for Leeds brought some charge against myself and an hon. member for one of the Simcoes with reference to the remission of some timber dues. The matter was referred to the Public Accounts Committee and an enquiry was made, and the charge broke down. No report was actually made by the Committee, but nevertheless the chairman sent a report to the House, and that report

with all the evidence taken, was published in the Journals, and no such rule was laid down as that which the hon. member refers to.

Mr. BOWELL. Whether the rule has ever been laid down as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) indicates or not, if he had taken the trouble to read the report of the Committee in this case, he would see that the evidence will be published in the Journals in the same manner as in the case to which he refers. If he will turn to the Votes and Proceedings of the 16th April, 1889, he will find this:

"Mr. Rykert, from the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, presented the Third Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:—

"The Committee have had under consideration the items 'Expenditure for clothing, Militia and Defence,' as set forth on Page C-190 of the Auditor General's Report for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1888; and for the information of The House submit herewith the evidence taken, and the papers referred to therein, in connection with the said items.

"(*For the evidence, etc., accompanying this Report see Appendix to the Journals, No. 2.*)"

That is pursuing precisely the same course as that which was pursued in the case to which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has referred. The remarks made by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) show that exactly the same course has been adopted which has been pursued in the past in similar cases. When a report is presented to the House, a motion is made that it be referred to the Printing Committee, and the Printing Committee have as a rule accepted the reference to them by the House as an instruction to have it printed. The reason for that has been that motions have been made in the House that certain returns be printed, and, as that implied an expenditure of public money, it has been ruled out of order by the Speaker, To avoid that difficulty, a motion of reference to the Committee has been made, and in most cases the Printing Committee has ordered the printing of the document.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Printing Committee decided otherwise to-day. This was referred to the Committee in the same way as the Minister of Customs has stated, and the Committee referred back to the House the question of having the evidence printed.

Mr. BOWELL. Of course the Committee can reject the reference if they please, but as a rule that is not done. As a rule they accept the reference as an instruction.

Mr. LISTER. The Minister of Customs states that the evidence is to be printed, and he reads the report to sustain that position. A member of the Committee states that the Committee have declared that the evidence shall not be printed unless the House orders it.

Mr. BOWELL. There is a difference between ordering the printing in the Journals and the printing for general distribution.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Committee decided to-day not to print it at all, either in the Journals or for distribution, and declared that, if it was to be printed, the House must decide it. I move that the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee be printed in the Journals.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. There is no necessity for that motion. When a report is presented, it appears in the Journals as a matter of course.

Mr. LAURIER. It will then appear after the Session is over, but we want it for immediate circulation.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. That is a different thing. Of course it will be after the Session is over when it appears in the Journals.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Committee has decided that the evidence shall not be printed at all.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. What Committee?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Printing Committee. It was referred to them.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No, they have nothing to do with it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The position the Committee took to-day was simply to say, "not printed," which is the usual course in regard to all such documents. It was not thought desirable to have it printed for distribution, but that does not prevent its going into the Journals, as the evidence in the case to which my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) referred did, but that was not printed for distribution.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I made a motion in the Committee that this should be printed in the Journals of the House, and that motion was rejected.

Mr. LISTER. The evidence is required, and we must have it. Why should it not be printed?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. That ought to have been done in the Public Accounts' Committee. That Committee should have ordered that the evidence should be printed from day to day and distributed amongst the members of the Committee. That has not been done, and I think it is very improbable that we shall get the evidence this Session. But I do not think that this report, or any other report presented to this House, goes to the Printing Committee.

An hon. MEMBER They all go there.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No; they are not referred there at all. It is only reports from evidence brought down by the Government and laid upon the Table. But this is a matter under our own concern. It is evidence taken by one of our own Committees, and they report to the House. Another Committee has no right to take cognisance of what is going on in the Public Accounts Committee, and that evidence was never properly before the Printing Committee.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If it is understood that the evidence is to be printed in the Journals, that is all that I want.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It will be printed, but not in time for discussion this Session.

Mr. BOWELL. I must say that this whole matter is quite different from what I anticipated. When I was on the Committee I enquired as to whether the evidence was printed, for I certainly understood that it was to be printed from time to time and laid before the members of the Committee to consider before it rose; and I was much surprised when I found that it had not been printed. I do not know why, as my time has been so much occupied otherwise that I could not give the matter attention. I simply asked the question and found that it was not printed, but supposed it would be reported to the House. I see no objection that it should be printed. I am quite sure it would be in the interest of the Department of Militia that it should be printed. For my part I would rather it were printed, for then the members would be able to form a correct conclusion upon the evidence.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think we have had this question several times before, and the practice has been that when the House wants a document specially printed, a motion was made that that document should be printed, and the Speaker would not put the question, but would send the motion to the Clerk, who would see that it went to the Printing Committee, and the Printing Committee would take up the matter and report to the House whether they thought the document should be printed. It appears that the Printing Committee has taken up this matter—perhaps it was not referred to them—and they have decided not to print it. When the report is made here, if we do not agree with it, we will either not adopt the report, or send

it back for the purpose of having that document printed. I do not know whether it is the desire of the House that that document should be printed. I do not think we should have an absolute rule that we cannot lay aside when necessary. We might move that this document be printed for the use of members, and that the rule be suspended, which can be done with the consent of the House. I will move to that effect.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I withdraw my motion in favor of the motion of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I submit this rule is hardly in the way at all. This rule relates to a motion being offered for the printing of papers. The Committee on Printing have to report before the question is put thereon.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That the evidence taken by the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts with regard to the items of expenditure for clothing, Militia and Defence, and reported by said Committee to this House, be printed forthwith and distributed among the members.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That does not take in all the evidence before the Public Accounts Committee. More evidence is reported than that.

Mr. MULOCK. I presume the documents and the public records that were laid before the Committee, are deemed to be evidence.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is quite clear that a motion ought to be drawn to satisfy the hon. member; then it could be put by the Chair.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand that we had, I think, two reports, if not three, from the Committee on Public Accounts, and the evidence that was taken before them was included in those reports. I thought the House wanted to have all that printed, and that is the motion I have made.

Mr. MULOCK. I desire whoever has charge of the carrying out of that motion, to understand that there are a number of documents before the Public Accounts Committee that are not referred to in the evidence of any particular witness, but yet they are very important, in my opinion, in regard to this enquiry. Therefore, if there is to be a public printing of the evidence, it should embrace the departmental reports which have been presented to the Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Were they reported?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The motion was that the evidence and the papers connected with it in regard to the enquiry concerning militia clothing, should be reported.

Mr. MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman will examine the proceedings before the Public Accounts Committee he will see that the Committee ordered the production of certain reports, letters and papers from the Department of Militia and Defence. They were produced before the Committee and have become a matter of record.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. They reported to the House that evidence had been taken and the papers referred to forwarded.

Mr. MULOCK. I have seen the papers brought down, and the document to which I have reference is not among them. The Public Accounts Committee directed that the evidence and papers before the Committee should be laid before this House. I have seen a certain number of the papers laid before the House, but I do not think that the Committee has referred to this House all the papers laid before it, and it is with respect to these missing papers that I now call the attention of the officer who has charge of the printing of the evidence.

SIR HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know the practice of lawyers or the rules of court in regard to evidence. A large number of documents were sent by the Militia Department to the Public Accounts Committee, and they certainly were not all put in as evidence. Those specially referred to were marked and filed, and these, I take it, have been brought down. Whether, when large numbers of documents are laid on the table of the Committee and not referred to, except by members of the Committee merely for examination purposes, they should form part of the evidence, I am not prepared to say; but it does seem to me that they should not.

Mr. MULOCK. We were not a Committee to arrive at any conclusion, but we were simply gathering evidence to lay before this House, and as such we secured certain documents which were submitted to the Committee, and when the Committee ordered that all the evidence, papers and documents in connection with the proceedings should be referred to the House, I consider that those particular documents to which I referred, should be sent down.

Mr. BOWELL. Were they put in and marked by the secretary?

Mr. MULOCK. It was not necessary to prove them by any witness. They came from the Department of Militia, and whether they are produced or not, I shall refer to them if I have occasion to deal with this matter at another time. I mention this fact merely for the information of other hon. members.

Mr. BOWELL. Of course, I am not trying to keep anything back, but I may say that when the hon. gentleman had the document in his hand, and thought it bore on the question before the Committee, it was marked and filed and became part of the evidence.

Mr. MULOCK. That was when I examined a witness.

Mr. BOWELL. There were a number of other documents placed on the table of the Committee which I do not think were intended to be brought down, nor do I think they should be.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps this motion will cover the ground:

That the second and third reports, with the documents laid before this House during the present Session, be printed for the use of members.

Mr. HICKEY. There are other documents which should go in if these are published. It will be a very large document to be printed.

Motion agreed to.

COMBINATIONS IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No 11) for the prevention and suppression of combinations in restraint of trade.—(Sir John Thompson.)

(In the Committee).

Mr. TISDALE. The Bill has not been distributed since it was amended, and it cannot, therefore, be proceeded with.

Mr. WALLACE (York). If the hon. gentleman will go to the post office he will find that it has been distributed.

Mr. TISDALE. I have been there, and I find it has not been distributed. I move that the Committee rise and report progress.

Committee rose and reported progress.

OCEAN STEAMSHIP SERVICE—B. C. AND AUSTRALIA.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on resolution (p. 1328) to provide for a subsidy for a fortnightly steamship service between British

Columbia and the Australian colonies and New Zealand: He said: Mr. Speaker, as there are three of these resolutions, I think it would be well for me to make a general statement before you leave the Chair, and any information outside of that may be given when the House is again in committee. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition asked yesterday that papers should be brought down as to what has been done in this matter, and I explained that negotiations were in such a state that there were very few papers that could be brought down, but that when we went into committee on the resolutions I would give as full an explanation as I could. After some consideration of the subject the Government determined, some time ago, to ask for tenders for an improved Atlantic service, and tenders were accordingly asked on the 20th July, and again on the 20th November in the year 1886. Afterwards the time for receiving these tenders was extended until 4th July, 1887, and in response to this invitation three tenders were received. I may say that the general conditions on which these tenders were invited were that the vessels should be of about the same power, the same size and the same capacity as the *Parisian* of the present mail service line, and a minimum speed was asked of 15 knots per hour. At the close of the advertisements, parties were asked to give alternative tenders for 16 knots, 17 knots and 18 knots per hour speed. One of the three tenders was from a proposed company which was not organised, and which has never since become organised, and which tendered upon the basis of a 15 knot rate of speed. The amount of their tender was, I think, $416,000. The second tender was from the Allans, who hold the present mail service between this country and Great Britain. They did not, however, put in a tender upon the specifications as called for in the advertisements, but their proposal was for a continuation of the present service with some slight modifications looking towards improvement, until the 31st March, 1889, and after the 1st April, 1889, an improved steamship service making a speed of about 17 knots an hour, for which they asked the sum of £2,000 sterling per trip, which would come to about £104,000 a year. The last tender was from the Andersons, of London, and it was on the basis of providing vessels which should have a power sufficient to drive them at a speed of 20 knots an hour; they stipulated to make the time between Rimouski and Great Britain in 140 hours *vid* Belle-Isle straits, 154 hours *vid* Cape Race, and 153 hours from Great Britain to Halifax. These tenders were not altogether satisfactory, and in the meantime the Government had altered its idea somewhat of the nature of the service and the equipment and speed which ought to be demanded in a new service, if the country were going to expend any very considerable amount of money upon it. The Government entered into still further negotiations with the two *bonâ fide* companies, the Allans and the Andersons, and a series of communications have been taking place for the last three or four months and are still proceeding. Although the negotiations are not completed the Government thinks that a probable conclusion is within sight, and therefore it asks Parliament to place it in a position to enter into a contract and requests a maximum sum of money to be placed at its disposal. This is done for the purpose of not causing any delay to the Government in entering into the contract, and for avoiding the delay which would occur if Parliament were to rise and if the matter had to be deferred until a succeeding Session. This is a plain statement of the case with reference to the Atlantic mail service.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman did not state the amount of the tender of Anderson and Company.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is £104,000, the same as the Allan's. The House will see that there is no disposition on the part of the Government to keep from it any information that is available, and it will also see that it would not be for the best interests of the conclusion that we hope to arrive at that the correspondence and negotiations, not yet completed, between the Government and those two companies, should be brought before the House at present. With reference to the service which is proposed between British Columbia and China and Japan, there is nothing to be said that has not already been stated in the House, as far as the negotiations are concerned. I think the then Minister of Finance stated last year that upon the British Government concluding to give a vote of £75,000 out of £100,000 for a fortnightly service, the Government of Canada agreed, subject to the sanction of Parliament, to give £25,000, and that if a sum of £60,000 was to be given by the Imperial Government for a monthly service to China and Japan, the Government of Canada was prepared, subject to the sanction of the House, to give a quarter of that amount. That is just the state in which negotiations with regard to this matter are. Communications have taken place between the company and the British Government, and I believe all the preliminaries have been arranged. I think we may practically say that the arrangements are made for signing the contract, and that it will very soon be done.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What company?

Mr. FOSTER. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, I think I am speaking of the China and Japan service. With reference to the proposed service between this country and the Australian colonies, hon. gentlemen who have been following this question, are probably aware that the Australian colonies have been very liberal in ocean mail steamship subsidies and that they have for a number of years past paid over $1,000,000 per year for this purpose. They have been paying for services direct by the Canal route, and they have also been carrying on a monthly service by way of San Francisco. The question of the rearrangement of these different services has come up, and negotiations are on foot at the present time with the view of obtaining, if possible, a monthly or fortnightly service with Great Britain *via* Canada, and a fortnightly or weekly service *via* the Canal; and the Government of Canada proposes to take power, in the event of these negotiations coming to a successful conclusion, to give a maximum sum of £25,000 a year for a fortnightly service or a lesser amount for a monthly service; and when the House goes into committee on that resolution, I shall ask to have it amended in that sense, empowering the Government to give for a monthly service a portion of the sum asked for, provided the fortnightly service does not materialise. So much with reference to the state of negotiations about the steamship services. I might, perhaps, say a word as to the causes which have induced the Government to endeavor to establish a more effective service on the Atlantic ocean, between Canada and Great Britain, and to assist in establishing the two services, of which I have spoken, on the Pacific coast. The present position of the Atlantic mail service is not satisfactory. Every year, as hon. gentlemen know, the number of people who go from one continent to another for the purposes of pleasure and sight-seeing is constantly increasing, and demands are constantly made for speed, and for what you may call the luxuries of travel; and that line will be the most patronised, other things being equal, which is the fastest and best equipped, and which gives the best accommodation to the travelling public. In those respects we find ourselves at a disadvantage, compared with the service of the ports to the south of us. For instance, there are magnificent lines of steamers constantly plying between New York and Europe, and making a maximum rate of about 20 knots, and the large lines making an average rate of from 16 to 18 knots; while our own service, which is

very good in some respects, is not able to make a maximum rate of more than 15 knots, I think, and an average rate of somewhere between 9 and 15 knots. The contrast is very great, and we find the results of that in two particulars—first, in the fact that the cabin passenger travel by the Canadian route is not increasing in proportion to the increase of the country, and in proportion to the general increase of travel. I have here, under my hand, a statement of the number of cabin passengers who have arrived at Quebec and Montreal from 1868 up to the present time; I will give the total number for a few years past, beginning, for instance, at 1880:

	Passengers.
1880	3,142
1881	3,538
1882	4,086
1883	3,937
1884	3,974
1885	2,744
1886	3,085
1887	3,488

If we contrast these numbers with the stream of travel which goes by New York, we will find to be true the statement I made, that passengers having a choice of route do choose that route which is the fastest and which gives the greatest accommodation for the money they pay. If we look at the list of passengers coming into New York, we will find that there are two lines which take the great mass of passenger travel. Out of a total of 86,302 cabin passengers who during the last calendar year arrived at New York, the North German Lloyd line carried 14,840 and the Cunard line 16,723. The North German Lloyd made a number of trips equal to 100, and the Cunard line a number of trips equal to 69; and an analysis of those trips will show that the Cunard line carried 242 passengers per trip, and the North German Lloyd 148 per trip. I think it will be considered that these are two of the most available lines in speed, in equipment, and in the luxuries which they afford, out of all the lines which ply to New York. We find, as I said, that our route does not offer sufficient inducements, to secure its proper proportion of the increasing number of travellers who are continually going and coming between this side and the other. When we come to mail matter, another significant fact strikes us. When I tell this House that of the letters sent from Canada to the United Kingdom, and from the United Kingdom to Canada, in 1887-88, 1,710,824 went by Canadian routes, while 3,008,206 went by United States routes, or 1,297,582 more than by the Canadian routes, hon. members will see the immense diversion of mail matter which takes place from our lines to these fast steamship lines. When you come to consider this same fact with reference to papers, there is a still greater disparity, 2,870,495 going by Canadian routes, and 6,544,021 by United States routes, an excess of 3,673,526 by United States routes. So that it seems certain that the Canadian mail steamship line is not, by equipment, by speed, and by its general condition, holding its rightful place, considering the geographical and other natural advantages which Canada possesses for the inter-oceanic travel. Those advantages are so apparent to the minds of all hon. gentlemen that it is not necessary for me to take up any time in pointing them out. But, besides the demand on that account for a better service, I think the present condition of Canada, her own best interests, her own self-respect, and her own growing importance, demands that she shall have, on that much-travelled route, which will be still more travelled year by year, a line more in consonance with the position of Canada and with the demands of modern travel. And so the Government, after carefully considering the matter, has come to the conclusion that if it is within the reasonable reach of Canada, without overburdening the financial power of the country, we shall have a service on the Atlantic equal to the best Atlantic service running to the ports to the south of us, that we also will have speedy and direct connection with the continent by way of an eligible French port, and so tap that great country and the tributary travel which would come from French ports; and it is within the bounds of all probability that such a steamship line would have the best and quickest connection with the other continental ports. Another thing that has been determined by the Government is that this new steamship service shall be distinctly a Canadian service. Heretofore we have granted subsidies to the Allan Line, and we are now paying a yearly subsidy of $126,000 to that line, their vessels having the privilege of going to an American port. That may have been necessary in the past; no doubt at first it was necessary. But I think it will strike the minds of hon. gentlemen that the time has come when, if we pay Canadian money to establish a route of this kind, the whole advantages of that route should inure to Canadian ports and to our own country, and so the Government have laid it down as a policy that whatever line be established, it shall have that characteristic and shall be a completely Canadian line in that respect. I may say, just as a slightly further development of this idea, that the steam services here proposed and outlined are, in fact, a sequence of the policy of Canada and the development of Canada during the series of past years. The completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the development of our railway system in general has had in it a larger idea, and has looked out to a wider reach than simply the benefit which would inure internally to Canada itself. When the Canadian Pacific Railway was projected and the idea was brought into practical form that we should have an uninterrupted line of communication from ocean to ocean, there was a larger idea than simply to unite the different Provinces by this channel of communication, and the development of the internal resources of the country consequent always upon the establishment of such a line of communication. It was not meant and never supposed that this line should simply begin at Halifax or St. John and end at Vancouver or New Westminster, but that it should be a highway for travel and for commerce between the old countries, the United Kingdom, and other countries contiguous to that on the other side of the water, and the old countries of the far east, between two which sections of the old world a very great development of commerce and of travel has been going on for the last fifty years and is constantly increasing. In fact, it would surprise any one who had not looked into this to take up the statistics of passenger travel between the old country and the far east by the different routes which are at present available, and to see the immense development of that travel, and the very large number of passengers that yearly come and go between these distant points. On business, touring, pleasure, or for various causes, the stream of travel is constantly increasing and is very large and important, and the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway had in it the idea of providing also a highway for this great stream of traffic and travel between the great European countries and the countries to the far east. This country occupies a unique position with reference to that trans-continental trade. If you take our ports, which, upon both sides of our country, the Atlantic and the Pacific, are of a kind which remain open the whole year round, and which are most eligible ports; if you take our coaling facilities which are unsurpassed by any country in the world for ocean service, at the termini upon the east and upon the western side of our country; if you take our temperate climate through a large portion of the travelling part of the year, and the variety which a break in the long line of communication between Europe and Asia gives, and the great variety which this break causes in passing through a new and young and growing country—all these things

put together point out this route as holding a very advantageous position for gaining its proportion of that immense stream of travel which passes between Europe and Asia and the traffic which follows in its wake. Of course there are two competing routes with the Canadian route. The one would be the Suez Canal, and the other the route *via* San Francisco. If we take the tables of distance, we will find that the nearest competitor is the route from San Francisco; and comparing the two, we will find that the route *viâ* Canada and across our part of the continent, and on to China and Japan, or to Australia, or to points in this country, has a decided advantage over the more southern route as regards distance and time. To all points north of the parallel of Boston and of Buffalo, in the United States, and in Canada, the distance by sea and by land is shorter by the Canadian route—if I may be allowed to so call it—than by the United States route which is further to the south of us. The same is true with reference to points in China and Japan. With reference to available ports in China and Japan, the distance is very largely in favor of the Canadian route over the San Francisco route, and with reference to Australasia—that great continent of islands lying in the South Pacific Ocean—taking the whole distance into account, the advantage is on the side of the Canadian route as compared with its competitor on this continent; and it is not too much to believe that with the service on the ocean equal to the more southern services, and with the service across the continent such as Canada now affords and as she will be able to afford for all years to come, and with the advantages of the route upon the Pacific Ocean, there is a very strong combination of favoring circumstances which go to point out the ultimate success of this route, established upon fair and equal conditions as to travel by ocean, over the more southern routes. I may state that, by a comparison of distances, I find that *viâ* the United States from Liverpool to New Zealand, the distance is 11,993 miles; *viâ* the Canadian Pacific Railway, the distance is 11,928 miles; and *viâ* Halifax the distance is 12,252 miles. The distance in mileage is greater *viâ* Halifax; but that is offset by the fact that a larger proportion of that mileage is by land, where, of course, the speed can be doubled, which, taken into consideration, still gives the advantage to the route *viâ* Halifax. From Liverpool to Australia is 12,780 miles by the United States route. From England to the same country by Quebec, it is 12,236 miles—a large difference, as you will see, in favor of the Quebec route—and by way of Halifax the distance is 12,560 miles, which is also considerably in favor of the Canadian route. Of course, when we come to consider China and Japan, we have the shortest Atlantic passage, we have the shortest passage across this continent, and we have the shortest Pacific Ocean route by from 200 to 400 miles, consequent upon whether the more northern or more southern route is adopted. As to the communication between British Columbia and China and Japan, for about two years past the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has had its steamers making monthly trips upon that route, and they have developed a very fair trade. They have shown the advantages of that communication to such an extent that they have practically concluded a contract with the British Government for carrying the mails through this country by that route to China and Japan. We need, however, a faster service than that which is supplied by the temporary vessels they have put on, and, with the amount which the British Government will pay and which we hope to supplement, a better and faster service will without doubt be obtained. With reference to the trade advantages which will arise from a steady, regular, and rapid mode of communication between this country and China and Japan, it is not necessary for me to occupy the time of the House. That is being practically demonstrated, and has been practically demonstrated for two years past. Our own manufacturers and merchants and business men are alive to the advantages which will accrue from that direct communication, and are taking advantage of it. What is practically demonstrated is better than any theory which might be advanced. With reference to the trade with Australia, that is something which is more in the future, having had no practical demonstration by this route so far as a direct steamship line of communication is concerned. However, by an examination of the trade which is carried on between San Francisco and other United States ports and Australia and New Zealand, we may gather a general idea of the drift of that trade. I find that, in the last fiscal year, 1887-88, the exports of the United States to Australia amounted to $9,543,474. That was a very respectable trade, and it might be of interest to the House to learn the chief items of that trade, as showing the kind of articles in which the bulk of this trade consists, and giving an indication as to whether or not they are of such a kind as could be supplied by Canada, and that in that way the commerce of Canada would be developed by our having regular means of communication. In that year, there were exported from the United States to Australia, agricultural implements, $299,490; books, $107,795; breadstuffs, other than wheat and flour, $50,500; a certain quantity of wheat and flour, about $120,000; carriages and cars, horse and railway, $358,692; chemicals and patent medicines, $334,837; clocks and watches, $127,296; cotton goods, $44,612; canned salmon, $327,180; other dried and pickled fish, a smaller amount; hardware, locks, keys, &c., $231,626; machinery not elsewhere specified, $391,004; carpenters' tools, $317,964; sewing machines, $124,626; other iron goods, $268,366; leather and leather goods, $256,006; oils of different kinds, $650,128; paper and stationery, $137,003; canned and salted meats, $22,594; tobacco, cigars and cigarettes, $1,428,762; wood, sawed, manufactured and so on, $1,440,696. These are nearly all articles which I think the Canadian trade could well take up, and, by means of direct communication with those countries, we might have a large and profitable trade carried on with Australia. Australia is situated naturally and geographically in such a position that it probably will be for all time a constant and increasing customer for certain classes of goods. It is probable that for manufactured goods of nearly all kinds Australia will have to depend largely on other countries where manufactures have been established, and will have to trade with them in exchange for raw products and the precious metals, and things of that kind. So much for the indications of probable trade between this country and Australia, as shown by the items I have read as to the trade which now takes place between the United States and Australia. I do not know that it is necessary for me to take up the time of the House to any greater extent with reference to these resolutions. As regards the amount of money which is asked, suppose the subsidies are granted and the steamship lines are established, and run to their maximum capacity, that is, fortnightly instead of monthly on the Pacific ocean, the total amount for which we would be liable would be £150,000 per annum, or we will say $750,000 in round numbers; but we must recollect that there is, to a certain extent, a set-off to this. We already pay for a service which we do not think so efficient as that which we shall have, $126,533 per year. We have been trying, somewhat spasmodically it is true, to establish a communication between this country and France, and we have been paying and are paying now $50,000 a year to a steamship company for making that communication. By an agreement between the company and the Government, that contract, which was to have run for a number of years, will be voided on the 1st July coming, and it is proposed to save that amount of $50,000 a year and to provide in this general fast line that they should make connection with a French port, and thus accomplish the object

we have in view. We have also, until this year, been paying $30,000 per annum for a service to continental ports, such as Antwerp and Hamburg. That has been discontinued, and the continental traffic will be able to make quick and close connections with the fast line, and thereby we will have a speedier means of communication with the continental ports outside of France, as well as with France, as I have stated, than we could by the slower lines of steamships which we have been subsidising to these ports.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is not contemplated, then, that the fast line shall go to a French port, but only make connections?

Mr. FOSTER. It makes a connection with a French port, and that communication it is proposed to make direct. I spoke a short time ago of the diversion of mail matter by the United States route. For that, of course, we have to pay, and the United Kingdom has to pay, and the amount that is paid does not go into our coffers, but goes into the Treasury of the United States. Now, that diversion of mail matter, of which I speak, costs to Canada and the United Kingdom $22,077 and $46,602 respectively, or the amount of $68,679. I think it is a moderate calculation to say that if we put on a service equal in every respect to the service of New York, we may count at least upon a diversion of 50 per cent. of that matter, so we will gain $34,338 by that diversion. An increased rateage is also paid by the British Government to the fast steamers plying to the port of New York. If the service here has the same speed and equipment, that increased rateage will, I think, without doubt, be paid to our fast steamers, and a calculation of what it would bring in comes to about $10,000 a year. So that the saving in the service, that we would otherwise carry on, or that we are now carrying on, the diversion of mail matter and the increased rateage for letters and newspapers, would amount to the round sum of about $250,000, which we may put as an offset to the $750,000 which the new and improved service will cost us if they are run at their maximum. That will be a charge, over and above what we lately have had, of a half million dollars per year; and to get these lines of communication at a cost not exceeding that, seems to be within the reasonable power of Canada, and to be a course which it is incumbent upon the Government to take in the best interests and the best development of this country. I am sure that when Canada has these three services established, and these lines of steamships running, we may all of us point with pride to our equipment in the way of trade facilities. With a railroad extension of over 12,000 miles spanning the continent, and running into all sections of our country, with a fast and popular line of communication on the Atlantic, with lines of communication of a superior kind stretching away from British Columbia to China, and Japan, and Australia, and with lines of communication which we hope to establish and for the establishment of which we have put an amount in the Estimates, stretching down to the tropical countries to the south of us, to the West Indies and South America,—I think when these things are accomplished and these great lines of communication are in active operation, we will have a commercial outfit and channels of trade and of travel which will be surpassed by very few countries in the world, and which will be a most essential factor in the development of this country, and of which this country may well be proud. I move that you now leave the Chair.

Mr. LAURIER. Everybody who has listened to the hon. gentleman and who has read the motion before the House, can agree with him that the subject brought to our attention is one of extreme importance. When the Government asks the House to vote such a large amount of money for mail subsidies alone, no one will deny the importance of the question involved. Therefore it is all the more necessary that the House should be in possession of the information which twice already I have asked the hon. gentleman to lay on the Table, along with all the information which the Government has in its possession regarding the negotiations which have been entered into with the different countries, some of which have already been completed, as I understand, and which were of material importance to the House in order to enable us to come to a proper decision. The hon. gentleman has not denied the importance of the demand which I made already upon two occasions, because this very day, in the preface of his remarks, in which he was very profuse as to his anticipations from the carrying out of the policy which he has presented to the House—in that preface he stated that he would give to the House all the information which the Government had in their possession upon this subject. Well, Sir, I must say to the hon. gentleman that I think he has not at all redeemed the promise which he made. He has been very chary, indeed, as I shall show presently, in imparting to the House all the information which, in my estimation, is indispensable for a proper discussion of this question. There are three propositions before the House. As to this service between this continent and Australia, I have no further remarks to make concerning the correspondence, because the Prime Minister stated yesterday that there was no correspondence, that the measure was a tentative one, and would be supplemented by further correspondence with the colonies which are asked to respond to the offer which is now made. If there is no correspondence on that subject, I have nothing more to say. But in regard to the Pacific steamship service between this continent and Japan, the hon. gentleman has told us to-day that the arrangements are completed, that the contracts are made, and that they only await the signatures of the different parties with whom the Government are negotiating. Well, Mr. Speaker, if all the papers are ready and only lack the signatures, if the contract is complete by itself, and if the Government is now in such a position that they cannot go back from their word, and that the country is engaged with these parties, what reason can they invoke why these papers should not be laid before the House? Certainly no one will deny the principle that whenever the Government ask for public money from the taxpayers of this country, the taxpayers have a right to be placed in possession of the fullest information as to the reason why they should grant these sums. I can see no reason, therefore, after the admission which has been made by the hon. gentleman, that the arrangements are all completed, why these completed arrangements should not be revealed to the House. Referring to the other subsidy, for the Atlantic service, which is by far the most important service, the hon. gentleman has told us that the Government has asked for tenders. They have asked for alternative tenders for a service of 15, 16, 17 and 18 knots. They say they have received, practically, three tenders, although one has been discarded because it has not been prosecuted, the company which made the offer not organising. The other two tenders have been made, one by the Messrs. Allan and the other by the Messrs. Anderson. The first was for a service which the hon. gentleman stated to be at about 18 knots, and the amount was £104,000 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. 17 knots.

Mr. LAURIER. Then the other tender of that Messrs. Anderson, was for a service, if I understood rightly, at something like 20 knots, for the same price, £104,000 a year. The hon. gentleman stated also that those tenders had not been found satisfactory; but he did not tell the House the reason why they were not satisfactory. The hon. gentleman made the bare statement that the tenders were not found to be satisfactory, and he said that new

negotiations were entered upon. And because the hon. gentleman did not find the tenders in answer to the demand he made to be satisfactory, new negotiations have been entered upon, and he now asks power from the House to complete those negotiations, without giving to the House the tenders which he thought should be rejected. Well, the Government are in the hands of the House and in the judgment of the House, so far as that matter goes. I have not at this moment to pronounce whether they were wise or unwise, whether they were right or wrong in rejecting those tenders which, they say, they did not find to be satisfactory, or whether it was wise or unwise to enter into new negotiations, because the House is not in possession of all the information which it should receive on that head. But the hon. gentleman will agree with me, and I hope the House at all events will agree with me, that when the Government are entering upon a new departure in the policy we have hitherto followed upon this subject, when they have asked for tenders abroad and have received tenders in answer to their demand, the House at least should be placed in possession, so far as possible, of those facts and should ascertain how far the action of the Government is judicious and ought to be supported in that behalf. New negotiations, as the hon. gentleman has said, have been entered upon, but for reasons of his own the hon. gentleman said they were not bound in the public interest to make these particulars public. Why? What reason can be given why it was in the public interest that these negotiations should not be given to the public. The hon. gentleman simply says: We asked for tenders, we did not find them satisfactory, and that is all the information the House shall have. The hon. gentleman further says that after having found these tenders not satisfactory, he set them aside and entered into negotiations, I presume, with the same parties, and if we are to believe the public press, one of those tenderers, Messrs. Anderson, have been invited to enter into these negotiations. Having said that much without giving any reasons, the hon. gentleman says: This is all the information to which the House is entitled. I must protest against the introduction of such a principle, the introduction—no, it is not the introduction—but the systematic carrying out of such a principle, because this is not the first, or the second, or the third time the Government have resorted to the same policy of refusing information to the House while asking the House to vote money, simply alleging that it is not in the public interest that they should afford it. Now, I must protest against this system; it is not in accordance with the spirit of our institutions; it is not in accordance with the proper administration of public affairs; and, as I said a few moments ago, as to the first resolution I have no further comment to offer, but when we come to the second resolution and the third resolution, I shall move that it is not expedient to enter into their consideration until the House has received that information to which it is entitled.

Motion agreed to.

House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to make an amendment to the first resolution in the line of my remarks when introducing these resolutions. I desire to propose that it be altered in this way: The resolution as it reads gives power to the Government to make a grant of £25,000 for assisting the establishment of a fortnightly steamship service between British Columbia and Australia and New Zealand. It may not be possible to get a fortnightly service. The present service by San Francisco is monthly, and I wish to have inserted a clause which will give the Government power to pay a certain proportion of that subsidy, whatever may be decided by the Government in Council, for the establishment of a monthly service, provided the fortnightly service is not established. I, therefore, move that the following words be inserted after "New Zealand":—

Or such proportion thereof as may be decided on by the Governor in Council to assist in establishing a monthly service between the same countries.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When the First Minister was discussing this matter he mentioned incidentally that a great deal of interest was felt in the undertaking by the various colonies. The Minister of Finance has not given us, I think, that information to which we are entitled and which my hon. friend asked on other points, but I suppose he can give us some idea as to what the Australian colonies are likely to contribute. He cannot, of course, state a precise sum, but I should doubt whether, over such an extended voyage as this, the sum we propose to give would be sufficient, unaided, to keep up even a monthly service. It might or it might not be sufficient. The distance is very great; and, by-the-bye, does the hon. gentleman propose to stop at any of the Pacific Islands *en route*? Is that part of the scheme?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman rather misunderstood my remarks. I said I had not personally had communication with gentlemen of standing in the different colonies; but I mentioned that the Canadian High Commissioner, in his daily communication with the Agents General of the different colonies, had had official communication with some of them on this subject, and I daresay, unofficial and private correspondence about the importance of encouraging the undertaking.

Mr. LAURIER. Unofficial, you say.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Unofficial. We are all anxious to draw the colonies together. There were conversations, and no doubt correspondence took place. I have myself had private letters from gentlemen, not to any great extent, all expressing the same desire and all being in the same direction, that of drawing all the colonies nearer together and developing trade between them. The impression conveyed to us by the High Commissioner was this: That it had been expressed in various ways, that Canada, being the largest colony as regards population, and the most important, as they said, the movement in favor of developing trade between the colonies should commence with us. As the hon. gentleman is probably aware, there has been a great desire expressed to have a cable from Canada to Australia, and with respect to that also they spoke of Canada taking the first step. This is tentative. The moment the representatives of the Australian colonies are informed that Canada has appropriated the sum mentioned in this resolution, they will at once address themselves to their different colonies in order to see whether they can make an arrangement for a fortnightly or monthly mail; and I expect and hope, although I have no positive information, but it is merely expectation, that Her Majesty's Government will also contribute towards the carriage of any mail matter which may be carried this way to or from Australia. That is precisely the position of affairs and negotiations between Australia and Canada. The hon. gentlemen asks whether there was any proposition as to stopping on the way. We have not got so far as that; it is one of the details to be worked out between the different colonies. I presume the steamers will stop somewhere on the way, perhaps for coaling purposes. Whether this line will stop at Honolulu or not has to be worked out in practice. I presume that if those San Francisco lines find it to their advantage to stop at the Sandwich Islands, a colonial line would have the same reason for making it a port of call.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will see that he is asking the House for an almost unprecedented thing when he does not mention the term of years

this contract is to run. Under such a resolution as we are now asked to pass, the First Minister might bind us for five, or ten, or fifteen or twenty years. For aught we know he may intend to give a fifty year subsidy to the steamship company which it is now proposed to establish. After our recent experience some words of limitation had better be inserted or we do not know where we may end up in these matters. I should think that, as this is a purely tentative matter, that a limited number of years should be fixed by the resolution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I should think so, too. I think it would be well to put in, for "a period not exceeding ten years." I think the first contract with the Allans was for seven or ten years."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it was for five years. There is a good deal to be said for the desirability of promoting intercourse with Australasia, and with a great deal of what the Finance Minister has said I daresay we would agree. After all, this is an experiment and we are very much in the dark indeed as to whether trade and commerce can profitably be carried on with those countries. I do not think myself that our own policy, which tends largely to increase the cost of manufactured articles, is at all calculated to enable us to deal with distant countries; however, I shall not enter into that discussion at the present moment. I think that under the circumstances we ought to limit it to five years in the first instance, unless it were found absolutely impossible to get any company to undertake it for that period. I take it for granted that it is not proposed to go on with this scheme unless the Australian colonies, collectively or individually will do something on their part. I gather that from the hon. gentleman's remarks, and still more do I gather it from the smallness of the sum named, because I do not believe that an effective service will be given without some assistance on the part of the Australian colonies. I would like to see some words of limitation inserted in this resolution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it would do to limit it to five years. The vessels will have to be very expensive, and it is a large and extended service. I do not think we could get any trustworthy company building ships to enter into a contract for less than ten years. If the hon. gentleman would consent to the proposition "not exceeding ten years," I think that is a reasonable time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that the Government ought assume all the responsibility of entering into any negociation in this matter and that the hands of the House ought not to be tied. We ought not to be asked to take a leap in the dark. We do not know what the proposition is to be; we do not know whether it would be one that the House could accept in the public interest or not, and I do not think we should be called in advance to say that we will approve of any proposition which the Government may see proper to accept and of any negotiation which they may think proper to enter into. The practice has been heretofore for the Government to enter into a contract with the steamship companies and then to submit that contract to Parliament at its next Session, and that is the English practice also. I must confess that, so far as I am concerned, I fear that the Government are asking the Parliament to take a leap in the dark. It seems to me that in any other deliberative body in the world when the Executive come down to Parliament to submit a proposition of this sort, they would give some account of the commercial interests involved, and in what way the commerce of this country would be benefitted by entering into negotiations for a plan of that sort. I listened to the Minister of Finance, and he did not state what the products of these countries were with reference to which an exchange was likely to take place with Canada. Our view at the beginning of this Session, and I have not changed my mind since, was that it was in the interest of two countries lying contiguous to trade with each other, rather than that we should take means to secure a trade at great expense between the uttermost ends of the earth. The hon. gentleman's proposition is that we are going to build up an extensive trade between this country and Australia, countries which are as far apart as they well can be, and the hon. gentleman says that the best thing to do is to incur a very great expense for the purpose of entering into this trade. Well, Sir, if there was a possibility of building up a very large trade, I would like to know how far we must contribute out of the profits that are likely to accrue from that trade, for the purpose of establishing this steam communication. It would require a very large trade indeed to pay out of its profits the expenditure that is being incurred in this way. I look upon this as a proposition to aid the Canadian Pacific Railway, which was built in advance of the public interest. It is one of the necessary outcomes of the statesmanship of the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. I do not say that this may not be in the public interest, that it may not be the choice between two evils, and that it way be the lesser evil that is likely to befall this country in consequence of the statesmanship of the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. The fact, however, remains that here is a proposition to pledge this country to the extent of three quarters of a million per year, for an enterprise which no hon. gentleman on the Government side of the House has yet indicated can be in any way commercially profitable. I suppose that it is for commercial purposes that such a grant is needed, and not for the purposes of the security of the Empire with a view to future federation. Is it a measure of defence or of commerce?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope it is not a measure of offence to my hon. friend.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not know what it may be to the people. I do not know whether the hon. gentlemen opposite, if they were putting their hands in their own pockets, would be as lavish as they have been, when the opportunity offers, of putting their hands in the pockets of the people. Certainly they have shown a great deal of magnanimity and liberality in dealing with the public funds. I would like to hear from hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches some account of the trade that is likely to be developed as a result of these subsidies. I remember that, not many years ago, the Prime Minister, in justifying the large pecuniary advantages which were being given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, assured us that by the year 1891, I think it was, we should receive back, over and above all expenses, something like $69,000,000. That prediction has not been realised, and is not likely to be. Of course the time is not up yet, and with the sort of premillenial view which the hon. gentleman takes on the subject of politics, the good time may be all just at the end of the period; but I do not know whether the hon. gentleman and his colleague the Minister of Finance have abstained from giving us any commercial predictions or any indication of the enormous advantages that the people of this country are to reap from this new enterprise, because of the failure in the other case or not; but, Sir, I do think this House would be greatly wanting in its duty to the public if it were to say—as it practically would say if it accepted this proposition without question: We are incapable of forming an opinion on the subject; it is true, the electors of this country have sent us here for the purpose of legislation, but we are not capable of legislating, and we have abdicated our functions and resigned our authority to the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches. Well, Sir, I confess that this is paying a very great compliment to a sick man—to the hon. Minister of Finance, who was

obliged to retire from the House so suddenly last evening because of his extreme illness. We are pleased to see the hon. gentleman in his place to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. Better to-day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, the hon. gentleman is better to-day; the circumstances have changed; this is a wholly different question from that which was brought up last night. This is a question which is not so offensive to the feelings of the hon. gentleman; there is much in it that is agreeable to him, because it enables him to tell us about his hopes of the future; there is a great deal in this question that is prospective, while the subject before the House last night was rather a retrospective one. I hope the hon. gentlemen, before they take any further step in this matter, will be prepared to give to the House some account of the trade which is likely to be developed by this measure, and afford to the hon. gentlemen who support the proposition an opportunity of justifying before the country the vote they are called upon to give; and time will show whether the grounds on which they proceeded were such as good sense and a careful consideration of the question would warrant.

The Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have listened with a good deal of interest to what the hon. Finance Minister had to say with regard to the subsidies to be granted, both to the fast line of steamers from Quebec to Liverpool, and to that from Vancouver to Australia. In giving a list of the articles which might compose the shipments from this continent to Australia, he mentioned a number that had been shipped from the United States to the Australian colonies within the last two years. Among those commodities I find that of farm products there were only $50,500 worth altogether. At the present time, when we are trying to extend our trade relations, I think it is highly desirable that the products of the soil should not be lost sight of. I admit the desirability of bringing closer together the colonies of Great Britain; but when we are contributing a very largely increased sum for that purpose, which is admitted by the Finance Minister to amount to $500,000 a year, I think some consideration should be given to that class of our people who are struggling with financial embarrassments, and whose annual resources have been seriously impaired by the policy inaugurated in 1879. By the proposition which he has made to the House, the Finance Minister evidently desires to secure extended markets for the surplus manufactures of this country. We do not wish for a moment, to deny the desirability of giving every encouragement to our manufacturing interests, when that can be done without increasing the burdens of the people We know very well that in some lines there has been over-production, and I daresay that is the reason why the Government have been driven to the action they are now taking. But, at the same time, we say, it is unjust and unfair to increase the burdens of the consumers and the laboring classes of this country, to the extent of $500,000 a year, for the benefit of one class. The opening up of trade with the Australian colonies is not going to be of any advantage to the farming community. The people of Australia produce about the same things as we do, and consequently our trade is not going to be of any great advantage to them, and the distance that intervenes here between the point of production and the point of shipment will add largely to the cost of transportation. So that, as far as the farming interest is concerned, there is nothing in the communication between Vancouver and Australia that will tend to improve that interest. In other respects this line may be a necessity, but I would suggest as a desirable change and one that would tend to benefit the condition of the farmers, that hon. gentlemen opposite should try to secure a permanent and fixed contract with one or two lines of steamers which would carry live cattle to the other side at a fair rate. In that case shippers will have a decided advantage which they do not enjoy at present, for it is well known that this year the freights ranged from 35s. to 55s. There being no fixed rate, whenever the markets in England improve, the steamship companies immediately raise the freights and in that way they pocket all the advantage. If an arrangement could be made by which a fixed maximum rate could be charged, that would be a step in the right direction. But here we are seeking outlets to the west and seeking closer and faster connection with the east, while we have south of us a market which if opened would be a decided advantage to the struggling classes of this country. But not one effort is made to obtain the admission of our products to that market free of toll, and we are now paying an enormous toll annually in order to obtain admission into it. Nearly a million dollars a year is paid by our farmers in the way of toll to get their barley into the United States, and a very large sum is paid on other products which cannot find a market elsewhere. Yet, while this condition of things exists, our Government are endeavoring to open up a market, not for the farmer, but for the manufacturers where their over-production can be disposed of. The Government are trying to open up connections with Australia and elsewhere in the interests of the manufacturers, while the Canadian farmers are driven to their wits' end to make both ends meet, and are moving to other portions of the continent in the hope of bettering their condition. The Government, while seeking to extend the markets of the manufacturers of this country, should make some effort to open up a better and more convenient market for the farming community than they enjoy at present, and relieve them, if possible, from this heavy toll to which they are subjected in order to obtain a market for their products right at their own door. I could not allow this resolution to pass without offering these few remarks. While I have no word of opposition to offer against the manufacturers and like to see them prosper, at the same time, when we consider the fact that the consumers of this country are now loaded down heavily in order to consume manufactured goods, the Government are forcing them to bear this additional burden in order to find for our manufacturers markets in distant lands where they may place their goods at increased prices, and add to the burdens which the National Policy already inflicts upon us. It is deplorable to think that while the people are heavily taxed not one move is made to relieve them, but everything is done to increase their burdens.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The proposal now before the Committee is one of rather novel character, and rather startling in its nature, when you come to look at the amount involved, extending over ten years, as contemplated by the Government. In view of such an important departure from the ordinary policy of the country, the Finance Minister should give to the House more definite and positive reasons than he has yet been able to assign for calling on us to pass this resolution. He should have informed us as to the nature of the trade it was intended to open up, as to the nature of the exports he expected to send to Australia as to the ports these steamers were intended to touch at, and what he expects they will bring back from Australia, as suitable to the commerce and wants of Canada. These are important points that the Committee should be placed in possession of before being called on to adopt the resolution now before it. Passing such a resolution as this merely on the general idea announced by the Minister of Finance, that there

was something big looming up in the future, without his able to give any definite idea of what that big thing being was, is rather an unbusinesslike way to enter upon an important business undertaking. Taking this vote for Australian communication on its merits, I have not yet been able to gather from the observations of the leader of the Government, or of the Minister of Finance, any *raison d'être* for this vote. The leader of the Government told us there had been certain confidential unofficial communications between the Agents General and the High Commissioner, and that he had some unofficial letters from official gentlemen, all bearing upon the future relation of the colonies and the Empire generally. Well, if this is a move in the direction of Imperial federation, or any jingo sentiment of that kind, we may as well know it at the outset, and then we can estimate it at its true merits. If, on the other hand, it is a business proposition, based on reasonable grounds, the Minister of Finance is bound to lay them fairly before the House. He has not dealt even in probabilities, so far as I have been able to follow him. He could only talk of the great possibilities of this great trade that might, under certain circumstances and eventualities, spring up. We want to know what he expects to derive from this trade. We want to know what he expects to be able to export to Australia; we want to know what he expects to bring back from Australia—what business there is, and every particular of that kind. We want to know on what he bases his views as to the possibilities or probabilities of an export trade in Canadian manufactured goods. The hon. gentleman and his Government voted down a proposition looking to closer trade relations with the United States, on the ground that the American manufacturers could come in and kill our own manufacturers at their own doors. They contended that we required our present high tariff of 30 per cent., and in some cases 50 per cent., to keep English and American manufacturers out of our own market. In the name of common sense, I would ask the hon. gentleman how he expects we are going to compete with the American and English manufacturers in another market which they will enter on the same terms as ourselves.

Mr. MILLS. Make it a slaughter market.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am afraid it would be a slaughter and not a market. I think the Finance Minister should have told us on what grounds he estimated that we were going to get any part of that trade, in a market where we shall have to compete, not only with England and the United States, but with other European countries as well. These are the real businesslike points which the House should, I think, be put in possession of before we are asked to vote this money. If it is merely on a sentimental basis, as indicated by the leader of the Government, in relation to the possibilities of uniting the colonies and the Empire, let us understand it, but if the Minister of Finance is expecting to derive any benefit to our manufactures or any trade in return, let us know that. I have not been able to understand anything of that kind from the hon. gentleman's speech, and I should be glad if he would give us all the information he can in regard to it, because otherwise the House will not be able to justify itself for passing its resolution.

Mr. McMILLAN. As a farmer representing the farming interest, I must say that if one-half the money which it is proposed to spend in subsidising steamers on certain lines, was spent with a view to obtain cheaper freights from Canada to the English market for cattle and sheep, it would prove, I believe, a greater benefit to the country than this expenditure. I shipped a lot of cattle to the English market last June at 30 shillings a head, or 35 shillings for space and insurance; but, on my last shipment in October, I had to pay 55 shillings per head or 60 shillings for space and insurance. If the Government is going to subsidise lines of steamers, I hold that the agricultural interest has the first claim upon the Government to do something on their behalf, and if something could be done of this kind, it would place us in a much better position, particularly when the people of the United States can send to the British markets and can get from 25 cents to 50 cents more per 100 lbs. live weight for cattle than we can. If the agricultural interest is going to succeed in this country, it could be very much assisted provided that only 5 shillings per head could be saved to the farmers on the amount they pay for space in these subsidised lines. I think the Government should consider this question. The farmers are the greatest taxpayers and producers in the country, and I do not see why our interests should not be taken into consideration. Instead of that, I find, on almost every occasion, instead of giving any encouragement to the farming community, the Government place impediments in our way. I have here a newspaper containing a statement which I am astonished to see, and I am sorry the Minister of Customs is not in his place to hear it. Charles James Fox states:

> "But now the farmers have a worse grievance. On April 1st I got notice of two bags of American fertiliser being at the London freight-house of the G. T. R. I sent up for it the next day, gave the man the bill showing I had paid $8 for it ($40 per ton). He is sent to the Custom House, but is sent back twelve miles with this message: 'A sample must be sent to Ottawa to be analysed before they can get at the amount of duty to be paid.' Wanting to use this fertiliser at once, I call myself at the Custom house, on April 8th, and all the satisfaction I got was that I must wait the pleasure of the Government's analyst."

I say that the large amount of $40 a ton placed on a fertiliser bore evidence on the face of it that no fraud was being attempted, and yet the Government has placed such conditions upon the importation of that article that we cannot get it in such a way as to assist us on our farms. This was evidently desired for a particular experiment, and no doubt the opportunity may have been lost. I hope the Government will see if something cannot be done to relieve the agricultural community of the large amounts we have to pay for freight in crossing the ocean, and also on the different lines of railway. Since I commenced to ship cattle, I have had freights from Seaforth to Montreal at 30s. per car, but last year I had to pay 50s. There is a combination amongst the cattle dealers, and, when they ship ten carloads, they get a rebate from the railway company, but the farmer who ships seven or eight carloads can not get any rebate. If the dealers shipped the ten carloads in one shipment, they might be entitled to a rebate, but they do not; they only ship in one or two carloads at a time as a farmer does, and I do not see why we should not have the opportunity of shipping at the same rates as they do. If we are to be successful in competing with the American farmers in the English market as far as beef cattle is concerned, we must not be put at a disadvantage by having to pay such very high rates on the railways and for freight across the ocean. I hope, therefore, that the Government, in granting subsidies to ocean steamship lines, will take that matter into consideration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think my hon. friend (Mr. McMillan) will find later on, that the Government, in their wisdom, are going to take that into consideration. Under the third resolution, they are proposing to vote $500,000 a year for a fast line service, and to take away the $126,000 which now goes to the Allan and Dominion lines. My hon. friend will find that the subsidy given to these lines, which now operates in reducing rates of freight on my hon. friend's cattle, will disappear, and that he and other farmers will have to pay more, so that he will discover that his case is being considered by the Government in that way.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If, a few years ago, a proposition had been made to add nearly a million to the annual charges on this country, it would have received more attention than

these propositions are receiving to-night, but we have been so accustomed of late years to deal with millions, that a matter of $125,000 a year appears to be nothing. I cannot assent to this proposition simply on the information which the Finance Minister has given to the House to-night. I think he should give us some information as to what he bases his opinion upon, and how he justifies this enormous outlay. He said that it was well known to everybody that there were special conditions which made Australia dependent on other countries for its supplies, and I had hoped that, when we got into Committee, he would show us what conditions there are which make Australia dependent on other countries, and especially on Canada. I do not intend to discuss this resolution now, but I hope that we may have some information given to us in Committee to enable us to discuss it on the second reading. From the silence of the hon gentleman, I fear that he intends to force this proposal through without any proper discussion. I do not think we have any right to sit here and vote half a million, or a quarter of a million, or an eighth of a million away at the mere demand of the Government. I do not think that, if hon. gentlemen were to go back to their constituents now and were asked to justify this vote of one eighth of a million, ten men in this House would be able to do it. For one, I insist that we shall have more information before we finally vote this money.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman tries to make this sum appear very large by bringing the word "million." He speaks of an eighth of a million. He might have said $125,000, but that does not sound so big. The hon. gentleman asks for more information to justify the statement that we will have an additional trade with Australia. I understand, though I was not present, that the Minister of Finance went into this matter at considerable length in order to show the different articles which Canada was calculated to supply to Australia, and we have the best means of judging whether his statement is true or not by looking at the trade which exists between San Francisco and Australasia. I take it that my hon. friend's statements were based upon the trade that has been successfully conducted by the United States, although a highly protected country; and the hon. gentleman, by the way, said that we, being a protected country, of course could not compete successfully in the Australian market with the United States. I think my hon, friend has shown that in our position, as well as, perhaps, from the fact that, from a free trade point of view, our tariff is not quite so large as that of the United States, the duties are not quite so high.

Som hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am looking at it from your point of view. My hon. friend has shown other reasons—the shortness of the distance between Liverpool and Australia, which will enable us to compete, at all events, on fair terms.

Mr. GILLMOR. Are the steamers subsidised that carry those articles from the United States to Australia?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Australian Government subsidises a line from San Francisco. The United States may do so, for all I know, but I am aware that generally they have hitherto opposed subsidising those lines since the unfortunate experiment of the Collins Line. My hon. friend has quoted the various articles that are shipped from San Francisco. We all know that Canada can produce those articles just as well as the United States and supply them just as cheaply. I may say that last year I got a very valuable paper, I do not know whether it was a tariff paper or not, from Mr. Van Horne, showing that fully 90 per cent of the articles shipped from San Francisco could be supplied on equal terms by and from Canada, and I think that information is reliable. I gathered from the remarks of the leader of the Opposition that he did not object, he could not object, the country would not allow him to object, the country would not allow us to object to any arrangement of this kind by which, at the moderate sum of one-eighth of a million, if the other colonies will join us and be as liberal in their aid, we will have a first-rate steamship line, greatly to the development of the steam industry, greatly to the development of Canadian manufactures, and showing that notwithstanding our protective tariff, Canada can compete with the United States, or with Germany, also a protective country, or with France, also a protective country, in and for the trade of our sister colonies.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has not comprehended the position I took. There are three propositions before the House. With regard to two of these, at least, as to the line between the continent and China and Japan, the Government are in possession of information, contracts, specifications, and so on; as to the other, they are also in possession of information, and I ask that this should be laid upon the Table of the House. In respect to the proposition now before the House, the hon. gentleman stated that there was no information, therefore I did not ask for any. I want to have from the Government, in respect to the other lines, all the information they can supply to us. What I complain of at this stage, is that the Government are not laying before the House all the information which we have a right to possess, or in order to a better understanding of the terms made with these lines.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The right hon. gentleman says he has come to a conclusion largely from a memorandum of Mr. Van Horne.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman urged it as one of his strong arguments why the House should assent to the proposition, that he has a memorandum from the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway pointing out that we can supply 90 per cent. of the goods that are shipped from San Francisco to Australia. That memorandum may be correct or not. It may be a statement upon which we can arrive at a conclusion, or it may not. I want to test it, I want to see it, I think the House should be put in possession of it before they are called upon to vote. We are to vote in the dark. Let us see Mr. Van Horne's statemant that we may analyse it. What percentage of the exports of Canada do we send at present to Australia? Not one half of one per cent. of our total exports. How does the hon. gentleman propose to increase it? With respect to what articles has he information that leads him to believe that we can increase our trade with Australian colonies? I understand there is a line of steamships between British Columbia and San Francisco, connecting with a line running to Australia; therefore, it is very easy, if the market will pay and the price will justify manufacturers in sending the goods now, to make some calculation as to the future. The fact that you subsidise a steamship will not put any more money into the pockets of the manufacturers who send their goods there. They have facilities almost equal now, and if they do not send now, why will they send after we pay out this eighth of a million? I want to see Mr. Van Horne's statement, and all other statements of which the Government are in possession, which justify them in asking this House to vote $125,000 a year. I do not know where this new expenditure is going to end. We were told a short time ago that we were going to enter upon an era of retrenchment and economy; it appears to me that we are going about it in a curious way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the Minister where he expects these articles to come from that we are going to send to Australia? Does he expect

them to come from Ontario and Quebec, or does he expect them to come exclusively from British Columbia?

Mr. FOSTER. It is wonderful what an amount of information my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) finds the lack of just now, what a vast amount he wants to know all at once. I suppose I could not insult my hon. friend's intelligence more than to tell him that he knew nothing about the trade of this country, that he knew nothing about the trade of the United States, that he knew nothing about the trade, or the products, or the requirements of the Australian colonies. My hon. friend knows about these, and he knows that he knows, and it would not be any information to him for me to specify the articles entering into the trade of the Australian colonies with Great Britian, with Germany, with the United States, or with other countries. My hon. friend has the trade returns of all these countries at his hand, he has also general information of what are the products and the requirements of these different countries. I do not propose to take up the time of the House by going into these markets at this late period of the Session. I took what was practically the best guide that could be taken—I took the trade of the United States, with a higher protective tariff than our own, and, therefore, from my hon. friend's point of view, laboring under greater disadvantages than Canada in conducting trade. Taking up that trade, I analysed it, and read a list of the larger items of exports from the United States to Australia. I did not read all the articles but the larger items. My hon. friend has intelligence enough to know whether these are articles that are manufactured in Canada, and in which Canada can compete with the United States in the Australian colonies. There is an Australian trade already. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) asks as to where we suppose these products will come from, whether from the older parts of Canada or from British Columbia entirely. That will entirely depend, I suppose, upon the nature of the articles and the different manufactures which are exported. To-day, I believe, some of our manufacturers have a field which they have exploited in the Australian colonies for their products, and where within two or three years they have built up a trade, under very disadvantageous circumstances, to the extent of about one third of a million dollars worth of goods in some lines of goods alone. One of these is the Massey Co, of Toronto, who have exported agricultural implements.

Mr. DAVIES (P E I.) The total exports are not half-a-million.

Mr. FOSTER. You will find exactly what they are by the Blue-books.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). $446,000 in value.

Mr. FOSTER. I have Mr. Massey's statement that he has worked up a trade in agricultural implements in that colony amounting to about $300,000, and he has done that under very disadvantageous circumstances.

Mr. LAURIER. The answer of the hon. gentleman is quite characteristic. The Government have introduced these important resolutions on the very last day of the Session, and when asked to give explanations, they say they cannot be expected, at this late period of the Session, to give explanations.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is the reason why I asked the hon. gentleman with respect to the portions of the Dominion from which he expected goods to be exported. The trade from Great Britain to Australia is conducted entirely by sea. The trade between San Francisco and Australia likewise is conducted by sea. There is next to no transhipment in either case. Any trade from the interior of Canada must be shipped over 2,500 miles of railway, which is an exceedingly serious consideration in the first place, and then there is the sea voyage. It may be that trade might be conducted in a great many articles profitably where you are close to the point of transhipment and there is no long railway journey to provide for; while, on the other hand, it might be very difficult to export goods from such points as Montreal, Ottawa and Toronto, where the goods have to pass over 2,500 or 2,700 miles of railway and then be transhipped and carried by sea. That was the reason I desired to know whether, in proposing this resolution to the Committee, the Finance Minister based his expectation on a British Columbia trade pure and simple, or to a considerable extent on a trade from old Canada. The point is one which requires more consideration than the hon. gentleman has given to it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. One would suppose from what the hon. gentleman stated that all the goods shipped from San Francisco were manufactured there, and that, therefore, there was only the water-borne carriage from San Francisco to that point. They, however, send a large supply of agricultural implements, for instance, from San Francisco; but they are not made there. They also send manufactures, cottons, woollens and mixed goods, which certainly are not manufactured there. All these goods have to pay as long a railway carriage as our people at Montreal, Almonte or Hamilton are obliged to pay, or is paid by the Massey Company of Toronto who are already doing an enormous trade, and are competing successfully with American agricultural implement manufacturers. These have all to pay the railway carriage, but American goods sent *vid* San Francisco have to do the same thing.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I utterly protest against the statement of the Finance Minister that, because he chooses to bring down an important proposition, involving the expenditure of a very large sum of public money, at a very late period of the Session, this House is bound perforce to carry it without receiving proper information. It is our duty to dissect, and discuss, and ascertain the basis of the Government's propositions, no matter how late they may be brought down. I have noticed during a good many years, that the rule is, the worse the proposition the later it is brought down; and hon. gentlemen opposite have been enabled, from a desire of members to return home after being here two or three months, to shuffle through propositions that would not bear examination if they had come down earlier. Let me examine the statement of the Minister of Finance. He told the House that he had come to the conclusion to recommend this vote on one fact, that one of the largest manufacturers exports of his manufactures alone to Australia some $300,000 or $400,000 worth. That is an important fact; but there is an important question connected with it, namely, Is it true? Do we export $300,000 or $400,000 of agricultural implements to Australia? If I take the hon. gentleman's own Blue-book, I find the total exports of manufactures of all kinds, from Canada to Australia, is of the value, not of $300,000 or $400,000, but of a paltry $132,000, including every kind and description. If we turn to agricultural implements, of which the Finance Minister says the Massey Co. export $300,000 or $400,000 in value to Australia, what do we find? We find a paltry $39,000 is exported altogether. If the Massey Co. export between $300,000 or $400,000 worth, the hon. gentleman's Blue-book is not worth the paper on which it is written and is misleading. One of two things must be true, either that the hon. gentleman came to the conclusion on false data, or that his Blue-book is entirely wrong. If he came to the conclusion that the vote was justifiable because such a trade had been established, and that it was capable of large development by placing on the route, a line of steamers, and having found that he was all wrong in his data, he should withdraw the vote. I should like to have a similar oppor-

tunity to test Mr. Van Horne's statement. Hon. gentlemen opposite should not vote blindly enormous sums of money simply because the Government ask them to do so. Hon. gentlemen have no information, and they cannot justify their vote, and I say it will be a shame and a disgrace if this vote were allowed to pass through the Committee without more information being given with regard to it.

Mr. McDONALD (Huron). I desire to place certain figures before the House with respect to our trade with Australia, especially when we are asked to vote a large sum of money for opening up a large trade relation with the Australian Colonies. The Finance Minister made a statement which shows that he is not well posted in the figures he has been using. He stated that the export trade of one manufacturing firm in Toronto, the Massey Manufacturing Company, was over $300,000 a year to Australia; but I find that the whole trade from Canada to Australia last year, 1888, was only $446,019. The whole of Ontario exported to Australia in 1888 only $132,932. If one manufacturer exported from Toronto agricultural implements to the value of $300,000, it does not appear as if the figures have been correctly given. If we look at the Trade and Navigation Returns, we find that, during the last ten years, our trade with Australia has increased very little, showing that it is almost impossible to establish trade with a country so far distant. It is impossible for the people of this country to compete on equal terms in a neutral market, such as Australia is, with other countries which have closer connections with it. We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that we cannot compete with the American manufacturers. How can we then after sending our goods several thousands of miles by land and then on a sea voyage, compete in a neutral market with American goods if we cannot compete with them on Canadian soil? In 1878 our exports to Australia were of the value of $370,723, and after ten years of Australian trade we find it has only increased by $75,296. Again, we find that nearly all the seaports represents manufactured goods sent from Canada. Out of the value of $132,932 exported from Ontario, there was a value of $131,723 represented by manufactured articles. So that if this $125,000 a year was expended, the farmers of the country have to contribute largely in that expenditure and it is an impossibility to open up in Australia a market for anything that they produce. So far as I can learn from the Trade and Navigation Returns not a single product of the Canadian farmers goes to Australia, and it is an unjustice to them to place upon their shoulders an additional burthen for the purpose of assisting and protecting the manufacturers of this country. Everyone knows that the farmers are already highly taxed for the purpose of protecting the manufacturing industries of this country, and they should not be taxed any further. The Province of Quebec has very little interest in the Australia trade, because that Province only exported goods to the value of $11,304 to Australia, and New Brunswick only exported $1,090 worth. British Columbia is the only Province interested in this trade. She exported to Australia, in 1888, $300,690, of fish $130,687, and of the products of the forest $169,836. However, of the agricultural products of British Columbia, only $220 worth were sent to Australia. We are also asked to grant a subsidy to a line of steamers between China and Japan and we were told by the Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech that, through the efforts of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the steamships which they put on this route, a large trade had been opened up with those countries. When we look at the returns of this trade we are astonished that the Minister of Finance made such a statement. The hon. gentleman was very thankful on that occasion and expressed his thanks to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the great railway they have built, and for the steamers they have placed on that line and he also thanked the energy and enterprise of the Canadian people for assisting these enterprises. We find that not a single article goes to China from the Province of Ontario, and that from that Province only $8,571 worth went to Japan. That is our whole trade in Ontario with those two countries to which it is proposed to subsidise a line of steamers at a very great expense. Quebec does not send a single dollar's worth to China and Japan, and neither does New Brunswick, nor Nova Scotia. Manitoba sends $100 worth only, and British Columbia sends $75,911 worth to China, and only $47,481 to Japan. I think it is too much to ask this country to subsidise a line of steamers to these countries at an expense nearly as large as the entire trade to these countries amounts to. In 1878 we had very few facilities for trade between China and Japan but at the present time we have the Canadian Pacific Railway across the continent and the line of steamers from Vancouver, and notwithstanding these facilities there has only been an increase of about $30,000 in our trade with these countries during the last ten years. I believe that these far distant countries do not require many articles which we produce, and we know that it is very difficult to establish a trade with a foreign country where we have to compete with the products and manufactures of other countries in neutral markets. It is my firm conviction that instead of trying to find markets in foreign countries, at the other end of the world, it would be much better, in the interests of Canada, to seek to open up trade with the markets to the south of us, which is just at our own doors. We can reach that market in a few hours, and we should avail ourselves of it, instead of opening up markets in countries thousands of miles away, and at an enormous expense. I think if the Government made a right-about-face in their policy, and tried to find a market in the United States, instead of seeking for one in Australia, it would be more in the interests of Canada, and easier and cheaper to accomplish. I believe that it is not right to impose such a burthen as this on the people of this country, when better and more lucrative markets can be found at our own doors.

Mr. PLATT. It is but natural that the members of this House should ask for all the information they can obtain when they are called on to give a vote for the very large expenditure of money which is now proposed. Thus far in the debate we have heard from the Government no reasons to sustain their proposition and nothing has been offered in support of it except their conjecture as to the results which may follow. The Minister of Finance says that he has a statement in favor of this policy from the Massey manufacturing firm. If he has that statement in his possession it would be of some interest to the House, but the statement he has made regarding that firm has been contradicted by those who ought to know. In seeking for information on this point I came across the remarks made by a prominent public man in this country, a man of high commercial standing in Canada and a leading spirit of the Toronto Board of Trade. Speaking on this subject not long ago, that gentleman made use of the following remarks in regard to the firm which the Minister of Finance has mentioned:

"The other case is that of the Massey Manufacturing Company, a company which has rare facilities for furnishing agricultural implements, of which they are such large producers.

"What has been their experience? The first venture of this large firm was the consignment of a shipment to a Government agent. The Government agent put the shipment, with all the knowledge of the facts and of the parties, into the hands of local dealers, and the expenses and charges were so excessive as literally to eat the shipment up.

"They then determined to send their own agent, who certainly found a market for their goods, but found also some twelve or fourteen American concerns competing for the trade, and this firm states in its application to the Government that they find themselves so handicapped in the excessive duty which many of the articles used in the manufacture of their goods have to pay that, in view of the great distance, the cost of postage, freight and other matters, unless these duties can be re-

moved, or a rebate equivalent to such allowance made upon their exports, they will be compelled to withdraw from the trade."

That is a statement from a gentleman who has every opportunity of knowing what the Massey firm are doing in this direction. Then in regard to another article of manufacture regarding which an experiment has been made, this gentleman goes on to say:

"In the case of furniture—the large and respectable concern, the Bowmanville Manufacturing Co.—at the invitation of the Government, sent out a shipment to the Melbourne Exhibition. The freight was paid by the Government, the local charges defrayed by the Commissioners so excellent was the work that first prizes were obtained. Under these circumstances the goods were sold and the sales realised cost price invited to send out regular consignments of goods to their market, the company expressed their readiness to do so on being advised as to the class of goods most suitable and being most likely to secure speedy sales.

"On the information being furnished, the goods were sent. The prices realised were ruinous, and on receiving returns at the end of two years or thereabout, the company withdrew from the market."

With regard to the supposed advantages that would accrue to us from having more extensive communication with Australia and the likelihood of a large trade with that country, the same gentleman says:

"In fact, the cause which led to the tardiness of the discovery of Australia that is its remoteness from the other portions of the globe must necessarily act as a bar between extended commercial relations with the Australias and Canada.

"Nature has been most profuse in the bestowment of her gifts to that country; and, as though it were in view of her being so far removed from the family of nations, has endowed her so richly that she has within herself everything that a nation requires to make it great, prosperous and independent.

"The superabundance of her gold has helped to change the value of commodities throughout the civilised world.

"Her coal and iron make her independent, so far as manufacturing is concerned, of any nation on earth. Her climate is so suited for wool-growing that if but the tenth part of her three million of square miles were but peopled, and a reasonable proportion devoted to sheep-raising, she could grow wool enough to supply the wants of the world; while the wheat fields of Southern Australia are sufficient to give food to the continent.

"Indeed, it may be affirmed that she wants nothing. Her manufactures, in some departments, have reached a perfection far, far in advance of anything we have attained in Canada. I refer especially to the manufacture of fine woollens broad and narrow, and also to the finest rugs, wraps and blankets. In these goods by far the finest exhibit at the Collindsries, equalling in perfection of coloring and excellence of finish anything which could be produced in any part of the world, were those from the woollen mills of Dunedin, in New Zealand. Almost everything which we have to offer she possesses, so that she looks upon us as lier rival in nearly all which constitutes her wealth."

I think this information neutralises all the information of a contrary character which we have had from the other side of the House; and until something more is given to support the conjecture of the hon. Minister of Finance, I do not think we will be justified in making the expenditure.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) The point which I wish to allude to is touched upon in the report which has just been read. This endeavor to cultivate a foreign trade for manufactures by a direct gift to a line of steamships, amounting to one-fourth of our total exports, to the Australasian colonies is neutralised by the action of the Government in another direction. I have protested against that action time and again, until, becoming tired of the effort, I have ceased in the last few years to say anything about it. It was pointed out to the Government when they introduced their tariff in 1879 that they were taking steps to destroy the foreign trade which we were cultivating, and which was prospering wonderfully. At the Philadelphia Exhibition of 1876, the Canadian manufactures made a very creditable exhibit. That exhibit drew the attention of the world to what we were producing, and as a result, a very large trade, comparatively, for a new trade, sprang up. But two years afterwards the Government introduced their high tariff and duties were placed on the raw material of the manufacturer, enhancing the cost of the article they produced. If the Minister of the Finance looks at the trade returns, he will find that there has been a diminution in our exports to those countries. We were told at that time by the Finance Minister that our fears were groundless, because, he said, we have devised a system of giving our manufacturers a drawback for the duties paid by them on their raw material. That would have succeeded very well if it had been carried out; but what has been the fact? From that day to this, the Government have so administered the affairs of this country that it has been impossible for our manufacturers to get the drawback. Many of the most enterprising manufacturers in the country, at great trouble and expense to themselves, had established markets in foreign countries. A firm in my own town, I dare say, has, more than any other firm in the country, made the name of Canada better known as a manufacturing country, but if you question that firm to-day, you will find that they are utterly discouraged, and are about to cease their efforts in establishing foreign markets, after spending thousands, nay tens of thousands, of dollars for that purpose. They have placed their goods in South America, in Australia, and in Europe; but they found when they went there that they had to compete against the manufactures of both the United States and Great Britain, against whom they would have been able to hold their own if they were in as favorable a position as those manufacturers in regard to their raw material. But when you tax their raw material 15, 20, 25 or 30 per cent., and then ask them to go into a foreign market and sell their goods in competition with those of other manufacturers who are not compelled to pay these duties on their raw materials, you can see what a disadvantage they labor under. If the Minister of Finance, instead of proposing to take the public funds of the country to subsidise a line of steamers to the amount of one-fourth of the entire value of our exports at the present time, would give the manufacturers fair play, not hamper them, not load them with restrictions, but enable them to get their raw material on as favorable terms as the manufacturers of other countries, they are able and ready and willing to hold their own in the markets of the world. But I charge upon the Government that from the introduction of their policy down to the present time, instead of their benefitting the manufacturers, they have hampered them, and they intend to continue their restrictions. I have heard no proposition to so administer their drawback that the manufacturers can take advantage of it; but they propose an expenditure for the aid of steamship lines which I believe will be futile as long as they administer their tariff system as they are doing. Our manufacturers ask no favors in the establishment of foreign trade; there is enterprise enough among them to open up markets for themselves; but if you persist in a system which makes their raw material cost them from 20 to 25 per cent. more than the raw material of manufacturers in other countries, notwithstanding all the subsidies you give, they will not be able to compete. I have brought these things before the House time and again, but I have ceased to do so in the last few years, because my efforts have been futile. These are facts which I know of my own knowledge; I know them also from the experience of the firm in my own town which has done so much to establish a foreign trade which has been gradually taken from them by this Government; for, from the first inception of the National Policy down to the present time, the course of the Government has been not to ease the duties, but to augment them, until finally they have become so great that this firm has not been able to compete. I submit, as an alternative proposition, save your money for your subsidised line, but carry out in good faith what you promised, that you would grant a drawback on the raw material entering into the manufactures for export. Then, no one is injured, because the goods are exported out of the country, and though you get no duty on the raw material, you encourage the export trade. With reference to the freight

rates, I do not know how you are going to improve them. The Canadian shipper can to-day avail himself of the lines of communication which are open as well as the American shipper; he can send his goods in bond; that is the way his trade has been carried on, and the only effect of this subsidy would be to compel the San Francisco line to give a lower rate of freight if, through your subsidy the British Columbia line were able, which I do not admit, to offer a lower rate. Hon. gentlemen may say that the Canadian manufacturer would derive that advantage. Certainly he would, but he would not have any advantage over his American competitor. But where you can benefit the Canadian manufacturer is to take your duty off the raw material that enters into his finished product. Then he would be on level with the foreign manufacturer; then he could hope to do a foreign trade, but until then he cannot hope to do a foreign trade of any dimension at all.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is not consistent with some of the hon. gentlemen who sit behind him. Three or four of them made the burden of their remarks that this Government was doing nothing for the farmers, but was doing everything for the manufacturers. My hon. friend from Brant makes the chief burden of his remarks a complaint against the Government, that we are not doing sufficient for the manufacturer, that, forsooth, the manufacturers ought to have their raw materials free in greater proportion, and ought to be given a better chance than they have at present. That is a little quarrel which my hon. friends opposite may fight out among themselves.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No quarrel at all.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will look at the tariff of the United States and contrast it with ours, he will find that Canada has a very generous free list; he will find that nearly one-third of the imports of Canada are on the free list, and that our free list is far greater than the list of free articles in the United States. The argument of another hon. gentleman that we cannot trade with countries profitably that are far distant, I do not think, as a proposition, will hold good at all. I think it will be found that the most profitable trade is, in a great many cases, not the trade which is done with the nearest country but that which is done with countries lying very far distant. Take for instance Great Britain. Owing to the strong competition which she meets in European countries, her trade in manufactured articles with these countries falls off relatively each year, while her most profitable trade to day is with the far distant countries of the world—countries far more distant from her than these markets are from us. Another hon. gentleman has stated that the greatest competitor we would meet in Australia would be the United States manufacturers. It is no doubt true that our people who have attempted so far to place their goods in Australia find that the competition of American manufacturers is the strongest they have to meet. But the manufacturers of the United States are no nearer to Australia than we are, in fact they are not so near, and they have not so large a free list of goods which enter into manufacturing processes as Canada has, and they have a higher protective tariff; and yet they go, according to my hon. friend, into the markets of Australia, and are our chief competitors there. I think there is an inconsistency in the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite in that respect. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) made the best of the trade returns which he holds in his hand, but I still believe the statement I made will be found correct. I think I have that statement, and I will look it up to see if it is right or not, but I feel sure it will be found true. I remember a conversation with Mr. Massey himself, going into the question thoroughly, and he detailed the expense and trouble he had been put to in the last year or two in establishing agencies for the sale of his goods. Hon. gentlemen must always recollect that the attempt to establish trade in a foreign country is a costly proceeding. It takes time to make your constituency of customers to trade with and to establish a name for your goods, and the first years of an opening trade are always the most costly; but the statement I made is this, and it will be found true, that within the last year a trade has been opened up in agricultural implements with Australia to the extent of about $300,000. My hon. friend must recollect that the Trade Returns only come up to the 1st of July of last year, and that a manufacturer, speaking to me about the matter, would have the trade year and not the fiscal year in view. My hon. friend said the people of Canada had steam communication already with Australasia; he said that there was steam communication from Victoria to San Francisco, and from San Francisco to Australasia. That is very true. There is an intermittent steam communication; but my hon. friend knows well there is a great difference between communication of that kind, which has to break bulk and transfer cargo, and communication direct from the port of shipment to the port of embarkation? It is everything in commercial transactions to have a line of communication which is not subject to the breakings of bulk and transfers of cargo with all their attendant expenses. I think my hon. friends have probably given the very best reasons why this country should endeavor to establish a direct line of communication by steamer with those countries, for the opening up of our trade, and the encouragement of our trade, for nearly all the difficulties in securing a good trade with these countries were owing mostly to the roundabout way in which our goods have to get there, and the lack of facility for regular and easy communication. With this regular and easy communication the manufacturers will be induced to open up their lines of trade, for a regular line of communication is, of course, a great thing with men who wish to open up trade with foreign countries. There is Australasia, a large and growing colony, with a population of 4,000,000 or 5,000,000, which does an enormous foreign trade in imports and exports, and that trade is carried on with European countries and the United States—with protectionist countries, as well as Free Trade Great Britain. If Canada produces large quantities of these very things that are required in Australasia, and if Canada requires those very things that are raised there, there is an opening for trade, and all it requires are facilities and enterprise, and the direction of the abilities of our mercantile world towards that market. Some of my hon. friends have shown quite strongly that they are afraid the opening up of trade with Australasia, China and Japan, would set far back the ultimate triumph of the fad to which they are particularly devoted. It may be that this will have a tendency to draw off the trade in other lines, by opening up profitable branches of commerce with these far distant countries—and profitable trade can just as well be carried on with countries far distant as with those near by. It depends upon demand and supply. It depends upon the articles that the people of a foreign country need, and that the country which is to trade with them is in a position to supply. Of course, if they are far distant from us they are very far from other manufacturers as well. And the cost of freight holds in the one case as in the other.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does not my hon. friend see where his argument lands him in talking about a fad, as he is pleased to term trade with our neighbors? If the Canadian manufacturers has to go into the Australian market and compete with the American manufacturers there, he must be able to produce as cheaply as the latter; and if he can outsell him in the Australasian market, why can he not compete with him in the American market? And when the fact stares us in the face that there are 60,000,000 of people in the States to trade with, is it not evi-

dent that that is a better and a larger market, and is it anything like a fad to advocate access to it in preference to a market with which we have only $400,000 worth of trade? Not only has the Canadian manufacturer to hold his own with the American—and if he can do that in Australia he could do it in the United States if free trade existed between this country and the United States—but he has to hold his own in the Australian and other foreign markets at a disadvantage with the American. The Finance Minister says our free list is as large as the Americans, and their duties as large as ours, but that does not touch the question. You cannot hope in all lines of goods to do a foreign trade. Great Britain has some specialties in which she can beat the world; the United States may have some, and we may have some, but as you burden your manufactures here with duties higher than are imposed upon American manufactures, you place them at that disadvantage. What my friend must consider, is the fact that a large part of the raw material required for the manufactured goods of this country which are exported to foreign countries is imported from the United States, and, therefore, there must be the amount of duty less in the United States on that raw material than there is to the Canadian manufacturers. Take boiler tubes take coal if you will, take malleable iron, take copper goods — I cannot remember all the articles, but all these things which are imported from the United States must be imported from that country because the manufacturer finds it is to his advantage to import them and pay the duty rather than to have them made at home, but the American manufacturer has that advantage over the Canadian manufacturer, and what I pointed out to the hon. gentleman was that the proposition of the Government was, at the time they introduced their policy, to give the Canadian manufacturer a drawback equal to the amount of duty which he paid on the raw material imported from the United States or any other country, but that, instead of that, they require declarations from our manufacturers which they cannot comply with. There are firms that have thousands of dollars of just claims, as I believe, against the Government in this matter, which they cannot get from the Government. Athough they have gone to the expense of tens of thousands of dollars in opening up markets in various parts of the world, they are paralysed by this system which is augmenting, and more augmenting, and still more augmenting the duties which they have to pay. That is what I pointed out to the hon. gentleman, and it is no answer to say that our free list is as large as or larger than the free list of the United States, or that their average of duties is as high or higher than ours. The point is that the large amount of raw material in this country is purchased from the United States, and, therefore, it must be that much lower in the market of the United States than it is in Canada. In order, therefore, to put our manufacturers on an equal footing with theirs, the hon. gentleman must arrange his system of drawbacks so as to allow the Canadian manufacturer to obtain that rebate which was promised. By doing that, you are doing no injustice to anyone, but you are encouraging a trade which you cannot have without that system. You are injuring no one, but are benefitting those manufacturers, and those whom they employ.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) has had his usual fling against the National Policy. He has travelled away from the question before the House, but he has relieved himself of the usual frenzy in which he indulges on every possible occasion against the National Policy. He is not content with that, but he refers to the injustice which is done to the manufacturers, and especially to those in his own city. I do not live so far away from him but that I can understand something of what is going on in the city of Brantford as well as in my own town, and I do not believe there is a place in Canada where more solid prosperity exists to-day than in the city of Brantford. If that is so, it is owing to the manufacturing industry there, and in regard to that very firm to which he referred, Harris, Son & Co., who are known throughout the country and throughout the world, it was not so very long ago that they were unknown; it was not so long ago that they went into Brantford, employing a score of men, and now I think I am within the mark when I say that they are giving employment to from 200 to 300 men or even beyond that. I have had the pleasure myself within the last two or three years of seeing a hundred farmers' teams loaded up to receive the deliveries from the agents of that firm in my own county, with a brass band at their head, in order to show off the excellence of the goods which that firm was manufacturing. That was pleasing to me, and must be pleasing to my hon. friend who resides in the city of Brantford. Now, he asks that a drawback should be granted to that firm. Apparently they are very prosperous. After having captured their own local markets, they are very wisely reaching out for foreign markets, and I think this Bill will enable them to do something to extend their trade. The hon. gentleman instead of attacking the policy of the Government in that regard, should give them credit for affording facilities for communication with foreign markets, which will enable that firm and others who are engaged in the manufacture of similar goods, and who, after securing their home market, seek to have a wider range for their products, to have an opportunity to reach those other markets. The hon. gentleman refers to the fact that many of the manufacturers of Canada are to-day compelled to go into the American markets and buy certain lines of goods, such as tubings, for use in their manufactures in this country. How is it that manufactures of tubings and other things which are needed in the manufacture of engines and boilers were finally made successful in the United States. I would ask my hon. friend whether it was not by the adoption of the policy which this Government are, in an humble way, endeavoring to follow. I admit that we are very much behind them, because the American tariff is very much higher than ours. But, when the hon. gentleman makes such a bold attack upon the National Policy, he should remember that it has been a great success in his own city, and I am rather surprised that he should make one of his great attacks upon the policy of the Government, when he remembers that. I believe that the manufacturers in the city of Brantford are prosperous to a very large degree, I believe they are prosperous very much beyond their own expectations, I believe that they are satisfied with what they have accomplished, and that they have greater hopes for the future. That is shown by the fact that they are now attempting to establish agencies not only all over this country, but also over other countries. If they have not their own market for themselves, they should have further protection, because we cannot desire better goods than those which they supply to the trade, and we cannot do better than to give employment to our own people. I do not know what the hon. gentleman wants unless it is to send our people to the American side to make these goods which we now import. If we have not sufficient protection for the manufacture of these goods here, it is time we had, and, if the hon. gentleman has any respect for the people of his own city, for the people who sent him here, instead of attacking the policy of the Government which has made the firm of Harris, Son & Co., and others who are manufacturing in that city and elsewhere, he should support the policy of the Government. As to these steamship subsidies, which is the question to be considered here to-day, I think that policy is one of the wisest which the Government has adopted this Session, and I am prepared to justify every word I say in regard to it before my constituents. The more facilities

you give to transact business not only at home but abroad, the more is the country protected and advertised, and the more probability there is for prosperity, the more opportunity there is for those enterprising men who now perhaps are confined within certain limits which they cannot go beyond. If the Government can give to these men good facilities for the development of their trade in China, in Japan, in Australia and in the West Indies, or wherever they can effect a trade and an exchange of products, I think the Government are taking a wise step and that my hon. friend should support the Government in the interest of the manufacturers he represents, instead of attacking the policy of the Administration.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It certainly is a great comfort to find that the hon. gentleman, in his speech of some length, has uttered some sane remarks. When he speaks of Brantford being a prosperous town and having enterprising manufacturers, he really has uttered sentiments that I can heartily concur in. His statements are much more nearly correct than they are sometimes. But I must remind my hon. friend that his bid for the position of Finance Minister, by showing himself more conversant with the subject than the Minister, will utterly fail, for while I have to regret that the Finance Minister had not fully grasped the situation, I think he was quite as near it as the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) who is unable to see any connection between the remarks I made and the subject under discussion. I, in my humble way, had thought that they were very pertinent, and I still think so, for the season that there was even a glimmering of the connection in the mind, even, of the hon. member for Perth, usually darkened on any subject of practical utility, when he seemed dimly to grasp the idea that there was something connected with helping our manufacturers in their export trade. I was only pointing out a way by which that desirable object could be obtained better than by granting this subsidy to those steamship lines. I think the Minister of Finance saw the point, but the hon. gentleman failed to see it. I made no attack on the National Policy, I did not desire to draw in questions that are not there. I did incidentally allude to the fact that under that policy the duties upon raw material place the manufacturer at a disadvantage. I did not advocate that the National Policy should be abandoned; I simply advocated that the Government should do what they promised to do when they introduced that policy, and that in order not to destroy the foreign trade, they should give a drawback equivalent to the amount of duty on the raw material that the manufacturers used. I may also say that my hon. friend, while he mentioned a prominent firm in that town, did not mention the firm to which I alluded. The firm to which he alludes is another firm doing an export trade, but the firm to which I allude does a very much larger trade, and has done for many years. But he is quite right in saying that there is more than one firm that does a large business. Therefore I am glad to be able to give him credit for alluding to the fact that there are men of enterprise in the city of Brantford. These men never asked for the imposition of a National Policy, they are willing to stand upon their own feet the same as others, but they do say, as manufacturers, that the Government ought to give them a drawback on the goods that they manufacture for export.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman will recollect that it is not so long since the city of Brantford began to prosper. I think if he were asked the question why, he would say at once that it is largely owing to the fact that they have had their own markets during the last two years, and that they have been able to sell to home customers. I am satisfied that if they are able to export goods, it is by reason of the facilities by which they are able to manufacture cheaply, which facilities come from the advantages of a home market.

Mr. GILLMOR. The real question before the House is whether it will be in the interest of Canada to grant a subsidy of $25,000 sterling to a steamship line running between British Columbia and Australia. I have listened to the reasons given by the ministerial advocates of this scheme, but I am not quite convinced that it is in the interest of the country to do so. I think myself that we have been doing a great deal for the great railway schemes that are now completed across the continent, we have done a great deal for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I think this scheme will increase the traffic over that line. If there is to be any increase of trade it is the Canadian Pacific Railway who will get the advantage of it. It appears to me this is a sort of completion of the great railway scheme. I so understood the First Minister in his remarks. I do not know where it has originated, I think it is a sort of speculation. I understood from the remarks, neither of the Prime Minister or the Finance Minister, that this originated with the High Commissioner, in consultation with delegates from those colonies in London, that they thought it advisable, and the Government seemed to have adopted their view. Now, the speculations of the High Commissioner in the past have not been realised; his predictions in regard to financial matters have been always very extravagant. I cannot see myself that we should be benefited by granting this subsidy to that line. I cannot see that we can increase our trade, that we can supply Australasia with the products of Canada to any extent. For those who have articles to export to that country, there is every opportunity to do so now, same as they are exported from the United States. I do not think Canada is called upon to grant any further facilities in that line. We have completed our great transcontinental railway at an expense of hundreds of millions. Our debt is large, I think it is time for us to call for a halt. I think it is manifest from the estimates that the Government had intended to begin to curtail and to economise, and I saw that with satisfaction. But it seems to me that they have been cutting off our expenditure in places where the people might be benefited, and that they are now putting it on in favor of an enterprise which cannot be of any material advantage to the large body of our people. After having completed this great railway of which we boast so much, I think the proprietors of that railway, if this scheme is going to give them a carrying trade, and there is going to be an income to them, ought embark in it themselves. Otherwise this speculation, I am afraid, will be like many other enterprises that have been started and that are not paying the people of this country. What does my hon. friend mean by giving facilities? Does he mean to charter vessels to carry cattle or manufactured articles? Those are facilities that offer themselves very readily to whoever believe that this business will pay; and can the people of this country afford to give subsidies and pay freight to enterprises that will not pay of themselves? Is that doing justice to the taxpayers of this country? I think not. The arguments urged in favor of this scheme have not convinced me that it is desirable.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would ask the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) if this National Policy which he abuses so much, has not had some material benefit upon his town of Brantford, and if it was not owing to the National Policy that a large manufacturing concern was lately located there, to which that town gave a subsidy of $30,000? I fancy the hon. gentleman supported that subsidy. I refer to the Cortland Carriage Co. No doubt it was the National Policy that induced that American concern to locate there, and also the bonus of $30,000, which the hon. no doubt assisted the town in giving. It would be inconsistent if this

Government would not, taking the cue from the course the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) pursued in his own town of subidising an American concern, subsidise a line of steamships to open up trade for our manufacturers who are starting from one end of the country to the other.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think nothing can be more clear than that the Finance Minister has brought down this proposition with the utmost possible inconsideration. It does not appear that the Minister of Finance troubled himself to become acquainted with the most ordinary details. We have had his statement, which I venture to say will prove to be utterly and wholly incorrect, that with respect to agricultural implements, a single firm has exported in the last trade year $300,000 worth to Australia. He gave the name of the firm, so there can be no possible difficulty as to ascertaining the facts. My hon. friend has called attention to the circumstance that, up to 1st July, 1888, our total exports of manufactured implements had been barely $39,000 all told. It is utterly impossible that during the remaining six months—at least I think so—any such figure as the hon. gentleman formally in his place stated to the House could have been obtained. I think it will be found that the hon. gentleman has not taken the smallest pains to acquaint himself with the possibilities, I will not say the probabilities, of this trade. I heard him just now make the statement in Australia, or Australasia, I give him the benefit of the doubt, there are 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 of people. The population is little in excess of 3,000,000, and I can give the hon. gentleman the details for every Province if he likes. I heard him state just now that the tariff we have adopted admits a number of articles free, and his intimation was that this was in favor of the farmer. Our tariff does not admit a single article which the farmers use free, except tea. I do not think there is one single article consumed by our farmers to any extent, except tea, which is allowed to be imported duty free; all the rest of the free importations are for the benefit of the manufacturers, or are settlers' goods, which no one would propose to tax. But I call the attention of the Committee strongly to the fact that the Minister of Finance has made the assertion that there was an exportation of $300,000 worth of manufactured implements to Australia in the trade year. If it is proved, as I think it will be proved, that the hon. gentleman was totally misinformed as to that fact, it is very clear indeed how much attention has been paid to this very important subject before the Government brought this resolution down to the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire not to discuss the general question of the National Policy, but to discuss our position with regard to Australia, the extent of the trade now existing, and what the commodities are. The total exports to Australia from Canada, as I take the figures from the blue book, are $455,839. Of that amount $300,473 went from British Columbia and consisted as follows: $130,637 of fish, which I presume was canned salmon, and $169,837 planks, boards and joists. The Minister of Finance will not propose to subsidise a line of steamers to carry planks, boards and joists 7,000 or 8,000 miles to Australia, and so the exports of fish and lumber may be put out of the question. What does that leave? A total value of $155,166 exported from the whole of Canada to Australia. It is now proposed to give a subsidy almost equal in amount to the total value of the goods which all Canada, outside of British Columbia, sends to those colonies. I was in the Public Accounts Committee the other day, and I heard some merchants from Toronto examined as to the amount of profit they reckon, and they put the profits at 5 per cent. Suppose we double that rate and allow 10 per cent., the conclusion is that we will be paying in subsidy about eight times the entire profits made on the total exportation to Australia. Upon this matter the hon. gentleman would not give much weight to any opinion coming from me, because I am not supposed to know much about it, I do not propose, however, to ask the Committee to give weight to my opinion as to the probablities of increasing this trade. My opinion as to the facts in the blue-books is just as good as that of anyone, but I propose on this question of trade with the Australian Colonies to call attention to the opinion of a gentleman who is probably as cabable of forming an opinion on this subject as anyone in Canada. The Senator from Toronto is the head of one of the largest mercantile houses in Canada, and he made a very able and exhaustive speech three or four weeks ago in another place, which I read with a great deal of pleasure. Among other matters he took up trade with Australia and discussed the possibility of its development. The hon. gentleman said:

"Nature has been most profuse in the bestowment of her gifts to that country; and, as though it were in view of her being so far removed from the family of nations, has endowed her so richly that she has within herself everything that a nation requires to make it great, prosperous and independent. The superabundance of her gold has helped to change the value of commodities throughout the civilised world. Her coal and iron make her independent, so far as manufacturing is concerned, of any nation on earth. Her climate is so suited for wool-growing that if but the tenth part of her three million of square miles were but peopled, and a reasonable proportion devoted to sheep-raising, she could grow wool enough to supply the wants of the world; while the wheat fields of Southern Australia are sufficient to give food to the continent."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That has been read already.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If so, I did not hear it; but I have some new matter I desire to read. The Senator continued, and I call special attention to the portion of the hon. gentleman's speech:

"Indeed, it may be affirmed that she wants nothing. Her manufactures, in some departments, have reached a perfection far, far in advance of anything we have attained in Canada. I refer especially to the manufacture of fine woollens, broad and narrow, and also to the finest rugs, wraps and blankets. In these goods by far the finest exhibit at the Collindaries, equalling in perfection of coloring and excellence of finish anything which could be produced in any part of the world, were those from the woollen mills of Dunedin, in New Zealand. Almost everything which we have to offer she possesses, so that she looks upon us as her rival in nearly all which constitutes her wealth. Coarse and cheap goods sent by steamer would be entirely out of the question; they could not by any possibility stand the heavy freight rates by sea and land. Fine goods of their own manufacture they can supply us with, and as for British goods the Australian merchants stand deservedly high in the markets of the world as men of great wealth, great ability, great uprightness, every house of note having its English house in London, in the Australian quarter of that great city. With British Columbia something might possibly be done to a limited extent in fish and lumber, but for either Ontario, Quebec or the Maritime Provinces I see but little prospect of a trade which would be at all likely to grow at any time into large proportions."

That is the opinion of the head of one of the largest mercantile houses in Canada. We have the blue-books which show the existing trade with Australia, we have this opinion which shows the prospects with regard to future trade, and we have this resolution proposing $125,000 a year as a subsidy to a steamship line to run out there in view of the possibility of developing that trade, and it is about as fatuous a policy as could be proposed to the House.

Mr. McNEILL. Notwithstanding what the Senator has said, the fact remains and has not been moved by any statement made by hon. gentlemen opposite, that our neighbors to the south of the boundary line do a trade with the Australian Colonies to the extent of something like $15,000,000 a year. That being the case, I do not see why we should not also endeavor to trade with those colonies. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) says that we cannot expect to compete with the United States in the Australian markets. That was a reasonable argument and one of the few arguments that really have been fairly addressed on the subject. He said we could not expect to compete with the United States manufacturers, because we were obliged to protect our-

selves against them. But if my hon. friend will just apply the same argument to the United States he will see that they should have never attempted to compete with British manufacturers in the Australian markets because they were obliged to protect themselves against the British manufacturers in their own markets. Notwithstanding this we find that American goods have displaced British goods to a very large extent in many lines in the Australian markets. I must say that I was much struck with the fact that the leader of the Opposition did not take this line of argument. He opened up the debate in a most moderate speech and he did not say one word, that I could gather, against our endeavoring to develop a trade with our friends in Australia. That was reserved for the gentlemen who sit beside him.

Mr. LAURIER. I merely said we had no information.

Mr. McNEILL. Quite so, but I understood that had reference to the terms of the contract rather than to matters of trade. The statement that we had no information as to the trade that could be developed in Australia seems to me most extraordinary in view of the fact that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance occupied from 10 to 15 minutes in reading a statement of the line of goods in which we might hope to develop a trade with Australia. It would seem that whenever we propose to go outside of this continent to look for trade one gentleman after another on the other side of the House is prepared to get up and object to the proposal. Last year the proposal was made that we should endeavor to develop a trade with our friends in the West Indies, and immediately one gentleman after another on the other side objected to our endeavoring to develop any such trade. To-night when a proposal of a similar kind is made, that we should endeavor to develop a trade with Australia we find exactly the same state of things occurring and we are told that what we ought to do is to look to our friends on the other side of the line and not beyond them. It seems to me that it is rather a more reasonable proposal that we should endeavor to develop trade with these who are prepared and willing to trade with us, for this proposal is that the Australian colonies should supplement this subsidy and assist in the development of that trade. It is rather a more reasonable proposal that we should endeavor to develop trade with those of our own kindred who tell us they are willing to assist us to develop that trade than that we should endeavor to force our trade upon a people who tell us that they will not trade with us unless we are prepared to trade with them on terms which would be a humiliation to this country and which the people of Canada will, I am sure, never agree to.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Finance has repeated the argument that he placed before the House last Session. He appears to have convinced himself of the very curious doctrine that there should be no trade between the nearest markets, but that the best market in the world is the one that is the most difficult to obtain access to. Last year he announced that proposition in very poetical language, as hon. gentlemen will remember, and in order to support it he pointed out how the energy of man had enabled him to overcome natural difficulties in order to force his wares into remote parts of the world. This evening he repeats that opinion. For his information I will tell him what the statistics show, having regard to some of the leading commercial countries of the world and from those statistics he will find that his theory is not sustained by the facts. Take, for instance, the nations of Europe: Germany, Norway, Italy, France, Portugal, Belgium, the Netherlands and Austria, which I think hon. gentlemen will admit, are the leading commercial countries of Europe, Great Britian excepted, Germany did 48 per cent. of her entire export trade with the countries contiguous to her borders; Norway did 48 per cent.; Italy, 56 per cent.; France, 56 per cent.; Portugal, 58 per cent.; Belgium, 56 per cent.; the Netherlands, 72 per cent. and Austria 80 per cent.; or these eight countries did, on an average, 60 per cent. of their whole foreign trade with their actual neighbors.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Many of them have no other foreign trade at all.

Mr. MULOCK. These are the principal nations of Europe, outside of England and Spain, that engage in foreign trade at all, and Spain, as appears by the returns up to the fiscal year of June, 1887, did one-third of her whole trade with France, the nation adjoining her, although, as is well known, both France and Spain are engaged in very much the same class of industries. I might point to the same state of facts on the northern portion of the American continent. Canada last year did 40 per cent. of the whole volume of her foreign trade with her nearest neighbor, in spite of the barriers that man has erected against this trade. Mexico did 60 per cent. of her whole foreign trade with the United States, and in the face of this we have the Minister still adhering to the view that it is wise to avoid the nearest market and to seek a remote foreign market. The best market in the world is the home market in any country, and when the producer can sell right around him he is getting a better market than if he goes to a distance. The home market is the best of all, and when that market has absorbed all it can absorb then, adhering to that doctrine the next nearest customer is the best customer that we can get. However, by this proposition now before the House, the Government propose to skip over our nearest neighbor and to subsidise steamships to establish trade in far distant parts of the world. I should rejoice to see trade established in any part of the world, provided that it is a profitable trade. I learned from remarks which have fallen from hon. gentlemen that Australasia last year imported from the United States $9,666,000 worth of goods, and from Canada $446,000 worth. It is apparently admitted that the gross imports of Australasia from Canada and the United States last year were $10,114,435 worth of goods. Now, assuming that we did get our *per capita* portion of that trade, Canada would be entitled to $722,500. I cannot see any reason for assuming that Canada will get any larger proportion of the trade with Australasia than her population bears to the population of the United States. If that be the case, we shall only get $722,450 worth of trade with Australasia. We export at present to Australasia $446,000 worth, so that by the increased facilities which are sought for we shall simply increase our trade by the sum of $276,450. In other words, the House is asked to vote $125,000 a year in order to gain an increased trade of $276,000, or to pay about 50 cents for every dollar's worth of increased trade with Australasia; and you take that $125,000 out of the pockets of the people of Canada; you tax the farming community whom you do not benefit, and tax them in order to benefit the manufacturers. The Minister of Finance cites two witnesses; but the examination of them is not very thorough. He tells us that he is basing his argument upon the evidence of Mr. Van Horne and Mr. Massey. So far as Mr. Van Horne's statement is concerned, we can hardly accept it as conclusive, because we have not yet been favored with any particulars regarding it. The Minister of Finance is the responsible person, and I am surprised that he should tell us that the real Minance of Finance is the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He has told us in plain language now, that this is a grant for the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I thought we had done the last for that company; I thought, when we dealt with them last year, we had given the last public money towards the Canadian Pacific Railway that we would be asked to give. I am aware that this year there was an attempt made to extract some more money for the company. Perhaps this is part of the arrangement by which they are to complete

the link between Harvey and Moncton; perhaps this has something to do with that.

Mr. FOSTER. That is it.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I think the proper thing would be for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to take their seats on the Treasury benches, and then they could be held responsible. But I cannot accept the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as the responsible party; I have a high respect for his business ability, but I think we must hold the Government of the day responsible. The hon. Minister of Finance also cites Mr. Massey. I remember a letter from Mr. Massey which was published last year, in which—I speak from memory—referring to the increased duty on iron, he said it was going to cost him in the course of manufacture, $30,000 a year, and he demanded larger markets for his wares, and if I remember rightly the market he demanded was the United States.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. MULOCK. I think that was the tenor of his letter to the press, and I think he put himself side by side with a number of prominent Conservatives, Mr. A. H. Campbell and others, in demanding reciprocity with the United States; and they said that with the advanced policy of the Administration of taxing iron, the raw material of the manufacturers, they would crush them out of trade altogether, and they demanded increased markets. We have it that this movement is a consequence of the unwise action of the Administration a couple of years ago in increasing the burdens of the manufacturers by taxing their raw material to an enormous extent by their iron duties; I think I would not be over the mark in saying that it amounted to $14 a ton. You are again asking the consumers of Canada to put their hands into their pockets and pay $125,000 a year, in order to provide markets for the people whom you have already helped by your tariff. The burden of this additional expenditure is going to fall on the farmers and on the non-producing classes, and it may as well be understood that it is another intensification of the policy of the present Administration.

Mr. FOSTER. A good word.

Mr. MULOCK. It is applicable, I think. It is further increasing the burdens of the people; and although hon. gentlemen opposite deem it a remedy, it is only an aggravation of the existing evil. Under those circumstances, I think the House would not be justified in adding $125,000 a year to the burdens of the people of Canada merely to obtain $276,000 of additional export trade. If there is to be anything done in that way, let us have, as the hon. member for South Brant says, a bounty system, and thus relieve the manufacturers of the tax on their raw material.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mine is not a bounty, but a drawback.

Mr. MULOCK. Very well, a drawback, and this $125,000 would provide a drawback on a million dollars worth of goods, or half a million dollars worth at any rate.

Resolution reported.

STEAMSHIP SERVICE—B. C. AND CHINA AND JAPAN.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider resolution (p. 1329) to provide for a subsidy for a fortnightly steamship service between British Columbia and China and Japan.

Mr. LAURIER. As I intimated this afternoon, this resolution stands on a little different footing from the one we have just considered. On the other resolution, the Government informed us beforehand that no information was in their possession, and that no correspondence had taken place on the subject. On this resolution, however, the Government have informed us that not only are they in possession of information, but that a contract has actually been entered into between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway to carry on this service. The contract is complete, but it only lacks the signatures of the parties. Under such circumstances, I deem that the Government cannot properly refuse to lay this information before the House, and, therefore, I move:

That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that the question of granting a subsidy for a steamship service between France and Japan be postponed until the Government has laid before the House all correspondence exchanged with the Government of Great Britain and Ireland on the subject, and also all correspondence with the Canadian Pacific Railway or other companies, and the agreements entered into with any such companies, if any there are, in relation to the said service.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend misunderstands me if he understood me to say there was a contract completed between this Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway for that service. I did not say so. What I said was, that the British Government had entered into negotiations with the company for the carriage of mails over their railway from the terminus on this side to Yokohama and Shanghai, in China and Japan, and that the negotiations had gone so far that they were practically concluded, although the contract was not signed. So far as the Canadian Government is concerned my hon. friend knows all that is publicly known about that. I mentioned that the British Government intimated they would give £75,000 out of £100,000, if the Canadian Government would contribute the other quarter, or if £60,000 for a monthly service were agreed upon, they would give £45,000 if the Canadian Government would give £15,000. All the papers to be brought down would simply give the hon. gentleman that information. With reference to the negotiations carried on between the British Postal authorities and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that is a matter with which we are not directly concerned, and which we cannot bring down to the House at present.

Mr. LAURIER. I may have misunderstood the hon. gentleman; but the hon. gentleman says there has been correspondence upon this subject between the Imperial and Canadian Governments, and yet though the hon. gentleman is acting upon that correspondence, and asking the House to implement their agreement by this vote of money, he refuses to bring to the House the correspondence.

Mr. FOSTER. The information is simply this, that the British Government will give so much if the Canadian Government will implement that by so much more.

Mr. LAURIER. Put the correspondence on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no complete correspondence. The High Commissioner, when in London, carried on the negotiations, and all the direct correspondence that was had with this Government was in the shape of a telegram, and surely my hon. friend, having the information, is not going to stand on a technicality and endeavor to stop this vote simply because I have not formally laid on the Table of the House the information I have given him over and over again.

Mr. LAURIER. Are we to understand that this important negotiation was carried on verbally and that there is nothing to show for it?

Mr. FOSTER. What I said was simply that negotiations were carried on by the High Commissioner, and that as the result of these negotiations an agreement was come to between the two Governments.

Mr. LAURIER. I would be sorry to believe that this important negotiation was carried on verbally, and that there is nothing official between the Canadian Government

and the Imperial Government. There must have been some correspondence, whether by telegram or otherwise, and this correspondence the House is entitled to have.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. the Minister was generally understood to have said that the agreement respecting this service was nearly completed between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway. When he referred to the company, I asked what company, and he said the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Leader of the Opposition immediately took exception to that statement, and asked him to produce the correspondence. He was followed by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) who reiterated that demand for the agreement between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Minister of Finance never made the statement up to now that he had been misunderstood. It would have been easy for him then to have said that he was misunderstood. But he left the House to believe the contrary.

Mr. FOSTER. I distinctly said that negotiations were being carried on between the British Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway for the carriage of the mails—not our mails but the British mails; and when I spoke of the Government after that, any person who followed the thread of my discourse would have seen that it was the British Government I referred to. With reference to what the hon. gentleman said about correspondence, the correspondence passed between the High Commissioner and the British Government; but it is impossible to bring that down until the whole matter is settled.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are we to understand that the British Government have formally pledged themselves to pay this sum of either £75,000 or £15,000; because they have taken no action, and I observe that in the British Parliament a gentleman put them a question recently on the subject, and, if my memory serves me right, they did not return a reply in any way committing themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. They have committed themselves to that extent. They have promised to give a certain amount provided we give a quarter of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that definitely and distinctly?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How did the Finance Minister ascertain that they had done that? How is he aware of it? Had Sir Charles Tupper anything to do with it, or did he make any report to the Government? How did it come to the knowledge of the Government that the British Government entertained the proposition?

Mr. FOSTER. I have already pointed out to the House that the negotiations were carried on by the High Commissioner.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant) How did the information come to the hon. gentleman?

Mr. FOSTER. The negotiations are not completed, and that correspondence cannot be brought down until they are.

Amendment negatived on a division, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand there is an existing line there now which has been running for some time. Has the Minister any results which he can give to the House as to the freight and the passenger traffic which has been carried?

Mr. FOSTER. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have had steamers running for a year and a-half or two years. I have no statement at hand as to the exact quantities of freight that have been carried other than that which I gave to the House on the occasion of the Budget speech. If my hon. friend will turn to page 452 of *Hansard*, he will see a pretty full statement of the Asiatic trade, giving the number of tons carried and itemising it in the way of tea, and silk, and general merchandise and so on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What conditions do the British Government intend to impose as to speed and so forth in the event of their granting this subsidy?

Mr. FOSTER. The British post office authorities, as my hon. friend knows, are very strict with reference to the carriage of their mails, and in tying down those who contract with them to schedule time and all the necessary provisions for security and despatch. All these terms are contained in the agreement which has been, as I said, practically concluded, and which will take the form of a contract. That, however, is a document I am not able to bring down to the House, because it is a matter between the British Government and the company, and has not yet been formally signed.

Mr. JONES (Halifax.) If these steamers have been running successfully for eighteen months, as we have been told, I would like the Minister to inform the House why it is now considered necessary to come with a Government subsidy to implement their earnings. Those steamships were placed on that route by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and we are told that they have been very successful in their cargoes each way. If that is the case, there would seem to be less reason for the Government asking the House to give them a subsidy. If the Minister of Finance will allow his mind to go back a year or two and remember the result of subsidies which have been given to other companies, he will find that the result has not been very satisfactory. There was a subsidy given to a Brazil line, and after one or two voyages, that fell through. There were subsidies given to a French line and a Hamburg line, and all these subsidies have proved to be inexpedient. Now, the Government are to subsidise a line which is already in operation, and I can hardly see under what circumstances that would be justifiable unless it was to give so much more money to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The First Minister stated that he was indebted to the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway for a statement showing the traffic to Australia, and doubtless he was also for one with regard to this route. It would really appear stripped of all other explanations, that both these grants are in effect grants to the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is what we may as well admit at once, and then, if the Government are determined to make that additional grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we cannot prevent it, they must take the responsibility, but we can protest, and the event may prove that our judgment is correct.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I). The Minister Finance has referred me to page 452 of *Hansard*. His statement there shows the comparative amount of freight carried in 1887 and 1888. In some of the articles, there is a large increase, and in others there is a decided decrease. What I would like to know is if the outward freight is of Canadian produce or not, because, if an appreciable proportion of it is of American produce, and that proportion is likely to increase, it would be rather hard to ask us to subside a steamer to carry American produce. Before we come to the second reading of this resolution, I, for one, shall require to have some definite and reliable information on that point.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister if we have to pay for carrying the mails in addition to this subsidy? Are we to get any consideration at all, or are we to pay for all the services?

Mr. FOSTER. Three gentlemen have asked questions, and I hardly know who asked which. I think the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) asked what necessity there was for giving a subsidy now to a line which has been engaged for a year and a-half or two years in carrying the trade between British Columbia and China and Japan, and which had been fairly successful. I do not know what may be considered fairly successful. They have kept on their vessels, and have done a trade which has been an increasing trade, and I suppose that, for the two first years, that has been fairly successful. Whether it has been a paying trade or not, I cannot tell. However, my hon. friend knows that, when this contract is entered into and the new line of vessels is put on, they will be of a very different class from the vessels which are employed there now. They will have to be completed according to specification; they will have to run upon schedule time; they will have to have a speed which is required in the contract, and that will be a very good rate of speed, and that requires, of course, a very different class of vessel, and a different outlay, than what is required in the vessels running now.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What speed?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot tell exactly, but it will be a very respectable speed. With reference to my hon. friend's statement he will find reference to cotton goods, that they are as stated as taken from Canadian mills. With reference to other articles of merchandise I have no returns which will show what proportion of them are Canadian, although I imagine a large proportion of them are Canadian.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The sum total of exports is very small.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) May I ask what port in British Columbia this steamer is to leave? From Vancouver?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly, from the terminus of the railway.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the steamer call at Victoria?

Mr. FOSTER. We will find that out by the contract.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I) I want to find it out now. I have received a letter from a gentleman in British Columbia to-day asking me to ascertain this very point. The inhabitants out there are very anxious to know whether this line of steamboat is going to call at Victoria. I do not know whether the British Columbia representatives in the House can say anything about it, but I can assure them that one of their constituents seems to be greatly interested in the subject. He would like to know before we vote.

Mr. PRIOR. What is the name?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have no objection giving the name privately to the hon. gentleman. Whether the steamer is to call at Victoria or not, ought to be decided before the contract is entered into, and the information should be given to the House before we consent to vote the money.

Mr. PRIOR. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) for bringing up the question of the steamers calling at Victoria. I may state that ever since I have been in Ottawa I have been badgering the Government about the same matter. I have had numerous letters myself on the subject, and before I started for Ottawa I had several interviews with gentlemen belonging to the Board of Trade who urged upon me the imperative necessity of pressing that subject upon the Government. I would like the hon. member from Queen's (P.E.I.) to hand me that letter that I may see who it is from.

Mr. DAVIES (P.EI.) It is from a gentleman who went out there from Prince Edward Island and who has been a resident in British Columbia for some years.

Mr. PRIOR. I am glad to hear it. I believe the whole population of Victoria desire the steamers to call there. I have done my best that they should do so, but I cannot say that I have had any very satisfactory assurances from the Government. I believe it is of the utmost importance that these steamers should be subsidised, and if we grant this subsidy I believe it will be the means of opening up a very large trade between Canada and China and Japan, and particularly between British Columbia and those countries. I have not the statistics to show the amount of business done at the present time, but I do not think that we ought to look at what is done now, but we ought to look at the possibilities and the probabilities of a future trade. The first steamers that ran on this route, I have it on good authority, lost £14,000. They will not run unless they are subsidised. and I think that the sooner our merchants and manufacturers come to the conclusion that there is a large trade to be done, and begin to bestir themselves, the sooner they send their agents to China and Japan, the better it will be for them, and the Dominion. I wish to repeat that it is imperative that these steamers should call at Victoria A few days ago I stated fully the importance of the city I have the honor to represent. The Victoria merchants do at least 75 per cent. of the trade of the whole Province of British Columbia, and I cannot see why these steamers, which are passing our very doors, should not call there. They come at the present time, and have done so for the last eighteen months, within one mile of our wharf, and there they take on a pilot and go straight ahead, and never pay the slightest attention to us. The Victorians are willing to put their hands in their pockets and make additions to the wharf, so that the steamer can come direct to the wharf and land the mails and passengers, instead of carrying them to Vancouver and letting them come back home by small steamer thereby delaying them 24 hours. We are willing to give her good wharfage accommodations if she will stop there on her way in and out, and I cannot see why the Government should not insist upon that being done. I believe it is contended by the Government that this is an Imperial matter, and that they have no right to say a word about stopping anywhere. I must confess that I cannot see the justice of that plea. The Imperial Government certainly subsidise the steamers, but so does the Dominion Government, and I consider that as British Columbia, and especially Victoria, contributes a large amount to the revenue of the Dominion, they have a right to ask the Government to consider them in this matter. If calling there would seriously delay these mail steamers, I would not ask them to do so, but I do not believe it would make a delay of more than an hour and a half or two hours, in a 13 or 14 days trip. I once more take this opportunity of urging the Government to consider the complaints of Victoria in respect to any subsidy that is granted to a line of steamers running from British Columbia to Japan, and that they will do their utmost to persuade the Imperial Government to insert a clause in the charter granted to any company, that it shall be imperative upon that company to call at Victoria, both outward and inward.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me the hon. gentleman is perfectly in his right, and that moreover, it is our duty to see whether this can be done. Now, this bringing down these schemes and asking us to vote them blindfold, is utterly objectionable. There is no great difficulty in sending a cablegram to the British authorities, asking definitely whether they are willing to consent to a reasonable proposition such as the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) has presented. It seems to me, if the case is as he states, it would be an extreme hardship that the mails and passengers for Victoria should be taken 75 miles out of their way and sent back again.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It does not seem to me that this is a matter wholly within the power of the British

Government. Surely if the Government of Canada is called upon to pay £15,000 annually for subsidising this line of steamers we have a right to say for what purpose we are subsidising them, and we should make it a condition that the line of steamers should call at Victoria. If the English Government want us to assist them by giving a subsidy, surely we should say upon what conditions it should be given, and if the Government choose to assert, what they ought to assert in order to promote the interests of the people residing on the Island of Vancouver, I have no doubt whatever that the Government can secure what the people of Victoria desire.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. Minister of Finance did not answer my question with regard to the carrying of the mails. I asked whether, under the subvention given to this line, our mails would be carried free?

Mr. FOSTER. By mails, I suppose the hon. gentleman means the mails from Canada to China and Japan. The mails from Canada to China and Japan are carried in consideration of the amount we give towards the subsidy, the same as the British mails are carried from Canada to Japan for the lump sum which the British Government give for that purpose.

Mr. MULOCK. We shall have nothing whatever to pay for mails between Canada and Japan during the continuance of the contract?

Mr. FOSTER. That is what I understand.

Mr. MULOCK. What does it cost at present to carry the mails?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot tell.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the Postmaster General can tell the Committee.

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot tell the exact amount, but a certain sum is now paid, although it does not amount to a great deal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will ascertain it and bring it down.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I). This Committee is asked to vote a subsidy not exceeding £15,000 per annum for a monthly steamship service or £25,000 for a fortnightly service. We are asked to vote this amount because it will promote Canadian interests. In such a proposition we ought to have a voice as to the conditions under which the company will run the line, and the ports at which the vessel will call. If it is not in the opinion of the Government desirable that the vessels should touch at Victoria, the statements of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior), should be answered. He submitted arguments to this Committee, and I am satisfied that the majority of the House are of opinion that the vessels should call at Victoria. If those arguments are incorrect they should be controverted, and at all events we should vote intelligently and not in the dark. We have a right to insert these conditions in the contract, and it is our duty to do so, until the facts submitted by the hon. member for Victoria are contradicted, and the vessels should call at Victoria, especially as it could be done with such little inconvenience to the company.

Resolution reported.

MAIL SERVICE—CANADA AND ENGLAND.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider resolution (p. 1329) respecting a contract for the performance of a fast weekly steamship service for the carrying of mails between Canada and United Kingdom, making connection with a French port.

Mr. LAURIER moved in amendment:

That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that the consideration of the granting of a subsidy for a fast weekly steamship service between Canada and the United Kingdom be postponed until the Government has laid before this House all the information in its possession on the subject, including the demands for tenders, tenders received and the precise nature of the service to be performed.

Motion negatived on a division, and House resolved itself in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman explain the precise meaning of the words "making connection with a French port?" Does the hon. gentleman intend that the steamer leaving Great Britain is to call at a French port?

Mr. FOSTER. The intention is that the mail steamers which carry the mails from the United Kingdom to Canada and from Canada to the United Kingdom should call at a French port.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Going and coming?

Mr. FOSTER. Each trip.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the French port to be the terminal point?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are they to call at a French port before they proceed to the English ports?

Mr. FOSTER. No; they will call at the English port first.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the French port will be the terminal point?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. WELSH. I should like to know where the terminus on this side will be before I vote this large expenditure. Where will the winter port be, and what port in England will be the terminal port and what port in France? I do not see that any benefit is going to be derived to Canada from this vote. It is an increase of $370,000 a year over what we have been paying to the Allan line, and as regards the very fast line in the St. Lawrence, I do not think it will be an improvement. I have made twenty or thirty passages on the Allan line, and I think it is a very fine line of steamers, with a body of officers and men well disciplined, and so far as trade is concerned there is no necessity for placing the taxpayers at any further expense by granting subsidies, because if there is anything to ship at Quebec or Montreal there are a dozen steamers ready to take any freight offered. As to mails and passengers, if you want your mails carried faster than the Allan line carries them, a person can address his letter "*vid* New York" or *vid* any line he likes and a passenger who wants to make a more rapid passage than the Allan line makes can go to New York. I want to know what benefit this country will get by this increased expenditure of $370,000 a year. If any hon gentleman can show where this country will derive any advantage from this expenditure I will listen to it. We have boats now running from Montreal to England carrying mails and passengers at a speed of 14 knots an hour, and I think that is quite sufficient for the St. Lawrence, because we must remember that the navigation is more dangerous than that from New York to England. The Cunard and other lines have greyhound steamers which go 18 or 20 knots an hour, but they can run out of New York into the open sea, clear of icebergs and the other dangers that the St. Lawrence is liable to. If you put those 20-knot steamers on the St. Lawrence with its fogs and thick weather, and especially when going through the Straits of Belle-Isle, you will have probably many accidents and loss of life.

The Government may convince me that this money may be well expended, and I am open to conviction, but my opinion is that you might as well throw this $370,000 belonging to the ratepayers into the river.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The resolution involves a very large expenditure and the Government should satisfy the House that the country demands such an expenditure for this service. I am ready to admit that there is a certain advantage in having a fast mail service if we can afford it, but the question is can we afford to have a 20 knot service for Canada? My opinion is that we cannot. A country like the United States with 65,000,000 people and its vast resources can afford a great many luxuries which a poorer country with four and a half or five millions cannot, and poor people have to put up with less expensive articles than their more wealthy neighbors. If we can get a line of 16 or 17-knot steamers, which would be ample for our wants, I think it would be quite as much as the people of Canada desire. We ought to be able to obtain a service of 16 or 17-knot steamers at a very large reduction from this $500,000 because the hon. Minister is no doubt aware that it is the extra two or three knots an hour which costs money far out of proportion of what steamers running at a moderate rate would cost. I think the Government would have been wise had they limited their aspirations to an 18-knot trial speed, and a speed of 16 or 17 knots at sea. There was a great deal of force in the remarks of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Welsh) with regard to the difference between the St Lawrence and New York routes. A steamer leaving England for New York takes the southern route where she is free from icebergs and fogs which result from them, but if she comes by the northern route, and especially if she comes through the Straits of Belle Isle, for a large portion of the year she is in danger of icebergs and cannot use her speed; therefore you are paying for speed which a vessel is not able to use. Then again, if she comes to Halifax or St. John in winter time the same remarks apply after a certain time of the year. The point raised by the hon. member for Huron (M. McMillan) shows that the cattle trade is very much involved in this question of a fast line. If the Government had limited their demands to a 16 or 17-knot service they would obtain steamers which would be freight steamers as well, and I think the commerce of this country is as much interested, and I venture to say more interested, in obtaining low freight facilities than it is in having the mails delivered one or two days sooner. A steamer with a 16 or 17-knot speed will be able to carry 3,000 tons of freight, and that freight coming to a winter port—Halifax or St. John, I presume Halifax—would come over our Intercolonial Railway. If you have a 20-knot service these steamers will not carry over 700 or 1,000 tons at the outside. The fast steamers which run into New York are essentially passenger steamers, and they take only a small quantity of first class freight. Under these circumstances it will be observed that our national highway, as we call it, would lose the advantage of the transportation of all that freight, and that, I think, is a very important item, looking at the unsatisfactory results of the working of the Intercolonial Railway for the past few years. Then again if those steamers were of the speed I have indicated they would probably belong to a line like the Allan line who has a large number of steamers in the freight and cattle business, and the company would be able to offer facilities for a cheap transport of cattle and freight to a larger extent than they will if this subsidy is taken away from them. A fast line of steamers has to run on its merits as a mail and passenger line and nothing else, and in it we lose all the advantages which we should have for the carriage of freight. These lines are very expensive in their way, and cannot be run unless at a very considerable expense. The hon.

gentleman referred to the number of letters which are carried by the steamers by way of New York. That, I think the hon. gentleman will understand, must always exist. No matter how fast a line you may have from Montreal or the Maritime Provinces, the ships only sail once a week, so that from the sailing of one ship to the sailing of the next the letters dropped into the mail bag go by New York, whence a steamer sails almost every day. As a matter of fact, you will have six or seven mail steamers sailing from New York for every one that goes from Montreal or Halifax. Therefore, the expectations of the Minister, with regard to the mail matter which will go by this fast line, will hardly be realised. The hon. gentleman has referred to the desirability of having a fast line for passengers. Of course, with a certain part of the travelling public, that goes a considerable distance. But I know from experience, having been connected with one of the lines, that other lines, though not quite equal in reputation to the first-class lines, take a large proportion of the travelling public because they will take them for $15 or $20 less; and while these fast steamers get what you may call the cream of the travel, they do not by any means get the bulk of it, which goes by steamers which may be two or three days longer on a trip, but which if less elegant are equally safe and comfortable. Then, again, though I do not for a moment wish to undervalue the position of my own city or the Maritime Provinces generally, I have realised from my own observation this great fact, that it is almost impossible for a line sailing from Halifax to get passengers west of Montreal. No matter what steamers were going—when the *Vancouver* and the *Parisian* were leaving Halifax—and they are as fine and comfortable steamers as cross the Atlantic to-day—they would leave Halifax six months in the year with 20 or 30 passengers, not one-half of whom came from the west, while at the same time the great bulk of the western travel went by way of New York. My attention was drawn to a notice in a Canadian paper about the time these steamers were leaving Halifax, in which it was stated that the *Etruria* had arrived on the other side with 72 or 75 Toronto people on board. These facts show that the expectations of the hon. gentleman are not likely to be realised; I am sorry it is to be so, because if the steamers go by way of Halifax, I would like the passengers to go that way. But what I particularly desire to impress on the hon. Minister as my own view is that he is aiming at a service which is not actually necessary, and at an expense which this country cannot afford. I repeat, if we had a 16 or 17-knot service combining commercial facilities with passenger accommodation, it would be more in the interest of this country than a mail line, even if it ran 25 miles an hour. Such a line, considering the large commercial interests involved in a cheap route, would be of more permanent advantage to the country. The hon. gentleman stated that his proposal was to obtain this 20-knot service in order to obtain more rapid communication with the east. I asked him how fast he proposed having the steamers between British Columbia and China and Japan. The hon. gentleman replied that they were to be faster than the present ones, but he did not by any means intimate that he expected them to be up to the twenty-knot standard, and I presume such a line would cost more money than he asks the House to vote to-night. Well, according to the old maxim that the strength of a chain is in its weakest link, I would ask him what value is the 30-knot service on the Atlantic if he is to have only a 12 or 14-knot service on the Pacific? He must have a 20 knot service on the Pacific to correspond with that on the Atlantic, or he will fail in the object he has in view, of establishing a fast mail communication between England and the east. He says travel will always choose its own routes. We know that is the case, but the

question is largely a geographical one. People will seek the point of departure which is nearest to them, or which they can reach in the shortest time and with the least difficulty. The hon. gentleman knows that if he were leaving for England to-morrow, he would not think of going to Halifax, even if there were a fast steamer there. He would go on board the train this afternoon, and to-morrow in the middle of the day he would be in New York, and would go on board the steamer there, and so avoid the long journey by railway.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be longer by sea.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I admit that, particularly at the time of the year when the hon. gentleman would have to go to Halifax to take the steamer; but I am sorry to say that I think he would prefer going by way of New York to coming down to Halifax by the Intercolonial Railway, and that circumstance would prevent the line obtaining as many passengers as would be desirable. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman also what point in the Maritimes Provinces he proposes to make the terminal point. Does he propose to make it Halifax or St. John?

Mr. FOSTER. Finish your speech.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Of course these points are interesting to know. I fancy there is no doubt where it will be. With all its advantages, St. John is a little out of the way; geography is against it. Another point on which I think the Minister should inform us is what port in England is to be reached and what port in France is to be reached. The hon. gentleman will find, I think, in making a contract, that the steamer, will be obliged to keep on board her English cargo, take it to the French port, and then bring it back and land it on her way to Canada again. If he has passengers on board for a French port, he can hardly expect that they will remain there pending the discharge of the cargo. He will also find another difficulty, that when they take this cargo in with their coals, which they are consuming all the way over, when they reach an English port and put out their cargo, they could not put it out and go on without taking other ballast and other coal, all of which involves delay. If the Minister has contemplated an arrangement of that kind, he will never find it to work. He may make connection with a French port, but to arrive at an English port and land the mails and passengers and go on to a French port with a cargo on board, and then come back again, she could bring no cargo from the French port, because she would be filled with a cargo from Canada. I would invite the hon. gentleman's attention to those points. He will find when he comes to make a trade and put in black and white the way in which the contract is to be carried out, those objections will all be raised, and he may have at the last moment to make an arrangement to connect with the French port, but not with the steamer that leaves for an English port. I am sorry the Government have gone so far as to undertake such a large expense which is entirely unnecessary. It is only of very late years that the Americans have built those very fast steamers, and during the winter time many of them are laid up. During the winter time their passenger rates are largely reduced. They will give you a ticket by the *Etruria* or any of those first class lines from Halifax all the way to New York at the same rate that the Allan and Dominion Lines charge from Halifax, about $60 or $70, while in the summer you have to pay nearly double the amount. I mention that to show that during the time the fast line comes to the Maritime Provinces those steamers will have very few passengers indeed. It is regretable that the Government are asking such a very large subsidy, because I am sure that in the summer, if the capacity and speed I have indicated were asked for, they could have been obtained at a moderate rate far below what the Committee has been asked to sanction. That would have been satisfactory to the country, and contributed more to its permanent advantage than this line the hon. gentleman proposes to obtain.

Mr. TROW. If it is the policy of the Government to grant large subsidies for mail and passenger service from Canada to a French and English port, it strikes me forcibly that the remarks of the hon. member for Halifax are to the point and that it would be carrying passengers out of their way thousands of miles if they were first taken to Liverpool or London. There are fast lines of steamers that leave New York twice a week, which would be given preference over the Canadian route. If it is the policy of the Government to have that connection, why not go direct to a French port, and land their passengers there without delaying them in an English port? There is much force in the remark made by the hon. member for South Huron that if there is to be any encouragement given at all to the carrying of freight, the same encouragement should be given to the shipment of stock, which in this country has quite recently been developed to such magnitude that it has become a source of great profit. It is well known that our Canadian route is much preferable to the New York route, from the simple fact that the cattle shipped at Montreal or Quebec become, before they reach the Atlantic, inured to hardship, and escape sickness, and arrive in much better condition than they would had they left New York. The moment the ship leaves New York at Sandy Hook she is on the Atlantic. The cattle become easily sick, and many of them die on the way. If encouragement were given to the shippers on our Canadian route, the Americans in the Western States, in Minnesota and even Dakota, and from the prairies generally, where they feed cattle very extensively, would no doubt prefer our Canadian route for the shipment of their stock.

Mr. KENNY. It must have surprised you, Sir, to hear the senior member for Halifax attempting to convey the impression to this House that Halifax as a port is not as suitable and fit as the port of New York for the terminus of a line of ocean steamers. Let me tell that gentleman that for 20 years after steam navigation was first established on the ocean, the Cunard Line so arranged their departure from the city of Boston that they almost invariably arrived at the port of Halifax during the night. During those 20 years only on one occasion in my recollection did those vessels get ashore. The hon. gentleman ought to know that the port of Halifax can be entered at any stage of the tide at any hour of the day or night, and at any season of the year, and in that respect offers facilities which the port of New York does not possess. I must say that I believe the hon. gentleman is the only merchant in Halifax, on either side of politics, who would speak so disparagingly of his own port. Let me say, that I believe the people of this country will almost unanimously approve the action of the Government in respect of these ocean mail steamship subsidies. I believe that it is the earnest desire of the people of Canada that we should possess on both oceans as efficient a service as that which is enjoyed by any other nation. I believe that one of the great objects which we had, when we spent so large a sum of money on the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, was to make Canada the highway from Europe to Eastern Asia, to Australasia and to the Islands of the Pacific. Every hon. gentleman who has considered this question must recognise that we cannot accomplish that object unless we have a first-class ocean service. To-day, unfortunately, we have not that. We have what is very little better than a first-class freight service. Every man should speak well of the bridge which has carried him over safely, and I have made pleasant and enjoyable passages across the ocean in the steamers of the Allan line, and I must bear testimony particularly to the admirable manner in which those ships are officered and

the careful way in which they are navigated. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I., that the navigation of the St. Lawrence River is a precarious and an anxious one, and that, if we desire to establish, as I think we showed ambition, an ocean service which should sail with the regularity of a ferry, then to attain that you should make Halifax your terminus all the year round. As to the port of departure on the eastern side of the ocean, I have given some consideration to that matter, and I think it should be some port in the Bristol Channel. I understand from what has fallen from the Finance Minister that that is now an impossibility, and that, as a French port has to be reached, it must be some port on the southern coast of England. I say, if we are ambitious to make our ocean mail service as efficient or more efficient than any other service, we should sail from some port in Europe which is not a tidal port, and I believe, if we ran all the year round to Halifax, we could make the voyage in five days. When I make such a statement, I know that I shall not meet with much sympathy in this Legislature. I know that the public mind of Canada is not educated up on that particular question, to entertain any such idea, and that, therefore, we must concede that, during the summer months, these vessels will go up the St. Lawrence; but I do still say that, if our sole ambition was to have a service which should navigate the ocean with the regularity of a ferry, it would be better if Halifax was made the terminus all the year round, and I know that that idea is entertained by gentlemen on the other side of the Atlantic who have given this matter very serious consideration. I referred to the fact of the large sum of money which Canada has spent for the construction of a transcontinental railway system. We know, we have heard, and we believe, that that system will be extended by the shortest and best practicable route in a short space of time to the Atlantic seaboard. That, of course, we fully accept. I ventured the opinion that the present service was unsatisfactory, and as regards the expenditure to which the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has referred, he has laid great stress on the fact that we are now called upon to spend $500,000 for as efficient a service as any on the ocean. That hon gentleman might have told the House that, in 1860, the two Provinces of Old Canada, Ontario and Quebec, incurred as great a responsibility in order to secure for themselves the best service of that day as this Dominion is now asked to assume. That was a wise expenditure of public money, I believe, on the part of those two Provinces. They were, in point of population, of trade, of exports and imports, and business generally, relatively small in comparison to this great Dominion, and yet, if I am correctly informed, those two Provinces, in 1860, incurred a responsibility of £104,000 sterling per annum to secure the best serivce of that day. Unfortunately, we have not kept up that standard. That was the best of the day. That was what Canada then ambitioned, and what Canada did in 1860 I believe we should attempt to do to-day. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has referred to the passages made by the present ocean mail steamers, and I took the trouble to compare the passages made by the Allan and Dominion lines from Liverpool to Halifax this year, after the close of the St. Lawrence up to the date of my departure from Halifax for Ottawa, with those made by the Cunard boats from Liverpool to New York. Everyone knows that the subsidised Allan Line sails on Thursday and the Cunard Line on the following Saturday for New York, but almost invariably the Cunard boats, which have sailed 2 days after the Allan boats, arrive in New York before the Allan boats reach Halifax, although they have steamed 500 miles further. The *Polynesian* sailed from Liverpool for Halifax on 8th November, 1888. The *Etruria* sailed 2 days afterwards. The *Polynesian* took 10 days to come to Halifax. Taking the passage of the *Etruria* to New York, if she had come to Halifax, she would have made the passage in 6½ days. The next steamer was the *Vancouver*, which I compare with the *Gallia*, which sailed 2 days after, and that would have made a difference of 5½ days. I compare the *Sarmatian* with the *Umbria*, and there was a difference of 3 days. The next was the *Sarnia*, which I compare with the *Umbria*, and here was a difference of 4 days. Then there was the *Parisian*, which is the best of our boats, and I compare her voyage with the *Etruria*, showing a difference of 3½ days. Then, the *Oregon* was 3½ days behind, and the *Polynesian* 4 days. Then I find that the *Vancouver* sailed from Liverpool on the 27th December for Halifax, and it so happened that the Cunard boat which sailed 2 days later was the *Bothnia*, which made a very long passage, and, if she had come to Halifax, she would have been as long on the voyage as the *Vancouver* was. On 3rd January the *Sarmatian* sailed, and I compare her with the *Gallia*, showing a difference of 6 days. I compare the *Sarnia* with the *Servia*, a difference of 2 days; the *Circassian* with the *Etruria*, a difference of 3 days. In other words, if the Cunard boats had been coming to Halifax instead of the boats we have, there would have been a difference of very nearly 3½ days on the average passage. Take, for instance, a passenger whose objective point is Toronto. He would arrive in Halifax a day and a-half before he could reach New York, with steamers of the same speed; and when we get the Short Line, when we have the Hong Kong fast express mail train which Mr. Van Horne has promised us, Montreal can be reached, he tells us, in 15 to 18 hours. It takes 12 hours longer to go to Toronto, and, therefore, you could reach Toronto before the steamer would arrive in New York. It is absurd to tell us that with such facilities it is impossible to establish a Canadian passenger traffic through Canadian ports. Nobody who has studied the question impartially, who is not prejudiced against our own country, and who has not lost all faith in Canada, could so express himself. Why, Sir, I do not wonder that gentlemen from Montreal, Toronto and those points do not come down to Halifax to-day to take those steamers. Halifax people themselves, in returning, at least, from Liverpool in the winter months, go all the way to New York and come down by land to Halifax rather than be 12½ days or 14 days on these steamers going to Halifax. I have given you several passages; they are the average, and since that I find that some of those steamers have been 12 days and 12½ days, and if they had been going to New York they would be just twice the time that the Cunard boats take to go to New York. Now, who, in the present day, when time is money, is going to be twice as long on the Atlantic than is necessary? As regards the mail matter which is carried by those subsidised Canadian boats, I am informed that the amount of Christmas mail matter for Montreal which came by way of New York was very much larger than that shipped by the regular Canadian mail steamer—I have that statement on the most undoubted authority. Now, hon. gentlemen have made a reference to the cattle service, and they have endeavored to frighten those who are interested in it, and that means the whole country, particularly the great Province of Ontario. Every hon. gentleman knows that no cattle are shipped to-day by mail steamers, there is no mail steamer that carries them. That service is at present conducted by the Beaver Line, by the Donaldson Line, by the second class Allan and Dominion Line boats, and a large number are shipped by Mr. Reeford of Montreal. I think we need not have the slightest misgivings as regards the cattle trade. As to the quantity of freight which these fast steamers carry, it is true that the *Etruria*, and some of those faster boats, do not carry more than 700 or a 1,000 tons; but it has been reported that the Andersons contemplate that the ship they are to build specially for this service, will carry from 1,000 to 2,000 tons. So I do not think there will be the slightest difficulty in handling that amount of cargo over the Intercolonial Rail-

way or at the port of Halifax. That is really a matter not for us to consider, it is a matter for the contractors to consider, and for the owners of the line of steamers who may enter into a contract with the Government of Canada; but it need not, I think, cause us any anxiety in considering this vote. I believe, Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important matters that the present Parliament has had to deal with. I remember being in England when the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed, and I have stated here and elsewhere, that there was no one act since Confederation which raised Canada so much in the estimation of foreign countries, and even in her own esteem, as the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I believe, also, that when it is announced that Canada, having established a land service which is unsurpassed, is also determined to establish an ocean service which cannot be surpassed, it will tend to raise Canada in the esteem of other nations, and will also be a policy which will prove generally acceptable to the people of this country.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) I do not expect my hon. colleague to agree with me, he seldom does, except on the Short Line, and even in that case, his point of departure and his arguments were utterly at variance with the true facts of the case, because in his party allegiance, he saw fit to abuse the Canadian Pacific Railway, which he is now lauding instead of blaming the Government who are the real parties at fault in that matter. I do not intend, however, to allow my hon colleague to place me in a false position in regard to what I said. He made a statement with apparent indignation, that I was abusing the port of Halifax. Well, I was stating what I always state, my honest opinion. My hon. friend sometimes, for party allegiance, conceals his opinion, as he had the frankness to tell us the other night that if he were on the Opposition side of the House, he would be much more comfortable in criticising an Act under consideration.

Mr. KENNY. Because it is so much more easy to find fault.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman gave us a list of the sailings and arrivals of the various steamers. He might have spared himself and the House that infliction. No one stated that the present line of steamers were equal to the lines running to New York. Everyone knows that the Allan and Dominion Lines of steamers are far behind the New York lines in point of speed. I never led this House to believe for a moment that our lines compared with them. But my contention was that when we get a line of steamers of 16 or 17 knots, which would be three knots faster than the present line, at a moderate rate they would be ample for our wants for freight and passengers. That was my contention, and the hon. gentleman should not have represented it otherwise. He mentioned the long passage of one steamer of the Allan Line called the *Polynesian*, that was 10 days. Well, if I were to reply in the same style as my hon. colleague, and say that to be frank I should have informed the House, and should have taken them into my confidence, and have told them all about it. I should say that he ought to have told the House that on that occasion the Allan steamer left Liverpool at a time when there was a strike among the stokers, and they could not get any stokers to handle the coal, and had to take men that were not accustomed to sea going vessels, and consequently she was at sea three days longer than she would have been under other circumstances. Therefore my hon. friend, who knows everything, should have informed this House, if he desired to be perfectly frank, of the true facts. As a piece of information which the House will, no doubt, be very grateful for, he says that no cattle are carried by mail steamers. I think the House will remember I made no such statement. I made no statement that the mail steamers carried cattle. In fact, everybody knows that they do not; the cattle go by different boats belonging to the same line, but the line being partly freight, partly mail and partly passenger, these different parts can all work together, and in that way they are able to perform the service at cheaper rates. My sole object is to warn the country against an unnecessary expenditure. My object is to have steamers come to Halifax that carry large cargoes, so that the people would have the benefit of handling them. My object is to get steamers that would carry 2,000 or 3,000 tons and have that freight pass over the Intercolonial Railway. The object of my colleague is to get steamers that will land 700 or 1,000 tons of freight. If he acuses me of running down the advantages of Halifax, I might say that he is surely undervaluing the advantages which would accrue to the laborers and people of Halifax from handling freight coming by such a class of steamers as I propose, in preference to the smaller quantity of freight which would come by the class of steamers proposed by my hon. colleague. I certainly say that if a steamer brought this increased quantity of freight and occupied one day longer on the voyage, it would be better than a steamer carrying so much less freight and occupying one day less. It would be more in the interest of the people of Halifax and the Intercolonial Railway, and more in the general interest of the business community as well as the public at large, and it would save the Dominion a large sum of money, and yet we would obtain steamers that would answer every purpose.

Mr. WELSH. I have listened to the remarks of the hon. members for Halifax. I am interested in that port and always consider it one of the best on the Atlantic seaboard. While I admit the truth of what has been said by the junior member (Mr. Kenny), I must remind him that steamers have many times been delayed from 24 to 48 hours outside the harbor by fog. I have been detained on board of these steamers by fogs, and if you were to go to St. John you might be detained there a week by fog. I have landed in the port of Halifax from ocean steamers about 100 times, and I therefore know about what I am talking. I challenge contradiction when I say that Halifax has as good a harbor as New York, and if we are to have a greyhound line, Halifax should be the terminal port in Canada. Passengers could be landed there in 24 or 30 hours shorter time than in New York; but in the winter season New York is the best port, as the route is a more southerly one, the vessels thus escaping the ice. We do not, however, know to what point the line is going to run, and if we had this information we could make a more satisfactory argument. In voting this sum of money, we must not take freight into consideration, for on principle I object to one shilling of the public money going to subsidise a line of steamers which would handicap our shipping interests. If a fast line has to be subsidised, let it be done, but put freight and cargo out of the question. If there is any freight to be carried there are 20 steamers at our ports ready to do it. As regards England, it is clear that if the line has to touch at a French port, the terminal port has to be Plymouth or Southampton or some port on the south; but we do not know whether the Government have made up their minds on that point, and therefore we are talking and voting in the dark. I see in the Estimates that we are voting large sums for railways, and I am afraid a great deal of the money will be even worse than thrown away because the lines will compete against existing lines. There is also the Marine Railway on which some millions are going to be thrown away. However, that is outside the question. I repeat that I have crossed the Atlantic a great many times, and I prefer sailing from Halifax to any other port on the Atlantic coast, and I shall be very glad to see that port made the starting point for steamers of the

Dominion, and if a fast line runs from Halifax to Plymouth or Southampton, passengers could be carried in a shorter time than from New York to England.

Mr. KENNY. Laboring under the great disadvantage of being a comparatively young politician I have often felt that Halifax should be better represented on this side of the House; that it should be represented by someone who would occasionally say a kind word on its behalf more forcibly and more eloquently than I can do. Therefore, I thank my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh), who came to the rescue of Halifax, when I might have expected rather the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) to have done so. As regards the want of candor of which I was guilty in not stating that the *Sarmatian*, which made this very long passage of 14 days, to which the senior member has referred, that hon. gentleman is quite correct in saying that was largely owing to the fact that there had been a strike among the stokers at Liverpool and that it was almost impossible for ocean steam lines to get men who were adapted and accustomed to the work. The long passage of the *Sarmatian* was undoubtedly due to that cause. So also was the long passage made by the *Gallia* of the Cunard Line, which sailed immediately afterwards. Some hon. members may remember that the Cunard Line, during December and January, made comparatively long passages, which was due to the fact that the stokers they had on board were not equal to their work. So, as regards the comparison, it was equally good, because both steamers suffered from the same cause.

Mr. FOSTER. We have to adjourn at 12 o'clock, Friday being a holy day. I would suggest that we should pass this now and leave further discussion until Concurrence on Saturday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman should certainly give us the information that has been demanded as to where he proposes to go from on the other side and where he proposes to make the terminal point on this side. To ask us to pass even the first stage of a vote of $500,000 without knowing these important matters seems to me an insult to the intelligence of the House and a thing we should resist.

Mr. FOSTER. We will discuss that on Saturday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; we cannot discuss it in the same way as we can discuss it in Committee. It is of very great importance and we ought to have this information before us.

Mr. LAURIER. This question is not exhausted and several of our friends want to speak on this side.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This is of very serious importance with regard to the Maritime Provinces, and my colleague and myself want to be heard upon it.

Committee rose and reported progress.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. MULOCK. With regard to the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee and ordered to be printed to-day, I find that it cannot be printed in time to be of any service. It is my intention at the earliest possible moment to make a motion on this subject, and I think it would be better if the evidence were kept within the control of the House so as it would be available when the discussion takes place. I make this announcement as I do not wish to have to postpone my motion merely because the evidence has not been printed.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12 o'clock (midnight).

Mr. WELSH.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 20th April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW FORM OF BALLOT.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). I beg to move, with the unanimous consent of the House, the following motion:—

That a Select Committee be appointed, composed of Messrs. Amyot, Bryson, Godbout, Perley, Mills (Annapolis), Thérien, Weldon (Albert), Langelier (Montmorency), McCarthy, Edwards, and the mover, to enquire into and report upon a new form of ballot for Dominion elections, patented on January 17th, 1889, by Messrs. Durocher and Chabot, of Ottawa.

Mr. LAURIER. At this period of the Session I do not think the hon. gentleman should be allowed to make this motion.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. gentleman is allowed to do so, I have a motion for a Committee on the paper and I might possibly call the attention of the Government to it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid we cannot consent to have motions taken out of order, but we must follow the rule. The hon. gentleman spoke to me in regard to the matter, and I told him I objected to it, but he thought that he could obtain the unanimous consent of the House, in which case I said I would have no objection. The leader of the Opposition is perfectly correct in the position he has taken, and motions must be taken in order if we want to see the end of the Session before the dog days.

Mr. LAURIER. I am satisfied that hon. members have every disposition to assist the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDonald), but if we consented in this case, the same course must be pursued with other members.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the leader of the Government had announced that there would be a general election during the coming year, the case would be different.

Motion withdrawn.

ORDNANCE LANDS IN THE CITY OF QUEBEC.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 143) to authorise the conveyance to the Quebec Skating Club of certain Ordnance lands in the city of Quebec. He said: This Bill is to authorise the Government to convey certain Ordnance lands to the Skating Club of Quebec. We are unable to dispose of Ordnance lands except by public auction. In this case we ask special power to convey these lands, as the old skating rink is situated close to the fortifications of Quebec and is found to occupy an inconvenient position there, not only as regards the fortifications, but also as regards the new Parliament buildings. This building has been used, and the new building is proposed to be used, as an exhibition hall. The local Government have granted a large sum towards the new rink, provided the company obtain the site proposed, and this Bill is to authorise this Government to grant that site.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is any arbitration to take place respecting the value, or is it to be transferred as a gratuity.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is to be transferred as a gratuity.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I might state that one of the reasons that has induced the Government to take this action is that the present skating rink is very close to the fortification walls, and it has been deemed by the military advisers of the Department injurious to those walls, and it

is considered that it would be an advantage if it were moved to the location suggested.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

EXTRADITION.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved :

That Bill (No. 84), "To extend the provisions of the Extradition Act," be removed from Public Bills and Orders and transferred to Government Orders.

He said : The object of the Bill has already been explained to the House so fully by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), that I was not aware the House would expect any further explanation with regard to this motion. The Bill is one of general interest and of very considerable importance.

Mr. LAURIER. This Bill has not yet been read a second time. The principle of the Bill is not likely to meet with very serious objection, but it is a very important Bill and it requires a very large amount of careful discussion. I may suggest to the hon. gentleman that at this period of the Session, if the Government are to continue to crowd the paper with new matter every day, we will have to sit here until a period which it is not possible to anticipate now. I hope the Government will see the propriety of not crowding the paper any more, but of disposing of what we have on now and allowing other matters to stand over for another year. This is a very important Bill, and it would be well that it should be digested by the public before it is taken into consideration by this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may pay a tribute to the quickness of perception of my hon. friend, and those who sit behind him, in making the discovery that the Bill was not brought down earlier in the Session. There is very great impatience on the part of the people of Canada at our being subjected to this overflow of rascality from the United States. The cynics may say that we have enough of the article ourselves without importing it, but I think it is of some importance that it should be known everywhere that Canada does not at all desire to have this particular accession to its population, notwithstanding our great desire to have our population increased. We have no desire to have those people coming over here with their ill-gotten gains, and spending them in Canada. I think the hon. gentleman ought not to object to this Bill being put on the paper, because it will merely call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as the attention of the public generally, to the measure. I think they will find that the Bill is so unobjectionable that there will be very little opposition. Of course, if it meets with serious opposition, it will be then for the House to say whether it ought not to stand over until next year.

Mr. LAURIER. The First Minister will see that the only fault I find is, that he has been so slow to get rid of this very undesirable population which comes from the United States. He only moves now, at the eleventh hour of this Session, and since the people of Canada are impatient in the matter, he should have submitted some legislation of this kind two Sessions ago. As to the compliment he pays us with regard to our quickness of perception, I may answer him in the words of the Latin poet: *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.*

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The provisions of this Bill will meet with a large measure of acceptance on both sides of this House, but there is no use denying the fact that it is an extremely important Bill, and that it will require a good deal of examination and discussion. I understand that a similar Bill was introduced some years ago in this House, and it is my impression that that Bill received some opposition from the Imperial Government, and that they were not disposed to have any legislation of this kind. If there were any reasonable probability of this Bill being passed within the measurable time left at our disposal this Session, I, for one, would not offer the slightest opposition to its being introduced. It seems to me, that if we are going to introduce this Bill for the mere purpose of discussing it, that it is rather late in the Session. Anyone who looks at the Order paper, will see that even with the utmost disposition on the part of the Opposition to expedite business we cannot get through less than another fortnight, and if more Bills are brought down it means that we are to remain here for three or four weeks longer. This is rather hard on members who come from a distance. If this Bill is one that has in the past met with opposition from the Imperial Government, or at all events some expression of opinion that we should not legislate on the subject, I would suggest to the House that it is undesirable to waste one or two days in the discussion of it. I really think that we have got as much business before us as we can dispose of within the time that we should be asked to remain here. Hon. gentlemen know that we have so managed business in Committee of Supply that there must be a large amount of work on concurrence, and that we cannot, under any circumstances, allow concurrence to go through without a good deal of discussion. That being the case, if we desire to get home within any reasonable time, we should not consent to the admission of new subjects unless they are of such importance as to entitle the Government to say that they must ask the House to go on with them. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) had his Bill on the Order paper and he had an opportunity of going on with it.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I beg your pardon, I had not even one opportunity of proceeding with it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, perhaps that is so ; but, strong as I am in favor of the principle of the Bill, I know that, so far as it is retroactive, it is going to receive opposition from a certain portion of the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. It strikes me that this Bill might be transferred to the Government Orders, and we can then ascertain whether it is likely to consume much time or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is my proposition.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is a very important Bill, and I have often felt, when in the United States, that there was a sort of stigma and opprobrium thrown on this country as being a refuge for all their scoundrels, and that the idea prevails there that Canada is an asylum for all the defaulters and thieves of the United States. I feel a little anxious that this Bill should receive attention this Session on account of the good name of my country abroad, and I do not think we would lose very much by giving that amount of attention to this matter which will be required.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I introduced a Bill on this subject in the Session of 1871 or 1872, but I failed to get it further than the first reading, and the following Session I introduced it, and the Bill was read the second time. The First Minister then informed me that there were Imperial objections to the measure and that it could not go further than the second reading. I think there was a despatch from Earl Granville on the subject objecting to the matter being dealt with by reciprocal legislation. This measure would restore the old condition of things that existed between the Province of Upper Canada and the State of New York. There are decisions on this subject which my right hon. friend will find referred to in Story's work on the "Conflict of Law." From that time to this no further action has been taken on this matter, on account of the decision of the Imperial Government that this important matter of extraditing persons must be a matter regulated by treaty, and that the liberty of a person seeking asylum in any portion

of the Empire is too important to be dealt with as a mere question of policy. The hon. gentleman, of course, knows whether this is still the view of the Imperial Government. I do not think that, at this late period of the Session, we should be asked to remain a week longer for the sake of discussing this subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot claim any credit at all for the introduction of this Bill, for it was introduced by my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon), who is of the same opinion as my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that there was a sort of feeling in the neighboring republic that we were making Canada an asylum for all their rogues.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not any more than they are making the United States an asylum for our rogues.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Our answer is plain, but it does not reach the general mind of the United States, that England and Canada have both been anxious largely to increase the number of offences for which extradition could be granted. If there has been any delay, it has been caused by the United States Government and Congress. It is quite true also, as the hon. member for Bothwell states, that there was an objection, which still exists, to this question being settled between the colony and the United States, if it were left there. There must be a treaty of some kind, and that treaty, as my hon. friend knows, looking back to the Statute-book, has been supplemented by Dominion legislation, carrying out practically the treaty, because the terms of the treaty, as between England and the United States, do not suit the circumstances of Canada and the United States. Under the treaty alone no man could be caught; such an opportunity to escape was allowed to him that the treaty was nugatory; and therefore, on two occasions at least, the Legislature of Canada provided by an Act of Parliament on the lines of the treaty, a means of carrying it into effect. My hon. friend proposes that this Bill shall take effect only on proclamation. That proclamation will, of course, not be issued until after communication with Her Majesty's Government. Her Majesty's Government will see what we are desirous of doing, and will press, I have no doubt, as she has hitherto pressed, the subject of an extended extradition treaty. The main object of having this Bill passed now is to inform the United States and England that Canada does not desire any such unworthy addition to her population, and that she is quite ready and anxious that a treaty should be made with the United States. I think the passage of this Bill will have a very beneficial effect in the United States. I think it will have a still more beneficial effect in preventing these men making this country an asylum when they know what the law of Canada as expressed by this Legislature, is, and when they know that it only remains for Her Majesty's Government to say whether the Act shall be in force or not. For these reasons it seems to me, unless there is very great objection to its terms, that it would be well to pass this Bill. My hon. friend proposes that we should put it among Government orders; then, the attention of the whole House being drawn to its terms, it can easily be decided whether there are any other crimes which should be included. In this way, if we pass the Act and send it home to England, I think it will be of great benefit in disabusing the minds of the people of the United States of the cry that has been raised, and in preventing these people coming into this country.

Mr. LAURIER. There is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman says, and I have no fault to find with the tenor of his remarks. The only objection we, on this side of the House, had to the Bill was that at this late period of the Session it was a very heavy Bill to undertake.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will let it go with the understanding that if it is going to cause unnecessary delay it will be postponed.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee, on Monday next, to consider the following resolutions:—

1. Resolved, That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned to the railway companies and towards the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say

To the Ontario and Pacific Railway Company, for a line of railway from Cornwall to Perth, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $262,400.

To the Ottawa and Gatineau Valley Railway Company, for a line of railway from Hull Station towards Le Desert a distance of sixty-two miles, a subsidy not exceeding in the whole, $320,000.

To the Cap Rouge and St. Lawrence Railway Company, for twelve miles of their railway, from Lorette *via* Cap Rouge to Quebec, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $38,400.

To the Parry Sound Colonisation Railway Company, for forty miles of their railway, from the village of Parry Sound to the village of Sandridge on the line of the Northern Pacific Junction Railway, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $128,000.

For a railway from St. Andrew's to the Canadian Pacific Railway, at, or at any point east of the town of Lachute, in the County of Argenteuil, in the Province of Quebec, seven miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $22,400.

For a railway from Truro to Newport, in the Province of Nova Scotia, forty-nine miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $156,800.

For a line of the Central Railway, from the head of Grand Lake to the Intercolonial Railway, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $128,000.

To the Albert Southern Railway Company, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 47th Victoria, chapter 8, not exceeding in the whole, $31,771.43.

To the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy mentioned in the Act 49th Victoria, chapter 17, not exceeding in the whole, $244,500.

To the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway Company, for a line of railway from the Victoria branch of the Midland Railway to the village of Bancroft, in the County of Hastings, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 47th Victoria, chapter 8, not exceeding in the whole, $145,000.

To the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company, for a railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidies granted by the Acts 45th Victoria, chapter 14, and 46th Victoria, chapter 25, not exceeding in the whole, $35,000.

2. Resolved, That all the lines for the construction of which subsidies are granted shall, unless already commenced, be commenced within two years from the first day of August next, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, to be fixed by Order in Council, and shall also be constructed according to descriptions and specifications, and upon conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made in each case by the company with the Government, and which the Government is hereby empowered to make; the location also of every such line of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council; and all the said subsidies respectively payable in cash shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada by instalments, on the completion of each section of the railway of not less than ten miles, proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established by the report of the said Minister, or upon completion of the work subsidised.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) May I ask the hon. gentleman if the rumor in the papers is correct that other resolutions, providing for further subsidies, are to be brought down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That rumor is correct. The hon. gentleman will see that the subsidies mentioned in this vote are mainly those which have lapsed, and the roads have not been completed within the statutory time. I

do not think there will be a very extensive demand on the Treasury for railway subsidies, but there will be some.

Motion agreed to.

DAIRY FRAUDS.

Mr. BOWELL moved:

That the Order on Public Bills and Orders for consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 16) to provide against frauds in the supplying of Milk to Cheese and Butter Manufactories, be transferred to Governments Orders.

Motion agreed to.

ENQUIRIES.

Mr. LAURIER. In the absence of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), I would like to ask the Minister of Finance when he proposes to bring down the Supplementary Estimates which he has yet to bring?

Mr. FOSTER. My present intention is to bring them down on Monday.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether the semi-official report in the Montreal *Gazette*, that the Government have extended the mail contract with the Allan line for another year, is correct?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 139) further to amend the Inland Revenue Act, chapter 34 of the Revised Statutes.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS. It would be a great advantage if the hon. gentleman would make himself slightly acquainted with the political geography of that country. Outside of the North-West Territories there is a large territory extending eastward to the Hudson Bay, that part of which, formerly called the District of Keewatin, is now a myth. The whole southern portion of the district—the only portion in which there are any white settlers at all, or half-breeds—is now included either in the Province of Ontario or Manitoba. The boundary of Manitoba was extended eastward from where it was formerly until it reaches the western part of Ontario. Now, there was formerly between the eastern boundary of Manitoba and what was admitted to be the western boundary of Ontario a considerable extent of territory which was declared to be in the district of Keewatin. That district was extended between these lines northward, and all the territory south of the Albany River, and in so far as Manitoba is concerned, the 54th parallel, is now included in either the one Province or the other, so that, except in the extreme north, there is really no district of Keewatin at all. If the hon. gentleman proposes to give jurisdiction not included in the North-West Territories, he had better say so, and leave out Keewatin.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events leave the word Keewatin in; it will do no harm, and we will have no boundary dispute.

On section 2,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This Bill was evidently prepared before the Bill amending the Summary Convictions Act was introduced by the Minister of Justice. The limitation of time for bringing an action in that Act was fixed at three months formerly, and the Minister of Justice introduced a Bill extending the time to twelve months. On discussion that was altered to six months. That legislation would render this section unnecessary, and the Minister ought to accept that limitation.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It was found necessary to amend the Customs Act by making the limit twelve months, and the same limit would apply to the Inland Revenue Department.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps it would be better to make this the same as the Customs Act at present, and next Session, if it be in accordance with the general opinion of members of Parliament, we might amend both statutes.

On section 9,

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister of Inland Revenue, if he has endeavored to meet the requests of some of the scientific institutions in regard to the sales of methylated spirits free of duty?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have received several applications from scientific and other institutions to have spirits furnished to them free of duty for the purposes of those institutions. In the change we made last year, we did away with the supply of methylated spirits manufactured outside, as that was much abused, and we have been obliged to refuse the application of many institutions in the country for the use of alcohol. The matter, however, is under consideration. We desire to meet the demand of those institutions which are erected for charitable purposes, but I cannot say that we have arrived at a decision. There is one way, perhaps, in which we might meet their demand. We furnish the trade with these classes of spirits of a higher and a lower grade. The objection made by the scientific institutions is that we introduce the wood naphtha mixed with spirits, which is objectionable for the uses to which they apply it. If they were furnished a higher grade of these methylated spirits, I think it would answer most of the uses for which they want it.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad the Minister is endeavoring to give a favorable decision to the application, but it is hardly meeting the case to say that it is under consideration. I believe there has been communications laid before the Department from a great many of the educational and charitable institutions of Ontario—hospitals, for example, museums, and various educational institutions which are all deeply interested in this matter. I understand from communications that I have received upon the subject, that the proportion of methyl in wood naphtha is so great in the spirits now issued by the department, that the methylated spirits are practically useless for the purposes of science and education, and it therefore involves them in the payment of this heavy duty on that grade of spirits. In the United States I understand they have got over the difficulty. I am not familiar with their scheme, but one of the gentlemen who have spoken to me on the subject, informed me that in the States a bond was taken from the curators of museums and from hospitals and medical schools. These authorities were entrusted with so much spirit, and this bond was given that the spirits would be used for the particular purpose for which they were handed out. Now, why might not that system be adopted in this country? The duty is very heavy—it is an enormous taxation; and I am sure if the Minister appreciated the difficulties of these institutions, which are, in fact, philanthropic in their object, he would not allow the Session to pass without meeting their wishes.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think there will be any great difficulty outside the question of duty; it is just a matter of giving up a certain amount of duty to the country. As concerns the spirits in the hands of these scientific institutions, that matter could be very easily arranged. These institutions, of course, are respectable bodies, and no doubt they would put the liquor so furnished them to the proper

use. I am now in communication with an institution to which we have made a proposition, which they may accept as satisfactory. We desire to meet their views, if possible. The hon. gentleman mentions the class of methylated spirits that we have now, which has 50 per cent. of wood alcohol. If we cannot give them the free spirits, we could give them a higher rate of methylated spirits, and we have enquired what grade would suit them.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I understand the Minister to say that there is no practical difficulty in meeting the requests of these public bodies; the whole question is one of revenue; that is the point that causes the Government to hesitate. If that is the only cause of hesitation, I do not think there should be any hesitation in regard to many of these institutions. Take some of the petitioners to the Government—hospitals, museums, and charitable institutions, depending upon charity for their maintenance—not business institutions, but existing simply for philanthropic purposes. Can we for one moment say that they should be taxed in their efforts? I do not think that the question of duty should cause any hesitation at all. I understand from the museums that the proportion of wood alcohol that you have been putting into the spirits up to the present time, renders the mixture wholly unfit for their purpose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They drink methylated spirits in the North-West.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister says he can get over the difficulty.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Leave it to him.

Mr. MULOCK. Why can you not take power in this Bill?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We do not want it, we have the power.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there power now to issue the methylated spirits free from all duty of excise? Suppose that during the vacation the Government and the applicants are able to come to an understanding; is there statutory power whereby you can issue spirits of the character in question, to these institutions, free of all taxation?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is meant in this section:

"There shall be imposed, levied and collected on goods manufactured in bond within Canada, the following duty of excise, which shall be paid to the collector of Inland Revenue."

What do these words "in bond" mean?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I said the other day that last year when we amended that clause for the purpose of doing away with the manufacture of methylated spirits, we repealed too much. There is a manufacture going on now of what is called fulminate, of which cartridges are made, and we repealed so much of the Act that we have no authority to collect the duty upon that article. We simply re-enact the old clause, leaving out what we intended to leave out, so that it covers everything. It is the old clause except that we leave out the manufacture of methylated spirits.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is comprised in these words of section 9, "all goods manufactured in bond"?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Such articles are manufactured in bond under the control of the Inland Revenue Department. This Act has been on the Statute-book for many years.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does it cover the manufacture of flour in bond?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No.

Mr. COSTIGAN.

On section 10,

Mr. DAVIN moved: That section 238 of the Inland Revenue Act be further amended by adding the following sub-section thereto:—

"The Minister of Inland Revenue may give permission to brewers in the North-West Territories to import or manufacture and use malt in the manufacture of beer, provided they shall not manufacture beer of a strength of more than 4 per cent. alcohol."

He said: I have been asked what is the reason why I fix 4 per cent. The reason I do it is this: At present, beer is permitted, on special permit, to come into the Territories and be sold there, and the grossest injustice is done to our brewers. Before this permission was given, we had brewers in Regina, Moose Jaw, Medicine Hat and Calgary who manufactured what is called hop beer. The moment 4 per cent. beer was permitted to enter, it entirely destroyed these men's industries, and all the capital they had invested. My friend, Mr. Allan, must have had no less than $10,000 invested at Moose Jaw. And the other day we had an instance as to the effect of granting this permission. Mr. Tracey, who manufactured 4 per cent. beer at Medicine Hat, was taken by the heels and carried before a justice of the peace, fined $300, his plant was confiscated, and he was thrust into prison for eight months for manufacturing that which is sold freely, on a special permit, at an hotel within a stone's throw of his own establishment.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Illegally sold.

Mr. DAVIN. Not illegally sold. I can assure this Committee there is not a temperance man or a prohibitionist in all the North-West who is not in favor of allowing us to manufacture our own beer, if once this 4 per cent. beer is allowed to be sold. We can grow the best barley in the world, and it is an anomalous state of things that 4 per cent. beer can he imported from Portage la Prairie and Winnipeg, where it is manufactured, and sent into the Territories, and yet our own brewers are taken by the heels and brought before a justice of peace and fined for making beer that is sold freely in the neighboring hotels. It is, of course, an anomalous state of things, which this Parliament should terminate at once. Any injustice like this, small though it may be, creates an amount of irritation which is very hard for those not familiar with the North-West Territories to understand. In regard to the enquiry as to why I put the strength at 4 per cent., I reply that I do so because I have no argument for putting it at any higher strength. I am not sure that is strong enough for the palates of the North-West people, but I have no argument to put it any higher. I hope the Committee will pass this clause. I am very unwilling, at this period of the Session, to occupy the time of this Committee, but hon. gentlemen must remember that if they take the responsibility of governing those territories, and there are two Bills before the House which show that the real responsibility for governing those territories rests with this House, they must not begrudge some time to discuss the interests of the territory, the responsibility for the government of which lies in them.

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

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 137) further to amend the General Inspection Act, chap. 99 of the Revised Statutes.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. COSTIGAN. I propose to add after section 5:

That section 33 of the said Act is hereby amended by adding the words "and Winnipeg" after the words "St. John, N.B.," in the fourth line thereof.

He said: This is with the intention that the Board of Trade of Winnipeg shall have a representative with the cities named in the Act in making such standards. I also move, in consequence of a representation made to me by the hon. members for Ottawa, Frontenac and Northumberland, as well as by others:

That section 99 be repealed and the following section inserted in lieu thereof: "That every person, except the inspector and deputy inspector, who stamps or numbers raw hides or leather above-mentioned and exposes them for sale so stamped or numbered, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding $20. But any person shall be allowed to mark in chalk on the said leather and hides the weight thereof."

Bill reported.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. DAVIN. I move that the Bill be referred back to Committee in order that the word "eleven" shall be inserted instead of the word "nine" in the second line of sub-section 3. As the section stands at present the whole North-West Territories will have only one representative on that board, and he will come from Regina. Now, Moose Jaw is the centre of as fine a grain growing country as there is in the world, and there is a Board of Trade at Moose Jaw. I believe we should have three representatives from the North-West Territories—one from Moose Jaw, one from Regina and one from Medicine Hat.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What about Calgary?

Mr. DAVIN. We will add Calgary, if the right hon. gentleman wishes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And Edmonton?

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I hope we shall have a railway very soon at Edmonton and that we shall have a representative from there too. It is perfectly clear that only one representative on this board is not just to the North-West Territories, for certainly within two years it will produce more grain than Manitoba.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am sorry the hon. gentleman found it necessary to raise that question. I will not question the propriety of his having done so, nor his motive; but there is one fact which I think he has overlooked, that this amendment is proposed at the earnest request of the people in the western country. It is not a question as between Manitoba and the North-West at all; it is to deal with the grading of the wheat of the western country, and the fixing of the samples in accordance with the standard established by law. I have no objection to changing the clause and making it read, "not exceeding 11."

Mr. WATSON. Then you would have to increase the quorum to six.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not necessarily.

Motion agreed to, Bill amended in Committee, and read the third time and passed.

LOAN TO MENNONITE IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. CARLING moved second reading of Bill (No. 138) respecting a loan therein mentioned to certain Mennonite immigrants.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CARLING moved to strike out the words commencing with "and" in the 36th line of the preamble, to the word "and" in the 41st line, and that the words "by a reduction of the rate of interest on the said loan," be substituted. He said: The amount of money loaned to the Mennonites was $96,400, and it has been agreed that they shall pay 4 per cent. interest from the time this loan was made to them up to the 1st of July, 1888, amounting to $33,986.54. This Bill is to confirm that arrangement.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The preamble, as it is, carries out the resolution as it passed the Committee, but now you propose to strike out the provision providing for 4 per cent. interest, and enable the Government to reduce it down to 1 per cent.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will see, in perusing the recital still further, that it mentions the exact amount which the Government has taken in full, and it then proceeds to enact in confirmation of the proceedings of the Government in so doing. The objection to giving the exact rate of interest is that a good deal depends, in ascertaining the amount, on the law of the appropriation of payments, as to which there may be some difficulty. The sums mentioned are the sums according to which the accounts have been kept in the Finance Department. The preamble therefore adopts those figures, which are really 4 per cent. on the loan, although perhaps the interest might not have been allowable sometimes on the payments which were made by the Mennonites, as it might not be strictly for principal. Therefore we propose in the recital simply to say that the loan bore 6 per cent. compound interest, that the Government agreed to reduce it to 4 per cent. and that they agreed to take the sum mentioned in full.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

COPYRIGHT ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 101) to amend the Copyright Act. He said: This Bill is intended to remove certain grievances which exist in connection with the copyright law of Canada. The House is no doubt aware that copyright in Canada is governed in part by Imperial statute and in part by the statute of this country. Under the Act of this Parliament, an author can obtain copyright in Canada only on condition of his printing and publishing or reprinting and republishing in this country. No such condition, however, is attached to the copyright in the United Kingdom, which is applicable also to Canada. The result is that while we have a copyright law requiring publication here as a condition of copyright, in the interest of our own people, our publishing houses are unable to republish the works which have received a copyright in the United Kingdom without a transfer of the rights of the author, or the person having obtained a copyright there. This grievance has been magnified by the treaties of Great Britain, by which she has extended the facilities given by her copyright system to the citizens of a great many countries, both in Europe and on this continent. Under these circumstances a citizen of any one of these countries having treaty arrangements with the United Kingdom, secures a prohibition in Canada of the republication of his work. That prohibition does not extend to citizens of the United States. While, therefore, a Canadian publishing house is not at liberty to republish such a copyrighted work, a publishing house in the United States, having obtained a transfer of the rights to Canada possessed by the author can republish in the United States and have complete command of the Canadian market, while, on the other hand, it is impossible for a citizen of Canada, under any circumstances, to obtain copyright privileges in the United States. This is not a matter of theory. As a matter of fact, and of actual practice, it has recently transpired that English authors and publishers prefer to sell their copyright privileges as to Canada, and the right to republish in Canada, to American publishing houses, who, perhaps, give them a larger consideration for the right to republish in Canada than the Canadian publishing houses would; and in consequence the American publishing houses issue

their enormous editions first, by the facilities which the free pirating system of the United States gives them, and secondly, under the rights of the British copyright author, which have been refused to be transferred to Canadians, and which give the American publisher rights all over Canada It is felt that this is a condition under which our own publishing houses ought no longer to continue. We ought no longer to continue a prohibition against our own publishing houses which does not extend to those of the neighboring country in relation to our own market. There is a further anomaly as regards the American author. It is necessary, it is true, that there be a residence by the authors to obtain copyright, in the United Kingdom, but the residence has been decided to be of a merely nominal character, and therefore the American author has a right, by the mere fact of residence in the United Kingdom or one of its dependencies for a very short time, to obtain copyright in the United Kingdom and thereby foreclose the publishing in Canada of his works. The American author, can also secure, by simultaneous publication in the United Kingdom and the United States, and by obtaining copyright in the United Kingdom and the United States—secure without any consideration whatever, so far as this country is concerned—the absolute control of the Canadian market. It may be supposed that that observation is subject to some qualification, because we have the right, of course, to import the English editions; but it is well known that until a long time has elapsed the English editions are high-priced editions—so high-priced that they cannot be imported successfully in this country or circulated generally in the face of the keen competition of the American cheap editions; so that it is quite feasible for the American author to obtain his copyright in both countries, issue his cheap edition in the United States, and his more expensive edition in the English market, and, under his copyright in the United Kingdom, still keep control of Canada, and, under his copyright with the United States, obtain the right to publish a cheap edition which will completely monopolise our market. We propose to prevent that; we propose to say that the conditions for copyright shall be—and this is the first part of the Bill—as heretofore, the publishing or republishing of the book in Canada; and we say that unless the author who has obtained copyright in the United Kingdom, shall simultaneously obtain a copyright in Canada, and republish his book here within a month after, the Minister of Agriculture shall be at liberty to give a license to any Canadian to publish the work. This is a strong step in the interests of all those connected with the publishing industry in Canada, it is true, and it may be supposed to be a strong step against the British author. But, on the other hand, we propose by this Bill—and that is its second feature—that there small be collected an excise duty on all the books published under that license. And those who have made a study of the subject assure me that the proceeds to be derived from that excise duty, will give the British author far more compensation for the sale of his works in Canada than he could possibly derive by other means. We propose that that excise duty of royalty shall be collected by the Department of Inland Revenue, under regulations to be made by the Governor in Council. We also propose, by an amendment which I will suggest in Committee, that the provisions of the Act shall not be retrospective in regard to any copyrights obtained before the passing of this Act. I may explain to those who are not acquainted with the publishing business, and to whom it may appear exacting to require that the copyright shall be obtained simultaneously in both countries, and that the work shall be issued within a month, that it would be impossible to provide for a greater interval. We must necessarily take care that, during the interval allowed between the obtaining of the copyright and the republication of the work in Canada, American reprints should not be allowed, because, but for that provision, the prohibition would be futile, as the market would be taken possession of by the American editions. It is therefore important that the interval should not be more, otherwise the reading public would be at a disadvantage in Canada compared with those in other countries. A month is not too long a time. It is the period allowed for *interim* copyright under the present law, so that principle has been established, and publishers inform me that it is not an uncommon practice for authors who desire to have copyrights in two countries to make provision for the work of the printing being proceeded with in the two countries simultaneously in such a way that a work could be issued in America within two or three hours of its issue in the United Kingdom. That, of course, would be necessary in any work of magnitude which required more than a month for its entire production in Canada; but, for the class of works to which this Act will generally apply, the month will not be found too short, and we could hardly make the time longer without doing an injury to the Canadian reader.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does not this Bill attack the rights given by the Imperial Act?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is in conflict with the Imperial Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How do you propose to repeal the Imperial Act by an Act of this Parliament?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not propose to repeal the Imperial Act, but, under the British North America Act, I think we have the right to legislate in respect to this subject irrespective of any statute of the Imperial Parliament passed before the British North America Act was passed. The Imperial Copyright Act was passed in 1842. The Act which declared that colonial statutes were invalid if they were repugnant to Imperial statutes was passed in 1865. Two years after that, we received the ample gift of powers which the British North America Act contains. In the exercise of those powers, we have repealed, sometimes by implication, and sometimes directly, scores of Imperial enactments, in addition to volumes of the Common Law of the United Kingdom; and, if the objection were sustained in regard to the exercise of our powers on the question of copyright, it would strike off at least one half of the Revised Statutes. That I may be candid with the House, I may say that the other view was taken by the Colonial Office, and in 1875, the despatch of Lord Carnarvon had this bearing, that a certain Canadian statute on this subject having been passed, Her Majesty could not be advised not to disallow that Act, because it was repugnant to the law of the United Kingdom in regard to copyright, which extended through Her Majesty's colonies. He stated that he had been advised to that effect by the Crown officers, and that, in addition to that, two lawyers of eminence had given an opinion to the same effect, and he referred to a parliamentary Blue-book to support that statement. I have looked at the Blue-book very carefully, and I think everyone who examines it will agree with me that it does not justify the statement by Lord Carnarvon in that despatch. I would feel some hesitation in asking Parliament to take a course contrary to Lord Carnarvon's opinion if we did not necessarily act from day to day on the principle that we can legislate on subjects of this character, which are given into our control by the British North America Act irrespective of anterior legislation of the Imperial Parliament, and if my views were not supported by three cases which have been decided since that date. The Privy Council has declared, in the most emphatic terms, that the Dominion Legislature has power to repeal an Imperial statute.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This question is reserved by the British North America Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Under the British North America Act it is stated that Acts existing prior to the union of the Provinces shall remain in force until they are repealed either by the Imperial Parliament or the Local Legislature, as the case may be, excepting as to Imperial statutes. So that would cut out Imperial statutes, and leave them as they were, irrespective of that section. We have repealed Imperial statutes since then, and the Privy Council has decided that we had the right to do so. The fundamental principle is that we are not restrained from legislating on any matter in regard to which power is given to us by the Act of 1867.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman state what decision of the Privy Council there is stating that this Parliament has the right to repeal an Imperial statute passed before 1867?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The three cases to which I referred are all contained in the tenth volume of Appeal Cases. The most direct decision is contained in Regina *vs.* Riel.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Those were Australian cases.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. One was an Australian case. The Act constituting the Legislature there, simply gave them legislative powers, as the B. N. A. Act does.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This is a very important constitutional question that has been raised by the Minister. The question has been raised whether, under the British North America Act, bankruptcy and insolvency are placed under the control of the Dominion Parliament in the same way as copyright. A similar case occurred in Ontario, some years ago, in regard to registration.

Mr. MULOCK. In that case the Act was passed after Confederation, but, by an Imperial Act, was declared to apply to the Provinces.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not pretend that the matter is so plain that it is not open to argument. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) gave notice of a motion for an address, asking that an Imperial statute should be passed. On explaining to him my views I think he agreed with me that the most dignified course would be to pass a statute of our own. I feel confident, especially in view of the decisions which I have referred to, that we have these powers; if we have not, the sooner we get them the better. It is impossible that we can have still applicable to this country, as, for instance, the North-West Territories, the English statutes that were in force in relation to those Territories when we purchased the country. Every enactment we have made with regard to that territory would be null if we had not the power to deal with Imperial statutes. It is so with regard to the great volume of our law. If we have power to legislate in this direction, this is probably the most dignified way in which to exercise it; if we have not the power, this is the most respectful and dignified way of seeking the enlarged powers which we need.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In the two Bankruptcy Acts we passed, we made express provision limiting the effect of a discharge in any other country except Canada, and the Acts were both sent to England for consideration.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. ELLIS. How does this affect the larger works which no Canadian publisher would undertake to publish? Take many English works of travel, or large maps, how will it affect them?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I asked that question of persons who are in the publishing business, and I was informed that this was provided for in two ways. If the English author desires to have his work copyrighted in Canada, he will make provision for publishing here while his work is going through the press in England. But you will find that there is no prohibition against the introduction of American reprints after the time has expired, and when no license is taken out.

Mr. ELLIS. That would seem to be all right, except that the terms of the Act seem to require that the book shall be printed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the English author wants his copyright here, he must print it here simultaneously with its being printed in England; but if he abandons a copyright and nobody takes out a license to reprint here, then the American edition is allowed to come in.

The CHAIRMAN. It is proposed to add the following as the third sub-section of the first section:—

"If any such copyright work has been reprinted previously to the passing of this Act, any person who has previously, to such date, imported any foreign reprint, may dispose of such reprint by sale or otherwise, but the burden of proof to establish the extent or regularity of the transaction, shall in such case be upon such person."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. MULOCK. Suppose the security should turn out to be defective and the Government did not succeed in collecting all the royalty, the Crown might be held responsible. This should be provided against by the insertion of the following words: "But the Government shall not be liable to account for any such royalty not actually collected."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to inserting the words. The security was merely against fraud on the part of the publishers. There must be some system by which excise duty will be paid before the books are issued.

On section 5,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This will prohibit the whole importation from the United States.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not see any other way in which to protect our publishers than by prohibiting the importation from the United States of a book which is copyrighted here. The same principle prevails in our copyright law at present.

Mr. ELLIS. An obligatiun ought to be put on the man to publish the book immediately.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the limit is well defined in the Act.

Mr. MULOCK. It appears to me that any person ought to be entitled to a license under section 3. As it stands at present, it is optional with the Government to issue more than one license. What would be the objection to any person being entitled to a license on coming here and complying with the conditions laid down, namely, giving security?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is what is intended by the Bill now.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Suppose a party applied for a license and shows that he is prepared to publish and print, and just as he is ready to publish another party makes the same demand; if you grant it you destroy all the labor and expense the first party was put to. Further, there is no provision as to the time the license expires.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that the only alternative between granting rival applications for licenses is to

give a monopoly and issue only one license, but I think this is a most objectionable alternative. We run the risk, it is true, of competition destroying the profit to the person who takes the license, but it is better to run the risk of that competition than to say that one licensee shall have the right to monopolize the market, even though he breaks down in making the publication.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think that the license should expire in twenty-eight years, the same as the copyright, and that provisions should be made for that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would ask the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) to consider whether, after all, it is necessary to limit the license, because he will see that it does not give any exclusive right to publish. At the end of twenty years a copyright expires, and then there is no necessity for a license at all, as anybody can publish.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The prohibition remains against importation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The amendment should be there, and not in the provision relating to the license.

The CHAIRMAN. The following is proposed as a sub-section of section 5:—

"The prohibition may also be withdrawn on its being made to appear that the copyright of the author has expired."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 6,

The CHAIRMAN. It is proposed to add the following to section 6:—

"Nor shall anything in this Act be deemed to apply to any work of which any copyright has been obtained in the United Kingdom, or such country as aforesaid, before the passage of this Act, but the law in force at the time of the passing hereof shall be deemed to be still in force as affects such work."

Amendment agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose that the Act shall go into force by proclamation on a day to be named by the Governor in Council. Owing to the view taken of this subject in England, it will be necessary that it be discussed by the Imperial authorities, and that the views of Her Majesty's Government be ascertained before it comes into force, because it might be subject to Imperial disallowance. I propose as section 7, therefore, the following:—

"This Act shall come into force on a day to be named by proclamation of the Governor in Council."

Amendment agreed to, and Bill reported.

SECOND READING—IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (140) to amend the Revised Statutes respecting Escapes and Rescues.—(Sir John Thompson.)

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

After Recess.

MAIL SERVICE—CANADA AND EUROPE.

House again resolved itself into Committee on resolution (p. 1329) respecting a contract for the performance of a fast weekly steamship service for the carrying of mails between Canada and the United Kingdom, making connection with a French port.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This is a matter which interests the whole Dominion of Canada, but more especially the Maritime Provinces, and to a still greater degree the principal seaports of the Maritime Provinces. In 1886, advertisements were published asking for tenders for a line of steamships from the United Kingdom to Quebec in the summer and Halifax in the winter, and it was provided that the terminal point might be Portland or any other place in the United States, as the Postmaster General might direct. That proposition created considerable agitation in St. John, and a large deputation waited on the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine in regard to it. The result was that the proposition was changed and the tenders were altered so as to make the terminal point in Canada. Nothing appears to have been done at that time in regard to it, but I understand that at present the Minister of Finance proposes to make the terminal point of the steamship line which may be subsidised a Canadian port. That, of course, interests the people of the Maritime Provinces, in regard to the winter, because it is clear that the steamers, during the summer months, will proceed to Rimouski and Quebec, as the present steamers do. As I understood from the Minister of Finance the other day, the Government had received tenders from certain steamship lines which were not satisfactory. I think, before we discussed this matter, these tenders and the correspondence in connection with then should have been submitted to the House. We are working in the dark in this matter. We neither know upon what terms those tenders were made, nor what was deemed unsatisfactory, nor what correspondence took place, nor what were the propositions of the Government as to the port from which the vessels should sail in the United Kingdom, and where they should touch, or where they will terminate in the Provinces. When we are casting such a large yearly burden upon the finances, I think we should be taken into the confidence of the Government, and should know what the Government propose, and what they have refused. First of all, we ought to know what size these vessels are to be, and what are to be the rates of speed. We should know if they are to be 20 knot vessels, or what speed they are to have, because the advance has been very rapid in the building of steam vessels and of the machinery which they require. The vessels of twenty years ago, and even those of ten years ago, are now obsolete, and every day we find a new class of steamers introduced with improvements in the hull and in the structure of the vessel as well as in the machinery; and we find that latterly a large class of vessels have been introduced by the Cunard line which have eclipsed those which were considered large steamers a short time ago, such large vessels as the *Umbria* and the *Etruria;* and those in their turn, large as they are, are eclipsed by such large ships as the *City of Paris* and the *City of New York*, of the Inman line. It is very important that we should know the size of the vessels which can be obtained for this service, and the number of knots they are to run. Then comes a very important question, which is the connection with a French port. That must be a very serious factor in the decision of the port from which these vessels are to sail in the United Kingdom, and it is also important to know with what port in France it is contemplated that the connection shall be made. If we are to have a class of steamers such as those which are now denominated the "greyhounds of the seas," it is certain that they would not make a connection with French ports themselves, because they would not think of crossing the English channel for that purpose. They would rather run the risks of half-a-dozen Atlantic voyages than cross the channel once. Therefore, the connection with France may be a matter very difficult to carry out. My hon. friend, the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) put forward very strongly the claims of Halifax, and gave a table showing that the distance from England to Halifax is less than the distance from England to New York, and he contended that the same class of passenger traffic which now goes to New

York would be attracted to Halifax by fast ocean service. While I would be very glad to see all our Canadian traffic come to our own ports, and also to see a great traffic diverted from the American ports to a Canadian port, we cannot help feeling that nature is to a certain extent against us in regard to that matter, that geographically we can never be in exactly the same position as New York. In the first place, without derogating from the capabilities of Halifax as a harbor, we know that the approach to Halifax is much more difficult than the approach to New York.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). We know that they have this advantage in New York, that immediately they leave the port, they are at sea. I will not quarrel with my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Jones), but that is the general opinion. Besides, the New York vessels are able to take what is called the southern route in winter, and so are able to avoid the dangers attaching to the northern route. We cannot help that. It is caused by the physical and geographical positions in which we are placed. That is not decrying the Canadian port, but it is simply looking at things as they are. Then, as to the mails, an hon. gentleman has already pointed out that, in regard to the carriage of mails and passengers from the west, our geographical position puts us at a great disadvantage and that, while only one steamer would leave Halifax per week, the steamers are running daily from New York. I recollect, many years ago, when we advocated the formation of a line to connect with the American system on the border of New Brunswick and then have a line built through New Brunswick to Halifax, the general belief was that as soon as these railway lines were completed we should have the ocean traffic, and I, myself, firmly believed that would be the case. At that time we had, comparatively speaking, the best mail service between the United Kingdom and America, with the Cunard line heavily subsidised, and, at that time, almost without a competitor upon the ocean, because the American lines had failed. But a short time afterwards we saw, that instead of the traffic following the course we expected, it went by the New York line, and our expectations ended in disappointment. All these matters have got to be considered in deciding what course we should pursue under the present circumstances. My hon. friend alongside of me has pointed out what he believes would be a better service than these vessels, one that could carry a larger quantity of freight, with steamers, perhaps, not so swift, but sailing 16 or 17 knots. Then with regard to the terminal ports in the Dominion of Canada. As I said before, the Finance Minister has adopted the doctrine that the terminal point in North America shall be a Canadian port, and not an American one. If so, it seems to me that both Halifax and St. John should be considered in that respect. The people of St. John do not object to Halifax. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) stated the other night that Halifax was far superior in every respect to St. John. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island said he was detained by fogs one day in Halifax, and my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island said that he would be detained a week off St. John for one day that he would be detained off Halifax. Other charges have been been made against the Bay of Fundy, and it is well known that if you give a dog a bad name it sticks to him. But I repudiate entirely the charge that the Bay of Fundy is unfavorable to navigation. It may be true that in the summer months we have fogs; my hon. friend alongside of me says, occasionally, and I believe statistics would show that it is only occasionally; but during the winter months there is no such a thing as a fog. I find that during the six months from November to April inclusive, the average fog per month is not over 19 hours, and that during the winter months there is practically no fog at all. The harbor itself is of easy access. My hon. friend from Halifax has stated that no accidents happen to steamers going into that port; but I think, compared with St. John, there have been more casualties to steamers at Halifax than at St. John. I find that during the last ten years there have been 3,627 steamers seaward and 3,898 arrivals, or a total of 7,525 during the last ten years, visiting the port of St John. Out of that number there were only four steamers who received any casualties, namely, the *State of Maine*, *York City*, *Humascoa* and *Dominion*. I see by a St. John paper received to-day that the following steamships are on their way to that port:—*Cervin*, from Mediterranean; *Cheniston*, from New York; *Damara*, from London; *Elstow*, from Cardiff; *Federico*, from Boston; *Merchant Prince*, from Cardiff; *North Angler*, from Palermo; *North Erin*, from Palermo; and *Washington City*, from Barrow.

An hon. MEMBER. These are tramps.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Perhaps some of them are but they are large ocean steamers, and just as liable to run on the rocks as smaller ones. Some persons cry down St. John, but I would remark that the harbor of St. John is, I think, the only harbor north of Baltimore, or north of Cape Hatteras that has never been blocked by ice. I believe at times steamers have been cut out of the ice at Halifax and at Boston, but so far, never at St. John. We find that vessels can enter St. John at any season of the year, which cannot be said of any other port north of Hatteras. I think if my hon. friend should go up the Bay of Fundy, he would find it remarkably free of fog. I doubt if any part of the coast has been better surveyed. It is admirably well lighted, and has automatic buoys and fog whistles. I venture to say that if you ask the masters who have been in the habit of going there, men who have experience, they will tell you that there is no safer navigation than the port of St. John. In times past I can recollect when the Allen Line steamers were first subsidised to Portland, they were unable to obtain any cargo there, and I remember seeing steamer after steamer come to St. John to take in cargoes, and then go down to Portland to take the Canadian mails. In 1862, we saw all the large steamers of England lying there with the troops brought out at the Trent affair: we saw those splendid troop ships, at that time the largest ships afloat, like the *Himalaya* and the East Indian troop ships, the liners of the Peninsula and Oriental Company, the Allan Line, the Cunard Line, all the large vessels of those lines, from day to day coming into St. John and landing their troops, and not a single casualty occurred. Since 1862 some of the largest sailing vessels that every floated on the waters, including that well-known ship, the *Great Republic*, have come into the port at St. John, loaded and went away with perfect safety. So much has been said in depreciation of the Bay of Fundy and the harbor of St. John, that I think it is necessary to give these facts and statistics to show how unfounded those statements are. I do not wish to decry Halifax. We admit that Halifax, geographically, is situated better than we are; but I do submit that in the selection of the terminal point for steamers, St. John should be considered. We have this advantage, we are the nearest Dominion port to the west, of course not so near as the American ports, but it is the nearest port in Canada to Montreal and the west. We also have a large amount of trade and can provide cargoes for any vessel that comes there. We find that during the years between 1877 and 1886 there were 16,719 vessels inwards, of 5,261,658 tons; and 16,794 vessels outwards, with over 5,500,000 tons; making 33,512 out and in of that harbor, with a tonnage of 10,792,846, and you will find that the casualties, so far, inside the Bay of Fundy, have been very small, and are decreasing from year to year. As I said before, the bay soundings have been thoroughly completed, and there is good anchorage.

With respect to the manner in which the coast is lighted, I may say that both the American and the British coast are well lighted and buoyed, so that there is no difficulty in vessels coming there. The International Line, which has run for years between Boston and St. John, makes the trip as regularly as a railroad train, and this fact shows that, so far as approaching St. John is concerned, difficulties do not occur. I claim that our port should be considered as having claims with respect to the subsidised line of Atlantic steamers. If the Government are so anxious on the other side that the vessels should run from England to France, it is not too much that we in New Brunswick should ask, at all events, that the vessels should come from Halifax to St. John, where they would receive freight from the west and also that freight with which we would be able regularly to supply them. If we can show that the vessels could enter our harbors with safety, that its navigation was such that vessels properly and carefully managed could enter with comparative impunity from danger, I hold that our port should be considered, and if it is provided that this subsidised line should call at a French port on the other side, we have a right to claim what is fairly our due. This is a very large amount to grant. and it will form a very heavy charge upon the country, and yet, in regard to the scheme itself, we are left to a certain extent in the dark. We do not know what position we occupy, we do not know what port the vessel will start from, to what port they will go, at what port in France they will call. Surely, before this House is called upon to vote this large sum, and add a heavy burden to the country, we should have some further information as to what the Government propose to do. If, after full consideration and due argument, it is found that we cannot obtain large and fast steamers, such as go to New York, let us adopt the next best course, and obtain a line which, although not such a fast line, would probably be equally beneficial to Halifax, St. John, and the whole country. Let us, after obtaining information, fully consider the whole question, for we have each to bear equally the burden, and decide what is best in the interest of the whole country. I consider that such a line as I have indicated would probably confer greater benefits than a fast line that would simply carry mails and passengers, and not be able to carry our freight. Perhaps it would be better to have the fast mail steamers to compete with New York lines, but before we adopt such a policy we should ascertain the whole facts and not run blindfold into this expenditure. The Government surely have some scheme or proposition, and have formed some definite idea of what they propose to do; if not, they are running as much in the dark as the members of this House. It is only fair to members of this House, and to the people of the country, that full information with respect to the expenditure should be presented, that the whole matter should be fairly laid before the House, so that it can be fully discussed in the light of what has taken place and what the Government propose, and we should then endeavor to carry out that scheme which will most benefit the country.

Mr. SKINNER. I wish to address a few remarks to the House before it passes on this question, speaking from a similar standpoint to that occupied by my hon. colleague from St. John (Mr. Weldon). I do not quite understand whether my hon. colleague approves of the general proposition to grant subsidies to steamers for the purpose of developing trade with the mother country and the colonies in the Pacific and China and Japan, or not. I gather that it is rather doubtful whether he is in favor of it, yet I cannot say from what he stated that he is so or not, but it does not make any difference in regard to the general question. I am of the opinion that the large majority of the constituents we represent are in favor of a supreme effort being made by the country for developing this, what we might call a foreign trade, as the complement of the efforts made in regard to our internal trade, and they will cheerfully join in any reasonable way for the furtherance of the great object in view. I also know that our constituents are very much worked up indeed with respect to what they think are their rights and their reasonable expectations with regard to what has been their anticipation for many years in the past, and which to them and to us is a very grave matter indeed. The expectations of St. John, with respect to these matters, dates far back to the time when we came into union, twenty odd years ago. Then the question in agitation was the Intercolonial Railway. It was supposed that the railway would go through the centre of our Province into Quebec, and touch the cities of Quebec and Montreal by the shortest possible route through which a railway could be built, but in that we were disappointed. For reasons other than commercial ones, the railway was carried around the north shore, and accordingly our people have been agitating for a shorter line ever since, in order that the primary and fundamental ideas of Confederation might be carried out, and a railway built so as to give an outlet to the seaboard by the shortest practicable route. But the influences of Nova Scotia, the influences of the northern portions of New Brunswick, the influences of the Province of Quebec were brought to bear in favor of the object to run the Intercolonial Railway by the north shore, and St. John was not able to realise her expectations. But we have continued along, working as well as we could and anticipating that things would be set right from time to time, at all events with regard to these matters. That has led our people to think a great deal about what we call the Short Line Railway; and now that the Short Line is about completed and will be opened, I understand, in a few days, the merchants and business men of St John have naturally been looking forward to this position: that if steamers were engaged by subsidy or otherwise to go to Europe, after the opening of the Short Line, St. John should be the Atlantic terminus of the line. Halifax, of course, has put forward her claim with respect to this matter, and it is said here, and was said the other night, that geography is against us in New Brunswick. I take issue with that remark as to New Brunswick. I say that geography is not against us as the matter now stands. My colleague, the member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) referred to the agitation that was aroused in our country twenty or thirty years ago with respect to the sending of the passenger traffic from the United States and elsewhere, along the shortest route to Europe. I well remember that during that period it was thought and expressed that if the railway system were perfected so that passengers from the United States and western Canada could go to Halifax or the most extreme point of Nova Scotia, I think Louisburg, they would take that route, not from necessity but from desire, and passengers would go from the nearest point of connection between the continent of America and Great Britain. At that time it took about twelve or fourteen days to make the Atlantic voyage, and you well understand that two days made a difference in the shortening of the voyage then, but since that time the development of science in regard to steamships has reduced the passage to six, seven or eight days and people have not the same idea about crossing the Atlantic as they had then. It is a fact, however, that people do not care to make a railroad trip any longer than they can help to the port of departure, and that they prefer to go on the ship at the most convenient point, without reference as to whether that point is nearer to their objective port on the other side or not. Therefore, during the past few years steamships sailing from Halifax to Great Britain in the winter time have not been a success. My hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) in speaking of this matter the other

night said that this was on account of the slowness of the steamers. I do not think that he was correct in that, for even although they were rapid steamers people would not travel over a long journey on the Intercolonial Railway to Halifax in the winter time. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that passengers would go to Halifax in preference to St. John, the latter being a much shorter railway route from Western Canada. Even when they get the Short Line it will be 250 miles shorter to St. John than it will be to Halifax. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that the passenger traffic can only be properly developed in Canada if St. John be made the winter port. We have now three lines of railway running out of St. John to the United States and to the western portion of Canada, and in a very short time we will have another line from that city through Maine to a number of towns and cities not now touched by railway communication. With these facilities for travel, the moment a passenger would land in St. John to go to the United States, or to Montreal, or Toronto, he would have a shorter journey to travel than if he landed at Halifax. On the other hand, those who oppose St. John say that it is not the easiest port of access from Liverpool. If a steamer from Liverpool sails for Halifax she has to deviate considerably in her voyage to come to the north and west, whereas if she came to St. John she would not have to deviate at all, and the fact remains that a fast mail and passenger steamer would arrive in St. John and have her passengers and mails discharged there as soon as or sooner than if she disembarked her mails at Halifax, and they had to come around by St. John by railway. Again they say: "Your port is not so safe as Halifax," and I have in my hand a statement put forth by the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Halifax only a few days ago, in which it is said: "Whereas the port of Halifax is the only safe and most desirable harbor on the Atlantic coast," and so forth. They have actually sent those circulars to the Government of this country and to the Parliament and people of Canada containing this false statement. What are the facts about the port of St. John? Here is the state of the marine business of St. John for the year ending 30th June, 1888: Tonnage arrived in vessels during the year, 514,858 tons. Tonnage departed from the port of St. John, 522,498 tons, or a total of 1,307,356 tons. That is a large business, and that business could not be conducted by any port that was not a safe port. We must remember also that some of the vessels trading with St. John were of the largest class and that among them were steamers of a much larger tonnage than will be those ocean greyhounds which may be constructed under the contract which it is now proposed to enter into. We find that the tonnage of the great port of Montreal, last year, was as follows: Tonnage arrived, 554,649 tons; tonnage departed, 594,858, total 1,149,507 only a little over the tonnage of the port of St. John. When you consider that Montreal has about four or five times the population of St. John and that we are conducting a business in St. John nearly equal to the tonnage required for the city of Montreal, you can see how important the port of St. John is. I think that it is not necessary to make any further remarks in reference to the safety of the port of St. John. The extent of the business that is done there confirms the statement repeatedly made that our port is one of the safest on the Atlantic coast, and I certainly was sorry to hear the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island the other night, in his flippant and unthinking way, make the statement that steamers would be detained off the port of St. John, on account of fogs. It is known to merchants and shipowners that in winter time there is no fog off St. John, and it is one of the freest port from fogs on the Atlantic coast. We have summer fogs which are driven from the coast of Massachusetts by south-west winds, but they do not affect us in the winter time at all. In winter time we are practically free from fog and our port is as a safe one and is easy of access as is proved by the large number of steamers which enter and leave it all the year around. Again, if passengers desiring to go to Europe will consider what is the shortest way they can go, they will find that from Montreal to St. John is only 94 miles farther than New York, and that difference would scarcely count for anything if the steamship service were all that is required. If the proposed steamship line is going to be equal to the best that sails from United States ports, then people will know that it is as perfect as can be had; and if they went by St. John and saved 200 miles of railway journey to Halifax, surely the line would be a success. When we consider that hitherto lines of steamships sailing from Halifax have not been a success, it is reasonable to suppose that if we had a line sailing from St. John, inasmuch as it is nearer to western Canada and nearer to the United States for business purposes, it would be most successful. Again, if Halifax is selected on the principle that the sailing point must be the nearest to Europe, Halifax would only enjoy the advantage for a few years, because the point nearest to Europe having railway communication would soon be White Haven, in Cape Breton. Therefore, that argument for selecting Halifax, because it is the nearest point to Europe, will not be available for probably more than two years longer. I, therefore, put forward here the claims of St. John, not from the standpoint of antagonism to Halifax at all. Halifax in the past has had nearly everything her own way in these matters. Freight going from western Canada to the seaboard can go to Halifax at the same rates as to St. John, although it is nearly 200 miles farther away, it has had the winter port business during all these years; and St. John has worked away, doing the best she could, improving her position constantly, while feeling that she has not been quite properly treated in comparison with Halifax. I have figures here with regard to the arrival and departure of ships at St. John for ten years, showing that there has been a gradual increase in her business. It must be remembered that during that period our city was nearly destroyed by fire; and yet these figures show that we have a marine business scarcely second to that of Montreal, although proportionately to population it is four times as great. Therefore, I am in favor of making this effort, for the purpose of bringing Canada to the front, and of maintaining the position of Canada, and I would go so far as to favor even what the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) referred to the other night as a jingo policy, by which I understand him to mean that by developing this foreign trade, we may bring the colonies closer together, and closer to the mother land. Whether that be a jingo policy or not, I believe it is going to be the policy of the future, and it is going to be sustained by this country. Therefore, while I support this proposition, I hope the Government, casting its eye over the whole commerce of Canada, and seeing how St. John is situated, and the facilities she possesses for sending and receiving freight for Western Canada, will not pass us over, but for the reasons I have given, and the reasons which will suggest themselves to any person who thinks the matter out, our port is so situated that it can accommodate both freight and passengers better than any other port on the Atlantic coast. I, therefore, hope when this matter comes to be settled that the Government will see that the reasonable anticipations of our people will be fully realised.

Mr. O'BRIEN. This question has so far been treated apparently as though it were one entirely affecting the interests of the Maritime Provinces, and as if the cities of Halifax and St. John were the only ports of the Dominion specially interested. I take it that this country is not going to pay half a million dollars a year for the maintenance of

a line of steamships to gratify the Maritime Provinces or any special interest in this country. I think we have to consider in this matter very materially the class of business for which we are going to pay this money. Not professing to have very much knowledge of the subject, I think we have to consider whether the class of steamships we propose to subsidise is the class best adapted for the general trade of the country. It appears to me that we have to take into consideration several matters altogether apart from local interests. We have to consider, in the first place, the class of business these steamships are to do. If they are simply to carry passengers to be transported across the continent by Canadian Pacific Railway, and then to be transhipped across to Asia or China, of course you cannot have ships by means of which the transport can be made too quickly; but if you are to consider the great bulk of the produce which we have to export, then you must consider not only what class of vessels are best fitted to carry it, but whether that produce can be carried most cheaply by rail or by water; and having decided these points, you can come to a conclusion where the terminus can best be. It is for the business men who deal in cheese, butter, flour, and other products to be shipped to Europe, to say, first, whether they can be carried most cheaply and advantageously by the class of steamships proposed to be subsidised, or by another class of steamships; and, secondly, whether that produce can be most readily and cheaply carried the greatest distance by water or the greatest distance by rail and the shortest by water. These are all important considerations to be taken into account in subsidising this class of steamships. It does appear to me that we ought to subsidise that class of steamships that would give to the farmer and the great producing classes of this country the best and cheapest mode of transportation. If you can accomplish that by the class of vessels you propose to subsidise, so much the better, because you will gain two objects: you will bring this country into the closest communication with England, with which, in the sense alluded to by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner), I am most heartily in accord, and you will also have a fast line for freight. But I think we have to take first into account the general trade and business of the country. If it can be shown that the class of steamers proposed to be subsidised will best serve that consideration, by all means give them the subsidy. If, on the other hand, another class will best satisfy the producers, I think they ought to have the first consideration. On these points I do not profess to give an opinion, but the Government ought to carefully consider them before they decide the terminus or the class of steamers to be subsidised. I wish to ask the Government one question. We have been led to make large grants for railways in Nova Scotia, notably for one which we were led to understand was to give us an ocean terminus at Louisburg. Now, the only reason that I can understand why we should support the grant for a railway in that particular direction, is that it will accomplish the great national object of giving us the best seaport at the furthest eastern extremity of the Dominion. If that be the object the Government have in view, I consider the building of that railway is a most reasonable thing; but if that object is to be abandoned, I think the country is not being fairly dealt with. The Government should let us understand whether Louisburg or some other point in that part of Cape Breton is ultimately to become the terminus of our great transcontinental railway. If it is, this expenditure which we are called on to make is, I believe, justifiable; if it is not, it cannot be justified. These are questions which I think this House should fairly consider before taking any action in this matter. I am heartily in favor of subsidising the best line of steamers which will best answer the general interests and trade of this country. I do not profess to be cognisant of the subject, but I want to have that question decided before giving a vote on this resolution. I look upon a steamer that will cross the ocean in six days in the light of a Pullman car; I look upon it as a luxury. If the people can afford to pay for it, well and good; but if the bulk of the people have to travel in ordinary first class carriages, and can only afford to pay the rate for a steamer which is not considered first-class, their interests ought to be taken into consideration. These are matters which ought to be decided before we pass n the resolution now before us.

Mr. PLATT. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has certainly put this question in a clearer light than it has appeared in heretofore; but he seems, to a certain extent, to look on this matter as if we had a half a million dollars jingling loosely in our pockets, and had no other purpose to devote it to except to subsidise a line of steamers across the ocean. In my opinion the first question to be considered is whether we should report the resolution at all or not. I question very much, leaving out the constituencies immediately interested in the expenditure, whether the Dominion at large is in favor of such an outlay. The hon. member for Halifax and the hon. member for St. John have taken up considerable time discussing the respective merits of those rival ports. It seems to me we had better first decide whether we ought to make the expenditure at all before we quarrel over the question as to which of those ports is the better. The hon. member for St. John says he has no doubt that a large majority of his constituents are in favor of this expenditure being made, provided, I suppose, that St. John be made the terminal port. The hon. members for Halifax could, no doubt, equally well say that a large majority of their constituents are in favor of our incurring this expenditure, provided Halifax be made the terminal port. Well, it has been truly said, that there are other constituencies between the two oceans besides Halifax and St. John; and I think the people of the central part of the Dominion at any rate, who will be called on to pay a large proportion of the money, should have something to say as to the advisability of spending this money at all. We have heard from the Government benches very little of argument in favor of the proposition now before the House. It has been said, and the opinion seemed to meet with general approval, that we would not be justified in making any expenditure of money for the purpose of competing with freight carrying vessels. We were told, and I suppose it is true, that there are vessels ready on every coast to receive every pound of freight we have to ship across the ocean, and that statement has received the general commendation of the House. Now, if we are to do nothing towards the expedition of freight across the ocean, I do not see how a very large majority of the people of this country are going to be at all benefited by this expenditure. If it is to be simply an expenditure in order that we may have rapid passages and rapid transport of mails, what proportion of the community are to be benefited by it? Very few of our people comparatively cross and recross the ocean, and those few are composed of the wealthiest men of the country. Very few comparatively are interested in having a rapid transit of mails, and they are also composed of the wealthiest men of the country. Upon the whole, it may be said that this entire expenditure—if we leave out of consideration the question of freight—is to be made for the benefit of the richer few, while it is the poorer many who will have to foot the bill. Another argument that has been hinted at by many, and hinted at broadly by the Minister of Finance is, that this fast line of steamers, rivalling the line from New York, would be something this Dominion might be proud of. I agree in the opinion that we might well be proud of it, if we could afford it; but there are times in the lives of a people, as there are times in the lives of individuals, when they are not able to afford all the

luxuries, and all the delicacies, and all the ornaments which they might desire and of which, if they had them, they might well be proud. It is a common incident in every day life, to see the wealthy farmer, who is able to make the outlay, obtain for himself and family a very fine turn out, and to see, on the other hand, his poorer neighbor, who is unable to pay for the enjoyment of such luxury, become jealous and envious, and, impelled by the desire to rival his richer neighbor, mortgage his farm to purchase an equally elaborate turn out, until finally, through that spirit of pride and envy, his whole farm becomes dissipated. It seems to me in attempting to rival our rich neighbor to the south of us, for the sake of having a line of steamers which will serve as an ornament to this country, as the American lines adorn their country, we are imitating the example I have just given. We had better wait until we get a little wealthier, and better able to pay our bills, before we incur this outlay; we had better wait until the general mass of the people are going to benefit by it rather than the select few. If any hon. gentleman from any part of this Dominion, not immediately interested, will go through his constituency, and discover how many individuals in it are interested, either in the rapid transit of passengers or mails across the ocean, they will find very few indeed. He will find that by far the larger number of the people do not feel any interest whatever in the proposition now before the House, and will be ready to favor a curtailment, rather than an increase, of our expenditure.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I agree in the remarks that fell from the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) that this is a question which not only interests the Maritime Provinces but also the whole Dominion, and I think that, while we in Ontario will have probably to pay the larger portion of the bill, we should have something to say in the matter. Now, the only argument that the hon. the Minister advanced in favor of this resolution was that our passenger traffic was going *via* New York, and that our mails were going *via* New York as well, and that it was necessary to put a fast line of steamers upon the Canadian route, calling at a French port in order to retain the passenger trade and the carrying of the mails by that route from this Dominion. I do not think it makes very much difference to Canadians whether their letters go *via* New York or Halifax, as long as they go at the same rate of postage, and I do not think it is desirable that we should spend a half million dollars a year simply to have a fast line of steamers in order to carry our mails from Halifax or St. John, instead of New York. Another thing people seem to forget is that it makes very little difference now to the business of this country whether their mails take seven days or eight or ten days to go over. Nearly all the business now is done by the Atlantic cable. There are very few business men who do their business by the mail. Hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of business is transacted between Canada and the old country, and scarcely a letter passes in regard to it, because it is all done by the aid of the Atlantic cable. Cabling has got down to a very reasonable rate, so that all commercial business can be done in that way. Then again, we do not require our mails so quickly, because, if anything important takes place in the old country, we have it all in our papers here the next morning, having been transmitted by the cable. Thus the great need of a rapid transmission of the mails which existed before the Atlantic cable came into general use does not exist at present, and, therefore, I do not think it is necessary to spend half a million of dollars a year for that purpose. The argument that the passenger traffic is going *vid* New York has been used as a reason why we should put on this fast passenger boat. What does it signify whether the people who cross the Atlantic ocean take the steamer at New York or at Halifax? All those New York vessels are English vessels, and we are patronising our own relatives when we patronise the boats that sail from New York. But I contend that, even if you are able to put on this fast passenger steamer, and, it would be able to make the trip from Liverpool to Halifax in the same proportionate length of time as the boats make the passage to New York, the great mass of the traffic, from Ontario at least, would still go *vid* New York. In that port they can get a steamer on any day in the week which they choose. They have the choice of five or six first class steamship lines, and they avoid a long and tedious railway journey to St. John or Halifax; so that, even if this steamer were put on, the great mass of travel from Ontario at least would still go *vid* New York. As my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) said, there are comparatively few of the people of this Dominion who have occasion to use this fast steamship service, and those who have go across the Atlantic in a great measure for health or for pleasure. They do not seek so much a fast steamer as they do the pleasure and the comforts of the voyage, and those who are seeking health find that three or four days longer on the Atlantic is the best medicine they can take. I do not think it is fair to those lines of steamers that have built themselves up in this country during the last few years to adopt such a measure as this. We have the Allan Line, the Beaver Line, the Dominion Line and the Temperley Line—four first-class lines of steamers sailing from Montreal to Liverpool and Glasgow—and all of them except the first have built themselves up without any Government assistance. They have proved serviceable to this Dominion, without obtaining a dollar from the Dominion treasury; they have overcome great difficulties; they have paved the way, and now it is proposed to subsidise another line to compete with those which have already built themselves up out of their own pockets. I do not think this is fair. The service which we have obtained during the last few years by the Allan Line has been a good service. It has met the necessities of this Dominion. I am not aware that there have been any complaints, or that any requests have been made to this Parliament to put on another line, and I do not think it would be fair to these lines to subsidise so heavily a new line to compete with them in their traffic. If we have $500,000 a year to expend in this service, I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that there are many ways in which he can spend it, which would be very much more in the interests of the people of this Dominion than by spending it in aiding this new steamship line. What the people of the country want, what the farmers want is a cheaper transport service. They want a steamship which will carry their produce at a cheaper rate. Reference has been made to the export of live cattle to England. The rates from Montreal to Liverpool are much higher than they are from New York, because of the greater number of steamships that go to New York. If we have $500,000 a year to spend, I believe we can spend it in many ways which would be more beneficial to the people than this fast line of steamers, which is only intended to carry mails and passengers, it has been proved that a steamship that makes 20 knots an hour is not suitable for the carriage of freight. In fact, it has been admitted that it would not be wise to subsidise a steamer to carry freight. In that case, you are simply going to subsidise these steamers to carry mails and passengers, and, as I said, it makes no difference to the people of Canada whether your mails go by New York or Montreal or Halifax as long as they go for the same rate. I can see no necessity for this grant, and I do not think the people of Canada will sanction this large expenditure of money, when the finances of the Dominion are so cramped as they are at present, and when all our expenses are running up at such a rapid rate. Under these circumstances, I do not believe it is judicious or wise to invest

this amount of $500,000 a year for ten years, which will add $5,000,000 more to the debt of the country. I hope the resolution will be withdrawn, and that no further effort will be made in this direction.

Mr. GILLMOR. I was much pleased indeed with the speech of my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). Every word of it was good common sense. But my hon. friends from the Maritime Provinces seem to have forgotten what you, Mr. Chairman, will remember, when you visited the Maritime Provinces and were advocating the International Ocean Line. You then went to St. Andrews, the nighest ocean port. The most sanguine people there never at that time supposed that in a short time that International line would be opened up and ready for traffic. My hon. friends from St. John appear to have forgotten that there is such a port as St. Andrews, where there is much less fog than there is at St. John. It is 70 miles further west than St. John, and therefore the traffic would reach the ocean nigher than St. John. It is 320 miles nigher than Halifax, and I do not know how much nigher it is than Louisburg. This International line is now carrying out the great scheme which was started before St. John or Halifax thought of having a railway at all. Forty years ago, a short line from the seaboard to Canada was projected in the town of St. Andrews, which is the nighest ocean port in the west. That has now become complete, and I think the Government ought not to forget that there is such a place as St. Andrews, and that, although it is not as great a city as St. John—that it is not a city at all—it is fast growing to be a city. I entirely concur with the opinion of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) that the Government ought to give the subsidy where the greatest good can be done to the greatest number. My own impression is that this idea of subsidising steamers that will travel 20 miles an hour, is visionary, it cannot be accomplished. I think it is a piece of extravagance under the circumstance; and I cannot believe that it will serve the interests of the people so well as a line of steamers such as we have now, those that can make 15 knots an hour; that is quite fast enough. It might be something to boast of, it might be something to be proud of, it might be something to point to, but I think it is an extravagance which we cannot afford—that is my impression—and I think the Government will consult the best interests of the country not to expend this large subsidy of half a million dollars a year for a purpose that will not, after all, afford us such facility for freight as a line of steamers would afford that we could subsidise for very much less money. We have been in the habit of giving $126,000 for this service, and I think that is quite enough, and I think the accommodation to all concerned will be best served by continuing that amount of subsidy. Now, with regard to speed by which mail and passengers can be conveyed, I think it is a matter of very little importance. We are not confined to one line of steamers. We can send our letters by the way of New York, or they can come by the way of New York; we can send letters almost every day in the week by one line or another without inconvenience. With regard to travel, it is a mistaken notion for us to try to rival the great nation to the south of us. Because they are able to have something better, something more costly, something more extravagant, it is a mistaken policy for us to try to imitate them. I do not wish to repeat what has been said with regard to the port of Halifax, but I really think the port of St. Andrews is quite as accessible as the port of St. John. I rise because some of my friends seem to have forgotten altogether that St. Andrews is mentioned as one of the ocean ports, whereas it is on record as one of the ports recognised.

Mr. ELLIS. Notwithstanding what the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has pointed out with regard to the rivalry between Halifax and St. John, the common sense of the people of both cities and the common sense of the people of the Maritime Provinces, is against the proposition of the Government to make such a very large expenditure of money on very uncertain information. In the first place we are not directly told where the winter port is to be, although I think it is a fair inference from what the Prime Minister told a delegation from St John the other day, that the winter port on this side would be Halifax. With regard to the proposition as respects the French port, it is impossible from the words of the resolution to gather any correct idea as to what is meant by that. We have no statement of how the service is to be performed as respects a French port, nor has there been any opportunity of discussing whether it is advisable to spend any money to make connection with a French port, inasmuch as nobody knows how that connection is to be made. I do not propose to go over the ground that has been gone over by my hon. friend and colleague for St. John (Mr. Skinner). He has argued from the point of view that this proposition was to complete the scheme of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and was intended to get the trade which might come across the continent by that railway. Now, this is not for a trade line of steamers at all, it makes no provision for the through carrying of freight. As to the general carriage I think it would be impossible to do service in the way the hon. gentleman suggested, because the greater portion of the bulk of the steamers will be occupied by the machinery and the coal. My own idea is that it is not necessary to provide a fancy service of this kind for the benefit of people who are able to pay for the best service, but that, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) it would be better, if large sum of money is to be used for subsidising ocean steamers, to devote it for subsidising freight steamers. I believe we had better go into that policy rather than to merely carry mails and passengers. With regard to travel I have never been able to make myself believe that the people west of Montreal will ever go to Halifax, or even to St. John, to cross the ocean. I could wish it were otherwise, but I am satisfied that if a man can leave Toronto or any part of Canada west of Montreal, and reach the ocean seaboard in New York in a night, he will not, as a mere matter of prejudice in favor of a Canadian line, go to more distant seaports. I think we might as well face that fact first as last. We see it is a fact every day. If you talk with gentlemen from Toronto and the west, as I have talked with them, with regard to the sea, the Maritime Provinces ports are not in their minds at all; they are thinking of reaching the sea by the shortest route across the continent. With that fact in view, I think it is not wise to expend such a large amount of money in this service. I would end my remarks here, but I feel bound to ask the House to give me an hour or so while I put upon record a number of statements to answer the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh) with reference to fog in the harbor of St. John. Last year he made remarks of the same kind, very improper remarks, and this year he has repeated them, and I think it is time that an effort should be made to set the matter right, and by statistics to correct the misinformation and the lack of knowledge which that hon. gentleman has in regard to the port of St. John. I do not know how many hundred years it has been since he was in the port of St. John. When he states that vessels have been kept out of the port of St. John six or eight days, I must say that that has not occurred within the memory of any living man, so it must have been at some time in the far distant past. Probably in some other stage of his evidence when he was a "Mother Cary Chicken." I would like the House to allow me just to hand these statements in as read.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. ELLIS. Well, then, if I must go on I will read you some statements and statistics which I have prepared. The St. John Board of Trade says:

"At the close of the last century the bay was but little frequented by vessels from abroad, and had but a limited coasting trade. Its summer fogs, its low temperature in winter, its want of lighthouses, fog horns, whistles, and automatic whistling and bell buoys unknown; its tides flowing to uncertain heights and setting in uncertain directions; its rugged shores and steep cliffs; its charts, more general than special no doubt caused the then current ideas of its dangers. Still, the navigators of that day, with their greater watchfulness, caution, and judgment, kept safely on their voyages, with not as pleasant a duty to perform as if sailing the Carribean Seas, yet meeting with as few accidents and losses as on other and better known waters in proportion to its trade.

"To-day most of the risks of danger are averted. All the modern guards necessary for safe navigation are introduced and applied. Better charts, shores studded with lighthouses, fog horns and whistles, almost within calling distances, automatic and bell buoys placed at all points of danger, its tides and their courses well known, the formation of its bottom so well described that the lead tells its locality; all these advantages dispel the fears of the olden time, and render its navigation as safe as the approaches to any other coast.

"Steam is largely superseding sails in the greater trade of the ocean and coast, when drifting in calms and with tides, losing reckoning, and its attendants, will be of the past, and steamers and sailing ships can enter and navigate the Bay of Fundy guided with all the confidence and equal safety as if entering the British Channel."

A constant practice of chart makers is to say that the "atmosphere is constantly enveloped in dense fog." Here is the statement of keeper of Partridge Island Light:

"For the winter months for 17 years from 1870 to 1886, both inclusive (See No. 1 of Appendix.) the fog average was:

Months.	H.	M.
November	11	55
December	8	09
January	21	21
February	16	46
March	17	56
April	40	04
A total of	116	11

or an average per month of 19 hours and 22 minutes, or 38 minutes per day.

"And from a comprehensive return by the same party (No 2 of Appendix), made up for the whole year during a period of 21 years from 1865 to 1885, your committee gather the information that the whistle was sounded from all causes on an average each month during the months of:

January,	3½ days.	May,	3¼ days.	September,	4 days.
February,	3 do	June,	6 do	October,	2½ do
March,	3 do	July,	7½ do	November,	1½ do
April,	2½ do	August,	7½ do	December,	3 do

or an average of 3 hours and 22 minutes per day during the 21 years.

"Your committee would remark that much of the time put down in this return as requiring the whistle to be sounded in the summer months is not from fog alone, but from smoke from the burning of the forests in proximity to the shore of the Bay of Fundy, and in winter from vapor arising from the water of the Bay caused by the extreme cold prevalent in the months of January and February.

Capt. W. A. Robinson says:

"I, as a seaman and mate employed in the coasting and foreign trade of the Bay of Fundy, from 1819 to 1824, and from that time until 1862, as master of St. John and other ships, in foreign trade, beg leave to make some statements concerning the navigation of the Bay of Fundy.

"My many years' experience warrants me in affirming that the Bay of Fundy can be navigated with as much ease and safety in summer fogs and winter snows as any other port in North America, notwithstanding all the unfavorable reports of ignorant or prejudiced persons.

"In respect to the great rise and fall of tides, they are a great convenience and no obstruction to navigation. I have never met those various and uncertain currents so much spoken of, and, consequently, dreaded by strangers. As to charts, I prefer to use the British Admiralty publication.

"The rocks and shoals in the Bay of Fundy are all within the line of soundings, and, with proper attention with the lead, may be avoided, there being a clear channel of 182 miles on a direct course from Cape Sable brulé to St John harbor."

Captain David Boddie says:

"St. John, N. B., 4th December, 1886.

"The St. John Board of Trade:

"Gentlemen,—In reply to your note of yesterday, asking me to give my opinion as to the safety of the Bay of Fundy for navigation, both in summer and winter, as to the regularity of the tides, and the inconvenience experienced from fog in the summer time, I beg to say that with respect to the fogs, by paying strict attention to the ship's course and the state of the tide at the same time, I never lost an hour's time in making a passage on account of fog in the Bay of Fundy. With respect to the tides, I have always found them very regular, only in the spring of the year, when the freshet from the river is running, I have found the ebb tide much stronger on the western side of the Bay than the flood, which in thick weather must be guarded against

"With respect to rocks and dangers in the Bay, I know of none but what are clearly laid down in the Admiralty charts, and can be easily avoided by using proper precaution and care, which is necessary for the safe navigation of shipping approaching, entering, or leaving any coast, bay or harbor. With respect to my experience in navigating the Bay of Fundy, as a master, I commenced 15th June, 1840, in command of the bark *Abeona* belonging to the firm of Milby & Thomas; the said vessel drew twenty feet of water when loaded, and was run between St. John and London for four years. I never met with an accident in the Bay of Fundy, except one slight collision in the summer of 1846, while in command of the brigantine *Mary* bound down the bay in the fog. From 1847 to 1854 I had charge of a brigantine called the *P. I. Nevius* during seven years in the coasting trade between St. John and Alexandria, Va. During the seven years I navigated the Bay of Fundy, both summer and winter, I never felt any more inconvenience in navigating the bay than upon any other coast. In the winter of 1851 the river Potomac was frozen over in the month of February, and I had a good deal of difficulty and loss of time in getting out, and had to get the assistance of an ice-breaking tug boat. When I arrived at St. John, N. B, I was glad to find a splendid harbor all clear of ice or any other impediment to enter it, and with the assistance of a pilot any vessel could beat or sail into the harbor and up to the wharf, as the wind suited, and during the seven years the said vessel run between this port and Alexandra, Va, I never required the assistance of a tug boat in the harbor. Since that date I have commanded several vessels, running out of this port, and have never had an accident in the Bay of Fundy or felt any inconvenience in navigating it. In 1877 I retired from the business."

"St. John, 9th December, 1886.

"The St. John Board of Trade:

"Gentlemen,—Having followed the sea for over half a century, and during that time having sailed out of St. John regularly from four to five times a year for ten years, and often afterwards, I can give an opinion of the Bay of Fundy from long experience. During the period from 1835 to 1845 I sailed between here and the West Indies as master of a vessel, and never met with the slightest accident in the Bay of Fundy. With our numerous lighthouses, fog horns and buoys now in use, it is an easy matter to make our port. I would far rather take my chances in the Bay of Fundy, making for St. John in fog, snow or storm, than to enter the ports of Boston or Portland under the same conditions. The Bay of Fundy is a safe bay, for one can always have plenty of drift and can readily tell where he is by the soundings. I consider St. John to be easier of access than any port on the Atlantic coast.

"CAPT. B. B. BUSTIN."

"St. John, N.B., 4th December, 1886.

"The St. John Board of Trade:

"Gentlemen,—During the past forty-six years I have been engaged as master of vessels trading between the western part of Nova Scotia and the port of St. John (ten years of which we carried the mails between those places during the winter months), and have had ample opportunity to judge of the safety of the navigation of the Bay of Fundy. I have had no difficulty during all that time, even in foggy weather, and long before there were any fog whistles, in making our trips regularly, sometimes five in a month, never once having touched bottom.

"I consider the harbor of St. John exceptionally easy of access, and safe to enter at any time of tide.

"Yours truly,
"DANIEL SMALLEY."

"Chatham, N. B., 16th January, 1887.

"The St. John Board of Trade:

"As an old shipmaster who sailed between St. John and the British ports for ten years in the *Lisbon* and *John Owens*—and in the days when the St. John fleet in the London and Liverpool trade embraced such fine ships as the *Peter Maxwell, Imperial, John Barbour, John Duncan, Lampedo, Harmonides*, (which latter I commanded for a time) and others, I am at a loss to understand how it has come about that the Bay of Fundy is looked upon as presenting any especial difficulties to competent navigators. The tides are simple—up and down—the soundings even, and safe to get hold of, and the approach to St. John harbor free, open, and unobstructed. I may say that I always felt as safe and sure of my position, making for and sailing up the Bay of Fundy, as I did in either the English or St. George's Channel, while St. John harbor, being more contiguous to the open bay than most of the principal ports of either side of the Atlantic are to their deep water approaches, it seems to me—from a sailing-master's standpoint—it is one of the most desirable and safe known. In all my navigation of the Bay of Fundy I never found any difficulties and never had any mishap. Of course, strict attention to the lead is required in thick weather. In winter there is no more fog in the Bay of Fundy than elsewhere.

"J. J. BROWN, *Shipmaster*."

Letter from Captain Hill, of the *Ulunda* of the Furness Line:

"HALIFAX, 29th December, 1886.

"The St. John Board of Trade:

"GENTLEMEN,—Having been asked by you to express my views for the benefit of the Board of Trade, respecting the waters we navigate between this port and St. John, I beg to report as follows: Since the 1st of May last (1886), I have made five round trips to St. John. Twice out of the five I encountered fog from time of leaving Halifax until I was in the Bay of Fundy so far as Briar Island. From that place to St. John I had clear weather.

"Three times I had clear weather the entire passage. On my return I experienced clear weather the whole five trips from time of leaving St. John until I arrived at Halifax

"The coast from here (Halifax) to Cape Sable is well lit, also the approach to Bay of Fundy; and good fog signals are provided for thick weather. Soundings I consider reliable; currents rapid, causing the navigator great anxiety in thick weather, but through sound judgment and careful study on the part of the navigator, Partridge Island should be reached with safety through the thickest weather.

"Referring to my personal experience during the five trips I have made to St. John and return, I cannot but report most favorable so far as the navigation part is concerned.

"Yours faithfully,

"R. S. HILL,
"*Master SS. Ulunda.*"

Letter from Captain S. H. Pike, late of the I.S.S. Line:

"The St. John Board of Trade:

"GENTLEMEN,—I have been engaged with the International Steamship Company, as pilot and as master, running their steamers between Boston and St John, touching at Portland and Eastport, for the last thirty years, prior to which time I was engaged in the coasting and West India trade. I consider the Bay of Fundy as easy of approach and as safe for navigation as any portion of the North Atlantic coast at any season of the year and in all weather I know of no bay on the North Atlantic coast so clear of obstructions to navigation as the Bay of Fundy from Moos-a-Peck, or Moss Peck, so called, on the coast of Maine, to Partridge Island (mouth of St. John harbor)

"During the whole thirty years of my experience, making one or two trips per week in all seasons of the year, and in all kinds of weather, I met with but one accident in the Bay of Fundy, viz., while master of the *State of Maine*, at Point Lepreaux. This accident I regard as exceptional, and I attribute it to the Point Lepreaux whistle not being in its proper place. It has since been placed in the right position. The fog whistle is a grand invention if well attended.

"The shores of the bay are generally high, and even in foggy weather we can frequently get sight of land, either from deck or from masthead, but we are never delayed by this, having run our course on usual time and speed, we make our points carefully, and take our departure. Our passages have been made with remarkable regularity, as all know who are acquainted with the line.

"In my opinion, steamers or vessels of any kind can approach or leave St. John any time of the year, and in all weathers, with as much safety as any port on the North Atlantic coast.

"The harbor of St. John is never frozen, and field ice in the bay is much less frequent than on the coast.

"S. H. PIKE."

"STEAMER *Damara*.

"HALIFAX, 31st January, 1887.

"The Board of Trade, St. John:

"GENTLEMEN,—I call St. John a good port, and the soundings are splendid for navigating a vessel up the bay and right into the harbor. They are so reliable that any competent person can easily find the way into the bay and up to St. John in the thickest and darkest night there can be.

"I remain, yours truly,
"EDWARD SMITH, *Master*."

Statement from Capt. Chas. S. Taylor, Harbor Master of St. John:

"The St. John Board of Trade:

"GENTLEMEN,—I was about 20 years a pilot in the Bay of Fundy. I have brought many steamships up the Bay of Fundy in the summer time; not many in the winter, as during the time I was pilot steamships did not come regularly from seaward in the winter, with the exception of the Allan Line. I would have no hesitation, as a pilot, in bringing any of the largest mail steamers to the port of St. John all through the year, summer or winter, but would prefer the winter, the atmosphere, as a rule, being more clearer then. With a steamer drawing 27 feet of water, the harbor of St. John can be entered about half flood. * * * The steamer *Kansas* loaded at the railway pier, about three years ago, and she drew 27 feet. At this time there were nine steamers in the harbor at one time, two of them respectively of 5,276 tons and 5,146 tons, and the other seven from 1,500 to 3,000 tons each. I consider the navigation of the Bay of Fundy as easy and safe as any place I know of; the running courses are few and simple, and the very few obstructions are hardly worth mentioning.

"CHARLES S. TAYLOR, *Harbor Master*."

Statement from Richard Cline, one of the St. John Branch pilots:

"ST. JOHN, 7th January, 1887.

"The St. John Board of Trade:

"Gentlemen,—I have been about thirty-nine years a St. John pilot, and have been in the habit of taking charge of steam and sailing vessels outside of Briar Island, at the mouth of the Bay of Fundy. I have brought many steamers of the Anchor Line and others from Halifax, and some from New York, and I have brought many ships of war, both British and United States, into the harbor of St. John. I was pilot on board H.M.S. *Northampton*, drawing 26 feet, from Halifax here in August, 1878. At the time of the Trent affair I brought several troop ships in here, boarding them in Halifax. I had the *Jura*, the *Calcutta*, the *Australasian*, the *Adriatic*, 5,555 tons, and many others were here that winter, brought in by other pilots. Thirty years ago last summer I piloted the United States' steamer *Mississippi* from Eastport here; she drew 22 feet; the weather was thick; there was no fog alarms in the bay then, and we got along well enough, although the weather was thick. I also piloted the American ship *Great Republic*, the largest merchant sailing ship ever built. We sailed up the bay and into this port, and came to anchor in the harbor without a tug. About three hours flood would be the time to enter the harbor with a ship drawing 27 feet, and the same applies to Boston and Portland, Me. The navigation of the Bay of Fundy compares most favorably with other ports and places where I have been. If a ship of deep draught of water arrives off the harbor and has to wait for the tide, she can either anchor outside Partridge Island with safety (the anchorage being excellent) or she can lay off and on, there being plenty of sea room. I would rather approach St. John in bad weather than any other port along the coast. During the time I have been pilot, I have myself brought in two hundred steamships and have never had an accident with one of them. The aid of a tug is not necessary either in entering or leaving the port with steamships. The land of the bay shore is high, and one can always see it over the vapor occasioned by extreme cold weather. It can generally be seen also in foggy weather by going aloft. The soundings are good from Cape Sable into St. John, and one could come in during the densest fog by using the lead The whistles are good and numerous, but when they cannot be heard, a pilot or captain can come up by soundings, which are very regular. I do not consider the tides dangerous by any means, but one must, of course, have some knowledge of them when entering the bay. From Briar Island up the tides are very regular. There is never any ice in the harbor to interfere with or injure ships There is never any field ice to contend with in the bay, even in the severest weather.

"RICHARD CLINE."

"The St. John Board of Trade:

"GENTLEMEN,—In reply to your enquiry, we beg to advise that the Anchor Line of steamships commenced the service to this port in April, 1864, and continued to land their cargoes here until 1879, and during that period they did not meet with any disaster or experience any difficulty in navigating the Bay of Fundy, or in entering or leaving our harbor, at all seasons of the year. * * * *

"SCAMMELL BROTHERS."
"*Agents of the Anchor Line.*

My colleague for St. John (Mr. Weldon) has already briefly touched upon the tonnage of St. John. The total of seagoing, steam and sailing vessels, and coastwise steamers which arrived at St. John in the ten years, 1877 to 1886 inclusive, is:

—	Number.	Tons.
Steam vessels	1,882	1,733,983
Sailing vessels	13,014	2,687,195
Coasting steamers	1,823	840,480
Total Arrivals	16,719	5,261,658

Departed in same period:

Steam vessels	1,745	1,694,650
Sailing vessels	12,974	2,935,253
Coasting steamers	2,075	902,285
Total Departures	16,794	5,532,188
Total Arrivals	16,719	5,261,658
Grand Total	33,513	10,793,846

The percentage of loss of tonnage as compared with the total entered and cleared is only ·26 of one per cent. And in

concluding I quote as follows from the report of the Board of Trade on this subject:—

"As an evidence of the opinion entertained by underwriters of the safety of the navigation of the Bay of Fundy, we are authorised in saying that the agents in St. John for marine insurance companies are taking risks from St. John *direct* to Europe at the same rate of premium as from Halifax, Nova Scotia, and from Boston and Portland.

"The coast all along from the entrance of the Bay of Fundy to the Harbor of St. John is so thoroughly protected by fog whistles, automatic whistling buoys and lighthouses that it must proceed from the greatest carelessness or unseaworthiness (unless in very exceptional cases) that a vessel should go ashore or even touch bottom. From the entrance to the Bay of Fundy at Machias Seal Island by way of the north or west channel, and at Briar Island, on the south channel, to the Harbor of St. John, vessels do not lose the sound of one fog whistle or automatic buoy until they catch the sound of another, and the soundings by the lead are so regular and the anchorage so good, especially at the entrance of St. John Harbor, that danger is reduced to a minimum, even in the thickest weather. Pilots state that they dread more to enter Boston or Portland or Halifax Harbors during a fog than they do St. John, and vessels bound to New York, Boston and Portland have sometimes to lie longer outside those harbors for tide than at St. John, and when foggy weather prevails, it is generally as dense (if not more so) at Portland and along the coast of the State of Maine as it is in the Bay of Fundy. In winter fogs are very rare. They are more frequent in the months of June, July and August, but seldom continue so thick for days in succession as to preclude seeing land in the bay, and neither fog nor snow prove a bar or delay to steam vessels, the navigation of the bay being so simple, there being no treacherous shoals or rocks in the way from the mouth of the bay to the Port of St. John. We may instance the steamers of the International Steamship Company, which have plied between St. John and the Port of Boston for a period extending over a quarter of a century, making three and four trips per week, each way, for part of the year, and two trips, each way, per week in winter, carrying an immense number of passengers and very large quantities of freight, and never lost a single life in all that time on that route. During the past thirty years passenger steamers have been running between St. John and the western part of Nova Scotia, and during all that time not one was lost, thus proving that neither fog nor snow interfere with steam vessels in their passage to or from the Harbor of St. John, where proper care is taken.

"In the matter of ice in winter, your committee may confidently assert that there is not a port north of Cape Hatteras so entirely free from ice as St. John is.

"This can hardly be said of any other port on the coast north of Baltimore; in fact, there is no port north of Baltimore, including Philadelphia, New York, Boston, Portland and Halifax, that have not been frozen over, and had vessels cut out of the ice in them, except St. John. Shipmasters and owners of vessels, therefore, may be fully assured that no damage can be sustained from river, harbor or bay ice, in navigating the Bay of Fundy, or in the harbor of St. John. Under the accumulation of evidence which your committee have been enabled to place before the Board, they feel that they may safely assume:

"1st.—That the navigation of the Bay of Fundy, from its month to St. John, is remarkably simple and free, whether by the south or west channels; so much so, that pilots prefer making the port of St. John in bad weather to any other port on the coast

"2nd.—That the fog or cold vapor never occasions delay of steam vessels in summer or winter, and that there is never the slightest obstruction from ice.

"3nd.—That Atlantic steamships need make but one straight course from their regular track to Portland and Boston up the Bay of Fundy to St. John.

"4th.—That the south channel, opening into the bay, is 18 miles in width at the narrowest part, expanding rapidly to 35 or 40 miles of unobstructed deep water navigation, which holds good all the way up the bay to the mouth of St. John harbor, where superior holding ground can be found, or giving clear sea room, of say 35 by 50 miles, to a stranger who might not feel confidence to enter our port in a storm.

"5th.—That both the largest war and merchant ships have visited our harbor, excepting the "Great Eastern," and that she could easily be accommodated.

"6th.—That the port of St. John, in so far as navigation is concerned, is not only 'one of the safest,' but actually the safest port, summer and winter, all the year round, north of Cape Hatteras."

"Respectfully submitted,
"R. CRUIKSHANK,
"ANDRE CUSHING,
"W. E. VROOM."

"ST. JOHN, January 26th, 1887."

I feel much obliged to the hon. members for the attention they have given me, and I think myself, in view of the facts that we have only one or two ports on the Atlantic, not counting either Louisburg or St. Andrews, which I think will not be formidable rivals to St. John and Halifax——

Mr. KIRK. You must not leave out Whitehaven.

Mr. ELLIS. Or even Whitehaven. My own opinion is that each of the ports of Halifax and St. John has its own special advantages and that there is no need for rivalry between them. Whatever may be the future as regards this ocean line of steamers I believe that a trade can be built up which can be based on sound conditions and need not be a forced trade. I believe there is no need for this large expenditure of money in this service and that it would be far better if we are to have freight coming over our great lines of railway from the west, to aid in developing that trade and in regarding the steamers as part of our railway system, instead of wasting money in aiding the carrying of passengers who can well afford to pay for themselves.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). The hon. gentleman who has just sat down, has occupied the attention of the House for some time dwelling on the merits of the port of St John. I quite agree with him in everything he has said in that regard, but I hardly see the bearing of the argument which he has used upon the position which he took at the outset of his remarks, when I understood him to say that it was impossible for St. John under any circumstances, considering its geographical position, to ever have any large portion of either the passenger travel or the freight traffic between this country and Europe.

Mr. ELLIS. I did not say that.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I understood the hon. gentleman to say something to that effect.

Mr. ELLIS. No. I confined my remarks entirely to the passenger traffic.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I certainly understood the hon. gentleman to say that neither Halifax nor even St. John could expect to compete for this trade.

Mr. ELLIS. If the hon. gentleman will allow me I will state what I said. I referred entirely to the passenger trade and particularly to the passenger trade west of Montreal.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I am quite willing to accept that explanation. In view of that statement I repeat what I said before that I for one at all events cannot see what bearing the argument which he has used regarding the advantages of the port of St. John can have on the question we are now considering, if it is a fact that the port of St. John can never have a large portion of the passenger traffic between this country and Europe. I did not intend to occupy the time of the House in discussing this question; were it not but for that remark to which I have just referred and to some remarks which fell from the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) with regard to this question. They endeavored to convey the impression to the House that this proposition would not receive the support of the majority of the people of the Maritime Provinces, and I must say that I heard these statements with surprise. I have watched the press of the Maritime Provinces, and I have yet to discover a single paper there which has opposed the policy propounded in this resolution now before the House. I do not think that the hon. gentleman will find a single business man in the Lower Provinces, belonging to either political party, who will be opposed to this policy or to the subsidy which is now proposed for a fast line of Atlantic steamers. I think that the remarks of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) and the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) were equally opposed to the general sentiment of the people of the Province of Ontario. I believe that they will find that the business people at all events of the great Province of Ontario are equally anxious to have this mail service secured as are the people of the Maritime Provinces. One of these gentlemen said that the members for St. John only supported this resolution because they hoped St. John

would be made the terminal port and that the members for Halifax supported it for the same reason as regards their city. Now the last gentleman who addressed the House from St. John expressly said that he would not support this resolution under any circumstances and he only pointed out, as it was a duty to point out to the House, the advantages which the port of St. John possesses. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) used some statements which to my mind are very extraordinary in their character. He told us that since the Atlantic cables had been laid the people of Canada were indifferent as to how their mail service was conducted and that it made very little difference whether letters were six, or eight or ten days crossing the Atlantic. I think that argument is sufficiently answered by the experience of the past. Why, the very fact that our mail matter largely goes by New York is due to the fact that the fast Atlantic steamers all sail from the port of New York. The hon. member for Kent used the same argument with regard to the Atlantic passenger traffic and stated that the majority of people were indifferent as to whether they were six or eight or ten days crossing the Atlantic. Every one knows that it is the fast steamers which take the large bulk of the passengers from America to Europe, and that the travel by the slower steamers which carry freight and occupy eight or ten days on the voyage is very limited indeed. It is a fact known to the people of the Maritime Provinces, and I think my hon. friends from St. John and Halifax will support me in this statement, that while the steamers are subsidised by this Government and sail from the port of Halifax in winter time, yet a large portion of the passenger traffic from even St. John and Halifax goes by the way of New York. That is due to the fact that those fast steamers cross from New York to Liverpool in two or three days less time than even the fastest steamers we have now on the service between Great Britain and Halifax. While I have listened with very great pleasure to what the representatives of the city of St. John have said with regard to their port and also to what my friends from Halifax have said with regard to Halifax, I consider that this is an element which should not be considered in this question and that the House at the present time is not called upon to decide which of these ports possesses the greater advantages. The primary object which we are seeking is to obtain a fast Atlantic mail service. It has been stated, by I think a majority of the gentlemen who have addressed the House, on the other side, that it would be a wiser policy if a smaller subsidy was given and a different class of boats secured, which would not be so speedy, and which would at the same time accommodate a greater amount of freight traffic. I for one entirely dissent from that idea. I believe the object we wish to secure is the conveyance of the mails and the passengers between this country and Europe. We have, in my opinion, advantages which will enable our line to compete successfully with any line for this class of traffic. It is well known that the mail service will always go by the quickest route, and the passenger travel largely follows in the same direction. If we shorten the voyage by getting a class of steamers equal in every respect to the best that sail between New York and Great Britain, we must secure a large portion of the mail and passenger travel between this country and Europe; and in my opinion there is nothing that will develop the traffic between the two continents to so great an extent as to secure this quick mail route. The freight traffic generally follows the line of the mail and passenger travel. Now, I do not wish to detain the House; I did not intend to speak at all on this subject; but I think the Government should be left entirely free to choose whatever will be most advantageous to secure the primary object we have in view, that is, the rapid mail and passenger service between this country and Europe.

Gen. LAURIE. I venture to trespass on the time of the House for a few minutes, because some remarks have fallen from several hon. members which I did not feel justified in allowing to pass unchallenged. My hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has stated that this is a question concerning not simply Halifax and St. John, and I will add—as my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) brought it in—St. Andrews also. The hon. gentleman says that it is a question which concerns the whole of Canada. I agree with him in his premises, but I differ from him in the conclusion he draws. I say it concerns the whole of Canada, because the prosperity of the Maritime Provinces concerns the whole of Canada. I was sorry to hear expressed in the House such a sectional remark similar to that made three years ago by the *Monetary Times* of Toronto, to the effect that we could do very well when matters were smooth with the country to the south of us, but that the Maritime Provinces were convenient in case of trouble. Now, Sir, we do not come to this House *in forma pauperis*; we do not come asking for what we do not consider our just rights. We were ready and willing enough to contribute our fair share to build your lines of railway in the west to develop the trade of Ontario and build up her large towns; and now we demand that we shall have consideration. Never mind whether Halifax, or St. John or St. Andrews will be the selected port; let it be the survival of the fittest. Let it be Shelburne, and that is the best harbor on the Atlantic coast—I say it advisedly; but it has not been favored with railway facilities, and we do not present its claims at present, whatever it may be in the future. But the point I am speaking to now is, are we justified in asking that these subsidies should be given with certain limitations? How was Liverpool built up? Not by the export of its own manufactures, but the merchants of Birmingham and Manchester selected what was the cheapest and most accessible port in their own country; and we demand the opportunity to do the same. If a protective or National Policy amounts to anything, let us use our own ports, and do not let us be at the mercy, as we were threatened the other day, of an unfriendly executive of the nation to the south. It is in the memory of hon. gentlemen that within the last few months we were threatened with a Non-Intercourse Act, and it is therefore right that we should develop our own commercial intercourse. It was in 1860 that the old Province of Canada gave an annual subsidy of $500,000 to the Allan Line to build up Montreal; and look to-day at that magnificent city on the St. Lawrence as the result of that expenditure. While we recognise that for a considerable time to come the St. Lawrence will be the outlet of our trade in the summer, whatever may be the fu we ture, ask that the Maritime Provinces shall be recognised as our winter line of trade; and I understood the Minister of Finance to say that the subsidy should be given with the understanding that these steamers will land at our own ports. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) states we now obtain our mail accommodation for nothing, and he proposes that should continue. I would remind him we now pay $126,000 a year to steamers that they may carry their freight past our doors to an American port. We are building up Portland, and is there any reason why our own ports should not be considered? I certainly shall support the proposition of the Government, and I think every hon member who is a Canadian at heart should support a proposal that will divert the whole trade of Canada in the winter months, as far as it can possibly be done, to a Canadian port and not to a foreign port. While the Government ask power to grant as much as $500,000 they do not say they intend to expend that amount. It has been said that certain proposals have been made to them. These are as yet inchoate, and I think the conditions they prescribe will be such as to commend themselves to every patriotic Canadian, that our mails, and our passenger and freight traffic will come to build up Canadian ports in the Maritime Provinces. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) says that no Canadian cares whether his mails

go by way of New York or not. I say, we in the Maritime Provinces, are Canadians also, and we care a great deal, although hon. members sometimes forget that.

Mr. KIRK. They forget that we are Canadians only by Act of Parliament.

Gen. LAURIE. I am a Canadian by Act of Parliament, and in spirit and in sympathy, and so are the most of us; but that is beside the question at present. I think even those who are only Canadians by Act of Parliament in the Maritime Provinces will support such a proposal as this, which is only just to the Maritime Provinces, that in developing our trade, we should develop it through Canadian ports as much as possible.

Mr. WELSH. As I spoke on this resolution the other night, I merely rise to reply to the strictures passed upon me by my hon. friend from St. John and another hon. gentleman who took umbrage at my remarks. I said that the fog might be in St. John for a week, more by way of a joke than anything else; but since I have had a rubbing up, I am going to tell them something. I take up Sessional Paper No. 62, of 1872, and I see a report sent to the Government at Ottawa, on the Bay of Fundy, which says:

"According to the sailing directions published in 1866, ships navigating the Bay of Fundy have to encounter an atmosphere almost constantly enveloped in dense fogs, the tide setting with great rapidity over the rocks and shoals with which it abounds, and a difficulty of obtaining anchorage on account of the depth; so that, under these circumstances, the most unremitting attention is requisite to prevent the disastrous consequences which must necessarily attend a want of knowledge and caution."

In 1872 or 1874, I forget which, there was a commission sent down by the Government of Canada to take evidence as to the feasibility of building a canal from the Bay of Fundy to the Baie Verte, and I was subpœnaed to attend that commission. While listening to the evidence, an old man, who had served a considerable time in the English navy and had sailed in the Bay of Fundy for several years, was examined. He described the dangers and the fogs, and the chairman of the committee asked him what the fog was like. He said: I have sailed over most of the world and have never seen fog so dense as in the Bay of Fundy. He said: I have seen the fog that dense that I could make a looking glass of my hand, and by looking at my hand I could see my face. The hon. gentleman threw a slur on my opinion, as if I had never been in St. John. Well, I have sailed in and out of the harbor of St. John frequently, and I know what it is like, and at all events, I have proved what I have said by the Government blue book. If I could get the report which I returned to the Library, and on which I cannot lay my hand just now, I could prove by the evidence therein contained, and given under oath, that every statement I made was true, and I will not take back one word of what I said. I will read you an extract from a publication that the people of St. John have issued to prove their case. In a letter from Captain S. H. Pike, late of the Inman Steamship Line, to the St. John Board of Trade, that gentleman said:

"I consider the Bay of Fundy as easy of approach and as safe for navigation as any portion of the North Atlantic coast at any season of the year and in all weathers. The snow storms, in my opinion, are not more severe in the Bay of Fundy than they are in the vicinity of Portland and Boston, while these cities also have a pretty large share of fog; still it always seemed to me that fog had a great love for St. John, and made its visits too long.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman should have continued to read. Captain Pyke goes on to say:

"But notwithstanding this, I know of no place I would rather approach on the coast, in fog or bad weather. The courses of the west channel—I am not so familiar with the south—are few and simple, and can be run without any great risk by a good pilot. I know of no bay on the North Atlantic coast so clear of obstructions to navigation as the Bay of Fundy from Mosspeck, on the coast of Maine, to Partridge Island, mouth of St John harbor. During the whole thirty years of my experience, making one or two trips per week in all seasons of the year, and in all kinds of weather, I met with but one accident in the Bay of Fundy, viz., while master of the *State of Maine* at Point Lepreaux. This accident I regard as exceptional, and attribute it to the Point Lepreaux whistle not being in its proper place. It has since been placed in the right position. The fog whistle is a grand institution if well attended."

My hon. friend might have saved himself his trouble of hunting up some old sailing directions of 1860. The report he hunted up was one of the Baie Verte Canal, surveyed in 1870-71, and it speaks of the sailing instructions published in 1866. If my hon. friend had gone to the report published in London, 1877, he would have found exactly the same language, which is a foul slander and utterly untrue. True it is that in summer there are fogs on that coast, but in the winter, and we have statistics to show it—the reports of the men who keep the fog whistles than which none can be more reliable—that the statements spread broadcast throughout the United Kingdom with regard to the condition of the Bay of Fundy are utterly unfounded. As regards anchorage that is exceptionally good, and since 1866 there are no coasts better lighted than both the coast of Maine and the coast of United States, which form the two sides of the Bay of Fundy, and besides that the automatic whistle buoys and the fog whistles enable vessels to make their way up that harbor through the thickest weather. There is not a rock or shallow to be found in the harbor.

Mr. KENNY. I did not intend to address the Committee again on this question if the hon. junior member for the City and County of St. John had not referred to me. When I addressed the Committee on Thurday evening, I made no reference to the city of St. John. I do not think I even mentioned the city of St. John, but I mentioned the part of Halifax because the senior member for Halifax had attempted to convey the idea that Halifax was not a suitable and good winter port for this Dominion.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman instituted a comparison between the port of Halifax and the port of New York, which reflected disparagingly on the port of Halifax.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is what you say.

Mr. KENNY. That is what the hon. gentleman said, and that is the impression he may have left on the minds of the Committee and it was in order to dispel that impression from the minds of the Committee that I made special reference to Halifax and to the undeniable advantages with which Providence has blessed that port. This is not a local or sectional matter, but a matter of national concern. This is a matter, not for St. John or Halifax or St. Andrews or Louisburg, but one which calls on the Government to select that port which will best suit the trade of Canada. I contend it is desirable in the national interest that we should endeavor to secure to our country as efficient an ocean steam service as that enjoyed by any other country, and I say that such a service is a necessary adjunct to our great transcontinental system. This service is not exclusively for Canada. We ambition to secure for Canada and to make Canada the highway of the traffic from Europe to Eastern Asia and to Australasia. And, as my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) has stated, as the mail traffic goes, so will the passenger traffic go, and so will the freight traffic go. My hon. friend from St. John has referred to the trade of that community and to the trade of the port of Montreal. Far be it from me to say one disparaging word in reference to St. John. I have the greatest regard and respect for the citizens of that community, and for its representatives in this House, and I have spent some of the happiest days of my life in St. John. I say to you gentlemen of Ontario who have not had the opportunity of visiting St. John, that the oftener you go there the more frequently you will desire to go. I tell you that it is one

of the pleasantest places to visit, and now that we are to have a short line from Montreal to Halifax, which Mr. Van Horne says will take us from one point to the other in fifteen hours, though I give you twenty or twenty-two hours, I hope we shall see and know more of each other than we have in the past. Then also, you will find that, with a fast line of steamers, the trade will be diverted to a Canadian port. When you can reach Liverpool a day and a half sooner from Halifax than from New York, I am satisfied that a large amount of our passenger travel from Ontario will go by our own port. Other things being equal, Canadians will travel by their own line, and we are not here to say that we are Canadians only by Act of Parliament. Here, and at my home, and everywhere, I contend I am as good a Canadian as any man who lives in the Province of Ontario, and I am proud to say so. My hon. friend from St. John has referred to the arrivals and departures and the tonnage of ships at various ports, but the trade returns show that these were larger in the port of Halifax last year than in any other port in the Dominion of Canada, Montreal included. While I recognise that this is not a local matter or a sectional matter, it is a matter of national concern, and it is in the interest of Canada that we should sustain the reputation of our ocean service and surely this Dominion is able to afford as much for that purpose as the two old Provinces of Canada were able to pay twenty-eight years ago.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Committee must agree with me that this is a very large sum of money, and that we should look at the probable results to be attained from this expenditure. A good deal has been said about the two ports which we have, and we are glad to believe that they are two good ocean ports; but this is merely a matter of trade and commeree, and we have to look at the probabilities. The gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Kenny) says that we desire to benefit our own routes and to secure as much traffic as possible for them. I believe that desire will be felt by everyone in the Committee, but there may be two classes of those who travel by ocean lines. Those who are in a hurry to cross the ocean and to reach the other side, and in haste to return from the other side to their homes, will be influenced to take the fastest line on the ocean in order to accomplish that end. Those who are not in such great haste, those who are travelling for health or who have leasure, will be influenced perhaps by the price which is asked for their trip. I think the hon. member (Mr. Kenny) figured that there would be an advantage to the people of Ontario in the establishment of this fast line of steamers. I would like to ask if the advantage is in point of time or in regard to business requirements. Has the hon. gentleman gone into a close calculation in regard to that? I have not, but, discussing the matter the other day with a member from his own Province, I was told that the distance from Liverpool to New York is not over 500 miles more than it is from Liverpool to Halifax. If that be the case, the fast ocean steamers sailing from New York would not take twenty-four hours longer to reach New York than they would to reach Halifax. But, taking the Ontario passenger—and that is one of the large Provinces from which a great many travel, and we may therefore take Toronto as a central point—taking the passenger to Toronto, he finds himself in New York twenty-four hours later than he would find himself in Halifax; but he has to reach Toronto from New York in the one case or from Halifax in the other. He sits down to figure out how long it will take him to come from New York to Toronto. I think the time is sixteen hours. From Halifax, how long would my hon. friend say it would take to go to Toronto?

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Van Horne is my authority for saying——

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Never mind Mr. Van Horne. What does my hon. friend say?

Mr. KENNY. I think at present it takes 12 hours from Montreal, does it not?

Mr. LAURIER. 14 hours.

Mr. BOWELL. 10 hours.

Mr. KENNY. Then it would take about 32 hours when the Short Line is completed.

Mr. KIRK. It takes 48 hours now to get from Halifax to Ottawa.

Mr. KENNY. The journey has been made over the Intercolonial Railway with the English mail from Halifax to Montreal in 28½ hours by that circuitous route.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That was under the Reform Government.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It takes 48 hours now. By some Short Line my hon. friend thinks he can reach Toronto in 32 hours. I rather doubt that, but if he does he will see that the argument is still against him for several hours. Therefore, admitting that you have your best line of steamers the man travelling on business, guided by business principles—and the hon. gentleman knows that patriotism, as it is called, does not come much into calculation there—admitting that it is as pleasant a journey by one route as the other, would still go by New York in preference to taking the other route. Then there is the other point which I have alluded to, that with the other class of people a cheaper rate might be an object. If my hon. friend will make a calculation in regard to that and will see how much better that $500,000 could be used, he will see that we could pay the passage of 10,000 people at $50 each to travel over our present line every year. Certainly that would secure a passenger traffic. My hon. friend talks about traffic, and I presume he is talking about freight and business. Well, I think my hon. friend had an elevator built in the city of Halifax. Will he tell us what business that elevator does, and how much grain has passed through that elevator in the last two years? There has been a large expenditure of money there and the grain was to flow down in one of those fanciful visions the hon. gentleman opposite had. Has it done so? Where is the traffic? Where is the trade he has diverted to this city? But if he will take this $500,000 that he proposes to spend on this line of steamers and use it for some useful purpose, what can he do with it? It will give a bonus of 10 cents a bushel on the 5,000,000 bushels of wheat that passes through that elevator and takes its way to Europe. Would not that be a little more sensible proposition than you propose at the present time? This whole proposition is one that cannot commend itself to the good sense of this Committee, and I am surprised that hon. members, not only from Ontario but from the other Provinces, can give it in any favor.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I desire to correct the figures of the hon. gentleman for Brant (Mr. Paterson). I am not going to say a word in respect to the relative merits of St. John and Halifax—I am not going to eulogise St. John, that much slandered city, so ably represented in this House by its three representatives, a city of which the truth has not been told in former years, a city of undoubted merits. Let me inform the hon. member for Brant that one-half of the entire population of Canada lies east of Montreal, including Montreal as a part, I am not sure, but I think rather more than one-half of the entire population of the Dominion of Canada—who, certainly during the winter time, will use Halifax as their port of departure. With reference to Toronto, which the hon. member for Brant has taken as a centre of gravity, so to speak, for Ontario, I desire to call attention to the fact that when the Short Line is working in good order, if Mr. Van Horne's figures are correct—and they are not extreme, they only imply a rate of only 32 or 33 miles per hour—if his figures are realised,

you will go from Toronto to Halifax in 32 hours, and from Halifax to the British Isles in six days and you save a clear day on the ocean. Going from Toronto to New York in 16 hours, the land journey is 16 hours shorter than by the way of Halifax, but there will be a loss on the ocean of some 25 hours. Therefore I claim that there is a net saving as between Toronto and the port of Liverpool of 9 hours by way of Halifax or St. John in the winter season. I desire strongly to express what I believe to be the sense of an overwhelming majority of the people of the Lower Provinces in favor of this proposition. There was a feeling of delight and of pride when the people of the Lower Provinces learned that the Government contemplated this scheme of putting greyhounds on the sea and making the terminal port in Canadian territory.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not know what Mr. Van Horne's figures are. Will the hon. gentleman say what is the present time between Halifax and Toronto?

Mr. WELDON (Albert). That has really nothing to do with it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I want to know whether it is probable that we can save this length of time.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). The hon. gentleman knows as well as I that we lie three or fours hours in Quebec, and if we take the Grand Trunk Railway we lie in Richmond for some time during the night and are delayed in Montreal.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If we grant the hon. gentleman's whole figures, and that when this line is built we can accomplish the journey in 32 hours, which I very much doubt, on this long journey he has gained 9 hours, and that is all he gains, that is all the advantage he will have for his fast travelling.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I took the hon. gentleman's own figures. It may be a good deal more.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You took the figures, putting in these 32 hours on the road that is to be built. That is something in the future. It may turn out something like the millions of bushels of grain that were to pass through this elevator that we built. It may turn out like sums of money that we have been voting to build a railway and of which we find the cost double or triple the amount that it was promised would be sufficient. The hon. gentleman's figuring is conjecture.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). No. As the road is completed at this hour, if the 20 miles of imperfect grading were in proper shape on the Short Line, I claim, within an hour of those figures, that we can realise the 32 hours.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not propose to discuss the relative merits of St. John and Halifax. When I spoke on a previous occasion I thought that it was more becoming not to make any invidious comparisons between those two cities; and I still think it is better to leave to others to speak of our surroundings than to boast of them ourselves. My hon. colleague seemed to think he was particularly charged with vindicating the interest of Halifax. Sir, Halifax requires no vindication here. She is so situated geographically that she always must command a certain advantage over St John. But be that as it may, the peerless port of Halifax stands there inviting the commerce of the world, and it will go there provided all things are equal, and it can be distributed there on as good terms as from any other place on the continent. I merely say this in passing, not standing in fear of the indignation of my hon. colleague who, doubtless, thought that he could make a point against me, which he always appears too ready to do, and which I must say worries me very little indeed. The resolution before the House invites us to the expenditure of a large sum of money. We asked the Government to give us information as to the mode in which they propose to carry out this steamship service. We have a right to expect from them a positive and deliberate statement where they are going to touch on the English side. We do not require them to tell us where they are going to touch on this side, because it is admitted that Halifax, at all events, is to be the port. But I claim that they are bound to inform this Committee, before we go out of Committee, where they propose touching on the English side, and as concerns the ship which leaves this side of the Atlantic, whether they propose terminating the voyage there or sending that vessel on to a French port. The Minister of Finance was not very clear in reply to my enquiry the other night. I cannot imagine a more unwise and unbusinesslike proposition than to subsidise a line of steamers to go to France by the way of England. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman must know, if he knows anything about it at all, that it would utterly destroy all chances of success for a line of steamers going in that way. He must have a terminal point in England, and he may have to go to a French port so far as his passengers are concerned. I say, so far as passengers are concerned, but the hon. gentleman knows that the small freight they would carry never could bear the expenditure of transhipment from one ship to another. It would go in direct lines from this side to French ports. Therefore, I invite him to consider this matter on the lines he has laid down here as his base of operations. I invite the hon. gentleman to consider seriously this question, because I cannot imagine he was in earnest when he stated that the Government would entertain such an insane proposition as to propose a subsidised line to go to a French port after touching at an English port. If the vessels took nothing but passengers and mails it might be done, but even in that case it would be most difficult, because those seas are very difficult to navigate in a stormy season and those large and valuable vessels are not handled without a great deal of apprehension, and it will add very much to the insurance on those steamers to compel them to make different ports. If the Government anticipate that the line will carry any freight at all, and the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie) justified his action in supporting this resolution on this ground, it will be death to the scheme at the very commencement. I was amused with the proposal of the hon. member for Shelburne. He said that the ground on which he was supporting this resolution was that it would enable those steamers to take large quantities of freight.

Gen. LAURIE. I never said anything of the sort.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman said he would vote for this subsidy to divert trade from Portland to Canadian ports.

Gen. LAURIE. I never said these steamers would do it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). We shall see what the report says. I took the words down. He said he would justify his vote on the ground that it was going to divert the trade from American to Canadian ports. In reality it is going to be the reverse. My proposal or my suggestion to the Minister of Finance was that a line of steamers less expensive, and which would not involve such a large annual subsidy and a large line which would make from 16 to 17 knots, being 3 or 4 knots in advance of the present subsidised line, would carry on each vessel 2,000 or 3,000 tons of freight each way, from Liverpool to Montreal and from Montreal to Liverpool, and from Liverpool to Halifax in winter time, this quantity of freight being carried over the Intercolonial Railway. In this way the Government might be able, if they obtained any profit out of the freight carried over the Intercolonial Railway, it would justify the expenditure, because if 6,000 tons of freight per week were to pass over that road, 3,000 tons each way, that revenue would go far towards paying the subsidy which the Government were asking this

House to grant. If they propose a 20-knot service with vessels carrying only 700 tons or at the most 1,000 tons, vessels like the *Etruria*, there would only be 700 tons or 1,000 tons to handle at Halifax, instead of 3,000 tons each way. I say that it would be very much better for the people of Halifax who are employed in loading and unloading those vessels that my plan should be adopted, and I do not care what my worthy colleague may say in this respect, because I have had a good deal of experience in that line of business, and I say it would be ten times more advantageous to Halifax that steamers such as I suggested should come there with their large cargoes to discharge and prepare to take large cargoes away, employing our people to unload them and reload them for their voyages, than if the steamers carried only 700 tons of cargo on board. That is the position I have taken with respect to this matter from the very commencement Statements have been made with respect to the United States. It must be remembered that the United States pays no subsidies, that England pays no subsidies, they merely pay for the carriage of the mail. They will give the business to any line of fast steamers put on by any individual company or speculators, and if they carry the mails at a certain rate of speed they will get the work. I repeat that they give no regular subsidy, but they give a certain sum by weight for the carriage of the mail. On that ground, therefore, we have taken a different basis entirely. But take the whole of these resolutions, and what do they mean? We are asked under these various resolutions to vote $750,000 minus $125,000 or $625,000, which means interest on $15,000,000 of debt at 4 per cent., it means an addition of $15,000,000 to our national indebtedness simply for an unnecessary object. If there were anything to be accomplished by it, I would join with the Government in supporting their proposal, for I have no desire as a business man except to see our trade developed to its utmost capacity, and I should like that the steamers going across the Atlantic should be adapted to our trade under the circumstances. But what reasonable man would add $15,000,000 to our indebtedness in order to obtain steamers that would make 2 knots per hour more than those which I propose. I believe you can get such steamers as I have mentioned for nearly one-half the proposed subsidy. I believe if the Government were now to insert an advertisement asking for tenders at the lowest rate at which the service would be performed at the rate of 16 or 17 knots, they would find that a very material reduction could be effected. The Minister of Finance has stated that the Allan Company last year tendered at £2,000 a trip for an 18-knot service, or pretty much the same amount as it is now proposed to grant to this new and faster line. I have no doubt that when the Allan Company tendered they thought they would have no competitors and might obtain their own price. It is possible that such is the case, as they have had the contract so long, but with all the discussion that is going on and all the information of which we are in possession and with the various companies looking for the contract on one side of the water as well as the other, if the Government inserted an advertisement asking for tenders for the fastest service that could be obtained for $250,000 or $300,000 at the outside, I should be very much surprised if they did not get the offer of a 17-knot service, which I believe would be all that is required and all that necessity dictates at the present moment, and this course would be in the interest of our trade generally. It must not be forgotten that these large companies at Montreal have a certain claim on this country. They have invested their money in these large enterprises and have helped to build up the commerce of this country, and if arrangements could have been made with an old company like the Allan Company, which had done so much to make Montreal what it is to-day, there would have been a general feeling of satisfaction in this country. But the Government have taken a different view, one which in my judgment would not be advantageous to this country. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) said the people of the Maritime Provinces were unanimous in their demands for this service.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I said an overwhelming majority.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is pretty nearly the same thing.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). No.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman has obtained his information doubtless by some underground means.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I watch the newspapers.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). We do not always take the newspapers as reflecting public opinion. If the hon. gentleman sometimes read what the newspapers say about him, he would not take the view that they always reflected public opinion. Be that as it may, I admit there is a desire among the people generally to improve the mail service. That is what I ask. I am asking that three or four knots more per hour be secured from the vessels than under the present contract, but hon. gentlemen who knows anything about steamships are aware that when you seek to obtain a speed of six knots more, the cost of obtaining the two or three last knots is out of all proportion to that of obtaining moderate speed, and if the Government are aiming to obtain a high rate of speed, they will have to pay a sum which will astonish them in the end and which is altogether unnecessary. I go back to the position which I started with, I think that perhaps this is a matter which we need not discuss so much as the point which we want to arrive at: what are the Government going to do? Where are they going to send the vessels to and do they still adhere to what I call the insane proposal of going to France with this same vessel—a proposal which will wreck every possibility of success for their undertaking. I think that these are points which we ought to have positively before the Committee before we grant this vote. It is a business-like way for the Government to give us this information and it is the constitutional way. Why, Sir, even if the Minister of Marine only brings down an estimate for $30,000 to build new lighthouses, it would not be allowed to pass unless we have information about it. I remember 20 years ago when I was a member of this House that they would not grant an estimate like this unless the Minister stated before the vote where and how the money was to be spent. If this Parliament has been so careful and watchful of its rights and dignity in the past, are we to-day to throw that principle aside and place this large amount at the disposal of the Government simply on their statement that "we are going to do this or that, we are going to have a line of steamers here, or we are going to have a line of steamers there." We have all heard the remark made by the late Sir George E. Cartier that the Governor in Council was a great institution. That may be true, and some people may have great confidence in the Governor in Council, but I do not pretend to have all that confidence in them myself. I would have more confidence in them as business men, if they would come down with a business-like proposal and if they would act as business men and also as statesmen who respect the rights of Parliament and lay before Parliament what Parliament is entitled to, a plain and explicit statement of how this money is to be spent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) was kind enough to check me in my figures I know he will esteem it a kindness on my part if I will check him, as we both desire to arrive at correct results. I have now a paper before me which gives the distances from Halifax to Montreal at 760 miles, and if I re-

member aright I think it is 333 miles from Montreal to Toronto.

Mr. KENNY. Are you speaking of the Intercolonial or what road?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am speaking of the Short Line. The figures were read by Mr. Scholfield in a paper before the St. John Board of Trade, and I presume they can be taken as authentic; if not the hon. gentleman can correct me now. 333 miles and 760 make 1,093 miles, and I take it that you will travel at 25 miles an hour.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). Thirty-five miles an hour is the mail train rate.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I prefer to take the 25 miles an hour, because people will not travel over the road unless they get three meals a day and they will want several meals in the course of a 43 hours journey. I think you will find that if you make 25 miles an hour between Halifax and Toronto allowing for stoppages and meals you will have nothing to complain of the rate of travel. Twenty-five miles an hour is a pretty good rate of travel and on that calculation it would take 44 hours to Toronto. If we take 25 hours off the extra distance to New York it leaves 19 hours from New York to Toronto, but I think it does not take that length of time. The hon. gentleman speaks about a proposition that the Government contemplate, and which will have to be considered when it comes down,—an expenditure of some millions more of the money of the people of the country to shorten this route to Halifax by only fourteen miles according to Mr. Van Horne's statement.

Mr. TEMPLE. It will shorten it more than that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have my authority beside me; the gentleman to whom Mr. Van Horne made the statement.

Mr. TEMPLE. I do not care what Mr. Van Horne or anyone else stated.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I know the hon. gentleman claims that it will shorten the distance by 30 miles but the hon. gentleman from Albert is precluded from going behind Mr. Van Horne's authority because he quoted him himself. I have the proof of Mr. Van Horne's statement here. We will suppose that after the expenditure of these millions of dollars the route of from Halifax to Montreal is shortened by 14 miles. Then you have a distance of 746 miles remaining and that with the 333 miles to Toronto makes a distance of 1,079 miles at the speed of 25 miles an hour, including stoppages, the journey would occupy 43 hours and if you are 25 hours longer on the ship to New York it leaves 18 hours from which to get to from New York to Toronto, but I think it will be accomplished in less time than that. I give these figures to my friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) in order to correct him, because I do not wish to be behind him in the kindness he manifested to me by correcting me when he thought I was wrong.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I am sorry that I cannot accept the correction of my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) much as I would wish to take information from a wiser and older member of Parliament. The figures the hon. gentleman has given are not quite correct, although nearly so. The estimate of Mr. Schreiber is that when the new link is built connecting the New Brunswick Railway with Moncton over 40 miles will be saved, but I will take the hon. member's own figures. He says that there is a total of 1,093 miles from Halifax to Montreal, and we need stop to argue his contention that a train runs 25 miles an hour. At the present time on the Intercolonial Railway, with its multitudinous stations erected to accommodate the villages along the line, the train makes 25 miles an hour and stops inordinately. It is only reasonable to suppose that a fast mail will go quicker. If they attach a dining car to this mail train so that the engine will only have to stop for coal and water, there is no reason why a train cannot make 35 miles an hour over that railroad to-day. Assuming that a train makes as good time over this very excellent road as she will make between Toronto and New York, it will be exactly 31 hours from Toronto to Halifax over the existing road and if you take the Short Line it will only be a little over 29 hours. The figures I gave a few moments ago with reference to the ocean distance were from imperfect information, but I have since obtained the correct figures from a map, and I find that whereas I stated there would be a saving on the ocean journey as between coming from the British Islands to Halifax and to New York, of 510 miles in favor of Halifax, the saving is actually 650 miles as appears from an extract from the railway guide which an hon. friend has handed to me. There is an advantage of 140 miles over and above what I had previously stated, and I did not lay enough emphasis on the great saving of time due to the fact that when anyone goes from Toronto to Great Britain *via* Halifax he has not a single Customs officer to deal with. As fast as they can get the luggage off the steamer to the train, it is done, while a great many hon. members know that when you go *via* New York you stand a chance of losing from five to ten hours at the Custom house. Then, putting the argument that the route *via* New York is about fourteen hours shorter, the advantage I have shown to the Halifax route instead of being measured by twenty-five hours is measured by twenty-nine or thirty hours.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is the route that much shorter, running at the same rate of speed as at present?

Mr. WELDON (Albert). Yes; the same rate of speed.

Mr. LISTER. There is no railway in Canada that runs 32 or 35 miles an hour.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I want to say in conclusion that whereas on this close calculation I have made out that the advantage in time in favor of Halifax was only 9 hours, it seems reasonably clear that it is 29 hours.

Mr. LOVITT. Where did the hon. gentleman get the distance of 650 miles of saving on the Atlantic?

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I got it from a railway guide which was handed to me by an hon. member.

Mr. LOVITT. He is mistaken. It is 3,100 from Southampton to New York and about 2,600 miles to Halifax. I do not take anybody's information on that; I can measure it for myself.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). You are speaking of Southampton, I am speaking of Liverpool.

Mr. LOVITT. Liverpool is shorter yet.

Mr. SHANLY. I may say for the information of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) that the mail trains from Halifax to Montreal have done the distance in 28 hours, and the exact distance is 842 miles. Of course, it is not to be supposed that the general running of trains will be equal to 30 miles an hour; but when a fast steamer lands at Halifax, and the passengers are put on board the mail train, there is no reason why it should not be run at the rate of 30 miles an hour, and on the Short Line that rate would bring them from Halifax to Toronto in 32 hours. It is not the regular thing to do, but when they chose to make an effort, they have had no difficulty in doing it.

Mr. WATSON. I cannot claim, like some hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House, any practical connection with the running of ships, but I have known from ex-

perienced men that when you speed a locomotive or a steamship several miles over its regular speed, the expense for the last two or three miles in wear and tear is much greater than any other part of the cost. I do not know of any railway train, for carrying mails or for any other purpose, that runs regularly at the rate of 32 miles an hour. I suppose we may take as a fair sample the trains running between Toronto and Montreal, a distance of 333 miles. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk are competitors for the traffic, and no doubt they run their trains between those cities as fast as they will be run on the Short Line from Montreal to Halifax, and we find that the time made by those trains is only 27½ miles an hour, and it is not fair to suppose that a company which is going to have the whole carrying trade—because we are not to consider the Short Line a competitive line with the Intercolonial—is going to run its trains any faster than it is obliged to. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) has told us that at one time the Intercolonial Railway did carry the mails at the rate of 30 miles an hour. I wonder why the Government did not keep up that rate of speed. I suppose they found that it did not pay, as the wear and tear on the rolling stock was too great. Coming from the west I feel that I would not be doing my duty if I did not raise my voice against paying $500,000 a year to assist a fast line across the Atlantic. As has been already stated, very few people in Canada will benefit by this fast mail service. I do not believe it will be possible for this fast line of steamers to carry any great quantity of freight, and the shippers of freight will gain very little from it; and it has been explained that most important transactions requiring immediate dispatch are now done by the Atlantic cable, so that there is little or no reason for a fast mail service. I also oppose it because there is great difficulty in getting even small sums of money to develop the North-West and to give a small mail service there. When a couple of days ago I tried to induce the Postmaster General to provide three mails a week on the Glenboro' branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, he informed me that he could not do so, although it would only cost $800 additional a year; and the other day he found it necessary to increase the postage and registration rates on letters in order to realise $75,000 a year; and yet the Government find it necessary to vote $500,000 a year in order to have these greyhounds on the Atlantic. Under these circumstances, I feel that I would not be doing my duty unless I raised my voice against this grant, which will be of little or no benefit to the western portion of Canada. It appears to me that the Government are looking for some hole to throw money into when they make this large grant to such an enterprise. I question whether any company will be able to operate a line of steamships at the rate of 20 knots an hour with this bonus. If it is necessary to maintain that speed, the chances are that in another year or two these people will be coming and asking us for an increase on the ground that it is not sufficient. When you tax machinery to its utmost it is very expensive to keep it in repair, and to my mind if all the travel from Canada to Great Britain were to patronise this route of steamers it would not pay.

Mr. McNEILL. It seems to me that the question we have to decide is whether or not Canada, which is one of the greatest maritime nations of the world, has made up her mind to retire from that position by refusing to give for a first class mail ocean service a sum that she gave years ago willingly. Is Canada prepared to give up passenger traffic, altogether and be content simply to carry freight? We know perfectly well that we are losing our passenger traffic simply because we have not got vessels fast enough to compete with the other ocean services, and the question is whether or not we will make an effort to regain the position we formerly held. We have expended an immense deal of money in providing for ourselves the most perfect railway communication in the world, and are we prepared to-day to say that we will dwarf that enterprise and destroy its advantages by rendering it impossible for us to obtain from it what we expected to gain from the expenditure of our money and energy upon that work. If we do not provide the sea service necessary to complete the service we have provided on land, the Canadian Pacific Railway must of necessity be a failure. I do not say that hon. gentlemen opposite would wish to see that, but everyone must feel that it must be a failure unless we supply a first-class service by water. It has been said that we ought to subsidise freight traffic. I do not see where the necessity to do so arises, as we have already any amount of competition in that line. We have the Allan Line, the Dominion and Beaver Lines, all competing and ready now to carry our freight, and to carry it as cheaply as we can reasonably expect it to be carried. Then we are told this subsidy will provide only a passenger traffic. On the contrary, the Minister of Finance told us that these vessels would be prepared to carry from one to two thousand tons of freight, and it is of the greatest importance that we should have fast vessels to carry a great deal of freight across the Atlantic. We have heard a great deal about the farmer, but there are many farm products which it is of the greatest importance we should have carried by the fastest possible lines of ocean communication. There is, for example, the butter trade, for which it is of the greatest possible importance to have a fast line. Then we have the cheese trade, for which, perhaps, a fast line is not so important a requisite; but the butter trade, which is one of the great future trades we are about to enter upon with the mother country, on the one side, and China on the other, is a trade which it is absolutely necessary should be provided with fast means of communication. There is a market in England to-day for something like $40,000,000 worth of our butter. Our cheese trade with England is one of the largest we have, amounting to something like $7,000,000; but the other trade lying waiting for us to-day we will never be able to take advantage of, unless we can provide vessels fast enough to carry the butter over in a reasonable time. Again we know that our neighbors to the south may make up their minds at any time to carry out their threats and close their ports to us, and, if they do, are we to be left with a second or third rate line of mail service, as well as freight and passenger service? It does seem to me, in so far as the arguments advanced on the other side are concerned, that it is almost impossible to imagine anything weaker, unless hon. gentlemen opposite have made up their minds that the development of the resources of Canada is of secondary importance, and that, what we ought to do is to build up the resources of the nation to the south of us.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). With reference to what has been said concerning passengers being delayed at the Customs houses in going from Toronto to Liverpool and returning, let me state that I have gone from Toronto to New York, and crossed the ocean and recrossed, and I know that when you come to Blackrock all you have to do is to present your through ticket from Ontario to Liverpool and your luggage is never opened. You take your passage on the steamer and you go right along, and when you return on a through ticket from Liverpool to Toronto your luggage is never opened at New York, so that the statement is incorrect regarding delay at the Customs there. With respect to the fast line of steamers, and such a long overland route, that is not fit either for butter or cheese. The sooner we can reach the ocean and get these commodities on board the steamer the better. The longer the land journey, the more danger there is to that class of articles such as butter and

cheese, especially in hot weather. If the Government wish to do something for the trade of Canada, let them take this $500,000 and give it as a bonus for carrying wheat, say 10 cents on an export of 5,000,000 bushels. And in that way they would do us more benefit then by the way they propose. In giving such a large sum of money, we should obtain something more than the mere carrying of the mails; we ought to have a line of steamers that would carry freight much cheaper than at present; for it is impossible for us to compete with our neighbors—and we are brought into competition with them every day—unless we can get cheaper rates across the ocean.

Mr. DAWSON. I am sure that the establishment of the Allan Line in the first instance was of immense advantage to Canada; but now matters have come to such a pass that unless we can have a fast line of steamers that will surpass any other line, passengers will not come by the Canadian route. People now go by the fastest line, where ever they can find it. It is certainly a matter of great importance to us to have people travel by our Canadian line. Again, there is another point to be considered. We have always held out to the Imperial Government that we would provide a fast line across the continent whereby troops might be conveyed with the greatest possible dispatch, in the interests of the Empire at large, from England to India, if the necessity arose, and no doubt the day will come when we shall have British armies crossing this continent on the way to the Pacific. Should we not then provide means of transit for them, for they certainly could not go *viâ* New York. That is at least one reason why we should make our line across the continent available for all purposes. A great deal of valuable information has been given to the House during this discussion, but that information has confirmed me in the opinion that we ought to provide the fastest line possible to the other side, and I shall have great satisfaction in supporting the resolution of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have listened with a great deal of interest to this debate and have come to the conclusion that, in the present financial condition of the country, it is extremely foolish for the Government to vote $500,000 a year in order to obtain a fast line of steamers. We have very fair accommodation at present. We have only a population of five millions, and I do not think that, when the United States had a population of thirty millions, it had anything like the accommodation in this respect which we have to-day. I quite agree as to the desirability of getting a cheap and a more efficient transport of freight from this country to the place of consumption. I have been amused, however, to listen to the discussion which has taken place as to short lines. I remember, a few years ago, when Sir Charles Tupper was a member of this House, that he promised that the Oxford, New Glasgow and Louisburg Short Line was to be the line of this country to take the whole carrying trade. What has become of that line? We are now talking of another short line. How many short lines are we to have? We understand that in a day or two a proposition will be brought down to vote $500,000 to complete a line—

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Not to complete, to start.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, to start a line to implement a promise made by Sir Charles Tupper a few years ago in regard to another short line. We have any amount of short lines in the East, and I have been amused to notice how many competing cities there are which are struggling each to get the start of the other in connection with this supposed fast line. It is time for us to consider where we are. Some people have been talking about trains travelling at the rate of 35 miles an hour. I think the country is running into debt at the rate of 35 miles an hour, and that the Government should reduce the speed. I have been amused at the discussion which has taken place between some hon. gentlemen who represent those eastern cities. There appears to be a constant difference between those hon. gentlemen, and I have been amused to listen to the two hon. members from Halifax, who remind me of the quarrels which we are informed took place between the Kilkenny cats. When one hon. gentleman gets up on the one side and makes a proposition, the other hon. gentleman gets up on the other side and makes a statement which is the exact opposite. I believe the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Kenny) is Irish, as I am myself. I do not know whether he is from Kilkenny or not, but, at all events, he shows the disposition of the Kilkenny cat in being always ready to assail anything which is said by my hon. friend here (Mr. Jones). Then, from St. John we have the same unfortunate exhibition of one man supporting the Government and one supporting the Opposition. I think, however, the City of St. John did itself the justice of electing two Rouges, but one has become Bleu since he came here. We must submit to that, however. One objectionable proposition is to take this fast line to France as well as to Great Britain. Looking at the public returns, I find that our total export to France last year amounted to $397,000, and our imports to $2,642,000. That virtually means 50 cents a head of the population of this country; and, in order to have a closer and more direct communication with that country, we are asked to expend $200,000 a year, which I think it will cost in excess of what it would to obtain a fast connection with the British Isles alone I think it is really insane to propose to add to the debt of this country to such an extent for the purpose of obtaining a shorter line to a foreign country with which we only do a trade of 50 cents a head. I have no objection to our obtaining close and rapid connection with the British Isles, but, in the present condition of our finances, it is very imprudent to expend such a large amount of money to subsidise a line for the sake of the gentry who want to travel at lightning speed. I believe that, in increasing our annual expenditure to $40,000,000 a year, which it soon will reach, or $8 a head, we shall be guilty of an insane and imprudent action by agreeing to this vote for a fast line of steamers. I think this proposition caps the climax of all the ridiculous propositions that have been brought before the House this Session, except the one in regard to our connection with Australia and Vancouver. I think we should turn our attention to the internal condition of the country, and should assist those men who are struggling without relief and waiting for more prosperous times, instead of assisting the aspirations and desires of the nobs of the country by subsidising fast lines of steamers for their convenience. In that case we would receive the thanks of the people to a greater extent than we will now.

Mr. MULOCK. Last Thursday, the Minister of Finance was asked certain questions in regard to this matter, and I understood it was his intention to give the information before we went out of Committee. I think we ought to know something in regard to the leading features of this scheme. I thought it my duty at that time to ask for the information, and I therefore now ask if the Minister of Finance has any further reason than he gave originally for proposing that this line shall go to a port in France, and I would also ask what extra cost is occasioned by extending the line to France? It might be very desirable to have this service in connection with Great Britain, but if we are to have it with the continent as well, we should have some information as to the extra cost and should know what the service is to perform. I think it is specially becoming of the Minister of Finance and the gentlemen at his back, to consider whether in connecting this service with the continent, they are not to a certain extent discriminating against the mother country. Are they not, by this movement, going to divert trade from England? Are they not, by selecting a conti-

nental port, going to give up some advantages to be obtained by stopping at the best port in Great Britain—Liverpool? If they are going to touch at a port in France, I don't see how they can use the port of Liverpool. It must be a port in the south of England—The First Minister intimated that much, the other evening; if so, they are not adopting the best port in Great Britain, but a secondary port for the sake of connecting with France. Now, I am not unwilling that we should have business relations with France, or with any other part of the world, but I think we should know the cost of the service at present. Would it be better to expend $500,000 a year and take a secondary port in England to connect with the continent in the way proposed, or would it be better to have our service connect simply with one port in Great Britain? Then we should look at it from the Imperial standpoint. Certainly these are considerations that are most material, and that it ought to be thoroughly deliberated by Parliament unless it is to become a mere register of the opinions of others, in which case we might as well give a general power of attorney to the Government and go about our business. But so long as it remains a deliberative and representative body, it is due to us, members of that body, that we should have that information which is necessary in order to enable us to come to an intelligent conclusion. In making these remarks I do not wish to be understood as opposed to any system of developing our trade and bringing us abreast of the times. When these resolutions were presented to us the other evening, I understood that we were to have other information before we were called upon to vote. I now ask the Finance Minister if he is prepared to give the information in the direction required?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he has any report on the subject from the High Commissioner? Will the Minister inform me if that gentleman has made a report upon the subject? The silence of the Minister of Finance, I fancy, would indicate that such a report has been made, and I would like to ascertain the basis upon which such a report is founded. What are the conclusions to be drawn from the High Commissioner on the subject? I think it is the member for Halifax—I do not know whether he is the junior or the senior,—I fancy they both look a little in the senior division—he speaks about being a Canadian. I presume he would not ship on a steamer for the old country from the port of New York. If I mistake not the High Commissioner has made similar statements in this House. I think the last time he came out from the old country he landed at New York.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). And on a German line.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I believe others have done so, but I do not know that they have been accused of disloyalty or treason. But probably the High Commissioner is not as truly a Canadian as the senior or the junior member for Halifax is. But if he has made a report on this subject it is proper that we should see it, and if half a million dollars is to be spent merely to get the best line of steamers across the Atlantic, it is desirable in the interests of this country that every information should be furnished to the House so that we may know, before the money is voted, whether it is going to be returned in profit to the consumers of this country. The people in this country do not find money on every gooseberry bush. Will the members of the Government tell the people of this country that in order to get a quick passage for the mails they have to be delayed in Canada for a week, whereas by taking other routes they start every day in the week? The High Commissioner, I think, when he came out, came in a sealed packet, and he has never been called treasonable by this side of the House.

An hon. MEMBER. The Secretary of State is coming that way.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why, he should be indicted for disloyalty.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Give him an opportunity of coming another way.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I presume when you get the State of Maine all right, you will bring him that way. Now, Sir, this new charge will be equal to an annual tax of $25,000 on every riding in Canada.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). How does the hon. gentleman make that out? Multiply the ridings by $25,000 and you will have $5,000,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I fancy the hon. gentleman must be a professor.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). He can multiply the ridings in this country by $25,000 and make $5,000,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am glad to be corrected.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). You have 10 times too much.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am amazed at my moderation. However, it is half a million divided among the constituencies of this country, and in ten years imposes on each riding the sum I have named, viz, $25,000. You do not take away from the fact that $500,000 are to be expended for the purpose of giving a mail once a week. I do not think this is a business like transaction, and the real excuse given by the Finance Minister is that we shall obtain a line of which we shall be proud. How many more objects of adoration are we going to have in this country? We have a Finance Minister, we are proud of him minus his prospectus. We have a High Commissioner, we are proud of him,—he is a pretty extensive luxury, however. We have a Government, and I presume some hon. gentlemen opposite are proud of it, and they are willing to expend a considerable amount of money for the purpose of keeping that Government in power. So far as regards the *personnel* of the Government, I have no objection to any of them, and I think they are about as good a lot as can be found on the other side of the House. I presume some hon. gentlemen are willing to immolate themselves on the altar of their country and enter into the Cabinet should such become necessary. I do not think it will be necessary for the Premier to go to the North-West again to bring in outsiders; probably he will be able to find members in the House for Cabinet positions, even though they may not have the experience which some of the outsiders have had. There is an outside service from which he requires certain people, and it is well that hon. members sitting on the back benches and voting for the Government should know that fact, because if they do not anticipate much they will not be disappointed. If these changes are to be made and positions are to be filled by outsiders, I do not see how members of the Government party in the House have a chance. I think this is granting too large a sum for mail subsidies in view of the present stringency of the times and the depression that prevails throughout the country, and I would not like to make members of the Government or hon. members opposite uncomfortable by saying it is due to their policy. They know that fact themselves, and I would not like to say anything irritating when it is so near the Sabbath, as it might interfere with their devotions to-morrow, and I think they require all the benefit they can obtain from their devotions because they may be held responsible for bringing about the depression and the hard times which exist at the present time. This is altogether too large a sum when we are not going to increase either the material or any other welfare of this country. The fact is that owing to the price of farm products having diminished since last year, the price of farms has also diminished, and when farmers and every other class have all they can possibly do to make ends

meet, it appears to be an outrage upon the feelings of the people that they should be taxed unnecessarily for postal or any other interests. A great deal might be said in regard to the ports, outports, French ports that have to be selected. Much has been said about Halifax and St. John. They are both, no doubt, splendid ports and such as the Dominion should be proud of, and we are proud to know that they send here such wonderfully able and discreet statesmen. I should like both ports to be selected, and it would be a good way of getting out of the difficulty, and I even think the Government may fall back on this suggestion before they are through with the matter. But we should at least know the ports from which these vessels are going to sail, and we should have all the information on the subject before we vote this allowance.

Mr. MULOCK. Now that the Premier has returned, I should like to ask him for some information. I may mention that his Finance Minister is so exhausted by his parliamentary labors that he is unable now to reply to inquiries directed to him and has not sufficient strength to address the Committee. When the House was considering this resolution on Thursday last, I understood the Premier to intimate that at some stage, before we as a deliberate body were to be called upon to vote on the question, he would impart some information to the House. The Minister of Finance made an extraordinary statement. He stated that there were no documents, there were no papers of any kind touching these negotiations, with the exception of a telegram, I presume he meant a cable, from the High Commissioner to this Government, but that negotiations had been conducted by the High Commissioner. It strikes me that there must have been instructions to the High Commissioner; there must have been communications between the High Commissioner and the Government. I do not understand that the High Commissioner has by virtue of his office the power to enter into negotiations of this kind with Great Britain and European countries without obtaining express instructions from the Government of Canada. If such is the case, it is high time the House and the country knew to what extent the High Commissioner has been clothed with authority. Certainly authority to that extent should not have been entrusted to any person, and I do not think such authority is given to any ambassador of any nation. On that point I ask, whether there are any communications between the High Commissioner and the Government of Canada in existence, and if so, whether there is any objection to their being laid before the House? I would ask the First Minister or some one else to answer this, and also to state why we are going to a French port, and what the extra cost will be of going to a French port? It may be advisable to connect with an English port alone. If we have to go to a French port it may deprive us of the best choice. If we do not attempt to make that connection, we can choose the best port in England untrammelled by other considerations, but if it is determined behind the possibility of change to connect with a French port, it limits our choice of ports in Great Britain. I ask the First Minister if he is prepared to give any information on this question, if the facts have been considered. Are these matters finally decided, is there any policy determined upon, or is the whole thing *in nubibus* at the present time?

Mr. FOSTER. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House ask so many questions, and one question succeeds another so rapidly that scarcely time is given to reply, and when information is once given the same has been asked for over and over again. I thought that when I introduced the three resolutions, I gave a plain and candid statement to the House, and I certainly gave a great deal of information specifically for which I have been asked over and over again by gentlemen who have spoken since. The senior member for the county of St. John (Mr. Weldon) asked to-night in the course of his address for various kinds of information. He thought the Government should take the House into its confidence and state whether any tenders had been refused, and why they had been refused, and how many tenders had been received. The hon. gentleman will find that information recorded in *Hansard*. I stated in introducing the resolutions that there were three tenders received, one proposing to give 15 knots an hour, another 17 knots an hour and the third a maximum of 20 knots an hour. I said that this did not prove satisfactory

Mr. LAURIER. Why?

Mr. FOSTER. I think I gave a very good reason at the same time. I said they did not prove satisfactory to the Government and that the Government had changed their mind somewhat in reference to the speed that was required and the equipment and style of vessel that should be put on if we went to the expense of getting a fast line service at all. Then I stated that we entered into negotiations with the two *bonâ fide* companies and that we proposed to give a service which would terminate in Canadian ports and which should be as good as any service that crosses the Atlantic, having vessels equal to such vessels as the *Umbria* and the *Etruria*, which ply to the port of New York. I think that gives definite information as to the kind of service we propose to have. Questions have been asked in reference to the ports to which we propose to sail, and the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat wants to know what the cost is for going from a port in England to a port in France. I cannot tell him. It is quite open to any gentleman in this House to say we had better not go to a French port, and the hon. gentleman may get support from his side of the House for that proposition; but the proposition of the Government is a plain and proper one: It is to make a French connection and it is asking the House to vote a certain amount of money to enable them to have an Atlantic service with a connection with a French port. If hon. gentlemen oppose that, let them give their reason for opposing it, but that is the proposition of the Government, and that is the proposition which we support by our arguments, and which after careful consideration we think would be the best. It is open to any hon. gentleman who may think it would not be the best to support by his voice and vote his feelings in that respect. Two hon. gentlemen said that to make a connection with a French port is insanity run madder than insanity. It does not seem to me an insuperable objection. Take, for instance, the ports of Plymouth and Southampton, and from the latter port you will find there runs one of the best lines that cross the Atlantic. Suppose we take Southampton or Plymouth is it impossible to make a French connection? About four hours would take a vessel from Plymouth to Cherbourg and four hours going across that channel is not a very long time out of the life of a man or out of the time in a week which a vessel can make this return trip. I think it will be found that calling at a French port is not insuperable, and that it can be very easily done. As I have said, the negotiations are not completed, and it cannot be stated with certainty from what port these vessels will go. With reference to the extra amount which it will cost between an English and a French port, I think that my hon. friend from York (Mr. Mulock) had better not take the financial calculations made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) who gravely ventured the opinion that it would cost $200,000 to make a French connection from a British port. I do not think it would cost that. I do not know that there are any other questions outside of those that have been asked, and we can answer. There is certainly no disposition on my part or the part of the Government to withhold any information that can fairly be given, and it seems to me that after this long discussion, and as it

is now a few minutes before midnight, the House ought to be prepared to adopt the resolution.

Mr. LAURIER. I will admit, with the hon. gentleman, that there have been a great many questions asked on this side of the House, but what is the reason? It has not been in any spirit of obstruction, but it was simply to obtain the information to which the House was entitled and which had not been given by the hon. gentleman. If the hon. gentleman had given us all the information which would have enabled the House to vote intelligently upon this matter he would have been spared all the questions which have been put to him and which he has not yet fully answered. For instance it is proposed in this resolution that we should have a connection with France. A very natural question which arises the moment this proposition is made that we should go out of the way to a French port when we want a fast line of steamers, is the question which was asked by the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock): What will be the cost of it? What answer to such a natural question do we obtain from the hon. gentleman? The only answer we have is simply this: "You can vote against it." Of course we can vote against it, but what we want is the information which will enable us to vote intelligently upon the question. It is not a fair answer to give to a question that "we can vote against it." If that is the way the House is to be treated, and that is the way it has been treated all along on this question, can hon. gentlemen be surprised that we insist on having information before we vote "yea" or "nay" to such a proposition as this? There is another important question that has been asked by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien): "What kind of service will you place on the ocean?" Will it be simply a service for the passenger traffic to rival the service between England and New York to-day, or a service for both passenger and freight traffic? And what answer have we had up to this moment? We have not had an iota which will enable the House to know whether that is the intention of the Government, or whether it is their intention to continue the passenger and freight service we have had in the last twenty years.

Mr. FOSTER. I have stated that over and over again.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman has stated it over and over again, I would ask him to repeat it once more. He said that we were to have a service something like the *Umbria*. Are we to understand, then, that this is to be a purely passenger service, or a service of combined passenger and freight such as we have to-day? If the hon. gentleman would say so in so many words, we would have something to go upon.

Mr. FOSTER. I supposed that question was fully answered when I stated on several occasions that we proposed to have a service equal to the best on the Atlantic. My hon. friend knows that while the class of vessels making the fast service to New York are passenger and mail vessels, they carry a certain amount of freight, though not a very large amount of freight; and in the discussion my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones), who understands the subject, has stated over and over again that they carry about 800 or 1,000 tons of freight.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, we have had so much after two days' discussion. I will ask the hon. gentleman one more question, and if he will answer without any equivocation, I suppose we can adjourn. I understand from what he said that the contract for the service between France and Canada has been cancelled, to take effect on the 1st July.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been cancelled, and the service ceases on the 1st July.

Mr. LAURIER. Can he state the reasons—reasons of state?

Mr. FOSTER. The reasons are these, and my hon. friend can judge whether they were reasons of state or not: The service was from the first unsatisfactory; it was not performed according to contract, it was not doing as well as had been anticipated, and the contract was voided, and on the 1st July the service ceases with the consent of both the Government and the line.

Mr. MULOCK. Are we to understand that each vessel of this new line will be of the character of the *Umbria* and *Etruria*?

Mr. FOSTER. The vessels will be uniform.

Mr. MULOCK. I call the Minister's attention to the difference between that statement and the one he has just made. A moment ago he stated that the service would be equal to the best on the Atlantic. I suppose he had reference to the *Umbria* and the *Etruria* of the Cunard Line. Most of the vessels of that line are far inferior to the *Umbria* and *Etruria*. If he meant that we are to have a service equal to the *Umbria* and *Etruria*, that is one thing, but if he meant that it was to be equal to the Cunard Line, that is another thing. I understand that it is to be something better than the best line, and equal to the *Umbria* and the *Etruria*. Is that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. The vessels are to be of that high class, and to be uniform.

Resolution reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 22nd April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SAGUENAY RIVER—BUOYS.

Mr. COUTURE asked, 1st. Whether the Government included in the call for tenders for buoys and lights on the Saguenay River, in 1887, the number of new buoys delivered to C. A. Sturton after he secured the contract? 2nd. Did the parties tendering know of the existence of the said buoys? 3rd. Did the Government take steps to make the same known to them? 4th. By whom and by whose orders were they made? 5th. Who paid for them, and what was the price of each buoy? 6th. On what conditions were they delivered to C. A. Sturton?

Mr. TUPPER. 1st. No tenders were invited for this service in 1887, and no contract entered into with C. A. Sturton. 2nd. Full particulars of the service were stated in a handbill dated 16th April, 1888, inviting tenders, in which intending tenderers were requested to apply to the harbor master for full information? 3rd. Only by advertisement by handbill, and in Chicoutimi paper. 4th. By agent of department at Quebec. 5th. Paid by cheque from the department price. 6th. There were no buoys delivered to C. A. Sturton that the department is aware of, but buoys were delivered to Mr. Ainsworth Sturton, the contractor.

ROYAL LABOR COMMISSION—LEGISLATION.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to introduce, this Session, legislation to carry into effect the recommendations and suggestions contained

in the report of the Dominion Labor Commission, lately laid before Parliament?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention of the Government is to read the evidence and the report during the recess, and to give a chance to hon. members to do the same; so that we may know, during the recess, what legislation will be required next Session.

CHIGNECTO SHIP RAILWAY.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, Whether the Government have a copy of the prospectus of the Chignecto Ship Railway, as issued in London, on which their money was borrowed? And whether the Government, if they have it, will lay the same before the House; and if they have not, will they take the necessary steps to obtain the same and lay it before Parliament?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government has not in its possession a copy of the prospectus of the Chignecto Ship Railway, as issued in London, and, therefore, cannot lay it before the House. I do not know whether it is a matter with which the Government have very much concern or not. I will be very glad to get a copy of it as soon as possible. We have applied to London for it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should think the credit of the country has much concern in it, and I think it is desirable we should have it.

NATIONAL DEFENCE COMMITTEE.

Mr. HOLTON asked, Has any arrangement been concluded between the Imperial authorities and the Canadian Government respecting the defence of the coast of British Columbia? If so, what is its nature?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Negotiations have been going on since 1885, and are still in progress between the Imperial authorities and the Canadian Government respecting the defence of the coast of British Columbia. So far, their nature is strictly confidential.

Mr. HOLTON asked, How is the "National Defence Committee" constituted? What are the powers of this Committee, and when will it meet again?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Committee is composed of the Major-General commanding the Militia, the Adjutant General, the Commandant of the Royal Military College, and the Inspector of Artillery. The Committee is to report confidentially to the Government on any improvements that can be suggested, or any plan that can be carried out in the present system of defence, so as to meet the country's wants and needs. The Committee will meet from time to time when it is deemed advisable.

SEIZURE OF THE *BRIDGEWATER*.

Mr. HOLTON asked, Have representations been received from the Imperial authorities or the Government of the United States, respecting the seizure of the vessel *Bridgewater*? Has any demand been made for compensation to the owners of said vessel for damages arising from such seizure? If so, what is the amount claimed?

Mr. BOWELL. Representations have been made through the Imperial Government by the United States authorities in reference to the seizure of the *Bridgewater*. Compensation has been claimed by Mr. Allan, on behalf of the owners, to the amount of $20,303.26.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will you pay it?

Mr. BOWELL. That is not part of the question. I can tell the hon. gentleman that it is not paid.

MANUFACTURES EXPORTED TO AUSTRALIA.

Mr. TROW (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, What is the total amount of manufactured goods exported from Canada to Australia from 1st July, 1888, to 1st January, 1889, and from 1st January, 1889, to 1st April, 1889?

Mr. BOWELL. The manufactures exported to Australia for the six months ended the 31st of December, 1888, amounted to $41,530. Returns are not completed to enable me to answer the last part of the question.

POST OFFICE AT BALTIC, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to establish a post office at Baltic, in Prince County, P.E.I., as promised last year by the late Postmaster General? If so, when?

Mr. HAGGART. I am unable at present to state what action shall be taken by the department in reference to the establishment of a post office at Baltic, as the matter is still under the consideration of the department.

PUBLIC WORKS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is the Department of Public Works aware of the amount of damages done to the breakwater at Miminegash, P.E.I., last fall? If so, is it the intention of the department to repair said breakwater immediately?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The attention of the department was called to the damage done to this breakwater, and the matter is now receiving the attention of my department.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is it the intention of the Minister of Public Works to cause, during the present season, a survey to be made of the shore at Fifteen Point, P.E.I., with a view of reporting on the practicability of building a breakwater at that place? Also, to report on the probable cost of the same?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not the intention.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is it the intention of the Minister of Public Works to cause a survey to be made at the harbor of Summerside, P.E.I., during the present year, with the view of building a breakwater at that harbor? Also, an estimate of the cost of the same?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. An examination was made for a breakwater at the entrance of Summerside harbor. Sometime since it was brought to the notice of the department, through a petition presented by Sir Adams Archibald, that further examination was desirable, and an order has been issued to that effect.

MONTREAL HARBOR POLICE.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) (for Mr. CURRAN) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to disband the Montreal Harbor Police, prior to the fall of this year?

Mr. TUPPER. It is not the intention of the Government to re-engage the harbor police of Montreal this season.

BOUNDARIES OF ONTARIO.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee, to-morrow, to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That a humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that she may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be submitted to the Parliament of the United Kingdom, declaring and providing the following to be the westerly, northerly and easterly boundaries of the Province of Ontario, that is to say:

"So much of a line drawn to the Lake of the Woods through the waters eastward of that lake and west of Long Lake which divide

British North America from the territory of the United States, and thence through the Lake of the Woods to the most north-western point of that lake as runs northward from the United States boundary and from the most north-western point of the Lake of the Woods, a line drawn due north until it strikes the middle line of the course of the river discharging the waters of the lake called Lake Seul or the Lonely Lake, whether above or, below its confluence, with the stream flowing from the Lake of the Woods towards Lake Winnipeg, and thence proceeding eastward from the point at which the before mentioned line strikes the middle line of the course of the river last aforesaid, along the middle line of the course of the same river (whether called by the name of the English River or, as to the part below the confluence, by the name of the River Winnipeg) up to Lake Seul or the Lonely Lake, and thence along the middle line of Lake Seul or Lonely Lake to the head of that lake, and thence by a straight line to the nearest point of the middle line of the waters of Lake St. Joseph, and thence along that middle line until it reaches the foot or outlet of that lake, and thence along the middle line of the river by which the waters of Lake St. Joseph discharge themselves to the shore of the part of Hudson's Bay commonly known as James' Bay, and thence south-easterly, following upon the said shore to the point where a line drawn due north from the head of Lake Temiscamingue would strike it, and thence due south along the said line to the head of the said lake, and thence into the said lake to descend the Ottawa River until the latter is struck by the north-western boundary of the Seigneurie of Vaudreuil, and thence along the said north-western boundary running south twenty-five degrees west, to the westernmost angle of the Seigneurie of New Longueuil, and thence running along the limit between the Township of Lancaster and the said Seigneurie of New Longueuil in the direction of south thirty-four degrees east, to a stone boundary on the north bank of the Lake St. Francis, at the cove west of the Pointe-au-Baudet, in the said limit between the Township of Lancaster and the Seigneurie of New Longueuil."

Motion agreed to.

SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee, to-morrow, to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient that a railway should be constructed, as a Government work, between a point of junction on the New Brunswick Railway, at or near Harvey, in the Province of New Brunswick, and a point of junction with the Intercolonial Railway, at or near Salisbury, in the said Province, or somewhere between Salisbury and Moncton, and that the sum of five hundred thousand dollars be granted towards the construction of the said railway.

Motion agreed to.

STEAMSHIP SERVICE—AUSTRALIA AND B. C.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the report of the Committee of the Whole on resolution to provide for a subsidy for a fortnightly steamship service between British Columbia and the Australian Colonies and New Zealand, be read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. LAURIER. I can scarcely hope, yet I would fain hope, that the majority of this House, before assenting to this resolution, will ask for further information on the subject. Not that I would at all condemn the idea of extending our trade relations. On the contrary, any proposition from the other side with a view to extending beyond the limits of our own country, be it far or near, our trade relations, is always sure to meet the favorable consideration of this side; but after all, however laudable the object may be, there are certain rules of government and safe administration which ought to be kept in view and which can never be departed from with impunity. We are to-day asked to vote something like $750,000 a year for the purpose of creating a steamship service between Canada and Europe, on the one hand, and between Canada, Asia and the far East on the other hand. That may be advantageous to the country or it may not; it depends altogether upon the results which are to be achieved in comparison with the expenditure required. Now, we have been debating this question for two days, and I submit to the House that we have not before us a single item of information which can justify us in coming to the conclusion that the advantages which are to be derived from this expenditure—if, indeed, any are to be derived—will be at all commensurate with the expenditure itself. I put it to the hon. gentlemen on that side, whether, in anything which has fallen from the lips of the gentlemen on the Treasury benches, on Wednesday or Saturday last, there has been a single iota of information which can enable anyone amongst them to come to the conclusion that the country will really be benefitted by this expenditure to the full amount. I submit that we have not any information on this point, and I do not believe that any legislative body would consent to such a proposition if submitted with so little information. As to some of these subsidies, the Government have information and have invited tenders. This information is refused to us. The tenders they have received, they refuse to lay before us. The negotiations they have opened up they have refused to make known to us. As to some of the other subsidies, the Government are no better informed than we. As to them, the Government are groping in the dark, and do not know what results will accrue from them, because they do not know on what basis they are proceeding. Take the Australian subsidy. We are asked to spend annually $125,000 for the object of opening up steamship service between Canada and Australia. I do not condemn the idea itself, neither do I approve it, because I am not in a position to do either. The Government themselves say that, in asking the subsidy, they rely altogether on hopes. They expect that the Australian Governments will meet their views and do as much as they do. But they have never opened up any negotiations with the Australian Governments in order to ascertain whether or not they are willing to respond. The Government have not taken the trouble to inform themselves what is to be the cost of such service. They have not taken the trouble, as far as I know, to inform themselves as to whether there is a possibility of opening up a trade at all commensurate with the expenditure. Yet they ask $125,000 a year. I ask them why $125,000 a year? Why not $50,000, or $200,000, a year? What are the facts upon which they base their demand for this sum, or upon which they base their demand for it rather any other? Can they give us information as to that point? I defy the Government to give information upon which they rely in asking us to vote this sum or any other sum. They cannot give a substantial reason to this House why they have selected that or any other sum. It might have been, as far as we know, or as far as they themselves know, just as well to give $50,000, or $200,000, or any other amount they please to ask. The amount they have selected is purely arbitrary. Now we are asked to vote another sum to subsidise another line of steamers, which is already in existence, between British Columbia and Japan. What is the reason for asking that subsidy? The service is already in operation. It is true that service is subsidised by the Imperial Government, and we have been told by the Finance Minister that there is an agreement between the Imperial Government and the Canadian Government whereby the Canadian Government have bound themselves, subject to the approval of Parliament, to contribute one-third of the amount contributed by the Imperial Parliament. I submit that, in all fairness to the House, we should have that agreement. But things have come to this point that the Government will not grant by courtesy what formerly they would have yielded to us as a right. There was a time when no Government would have dared to ask the disbursement of any sum based upon an agreement without first laying that agreement upon the Table. We have not that agreement. Nay more, the Government have undertaken to expend a large sum of money while, over such expenditure, Parliament will not have, so far as we can see, the slightest control. We have in the west two rising and lively cities, Vancouver and Victoria. They stand almost opposite to one another, and, as is natural under the circumstances, there is a rivalry between them. The one sees that the other shall not excel it, and there is a rivalry also in reference to this

subsidy between the two cities. This subsidy is to be granted, as we have heard, for a line of steamships to Vancouver, but Victoria wants the steamers to call there either going out or coming in. The hon. gentleman who represents Victoria (Mr. Prior) told us the other night that he had begged and prayed the Government to agree that the steamers should call at Victoria, but the Government would not give any answer to satisfy him, the only answer given being that this was a matter in the hands of the Imperial Government. I ask the majority in this House if the Canadian Parliament is ready to vote a sum of money over the expenditure of which they are not to have the slightest control? Under such circumstances, I think it would be the duty of the majority in this House to see that the Canadian Government have some control over that expenditure, as the people of this country will have to contribute towards that service. Then, we are asked to vote $500,000 a year for a mail subsidy for a service between Canada and Europe. As to this we know at least to some extent what we are going to have, though we do not know it completely. We are told that we are going to have a line of steamers of the class of the *Etruria*. That is, we are to have a line devoted to passenger traffic, but not to passenger traffic and freight traffic as well. Whether this would be better in the interests of the country or not, I do not know, but I do not believe it would, but others who are more competent than I am can be heard upon that question. However, there is some further explanation which we should have. We ought to know from what port these steamers are to start on the other side of the Atlantic, and to what port they are to come on this side, whether it be St. John, or Halifax, or any other port. As to this we are now completely in the dark. The conclusion I come to is that the whole of this expenditure is premature, and that we should revert to the old practice, which was a wholesome practice, and should say to the Government, Get information first, and after having obtained that information, if you choose to come to an agreement, you can come with it to Parliament, and then you will be able to enter into an agreement upon which Parliament has pronounced; but I submit that it is intolerable that we should recognise a system of placing money in the hands of the Government to expend at their own pleasure without Parliament being previously consulted upon it. The Government ask us, in fact, for a blind power of attorney to do as they please in this matter. This system has prevailed already too long and to too great an extent. Five years ago, we were asked to vote $500,000 a year for twenty years to build a short line railway which would include a line from Harvey to Moncton, and now we see that, though we trusted to the Government then, Parliament has been deceived, the instructions given by Parliament to the Government have not been carried out, and, in consequence of that deception, we are asked this year to vote $500,000 more, and I do not know how much we may be asked for next year. That was one deception which has been practised upon Parliament. Upon another occasion—nay, on several occasions, Session after Session—we were told that the terminus of the Short Line would be at Louisburg, and that would be the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that it would be the ocean port. Time after time the Parliament of Canada was induced to vote money with that object in view and with that statement made on the floor of Parliament; and yet, to-day, what do we hear of Louisburg, who has a word to say about Louisburg? I do not say whether it is right or wrong that we do not hear of it, but I say again that this Parliament was deceived in regard to that matter, and, after so many deceptions as have been practised—I use the word deception, though it may be a hard word, because such conduct cannot be otherwise characterised—it is not fitting that Parliament should give another blank power of attorney to the Government to do as they please in reference to this matter, and, after perhaps the intentions of Parliament may not have been carried out, to come next year with another demand for money. Under these circumstances, I beg to move in amendment:

That the said resolution be not now concurred in, but that it be resolved, That, whilst this House will ever be ready to favor any reasonable scheme to promote and extend the trade of this country, the Government, in asking an annual expenditure of £25,000 sterling for the establishment of a steamship service between Canada and the Australian Colonies and New Zealand, has failed to show that such a service would result in advantages in any way commensurate with the large amount of the expenditure required.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before this motion is voted upon, I wish to make only one observation. When we discussed this question in Committee the other day the Finance Minister stated to the House, as one reason why we should assent to this large expenditure of money, that a large trade in manufactures had been developed, and was still more being developed, between Canada and Australia. He then said it was within his knowledge that he had the information from the manufacturers themselves, that the firm of Massey & Co. had, in one year, exported goods of their own manufacture to Australia to the extent of between $300,000 and $400,000. I turned up the Blue-books of the last financial year, and I found that the total manufactures of Canada, of all descriptions and all kinds, exported to Australia during that year, amounted to $39,000, so that it was altogether impossible that Messrs. Massey & Co. could have exported goods to the value of between $300,000 and $400,000. The hon. gentlemen persisted in his statement. He did not insist that the Blue-books told a false story, but he suggested that, as the Blue-books referred to the year which ended on the 30th June, possibly his statement might be consistent with the facts, and the increased exports might be for the remainder of the calendar year. Well, Sir, we had that matter settled to-day by the answer the Minister of Customs gave to the question put by Sir Richard Cartwright. We find that up to the 31st December, from the 1st of July, the total exports of manufactures from Canada to Australia was only $41,000. The hon. gentleman, it is true, stated that he was not able to give the figures with absolute accuracy, but he gave them with approximate accuracy, so that between $40,000 and $45,000 was the amount. Now, it is clear that the hon. gentleman has asked this House to vote this money on an assumption of facts which are clearly proved to be false. We do not export, we could not have exported, any such quantities of goods—not one tenth, not one-fifteenth, of the goods—that the hon. gentleman gave the House to understand we did. The fact is we are proceeding here on false data, on a false basis, we are going it blind. Ministerial statements are made which, when they are tested, turn out to be entirely inaccurate. The hon. gentleman, if he formed his conclusion upon such facts as he gave to the House the other day, that it was desirable to vote such a large amount of money as he asked the House to vote, now that he sees these facts are not correct, should reconsider his proposition, for I venture to say that the statement made by the Minister of Customs to-day does absolutely refute the possibility of the truth of the statement made by the hon. gentleman, and he should withdraw the proposition based largely upon the truth of that statement.

Gen. LAURIE. I listened to the statement made by the Finance Minister the other day, and I certainly did not gather from him that he stated that this firm of Massey & Co. had exported during last year $400,000 worth of implements.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes.

Gen. LAURIE. I am open to correction, but I understood him to say that they had opened up a trade to

that amount. Now, Sir, I have it from Mr. Massey himself, with whom I had a long interview since this Session opened, that he had sent his son to Australia and New Zealand in order that he might open up this trade, and that he took orders for a very large amount of goods, to the amount stated by the Minister of Finance. However, as I did not like to speak solely from memory, I desired to verify the statement, and I at once communicated with the firm in order to ascertain if the facts were as I understood them to be. Mr. Massey repeats the statement that he had opened up trade to this extent. This is what he says:

"You are correct in the inference made in your letter in regard to my sons having been in Australia. They also were in New Zealand, and we have opened up a trade in these countries which has bright promises for the future, and in fact it has exceeded our expectations in the past year. Our trade in South America is also well established."

This, perhaps, is not a matter that I should advert to now, but I do so as showing the prospects of trade and the way they are working it up.

"Our trade in South America is also well established, and there are large orders for the coming season for that territory. We anticipate a better trade in the countries referred to than we shall possibly get in Europe, though it is attended with very large expense; and therefore, for the present, we cannot expect the results to be as favorable as they will be in Europe. Thus far, our machines in foreign countries have received the highest commendations, having successfully competed with the best machines of foreign make, and we have been awarded more prizes than any American manufacturers, who are our principal competitors, so that our position for commanding the trade of these countries is good, or even better than any of the leading foreign manufacturers. We have every reason to expect a prosperous future for our foreign business."

I think that, with the fact that they had to draw upon their supplies in Europe in order to supply the Australian trade, so Mr. Massey informs me, shows that the position taken by the Minister of Finance in desiring to open up more speedy and more regular communication with the Australian colonies, is justified by the promises that this gentleman, at any rate, one of the leading manufacturers of our country, has obtained, and which afford him substantial prospects of increased trade in the future.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). As to the question of veracity to which the hon. gentleman called the attention of the House, I may remark that there was no misunderstanding at all of what the Finance Minister said, because, after referring to three or four hundred thousand dollars' worth of agricultural implements which Massey & Co exported, and after the discrepancy between that amount and the amount shown by the Blue-book to have been exported, had been pointed out, the Finance Minister stated:

"My hon. friend must recollect that the Trade Returns only come up to the 1st of July of last year, and that a manufacturer, speaking to me about the matter, would have the trade year and not the fiscal year in view."

Now, we have the fiscal year from the 1st of July to the 1st of January, showing only $41,000 worth of all kinds; so that the gallant General, in coming to the rescue of the Finance Minister, has rendered him no service.

Gen LAURIE. I stand to the point I made, which was distinctly that Mr. Massey stated he had opened up a trade to that amount.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You did not read it.

Gen. LAURIE. Mr. Massey stated to me verbally, about $400,000 was the extent of the trade he had opened up. I asked him again, and he answered that the prospects were even more favorable than those he anticipated. This trade is in the future, so are the prospects of the Australian steamer service; and in canvassing for trade, Mr. Massey sent his son out to obtain a trade that he had not then obtained, but that he hoped to obtain, and that he has obtained.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Laurier:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Gillmor,	Mills (Bothwell),
Armstrong,	Godbout,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Hale,	Neveux,
Béchard,	Holton,	Paterson (Brant),
Borden,	Innes,	Perry,
Bourassa,	Jones (Halifax),	Platt,
Bowman,	Kirk,	Robertson,
Brien,	Landerkin,	Rowand,
Campbell,	Lang,	Ste. Marie,
Chouinard,	Laurier,	Scriver,
Colter,	Lister,	Semple,
Couture,	Livingston,	Somerville,
Davies,	Lovitt,	Sutherland,
Doyon,	Macdonald (Huron),	Trow,
Edgar,	Mackenzie,	Watson,
Ellis,	McIntyre,	Weldon (St. John),
Fiset,	McMillan (Huron),	Welsh,
Flynn,	McMullen,	Wilson (Elgin).—55.
Gauthier,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archibald,	Freeman,	Perley,
Audet,	Gigault,	Porter,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gordon,	Prior,
Bernard,	Grandbois,	Robillard,
Bell,	Guillet,	Roome
Bergin,	Haggart,	Ross,
Bowell,	Hall,	Shanly,
Bryson,	Hesson,	Skinner,
Burns,	Joncas,	Small,
Cargill,	Jones (Digby),	Smith (Ontario),
Carling,	Kenny,	Sproule,
Carpenter,	Landry,	Taylor,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Temple,
Cimon,	Laurie,	Thompson (Sir John),
Cochrane,	Macdowall,	Tisdale,
Colby,	McCulla,	Tupper,
Corby,	McDonald (Victoria),	Tyrwhitt,
Coulombe,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wallace,
Daoust,	McKeen,	Ward,
Davin,	McNeill,	Weldon (Albert),
Davis,	Madill,	White (Cardwell),
Dawson,	Mara,	Wilmot,
Dewdney,	Masson,	Wilson (Lennox),
Dickinson,	Mills (Annapolis),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dupont,	Moncreiff,	Wright.—77.
Foster,	O'Brien,	

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White), and the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Marshall), have not voted.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am paired with the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Waldie). Had I been at liberty to vote, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am paired with the hon. member for West Elgin.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for Lunenburg has not voted.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I would have voted for the amendment, but I am paired.

Resolution concurred in.

STEAMSHIP SUBSIDY—CHINA AND JAPAN AND B. C.

Mr FOSTER moved that the report of the Committee of the Whole on resolution to provide for a subsidy between British Columbia and China and Japan be read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If we had reason to complain of want of information respecting the subsidy just voted, we have equal reason to complain, and, perhaps, greater reason in regard to the proposition that is now before us. When in Committee, the other day, on this resolution, efforts were made by many hon. gentlemen to ascertain from the Finance

Minister whether he was in possession of any data or facts to give to the House to justify him in making this proposition. The hon. gentleman spoke several times, evidently under some restraint, and the result was he produced nothing. He stated to the House that he had no information to give. It did transpire, on the cross-examination to which the hon. gentleman was subjected, that negotiations had been carried on for some time between the British Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with respect to a subsidy for this very line, and there had been correspondence, and these negotiations and that correspondence had resulted in an agreement between the British Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which was not yet signed, but was practically concluded. We also learned that the High Commissioner, acting on behalf of Canada, had carried on negotiations with the British Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with reference to a supplementary subsidy to be voted by this country, conditional on the British Government voting a subsidy. The House very naturally asked that the correspondence and agreement should be laid on the Table before hon. members were asked to vote the money. The hon. gentleman could not do it; he said he had not the documents at hand. To me it is absolutely incredible that negotiations should have been carried on by our agent in London, the result of which would be to commit this country to a subsidy of £15,000 or £25,000, dependent upon whether the service is fortnightly or monthly, and that the High Commissioner should not have made a report to his Government on the negotiations. It is incredible that such a thing could have happened. The Minister of Finance said there was a telegram from the High Commissioner to the Government. But so little respect has the Government for the House of Commons, which votes the money, that they positively asked us to vote the amount without even producing the telegram of the High Commissioner. I, for one, do not believe that the High Commissioner carried on these negotiations for months without having a large amount of correspondence both with the British Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. There were many terms which had to be arranged. There must have been a great deal of discussion as to the size of the steamboats, the speed required, the ports at which they should leave and call, the terms required, and a thousand and one other things which are necessary to settle before an agreement could be arrived at. As my leader said in the debate on the previous resolution, parliamentary government now has reached that stage when members vote like dumb dogs large amounts of public money, without obtaining any information, and the Government treat them with contempt. I do not believe that even the Government called a caucus to give private information to supporters of the Government. It is not very creditable to our system of Government, and it is discreditable to the House, that we should vote these subsidies in the absence of information. I do not mean to say that this project is one to which we are opposed. We have not the means given us to form an opinion as to whether we could support it with due regard to our duty to our constituents. The information on which we could come to such a conclusion is withheld, and if the hon. gentleman has these documents in his possession he keeps them under lock and key in his desk and refuses to allow hon. gentlemen to obtain possession of them. He stated, again, that negotiations had been carried on between the British Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under which a subsidy was to be paid by the British Government. That agreement has not been produced. It is very important we should have it, because all the information as to the size of the ships, the time of the passage, and the ports at which the vessels would call, and the mails they would carry, and everything else must be contained in the agreement. It is necessary, in the interests of Canada, that this agreement should be submitted before we are asked to vote this money. That, also, was withheld, and the hon. gentleman told us even that he had not got it, that he did not know what it was. He said:

"All these terms are contained in the agreement, which has been, as I said, practically concluded, and which will take the form of a contract. That, however, is a document I am not able to bring down to the House——"

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman be fair and honest in dealing with the House and with me, and take back what he stated a moment or two ago, that I stated to the House that I had not those documents in my possession?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman say he has the documents?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman stated to the House, and I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, that I stated to the House that I had not those documents in my possession. He went on to frame an argument on that. He now appeals to *Hansard* to prove his assertion, and *Hansard* proves nothing of the kind. Then let the hon. gentleman be manly enough——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. I referred in the first part of my argument to the negotiations and correspondence carried on between the High Commissioner of Canada and the British Government with respect to the subsidy, and I said then, and I repeat now, and I will dare the Minister of Finance, holding as I do the *Hansard* in my hand, to deny that he said he had not one iota of that correspondence in his possession. I challenge the hon. gentleman to rise in his place and do so.

Mr. FOSTER. You cannot find it. You cannot substantiate it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I say the hon. gentleman stated, with truth or not I know not, but he stated on his honor in this House that he had not a scintilla of a letter from the High Commissioner, nothing but a telegram.

Mr. FOSTER. Prove it. I ask the hon. gentleman to prove his statement.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman deny it?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to know if the hon. gentleman denies it.

Mr. FOSTER. You have misrepresented me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the Minister of Finance deny that he was not in possession——

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has misrepresented me half a dozen times to-day, and I do not propose now to deny or to affirm until I find he has *Hansard* at the back of his statement.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I read:

"Mr. FOSTER The information is simply this, that the British Government will give so much if the Canadian Government will implement that by so much more.

"Mr. LAURIER. Put the correspondence on the Table.

"Mr. FOSTER. There is no correspondence."

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have not finished my sentence.

Mr. SPEAKER. You must give the hon. gentleman a chance to state his point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman must state, before he proves his contention, to what correspondence I referred. He says that referred to correspondence.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman had waited until I had finished my statement, instead of violating the Rules of the House, he would have heard me read a further statement made by him on that occasion:

"There is no correspondence. The High Commissioner, when in London, carried on the negotiations, and all the correspondence that was had with this Government was in the shape of a telegram."

I appeal to the House if that is not the exact language I used a few minutes ago, when I said that the hon. gentleman stated a fact which to me appeared incredible, that the only correspondence in his possession was a telegram they had received from the High Commissioner.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not state it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is in *Hansard*.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not in *Hansard*.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I say it is.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not in *Hansard*. Now let the hon. gentleman give me a chance to explain.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity directly, and he has got a good deal to explain. After referring to the suspicious absence of these negotiations and correspondence, and to the refusal of the hon. gentleman to bring them down and put the House in possession of them, I then went on to refer to another document and that was the agreement which the hon. gentleman stated was made been the British Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. That agreement, he said, contained all the terms which were practically concluded and largely took the form of a contract. He goes on to say:

"That document, however, I am not able to bring down to the House. In any case, it is a matter between the British Government and the company, and has not yet been forwarded."

That was the statement made in reference to the agreement, and I then stated to the House that the correspondence and negotiations which took place between the High Commissionner and the British Government must have been reduced to writing by the High Commissioner; must have been made a memorandum of, and that he must have furnished this Government with a copy of the correspondence he carried on with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the one hand and with the British Government on the other, and also with the recommendation he made and on which they are acting to-day. I say it is incredible that the Government should ask this House to vote this resolution without bringing down the documents on which they came to a conclusion themselves. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman, when he was justifying this vote, referred to the exports which go from Canada to China and Japan. He was asked whether those exports were the productions of Canada, and the hon. gentlemen was unable even to tell us that. I hold that in the absence of this information, it is not fair, it is not right to ask hon. members to pledge their votes for an expenditure of this annual sum of money for a long number of years without giving them some information. More than that, this House is going to vote a large sum of money, Canada has some interest in this business and Canada has a right to see that these interests are subserved. The other night it was argued, with irresistible force, to my mind, that with the information at present before the House, we should not give these large subsidies unless the steamboats called at Victoria. The hon. gentleman who represents Victoria (Mr. Prior) says it is indispensable that the steamer should call there. He pointed out to the House that the steamer has been running for a year and a half within a mile of the port of Victoria; that she stopped there to take on a pilot, and that the Victoria people were ready to build a wharf to enable these steamers to stop there. That stoppage would cause very little delay; and although no answer was vouchsafed to this, and no reason given, it is suggested to us to vote without any provision being made for that steamer to call at Victoria. We have not got the proper information before us to justify us in voting this money, and if we do vote the money I hold it is indispensable that the steamer should call at the port of Victoria. I, therefore, beg to move in amendment:

That all the words after the word "That" be struck out, and the following substituted therefor: "This House should not be asked to agree to a resolution providing for the granting of an annual subsidy for a fortnightly or monthly steamship service between British Columbia and China and Japan, supplementary to one to be granted by the British Government, until the correspondence and negotiations relative to the granting of such a subsidy and the agreements between the British Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company under which the subsidy of the British Government is payable, and all other necessary information relative to the character of the service, have been laid before it; and the House is further of opinion, from the information at present before it, that, if any subsidy is voted for such service, it should be conditional on the steamships calling at either Victoria or Esquimalt."

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that now I can properly take up a little of the time of the House, and that the House will not regret giving me a moment or two in order to clear up one or two of those matters about which a great deal of fault has been found. It is pretty hard to sit in this House and to hear what you have stated put in a light which was not warranted either by the intention you had in your mind or by the expression that you gave to that intention. I am not going to make any charge backwards or forwards at the present moment, but I am simply going to make myself right from the *Hansard* on both of these points, and I think I can do it to the satisfaction of any candid-minded man who listens to me. In the first place, with reference to the disagreement between the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies) and myself about the Australian exports, so far as has reference to agricultural implements, the hon. gentleman stated to the House that I had based my demands for the passage of the first resolution upon the statement I made, that Mr. Massey had exported to Australia last year three or four hundred thousand dollars' worth of agricultural implements. Now, Sir, even although I had made that statement, that was not the statement upon which I based the claim that this resolution should pass the House. I gave, in my opening statement, the reasons why I thought the resolution ought to pass. In the course of the debate I happened to remember a conversation that I had with Mr. Massey, and when the question was asked as to the kind of manufactures we sent there, I stated that several manufacturers had had dealings, notwithstanding the difficulties, with Australian countries, and among them Mr. Massey. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies) said that I stated that Mr. Massey in the last fiscal year had exported three, or four, or five hundred thousand dollars of agricultural implements. I will read exactly what I said:

"To-day, I believe, some of our manufacturers have a field which they have exploited in the Australian colonies for their products, and where within two or three years they have built up a trade, under very disadvantageous circumstances, to the extent of between one-third and half a million dollars worth of goods in some lines of goods alone. One of these is the Massey Co., of Toronto, who have exported agricultural implements.

"Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The total exports are not half a million.

"Mr. FOSTER. You will find exactly what they are by the blue-books.

"Mr. JONES (Halifax) $146,000 in value.

"Mr. FOSTER I have Mr. Massey's statement that he has worked up a trade in agricultural implements in that colony amounting to between $300,000 and $400,000, and he has done that under very disadvantageous circumstances."

That is the statement I made, that is the statement that is in the *Hansard*, and that statement bears out what my hon. friend from Shelburne stated. What I had in my mind was the conversation I had with Mr. Massey, who went very fully into his prospects of trade in that country,

detailing the steps that had been taken by his son, who had been sent out there, and his expectations. I did not state definitely that a trade to that amount had been carried out in the last fiscal year; I simply stated that they had worked up a trade in agricultural implements to that amount.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E I.) I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to page 1427, where he made the direct statement.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will wait, he will get everything. I am not disposed, like the hon. gentleman, to pick out a line here and a line there, but I propose to give the whole statement. On page 1427 I stated:

"The hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) made the best of the Trade Returns which he holds in his hand, but I still believe the statement I made will be found correct."

The statement I made was that I believed Mr. Massey had worked up a trade to that amount.

"I think I have that statement, and I will look it up to see if it is right or not, but I feel sure it will be found true. I remember a conversation with Mr. Massey himself, going into the question thoroughly, and he detailed the expense and trouble he had been put to in the last year or two in establishing agencies for the sale of his goods."

These are all the remarks I made on that subject.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I) No, you have stopped just short of the statement. In the very next sentence the hon. gentleman stated:

"The statement I made is this, and it will be found true, that within the last year a trade has been opened up in agricultural implements with Australia to the extent of $300,000 or $400,000. My hon. friend must recollect that the Trade Returns only come up to the 1st of July of last year, and that a manufacturer, speaking to me about the matter, would have the trade year and not the fiscal year in view."

Mr. FOSTER. I have marked here in pencil the whole passage that has been read by my hon. friend, and I thought I had read it all. I will also read that again:

"I remember a conversation with Mr. Massey himself, going into the question thoroughly, and he detailed the expense and trouble he had been put to in the last year or two in establishing agencies for the sale of his goods. Hon. gentlemen must always recollect that the attempt to establish trade in a foreign country is a costly proceeding. It takes time to make your constituency of men to trade with and to establish a name for your goods, and the first years of an opening trade are always the most costly; but the statement I made is this, and it will be found true, that within the last year a trade has been opened up in agricultural implements with Australia to the extent or $300,000 of $400,000. My hon. friend must recollect that the Trade Returns only come up to the 1st of July of last year, and that a manufacturer, speaking to me about the matter, would have the trade year and not the fiscal year in view."

That, then, is exactly what I stated, that during the last year, when Mr. Massey had his agent in Australia and New Zealand, he had worked up a trade to that amount; and when the hon. gentleman thinks that he has made a point against me in connection with my stating that he had the Trade Returns only up to the 1st of July, 1888, the hon. gentleman will easily find an explanation of that, if he wishes, in the fact that he read the fiscal year returns, which did not show the amount of trade that had taken place in the calendar year, large or small, as we might find afterwards, but they had reference to the actual amount exported in the fiscal year. Since then, I have received a telegram from Mr. Massey, referring to what was stated by the hon. member for Shelburne, in which he says:—

"Have just wired J. W. Laurie as follows:—Foster had reference to our prospective trade. Customs records misleading, owing to very large shipments to Australia from our European house. Prospects warrant our large anticipations. South America orders already exceed them."

My hon. friend sees now that he cannot rely on the accuracy of the Trade Returns which he held in his hand at the time, as Mr. Massey had to draw from his European warehouse last year in order to supply the demands made by Australia, and consequently that would not be shown in our Trade Returns as a direct export during that year to Australia. So much with reference to that. Now, Sir, I wish to say a word with reference to what I stated about the correspondence. With reference to the correspondence taking place in regard to the China and Japan mail service, I stated on page 1433:

"With reference to the negotiations carried on between the British Postal authorities and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that is a matter with which we are not directly concerned, and which we cannot bring down to the House."

The correspondence which I had reference to there, as I stated, was the correspondence between the British Postal authorities and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The hon. leader of the Opposition said:

"I may have misunderstood the hon. gentleman; but the hon. gentleman says there has been correspondence upon this subject between the Imperial and Canadian Governments, and yet, though the hon. gentleman is acting upon that correspondence, and asking the House to implement their agreement by this vote of money, he refuses to bring to the House the correspondence."

That was the correspondence between the Imperial Government and the Canadian Government, of which the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, spoke. In reply to that I stated:

"Mr. FOSTER. The information is simply this, that the British Government will give so much if the Canadian Government will implement that by so much more."

"Mr. LAURIER. Put the correspondence on the Table."

What correspondence? The correspondence of which he spoke, between the Canadian Government and the Imperial Government, to which I answered:

"There is no correspondence. The High Commissioner, when in London, carried on the negotiations, and all the correspondence that was had with this Government was in the shape of a telegram, and surely my hon. friend, having the information, is not going to stand on a technicality and endeavor to stop this vote simply because I have not formally laid on the Table of the House the information I have given him over and over again.

"Mr. LAURIER. Are we to understand that this important negotiation was carried on verbally and that there is nothing to show for it?

"Mr. FOSTER. What I said was simply that negotiations were carried on by the High Commissioner, and that as the result of these negotiations an agreement was come to between the two Governments.

"Mr. LAURIER. I would be sorry to believe that this important negotiation was carried on verbally, and that there is nothing official between the Canadian Government and the Imperial Government. There must have been some correspondence, whether by telegram or otherwise, and this correspondence the House is entitled to have."

A little time afterwards I stated:

"With reference to what the hon. gentleman said about correspondence, the correspondence passed between the High Commissioner and the British Government; but it is impossible to bring that down until the whole matter is settled."

The House will see that three different correspondences were spoken of. There was the correspondence between the British Postal authorities and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; the correspondence which the High Commissioner had with the British Postal authorities and the British Government; and there was the correspondence had between the British Government and this Government; and if hon. gentlemen will hold in mind these three facts, and read carefully my statement in the *Hansard*, they will find that I have not stated with reference to these what the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has asserted. I stated, first, that the correspondence between the British Postal authorities and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was their business, that it was not yet concluded, and that it could not be brought down. I stated distinctly that the High Commissioner was carrying on negotiations, and that they could not be brought down, as the results had not yet been finally reached; and the question being put to me as to the direct correspondence between the Canadian Government and the Imperial Government, I stated that it consisted in a telegram to the Government, and I gave to my hon. friend the purport of that telegram. That is a plain statement of the case, and I do not propose to carry it any further. I propose, however to place the

statement before the House, so that hon. members my see that I had no wish to mislead it, and that I answered each question fairly and according to the truth of the matter. Now, with reference to the hon. gentlemen's motion, his complaint is that, with regard to the China and Japan mail service there has not been sufficient information. The hon. gentleman says that he cannot decide whether he would approve or not of the measure, whether he would vote or not for the appropriation; and the reason why he cannot make up his mind is because he has not sufficient information. Will my hon. friend just look at what information he has? In the first place, there have been negotiations carried on between the British Postal authorities and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to carry the mails from the Atlantic seaboard to China and Japan.

Mr. LAURIER. Where is it?

Mr. FOSTER. If hon. gentlemen opposite will let me make my speech, I will get through much more easily, and then they will have an opportunity to make theirs. There have been negotiations between the British Postal authorities and the Canadian Pacific Railway to carry the mails from the Atlantic seaboard to China and Japan. These negotiations have culminated practically in an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the carriage of those mails. Now, everybody knows that the British Government, when it proposes to put on a mail service, proposes to put on a regular and efficient service; proposes, under the most stringent rules and regulations, to have the service carried on; proposes to have the vessels built according to regulation; and I think my hon. friend may take it for granted that if the British Government were negotiating with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and if the British Government enter into an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to carry the mails from the Atlantic seaboard to China and Japan, they have taken care to provide that the vessels in which the mails are to be carried, the schedule of time, the regulations under which the mails are to be looked after, the departure and the arrival of the vessels, and their time limits will be such as will be in consonance with such an important service, on so important a route. Why? Because the British Government propose to abandon the old route between China and Japan, and to open up an entirely different route, because they propose to take a new route across the continent of America and within that portion which lies within the Dominion, and because, in abandoning the old route by the Suez Canal, it must be taken for granted that the British Government in so doing will have made sure that the new service will be superior to the old and equal to the magnitude and importance of the task to be undertaken. And yet my hon. friend, having that satisfactory explanation given to him, knowing that the British Government, having canvassed the whole matter, are satisfied, and have practically concluded an arrangement for carrying the mails, says he does not know whether or not we ought to make up our minds to contribute £15,000 towards that service, because he has not information enough. Now, the British Government say to us: If we send our mails across your country by your railways, with all the advantages that are to accrue to you from making your country the highway for the transmission of mails and of the passenger traffic which will follow in its wake, and if we give £45,000 for that service, will you give £15,000? And the Government of Canada concluded to give the £15,000 on condition that it be a monthly service, and if it be made a fortnightly service, they concluded, with the sanction of Parliament, to give £25,000 a year for that service. I do not think, under the circumstances, that the House is called on to vote anything in the dark, or that it is a proposition we ought not to accede to.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. LAURIER. Where is the correspondence between the Canadian Government and the Imperial Parliament?

Mr. FOSTER. I have already stated to my hon. friend several times, with reference to this correspondence, and I state it again, that the British Government made to us the proposition that they would give so much, provided that we gave so much.

Mr. LAURIER. That is what we would like to see.

Mr. FOSTER. That proposition is contained in a telegram, as I stated to my hon. friend.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Bring it down.

Mr. FOSTER. They say, with reference to this contract, that it ought to be laid on the Table. I have stated, that this is not a contract which has been signed, but an agreement which is the result of certain negotiations—an agreement which has been practically concluded, but not finally concluded. The contract has not been signed, and therefore the terms of that contract, and the negotiations which led up to it—the whole being incomplete—are not in a position to be laid on the Table. But is there not sufficient for hon. gentlemen to make up their minds, as to whether or not the proposition of the Government is entitled to support? My hon. friend spoke a good deal with reference to the ports at which the steamers are to call, and from which they are to start. This question will probably come up on the third resolution, and when that resolution comes up, I will have something to say on it.

Mr. LAURIER. I commend the answer of the hon. gentleman to those who sit behind him. I want the House to understand that the amendment before it is not one condemning the resolution of the Government. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) did not say that he condemned the proposition of the Government, but he simply complained that, with the want of information on this question, the House could not come to an intelligent decision. What is the answer of my hon. friend? He says that we ought to be satisfied, that we have as much information as we ought to get, in order to come to a decision. In the first place, he says that there has been correspondence between the Imperial Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that the Imperial Government have agreed to subsidise that steamship service. I ask, Where is that correspondence, and the hon. gentleman says he has got it. Are we to be told that the Canadian Government agreed to intervene in a bargain between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the British Government, without knowing what that contract is? Are we to be told that they have not even seen it, and cannot say what are its terms? And yet, although they do not know what are the terms of the contract entered into between the Imperial Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway, they ask this Parliament to vote £25,000 a year, in order that that contract, which they have not seen, may be carried out. I put it to the fair sense of every supporter of the Government, whether it is right that they should be thus called on to vote in the dark, blindly, anything that is asked of them? Is it fair that we should be asked to vote away the people's money without knowing what we are about? Whatever may be the intention of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, on this side at least we will insist that before a cent of the people's money be disposed of we shall always know for what and on what conditions it is to be expended. The hon. gentleman tell us, moreover, that we ought to be satisfied because, forsooth, the Imperial Government have no doubt made the best arrangement possible, because the Imperial Government have their eyes open and have looked after their own interests. No doubt the Imperial Government have been careful to look after their own interests, but does it follow that the Canadian inte-

rests have been looked after? If the interests of Canada had been looked after, surely the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) would not have complained, as he did the other day, that he had been begging, without success, the Canadian Government to make Victoria a port of call? This is the best evidence, that the Imperial Government have been careful to look after their own interests, but the Canadian Government have laid themselves open to the charge of not having taken a similar precaution in our behalf. And yet, they ask this House to vote this large sum of money. Now we are told also that the correspondence entered into between the Canadian Government and the Imperial Government by the intermission of the High Commissioner, is incomplete. Well, if it is incomplete, is that not the very reason why this subsidy should not be voted to day? Let them complete it, if it be incomplete, and, when it is completed, let it be placed on the Table, so that every member may come to an intelligent opinion on the subject. This is the very object which my hon. friend's motion has in view.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understood the Finance Minister, when he was giving the figures in regard to the export trade which we had, or which we were likely to open up with Australia, to give us certain definite figures as to one house. We would all be very glad to know that our trade was greater than it is, but the public records do not bear out the statements made by the Finance Minister on that occasion. To-day he strengthens himself by a statement of Mr. Massey that you cannot get the full amount of their exports from our returns, because some of them went from their English house. Well, I find that the total export of agricultural implements from Ontario to Great Britain in the year ending the 30th June, 1888, amounted to $44,642. If that statement were to be amended by Mr. Massey, and if he had a depot in every country under the sun, I find on page 771 of the return, that the total exports of agricultural implements from Canada to all countries was $155,219. One reason why I rose was to remind the Finance Minister as well as others, that, while I do not object to the Massey Company being boomed in this way on the floor of Parliament, though the statement made does not bear the light of investigation, you must not think that all the agricultural implements which have been exported, have been exported by that firm. As the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) stated the other night, there is in my own town of Brantford one of the largest firms engaged in this line of manufacture, and their exports are included in this statement, as well as those of all the other implement manufacturers of Canada.

Mr. MARA. With regard to the portion of the amendment which states that the subsidy should be conditional on a steamship calling at Victoria or Esquimalt, I may say that this is not a new question. It has been threshed out in the British Columbia press for some time past, it has been discussed in the Boards of Trade, and it has had the attention of the members from British Columbia in the earlier days of the Session. It has been stated by one hon. gentleman that there are two rival cities in that Province, and that jealousy exists between them. As far as the members from British Columbia are concerned, there is no jealousy whatever. We are all proud of Victoria, and of the position which Victoria has attained; but this is not a question relating either to Victoria or Vancouver; it is not a provincial question; it is not simply a Dominion question, but it is an Imperial and Dominion question. We are asking the Imperial Government to give us $3 to our $1 to assist in diverting the eastern trade from the Isthmus of Suez and from American channels, so that it will be carried through British territory and over Canadian soil. We are asking the Imperial Government to assist us in bringing the passenger traffic and the trade of the East over our transcontinental railway, and in making, as has been previously said, the termini of the Canadian Pacific Railway, not at Halifax or Vancouver, but at Hong Kong and Liverpool. For these reasons, I must vote against the whole of the amendment, but I wish to state the position in which the majority of the members from British Columbia are placed as to the latter part of it. Of course, my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) differs slightly from us in this respect, that, as a representative of Victoria, and as the Board of Trade and the press of Victoria have demanded that the steamers should call there, he may feel bound in honor to vote for that part of the amendment; but as the other members from the Province take a Dominion view——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is hard on the member for Victoria.

Mr. MARA. I do not think so, and further, I think that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has inserted that portion of the amendment in order to place my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) in a false position. I think, in fact, that he has introduced the amendment in order to place, if possible, the whole of the members from British Columbia in a bad position. But my constituents do not wish me, nor do I believe that any constituency outside of Victoria would wish its representatives to vote for the amendment with that clause attached to it. Further, although the hon. gentleman may think that the residents of Victoria will thank him for the amendment he has offered, I believe they will look upon him rather as a false than a true friend. Though I am prepared to admit that the hon. gentleman has introduced his amendment from fair and honorable motives, still, from the great distance, not knowing how party feelings actuate members here, I believe the people of Victoria will not be quite as charitable to him as I am, and they may think that he has done this not only to embarrass the Government and to embarrass the members from British Columbia, but that he has acted the part of a false friend, and has given them a stab in the back.

Mr. PRIOR. I stated to the House, two or three evenings ago, the importance of these steamships calling at Victoria, and I gave the reasons, that Victoria is the capital of the Province, that it does at least 75 per cent. of the trade of the Province, and that it is not out of the way of those steamers to call there. As the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has said, it would not take more than an hour and a half or two hours for these steamers to call there and leave the mails and the passengers, and that is all we ask. My hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Mara) says there is a jealousy between the two cities. I say there is no jealousy except the proper rivalry between two cities which are endeavoring to get ahead of one another in an honorable way.

Mr. MARA. I referred to a remark made by an hon. gentleman opposite that there was jealousy. I said there was none.

Mr. PRIOR. Well, if my hon. friend did not say so, I apologise. In regard to the question of the steamships calling at Victoria, although the Imperial Government give $3 to $1 which is proposed to be given by us, I do not see why the Dominion should not have some say in the matter. I think it will be a gross injustice to Victoria, unless the Dominion Government does its best with the Imperial Government, to get those steamers to call there. As to the amendment of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), I agree with my hon. friend from Yale (Mr. Mara) that it does put me in an awkward position. If he had brought the matter down in two different amendments, I should have known what to do, because, though I am bound to ask that the Dominion Government should make it imperative

for the steamers to call at Victoria, still, if they will not or cannot do that, I could not go so far as to vote for no subsidy being given, because I do not think any member should stand in the way of the advancement of the Province or of the whole Dominion. I think I have a right to ask something of the House. Dr. Bourinot, in his "Parliamentary Procedure," says:

"As respects what are known, in parliamentary language, as 'complicated questions,' they may always be divided into distinct parts with the consent of the House. No individual member, however, can ask as a matter of right, that such a question be divided, since the House alone can properly decide whether it is complicated or not, and into how many propositions it may be divided. The fact is, the necessity of dividing a complicated question may be obviated in a great measure by moving amendments to it. But, in any case, it is always open to a member to move formally that a question be divided."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member for Queen's if he would not divide his question.

Mr. DAVIES. My question is so very simple that it cannot be divided.

Mr. PRIOR. I think it is very complicated.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the resolution which is moved by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), embarrasses the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior), I think the hon. member for Victoria, in justice to the hon. gentleman who has moved it, must acquit him of any such intention. If he will cast his eye over the resolution he will see that the hon. member for Queen's has been too candid altogether in the proposition he has put before the House. So far from its being as my hon. friend from Victoria supposes, a resolution indicating the opinion of this House that the steamers ought to call at Victoria, the hon. member for Queen's has been so candid as to couple that with a distinct affirmation that in the present state of negotiations there shall not be a dollar of money given for a Pacific subsidy at all. Under these circumstances, I think the hon. member for Victoria will see that the expression of sympathy which the hon. member for Queen's and his friends are going to vote for to-day, is carefuly coupled with a scheme by which there shall not be one dollar given for steam communication between Asia and British America. This being so, I fail to see that the sympathy of the hon. gentleman is at all embarrassing or misleading. But I would call the attention of the House to the impossibility of the House, in the present state of the negotiations, undertaking to lay down and prescribe that this or that condition shall be made essential to the termination of a contract. In the first place, as the Minister of Finance has stated, it is a case in respect of which the negotiations are not altogether ripe, and when the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) reproaches the Government with inviting the House to accede to a contract which they have not even seen, he had surely forgotten for the moment that which had been told to him twenty times, that there was no contract in existence upon this subject, but that the basis of a contract, with negotiations for a contract, had been submitted and partially agreed to between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and Her Majesty's Government. Under these circumstances it does not lie in the mouth of the hon. gentleman to reproach us for being willing to become parties to a contract which we had not seen. If, as I have said, and as he has been told no contract has been made, and this is a question in which three parties must be consulted, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Her Majesty's Government and the Government of Canada, are we, in defiance of all that, and with the two other parties to be consulted, and with the negotiations still unripe, to invite this House, either by this amendment or by the other that is to be offered, to lay down as a preliminary condition before we go to Her Majesty's Government, and before this House is willing to give any money, that this or that condition shall be indispensable, and that unless the steamers call at Victoria there shall be no subsidy for a Pacific service at all? I think the House will hardly put us in the position to go to Her Majesty's Government, after all the negotiations that have taken place, and all the efforts that have been made to reduce this to a practical undertaking, saying: "We regard this or that item of the contract, however small it may be in comparison with the great magnitude of the whole service as indispensible—we are unable to agree, we are unable to carry forward an enterprise which promises a great deal for the Empire, and which promises for Canada more than for any other portion of the Empire, simply because some sectional interest, however important it may be, is to be served before the interest of the rest of the Empire is to be considered at all." I am satisfied that is not a position in which the House would be willing to place the Government. The position in which the hon. member for Quebec East seeks to place us is still more humiliating. After being told that these negotiations have been on foot for a long time, and are waiting the action of this Parliament, what he proposes as the only other alternative is that we shall do nothing this Session at all, that we shall say to Her Majesty's Government that this Government are not in a position to come down to Parliament and ask for a vote, but can only say: "Show us your contract, show us your terms, and we will sign it, subject, of course, as every contract of that kind must be, to the final ratification of Parliament next year." Then for one year more, although we have reason to believe that matters are nearly in a position to close, for one year until the ratification of Parliament can be got, we shall not be able to conclude any satisfactory contract or any contract upon which any steamship company would put their boats on the service. We all know, Sir, what the answer would be next Session after we had concluded a contract like that. The answer would be that, in the absence of parliamentary authority, and without consulting Parliament, we had no right to make such a contract and bind the hands of Parliament; and that, after sitting here for three months in 1889, we ought to to have taken the House into our confidence and got a vote authorising us to enter into some contract of the kind. Sir, we have done all that possibly could be done under the circumstances, and it is not our fault, nor is it the fault of anybody else, if we are not in a position to give hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House all the documentary information which they desire, and naturally desire on a question of such magnitiude. But we are forced to the conclusion of asking the House to entrust its confidence to the Government to enter into a contract simultaneously with Her Majesty Government because we have only the other alternative of having this matter put off indefinitely, and perhaps losing a service which we have come to the conclusion is one that we ought to recommend to this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I must confess that I am rather surprised at the speech made by the Minister of Justice, not only in criticism of the resolution, but in justification of the course which the Government has taken upon this question. The hon. gentleman says that the information in regard to this matter cannot be brought before the House; he says that negotiations are going on, that the Imperial Government are making arrangements and are about to contribute a larger amount than the Parliament of Canada are called upon to contribute, for the establishment of a steamship line. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Imperial Government are entering into correspondence with any parties for the purpose of establishing this line and granting the subsidy, I suppose they are stating upon what conditions they will make this grant; I have no doubt the Executive of the Imperial Parliament have in their minds the terms and conditions upon which they are willing to grant aid to that steamship company. I think the Minister of Finance has told

us what is to be the number of calls to be made by these steamship companies, how frequently they are to cross the Pacific Ocean; he has also told us something about the rate of speed of some of these steamship lines. Now, all these matters are terms and conditions, and I suppose that the Imperial Government have made for the United Kingdom the necessary stipulations in these negotiations. Well, Sir, if the Government of Canada propose to Parliament to subsidise this line, they are proposing to subsidise it for some purpose or other that they have in their minds. The hon. gentleman has, perhaps, in his mind what he expects to accomplish by subsidising this line; he has in his mind some notion of the way in which the people of Canada are to be benefited by this steamship line across the Pacific Ocean. The hon. gentleman certainly would not grant the money without some terms or conditions; he would not grant money to a steamship company simply because it is a company proposing to establish a line of communication between British territory on the west and the continent of Asia on the east. We know that these hon. gentlemen must have in their minds some condition upon which this company is to be aided. We want to know what that condition is. The Minister of Justice says there is no contract; but the Minister of Finance said the contrary. He said that it was not signed; but there was a contract, the terms of which were set out, and, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, the contract has been reduced to writing. We require to know what are the terms and conditions of the contract in so far as the Canadian Government is concerned. The simple fact that the Imperial Government has entered into this contract is no reason why we should be called upon to subsidise the same line, unless we affirm to our advantage, some terms and conditions. We are not supposed to grant this aid simply from Imperial considerations and for Imperial benefits; it must be because in some way it will be beneficial to Canada. The Minister of Finance has asked, and the Minister of Justice has repeated that request, that we should manifest confidence in the members on the Treasury benches; but his request involved that we should express confidence in the Imperial Government, because the hon. gentleman has practically said that we have no voice in the matter, that we have nothing to say beyond contributing our money, that we have no right to demand such a condition as that the vessels should call at the city of Victoria. I do not agree with that view. If we are going to subsidise this line, we should know for what reason we are subsidising it, what benefits we are going to obtain, what advantages will accrue from our granting this aid. The hon. gentleman has not yet given us this information. Do hon. gentlemen suppose for one moment, that the Imperial Government would go down to the Imperial Parliament and ask for a subsidy without giving hon. members the slightest idea as to the terms and conditions on which it was to be granted? If the contract is not completed, we do not expect the Finance Minister to state the conditions, which, of course, are known; but we do expect him to state the advantages which the Government expect to derive from the service, and some of the conditions imposed in connection with the subsidy which is proposed to be granted. The hon. gentleman has not done so. That is the very least the Government should have done, and until they are prepared to do that, they are not in a position to ask Parliament to place a sum at their disposal for this or any like purpose. The Minister of Finance has simply stated that the Government have had negotiations with certain parties, but they were not prepared to state what they were; they have stated that certain terms and conditions were imposed in connection with the subsidy, but they said they were not prepared to state what they were. That is their position, and it is a wholly untenable position. We say further that whenever this aid is granted, and the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) should bear this in mind, one of the necessary conditions of granting the subsidy will be that the steamer should call, on its outward and inward passage, at the city of Victoria; and if the hon. gentleman is prepared to vote against this resolution, he must be understood as being prepared to vote against having steamships call at the city of Victoria, unless they choose to do so. That is the position which the hon. gentleman occupies. It is as clear as noonday that that portion of the resolution provides that whenever this money is granted the steam vessels shall call at Victoria. That is, however, what the hon. gentleman proposes to vote down, and his constituents will see whether he can explain away this proposition in the way the Minister of Justice has undertaken to explain it away in this House.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not going to take up much of the time of the House in discussing this matter, but I feel it to be a question so important and involving so important a principle that I should not give a silent vote in regard to it. I may tell hon. gentlemen opposite that, notwithstanding that I have very little confidence in the Administration which is asking the vote, and although they are pursuing a course of treatment towards Parliament in refusing to give information to which Parliament is entitled and which it is the duty of the Government to submit before they asked for a vote of this kind, I must support the proposition. The explanation given by the Government for their course is that their contract is not completed. We, however, understand that the contract is written out, and therefore its terms are complete. I believe it to be the duty of the Government, who are the servants of this House and are nothing else, and we are here supposed to carry out the will of the people, to give their masters that information which they have a right to give and for obtaining which we will be held responsible to the people. That is the position in which hon. gentlemen opposite have placed themselves, and in that regard I must condemn them. There is, however, a point beyond the simple question as to whether the Government have performed their duty in this matter, and it is, as to how the interests of the country will be affected in this matter. I am not prepared to allow my lack of confidence in the Administration to prevent my vote being given for this measure, although I am voting under protest, because we have been refused information that we are entitled to receive, and in the absence of which we can scarcely justify before the people the granting of this money; but the interests involved in this question are great, and if we fail to grant this aid and to carry out the negotiations that have been entered into with the British Government, we may find ourselves, next year, in the position of being compelled to impose heavier burdens on our people in order to obtain this service. I believe it to be of great importance to this country that the scheme of obtaining communication between Europe on the one side and Asia on the other, by a line of steamers across the Atlantic, by a railway line across the continent and by an ocean service across the Pacific, is one which should have been adopted long ago. It has been too long delayed already, and I feel that, while I cannot have implicit confidence in the Government, it is my duty to my country not to stand in the way of having this service established; but I shall hold the Government to a strict account hereafter with respect to the terms of the contract, and the conditions upon which they have caused this country to be taxed for a very considerable sum of money. I regret that I am placed in the position of having to vote against my convictions in this respect, for I hold it to be the duty of the Government to lay all this information before this House, but I believe that the interests of the country will be subserved by the adoption of this scheme. I shall, therefore, have to support the motion, but I do so

with reluctance, because the House has not had the papers laid before it.

Amendment negatived on a division, and resolution concurred in.

MAIL SERVICE—CANADA AND UNITED KINGDOM.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of resolution respecting a fast weekly mail steamship service between Canada and the United Kingdom.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). During the discussion that has taken place on these resolutions it has been made evident that we require information which the Finance Minister has not been able to impart to the House. The hon. gentleman, in introducing his resolution the other night, laid it down as a proposition that he intended to ask for a contract with a company owning steamships similar to the *Etruria* and *Umbria*, sailing from New York. The hon. gentleman stated that those steamers made a maximum rate of 20 knots per hour, and that:

"The Government, after carefully considering the matter, has come to the conclusion that if it is within the reasonable reach of Canada, without overburdening the financial power of the country, we shall have a service on the Atlantic equal to the best Atlantic service running to the ports to the south of us."

The hon. gentleman then went on to show that taking those steamers at a 20 knot an hour rate of speed that they were going to make the voyage between Rimouski and Great Britain in 144 hours *viâ* Belle Isle, 150 hours *viâ* Cape Race, and 153 from Great Britain to Halifax. The hon. gentleman also stated in the same observations, to which I desire to draw the attention of the House, "that the last tender was from the Anderson Co. and that the steamers should have sufficient power to drive them at a speed of 20 knots an hour." That statement of the hon. gentleman might be very misleading. He said that they should have a power sufficient to drive them at 20 knots an hour, but it is evident that he entered into the calculation without any knowledge of the distance, or that he never expected those steamers would be driven at the rate of 20 knots per hour, because, had the hon. gentleman anticipated such a result, so far from the steamer making the voyage to Rimouski *viâ* Belle Isle in 140 hours, she would, as a matter of fact, make it in 115 hours. The distance between Rimouski and Moville is 2,303 miles, and at 20 knots an hour a steamer would go that journey in 115 hours, so that the hon. gentleman was either in error in regard to the distance, or he is evidently not contemplating that those steamers shall run at 20 knots an hour. Then, with regard to the voyage *viâ* Cape Race. The hon. gentleman stated that it would be accomplished in 154 hours. The distance *viâ* Cape Race is 2,447 miles, and a steamer running at 20 knots an hour, would make the voyage in 122 hours. From Moville to Halifax the distance is 2,280 miles, which would be made by a steamer of 20 knots an hour in 114 hours, whereas the hon. Minister sets it down at 153 hours. There is such a marked discrepancy in the distance and time given by the hon. gentleman, that I am led to the conclusion, and I think that the House will arrive at the same conclusion, that the hon. gentleman has not informed himself sufficiently on this point, before he made the statement to the House. Why, Sir, a steamer of 17 knots an hour would make the distance to Rimouski *viâ* Belle Isle in 135 hours, whereas the hon. gentleman with his 20 knot boat put it down at 140 hours; and a 17 knot boat would make the distance *viâ* Cape Race is 144 hours, as compared with 154 hours calculated by the Finance Minister for his 20 knot steamer; a 17 knot steamer would make the voyage from Moville to Halifax in 114 hours, whereas the hon. gentleman put it down at 153 hours. If these figure are correct, and I challenge contradiction, the hon. gentleman must see the result of his proposal, viz.: that while he is asking the House to subsidise a line of steamers at the possible speed of 20 knots an hour under pressure, that neither he nor his Government can have any expectation of their making that speed. It is, therefore, evident to me that the hon. gentleman has been dealing with this subject without due information with regard to the various distances that ought to be run. In passing, I may correct a misapprehension which arose the other night during a discussion with regard to the comparative distances between Halifax and Liverpool and New York and Liverpool. I cannot do better than to quote from an authority which will, I am sure, be accepted by hon. gentlemen on that side of the House—that is, the Government map of the Intercolonial Railway, which I have no doubt has been prepared with great care and which, at all events, cannot be disputed by hon. gentlemen opposite. I find by this authority that the distance from Halifax to Liverpool is 2,480 miles, and from New York to Liverpool 2,986 miles, making a difference of about 500 miles, which was stated by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House the other night. This question has been, no doubt, discussed at considerable length, but there are some points which require to be referred to again. I have taken the ground from the commencement, that the amount asked by this resolution, for a 20 knot steamship service, was in excess of the present postal traffic requirements of our country. I have taken the ground that a 16 or 17 knot service and an 18 knot trial speed, (being about 3 or 4 knots in advance of the present mail service, which I admit requires improvement), would be all that the public require and would be more to the general interest of the country than a very fast line of steamers, and for this reason. A 20 knot service of ships like the *Etruria* would be capable of carrying only a small proportion of freight, say from 700 to 1000 tons, because they require so much coal and so much boiler space. Therefore, if they come either to Montreal or to a winter port in the Maritime Provinces there would only be a small portion of freight to come over our Intercolonial Railway, and the same applies to the return freight for England. If the Government were satisfied with a service of 17 knot capacity, which would make the time in fewer hours than what the hon. the Minister of Finance has laid down as required of this new expensive service, you would obtain a service for very much less money, while at the same time these steamers would be able to carry a very much larger cargo. Take, for instance, steamers of the capacity of the *Vancouver* and *Parisian*, which are about 5,000 tons burden, and are supposed to carry 2,500 or 2,000 tons of cargo each way; made somewhat larger they, no doubt, would carry 3,000 tons. My object throughout this discussion has been to show the House that it is much more in the interest of the country to have steamers capable of carrying large cargoes, whether of freight or passengers, than to obtain a line of steamers which would run one or two knots faster, with a very small carrying capacity. If the Government are going to vote a sum of money for a fast service, they will naturally look around to see by what means they are going to be recouped. Therefore, if the steamers were such as would carry 3,000 tons of freight inward and 3,000 tons outward each week, they would afford such employment to our public works as would compensate us to some extent for the subsidy which the Government propose. The great object should be to build up a line of fast steamers having such accommodations as would meet the business wants of the country. The hon. gentleman may say that we have no assurance that such a service could be obtained for less money, and that the Messrs Allan had offered an 18 knot service for about $10,000 per round trip. I am aware, as I said the other

night, that there was some difficulty in that matter, because at that moment there were very important discussions going on in England with regard to improved machinery and improved methods in connection with the steamship service, and they were unwilling to undertake any heavy obligations until they were satisfied that all the improvements the engineers had in view could either be proved or disproved by actual test. Since that time these difficulties, I understand, have been solved, and I believe if the Government were to advertise to-morrow for a 17 knot service, combined with a larger carrying capacity, they would receive tenders very shortly for a satisfactory service for not much more than half the amount which they are asking the House to vote under this resolution; and I have some grounds for stating that opinion. Therefore I think the House should hesitate to pledge this large sum under such conditions. I believe that if the Government would subsidise a fast line of 17 knots, making the voyage across in less time than the Finance Minister contemplates by his proposition, and terminating at a British port, it would probably be a permanent success; but if the Government seek only to have a mail line, and the steamers have to go to a French port, its usefulness will be so impaired that there will not be sufficient travel from either side to support it. It may run for a short time, but the steamers will be taken off and put somewhere else. I quite admit that we want a considerable improvement in our present mail service, and I am willing to go to the extent proposed by the hon. Minister of Finance the other day, that we should have a service across the ocean in the time he mentions; but that can be obtained, as I have already shown, by a 17 knot service. A 17 knot service will accomplish the voyage in 135 hours, whereas the hon. gentleman stated the other night that he was aiming at accomplishing it in 140 hours. We have to look at the permanency of this service, because this is a new departure, and the steamers that are to be built for such a line will, of course, be very expensive. They will be peculiarly adapted for a northern service; in fact, they will only be fit for a northern service; a company entering into a contract with the Government for the service, must naturally look upon it as a permanency, at any rate for a considerable number of years; and we are not likely to have so many people competing for a 20 knot service as for the more medium service of 17 knots. If you confine yourself to 20 knot boats, probably only one concern will tender, and according to the explanations given by the hon. Minister of Finance the other night, while they are to have that power, it does not at all appear that they are to make that speed. I invite the attention of the hon. gentleman to that very important point, on which it appears to me he has hardly bestowed sufficient attention. Entertaining these views, and feeling that a 17 knot service would meet the requirements of the Government as indicated by the Minister of Finance the other evening, and that would also serve the interests of the country generally, I beg to move:

That the said resolution be not now agreed to, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole to amend the same, so as to reduce the amount named therein to a sum sufficient to provide for a 17 knot fast, mail service, which, in the opinion of this House, is all that is required to promote the postal and passenger service of the Dominion, and is at the same time better calculated to serve the general business and commercial interests of the country; and that it be expressly provided in any contract entered into, that the terminal point on this side shall be at a port within the Dominion of Canada.

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

After Recess.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not intend to go into the merits of the question now before this House, but only wish to say a few words with regard to the amendment now submitted to us. The motion made by the hon. the Minister of Finance calls for a subsidy to the steamer service between Canada and England, and the amendment of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) is to the effect that the sum asked for is too large, that we should provide but for a service of 17 knots an hour, which, he thinks, is all that is required to promote the postal and passenger service of the Dominion, and that there be inserted a condition that the maritime port on this side of the ocean will be in the Dominion. I really do not understand why the Government should be asked to reduce the amount of the subsidy. The press of the country, and the whole country, have, since many years, been clamoring for a faster service, and, certainly, we will not be able to attain that object by diminishing the amount of a subsidy already declared to be insufficient. For my part I am opposed to any reduction in the amount. We want a fast service, and we require also that our winter port be in Canada. We are glad to see that the Maritime Provinces are able to furnish that winter port. We are glad to see that the acquisition we have made of those Provinces by Confederation gives us the advantage of such a winter port in the Dominion. We are happy to have those Provinces with us. We are proud of their population and resources, and we look upon it as a great benefit to Canada that we shall be able at last to have our winter ports within the limits of our territory. If we were not able to have those ports in Canada, if we remained obliged to send all our goods through the United States, we might as well be annexed at once; but if we want to build up Canada for the Canadians, let us encourage what will give us a fast and good ocean service during winter and summer, and which will be entirely under our control. But it is not on that special point that I wish to speak just now. The hon. gentleman who moved the amendment, and some other hon. gentlemen, have objected to the resolution of the Government, because it is provided that the new line will make connection with a French port. I would like those hon. gentlemen to give us their reasons. Why do they object to connection being made with a French port? Is it on account of commerce, or on account of nationality. They must have some motive for their objection. We are seeking new markets everywhere across the globe. We are ready to expend millions of dollars for that object, and here is a country with a population of over 40,000,000 people, to which markets the hon. gentlemen object to sending our subsidised steamers. Why, if we look at the question from a commercial point of view, we will find any number of articles which we may sell there with profit. I have had no time to prepare a complete list of those articles, but in the few minutes at my disposal, after having heard the motion, a number of articles occurred to my mind in which a profitable trade might be engaged by us with France. To-day we export our cheese to England, and when it reaches the English market, the mark is taken off, and our cheese is sent to France and sold there by English merchants at a profit. Well, if we could send that article direct to France, and sell it there ourselves, it would be so much more profit to us. Our woods, our minerals of all kinds, our live stock, our furnitures, our boots and shoes, our maple sugar and all products of the farm generally, our iron and copper ore, our cement, all these articles and hundreds of others, of which I have not had time to prepare a list, could be profitably sold in France. And in return we might buy from France their light wines, silks, gloves, umbrellas, clocks, watches, fancy articles, linen, and a number of other articles which are in great demand here. Will anybody deny that Canada as a whole is not largely interested in having commercial dealings with France? And if it is in the interest of our commerce generally that we should trade with France, why object to this resolution? No one will deny that if we had a commercial treaty with France, our commerce would be much

larger than it is. This resolution is the first serious step made towards obtaining a treaty with France. Would these hon. gentlemen object to the resolution on that score? When the Government is assuming the responsibility of opening up a trade and paving the way for a treaty with France, are my hon. friends on this side those to object to the action of the Government? I am surprised and sorry that any such objection should have been raised. I believe that by making this steam connection with a French port, we will eventually be able to make a treaty which that old country desires to see effected—not only with the people of the Province of Quebec, but all the Provinces of the Dominion. Those who are at the head of this new line must understand something of what they are doing, and no doubt they see the immense interests we all have in opening up commercial relations with France. Do those hon. gentlemen object to our trading with France on the ground that we will be trading with the French people? We have passed legislation to prevent Chinamen from coming to this country, but that does not prevent our subsidising a line of steamers to go to China and trade there. Are the French people more objectionable to trade with than the Chinese? I would be inclined to believe that there are in this country certain people of that opinion. Are they in this honorable House? No; I do not believe there is one hon. member here who would be guided by such sentiments, and recent events have proved that beyond a doubt. But there is a class in this country who are animated by this sentiment. If I take up one of the leading papers of the Dominion—a paper which receives large subsidies from the Government and which has wide circulation—I find in its columns the following lines, which go to show how a certain class of people understand how to cement union among Canadians and build up a Canadian nationality:

"I trust that some united action on the part of our people will result in an immediate protest against a project, the purpose of which is to fill up this British Canadian Dominion with the *ezuvia* of France and Belgium a worse than good-for-nothing addition to the population of a country such as this. We want no more French or Belgians in this country. God knows we have more than enough of them now. We want English, Scotch and Irish emigrants, natural-born subjects of the Empire. We want neither the infidelity, socialism, nor ignorance of the continent—the cankers of a long reign of Popery and its accumulated vices—to be foisted upon the Dominion at our own cost."

An hon. MEMBER. What paper is that?

Mr. AMYOT. The *Mail*.

An hon. MEMBER. That is your organ.

Mr. AMYOT. No, it is not our organ. The *Mail* has been paid over $20,000 in a few months by the Government, but I do not hold the Government responsible for those writings. I speak of the *Mail* as representing a large class in this Dominion, and pretending to form a great nationality in British North America. The hon. gentleman knows that another paper had to change its course because it was being financially led by the *Mail*, who exceeded him in hatred. Someone must protest against that nonsense, and against those brutal attacks. When do we Catholics attack the Queen as the head of the Protestant religion? When do we attack our fellow countrymen, Protestants of any denomination? When do we insult anybody? We want to be respected as Catholics. The Pope is the head of our church, and we want him to be respected. If Catholics are to be treated as they are because we are in the minority in this Confederation, I declare that the basis of the Confederation is shaky and cannot stand. I am glad to state that in this House such ideas were rejected, but I must remind the fools who hold the pen and have the responsibility for these writings that they do not understand what it is to attack two millions of Catholics by two millions of Protestants. They are destroying the peace and the prosperity of this country, and the mutual respect which has existed. They are not worthy of the great British Crown, they are not worthy of being citizens of Canada; and yet we see that, not one paper but ten or fifteen papers have adopted this course, and we know that those papers would not live unless they were supported by a great number of readers who believe in them. It is time to remind them that we have our rights here. We respect every nationality and will give all their rights to others, but we are entitled to be respected ourselves and to have justice, and we mean to have it, and this course must come to an end. I know the great trouble which the members of the Government have in regard to that. They should be supported in their efforts to bring back calm and harmony. When I see these articles in the press, and when I see them echoed, in one particular, in another form here—a milder form, it is true—I feel bound to protest, and to speak on behalf of those who respect others but who want to be respected themselves. The paper in question goes on further:

"We have got to put our foot down and stop this accursed work as well in the Dominion as in the Provincial Chambers; and Liberals and Conservatives must join hands in the work, by the formation of a new Liberal-Union party similar to that adopted in the mother country, for the protection of the integrity of the United Kingdom against the assaults of Romish sacerdotalism, and the masked atrocities of the Catholic party, under the guise of Fenianism and Home Rule."

Perhaps, without the Romish sacerdotalism the British Crown would not be here to-day. Our clergy has always been faithful to Great Britain; our clergy is loyal; our clergy has nothing to do with Fenianism. As to Home Rule, it is not our affair, and we try to mind our own business. Our clergy is loyal, and has instructed the people to be loyal, and these brutal attacks only prove an equal amount of ingratitude and injustice in the heart of those who prefer the same. The integrity of the Empire, and the integrity of the Confederation, we French Catholics desire. We work for it. Those who attack us in that manner do not desire it. They want to destroy it. There is the distinction. We are loyal; we are truly Canadians; we are in favor of all that benefits Canada. When British Columbia desires commerce with Japan and other countries, we are ready to say they are right. When other parts of the Dominion want to trade with England, Scotland, Ireland, or any other country, whether it be Switzerland or Spain, do not we say: You are right? Then, when this Government wants to give us an opportunity of communicating easily with France, why should hon. gentlemen say they are wrong? We are about 1,500,000 French people in this country, and we have an equal right with the other portion of the population to a speedy means of communication for our letters, our books and our papers with France, as others have with England, or Scotland, or Ireland. After all, is it because we are of French descent that we should have to pass through other countries before reaching France, no matter what may be the name, or religion, or language of those countries? I contend that the Government are taking a step in the right direction in including that clause in reference to a connection with a French port. I will give to my vote the meaning of a protest against the brutal attacks, not only of one paper, but of many papers, backed by thousands and thousands of readers, and as a warning to them that we exist, and that we are able to read those articles, which is an advantage which they do not possess in regard to ours. We are attached to Confederation. We teach English to our children as well as French. We want them to be educated in both languages. But we are not to be looked upon as slaves. We are not here by endurance, but we are here as a right; we are here by virtue of the constitution, and we want equal rights. I know that the intelligent part of the population, represented by those I see before me now, understand that, and are willing to deal with us in that way. I know that they regret these stupid attacks, and that they will allow me to say to the brutal writers of that press, that they are fools to attempt to burn the temple of Ephèze. I am sorry to see that one of the

objections which have been made to the proposition of the Government is that these vessels are to stop at a port in France. I think that is one of the best reasons why I should give my vote to support that proposition. I owe nothing to the Government. I was elected in spite of them. They fought me bitterly. I received the support of the leader of the Opposition on that occasion, and I thank him for it. I was elected by both parties. I intend giving an independent vote as a solemn protest, as I said. When the resolution will have passed, I hope we will soon have another country added to those with which we have communication, and that is France; and, later on, I hope that Belgium and other countries will be added to that list.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think my hon. friend could have been in the House this afternoon when the motion of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) was placed in your hands. My hon. friend must see that, according to the terms of that motion, the question of a French port is not in issue.

Mr. AMYOT. I spoke of the terms of the speech. He said it distinctly, that was one of his objections.

Mr. LAURIER. I take the motion first, but I will refer to the speech. In the motion there is not a word in reference to making connection with a French port. Now, coming to the policy of the speech of my hon. friend, and coming to the speech of my hon. friend who followed him, the hon. gentleman must admit that the policy which he and I advocate, that is to say the extension of trade, not only with France but with all nations—but let us speak of France—is certainly more favored by the policy which is advocated by my hon. friend from Halifax, than by the policy of the Government. How do we stand to-day? My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) and myself have more than once, upon the floor of this House, advocated a commercial treaty with France. I am still of the opinion that we should have a commercial treaty with France, and my hon. friend is still of that opinion; and he believes that, having to-day a connection by a line of steamships with France, the proposed scheme will develop that connection. But if that is the object in view, would it not have been far better for the Government to continue the service which exists to-day between France and the port of Quebec, than to have a sub-service between France and England, with connection with a French port? My hon. friend has to choose between these two policies. The Government have to-day a line of steamers plying between the port of Quebec and the harbor of Havre. The contract under which these steamers are so plying is now cancelled, and the cancellation is to take effect on the 1st of July. They substitute a line of steamers which is to ply between Canada and England, making connection with France. Does my hon. friend imagine that the trade of France will be better served under the new arrangements?

Mr. AMYOT. Yes; because the other line took two months to go and come.

Mr. LAURIER. I cannot see that. If the subsidy at present is insufficient to connect with a French port, that is a reason to increase it, but not to cancel it. The object my hon. friend had in view was to create trade with France. The line now subsidised is too slow, he says; then let the subsidy be increased, let the time be made faster; but certainly it is not by an indirect communication with France that we shall advance the interests of the trade we have in view. Moreover, my hon. friend has not reflected that the character of the line which we are asked to subsidise is one not adapted for fast freight, but is intended for mail and passenger traffic alone. Therefore the very object he has in view—he has enumerated all the different articles which we might export to France—his object will be defeated by the present arrangement rather than promoted. The hon. gentleman forgets that the Minister of Finance, the other day, stated that the standard of the vessels which are to ply under the new arrangement, was to be that of the *Etruria*, that is to say, to carry only live freight and passengers; certainly under this arrangement the very object which my hon. friend has in view, the promotion of trade between France and Canada, will be injured. It is by reason of this very fact that the motion of my hon. friend from Halifax should commend itself to the sympathy of my hon. friend from Bellechasse. Of course, I know my hon. friend has acted in good faith, but if he will consider the whole matter he will see, according to his own reasoning, that he will advance his object by supporting the motion of my hon. friend.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think that the present accommodation we have got is amply sufficient for the requirements of this Dominion. My impression is, that the electors of this Dominion are now sufficiently taxed for that purpose, and that it is not necessary to increase our annual subsidies in order to have a faster service. When our population becomes considerably larger than it is now, and when travel is increased to a volume that might support faster lines, and when the finances of the Dominion get into a position that will enable us to support an increased service, then, I think, it will be ample time for us to consider increased subsidies for steamships. On Saturday night, I opposed a subsidy to Australia, and I am opposed to the increased subsidy that we are now asked to grant to a line across the Atlantic. Without detaining the House, I beg to move the following in amendment to the amendment:—

That all the words in the said amendment after the word "That" be left out, and the following substituted therefor: "This House is of opinion that the mail and passenger service now rendered by the Allan, Beaver and Dominion lines of steamers is amply sufficient for the requirements of this Dominion, and that it is inexpedient to increase the burdens of the people by granting increased subsidies to foster Atlantic steamship lines."

Amendment to amendment negatived on a division.

Amendment of Mr. Jones negatived on a division.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 144) relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COMBINATIONS IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 11) for the prevention and suppression of Combinations in restraint of Trade.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of Justice, I believe, is taking charge of this Bill, which, so far as I notice, does not make any alteration whatever in the common law. It provides for the punishment of what is now unlawful, and for which punishment is already provided. I do not understand that to be what the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) first proposed in the Bill. I understand that he asked for something more. He proposed to make that a crime which is not a crime now, he proposed to declare some acts unlawful which are not unlawful by common law; and if we are simply going to engage in declaratory legislation, upon which there has hitherto been no doubt, we are entering upon a new policy altogether. We have sometimes, by legislative enactment, in this country, and they have also done so in England, declared that to be the law in regard to which there was a difference of opinion, where one division of the court had taken a certain view, and another had taken a different view; but I do not understand there is any difference of opinion that is to be removed. We are simply engaged in declaring that to be unlawful which the law says, as it now stands, is unlawful;

we are proposing that certain unlawful things shall be punished, when the law already says those unlawful things shall be punished. I suppose the Minister of Justice has looked into the matter, and come to some conclusion as to why he thinks legislation is necessary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In response to what the hon. gentleman has said, I may state briefly what is my general view of the Bill. I think it is, as the hon. gentleman has said, mainly declaratory of the common law. I think the hon. gentleman who has had the Bill in charge, and those who are interested in passing it, have come to the conclusion that it is desirable to declare the common law with respect to this subject. It has seemed to me from the first, with respect to legislation of this kind, that the propriety of adopting it is not at all based upon any view of the law, because, I presume that as regards the general principles of law bearing on the subject, they are almost beyond a doubt. But it does seem frequently to be the case, that it is desirable to declare the common law, with respect to matters which are offences. I need hardly remind the hon. gentleman of the multitude of cases on our own Statute-book in which the common law is declared. The law respecting murder is common law, but it forms the subject of enactment also, and so on through almost every grade of the criminal law; but, as I have said, I think the question as to the propriety of adopting legislation of this kind depends upon a view of the business outlook of the country. I have said candidly to the hon. gentleman who has had charge of the Bill from the first, that I think his Bill as now framed will add no new penalty, no penalty which could not already be enforced, and will not create any new offence; but in his opinion and in the opinion of a number of other hon. gentlemen, who have studied the business outlook of the country and the business prospects of the country, it is desirable in connection with these subjects covered by a portion of the criminal law, which is not generally understood, to have the law proclaimed and declared, as a statute of this kind would do. On the other hand, we have gentlemen connected with large business interests who think that legislation is not called for and that it is unadvisable to bring to public notice the fact that any such law exists. The question is simply between the classes holding those two opinions, and my own opinion, I must say, inclines me to the view that wherever public sentiment calls, as I think it does in this country, for a public declaration of what the law is, it ought not to be objected to have Parliament declare that law, as a warning to those who may be inclined to transgress it.

Mr. EDGAR. I cannot see that this Bill declares what the law is. As I read the Bill which was introduced by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), first, it certainly did seem to attempt to grapple with the evils which he thought he had discovered by the investigations of the Committee over which he presided last Session, and I think there was a great deal to be said in favor of a straightforward attempt to deal with the evils of combinations and trusts, and so forth. The Bill which was originally introduced this Session attempted, perhaps unwisely and certainly ignorantly, to deal with that question, but at all events it honestly did so. Now, what is this piece of legislation we have before us? I entirely decline to admit that it is what the Minister of Justice has said, a declaration of the criminal law. It does not declare anything at all, it simply says that every person who conspires, and so on, unlawfully, is guilty of a misdemeanor. The other Bill attempted to declare what the law was, because it said every person who conspires to do so and so does it unlawfully. Now we only say if he does it unlawfully he is guilty of a misdemeanor. The Minister of Justice must admit there is no enactment of a declaratory character in that; there is nothing laid down in that proposition except that those unlawful conspiracies shall be misdemeanors and shall be punished in a certain way. If we look at the Statute-book to day, without going to the common law, we find that anyone who is guilty of conspiracy is to be punished by the law as it stands, and in cases where the punishment for conspiracy is not otherwise provided for, the Revised Statutes say that the punishment shall be imprisonment not exceeding seven years. There is, I admit, something in this Bill when it says that the punishment shall not exceed two years. That is, so far as I can make out, absolutely the whole of the new features in this Bill. It does not make any new crime, it only declares that the penalty for a conspiracy of this kind shall not exceed two years' imprisonment instead of seven years. So that the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), if he succeeded in carrying this Bill through, would have succeeded in reducing the punishment for the offences at which he is particularly aiming. The Revised Statutes of Canada are very clear on that point. Chapter 173, section 26, reads in this way:

"Any one who is convicted of fraud, or of cheating or conspiracy, shall, in any case in which no special punishment is provided by any statute, be liable to seven years' imprisonment."

My hon. friend now proposes to provide a special punishment by this Bill, and therefore such an offender would not be liable to imprisonment for seven years but for two years only. I, therefore, congratulate the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), on the result which he will achieve if this Bill is passed. If the Government really desire to take some reasonable and proper measures to prevent the evils of combinations, I would ask them to take up my Bill introduced this Session, but which, from the pressure of business, has not been reached, in order to strike at combines, not by altering the criminal law, but by dealing with them in a business way and providing for the great class of combines which do exist, and which may exist to a greater extent in the manufacture and sale of articles which are subject to a high tariff duty. Now, the combinations in all articles which the hon. gentleman from West York (Mr. Wallace) has referred to exist by reason of monopolies, and the monopolies are either natural monopolies or artificial ones, such as tariffs. I admit that there are a certain class of cases which cannot be reached by throwing the duty off articles when combines exist; for instance, take the case of anthracite coal. I am perfectly willing to admit that it is not the high tariff which renders a combination in anthracite coal possible, either in Canada or in the United States. It is the monopoly that has been acquired by the aggregation of capital which has controlled the output of the mines so that they can regulate the prices in Canada as well as in the United States, until we have anthracite mines of our own. But in the case of sugar, cotton goods, and almost any of the articles manufactured in Canada which come under our high tariff, if the Government will make provisions that when a combine has been proved to exist in that particular article they shall by proclamation be entitled to declare that the duties shall be taken off, and that these goods shall be put upon the free list while the combines continue; they would find that this remedy would meet the case, and that very little revenue would be lost, because as soon as the investigation has taken place and the proclamation issued, the combinations would cease. Now, that would be a businesslike way for the Government to meet the evil, and it would not involve a new criminal law being created, as is proposed by the original Bill, but as is certainly not proposed by this. That at all events would be the sensible way of meeting the evil. In case of combinations in other cases than these, I dare say that some clearer definition of the law, as it ought to be at any rate, should be made by this Bill, and if the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) will undertake in another year to introduce a straightforward measure I shall help him to put it on the Statute-book. I do not see that there is anything to either support or oppose in this Bill, except

that one single feature which reduces the punishment of conspiracy from seven years to two years.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman say that this Bill does not declare the law—he does so because the Bill does not define the law in every man's case, and prescribe exactly the evidence that shall be necessary to convict a man of an offence under the Bill. When the hon. gentleman has read, as he has done, from the face of the Bill, that a person who unlawfully conspires to do these things is guilty of a misdemeanor and is punishable, it is impossible for him to state that the Bill does not declare what the law is. It is true that offences of this kind are at present unlawful as conspiracies, and that very severe penalties are attached to conspiracies by the Revised Statutes, but I will venture to say that there are not two persons in Canada outside the legal profession, who knew before this Bill was introduced that unlawful conspiring in respect to trade was conspiracy punishable under the Act wtth five years' imprisonment. They will know the law hereafter, and, therefore, the Bill is a declaration of the common law; and those who support the Bill say, a useful declaration of the common law. When the hon. gentleman tells us that the Bill does not do anything more than reduce the penalties for those offences, the hon. gentleman, I submit, does not state half the case. It not only declares that these combinations in restraint of trade are conspiracies, but it establishes the minimum penalty, contrary to the principle now established by the Revised Statutes, for under the Revised Statutes the punishment for a conspiracy of this kind may be almost nominal. But if this Bill reduces the maximum the hon. gentleman will not forget that it establishes a minimum far above that which the present statute provides, for it fixes a penalty of $200 which is to be the minimum in regard to an individual, and $1,000 in regard to a corporation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E I.) This Bill ostensibly is a Bill to punish those engaged in fraudulent combinations, but it seems to me that the Bill itself is one of the greatest frauds I ever read. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) moved a year ago for a Committee to investigate these alleged frauds, and at a very great expense to the country he, and his Committee, sat and took a great deal of evidence. They submitted to Parliament a book containing that evidence with their report, and I just ask the attention of the House for a moment while I read to them what that Committee reported to Parliament should be legislated against. Then I will call their attention to the Bill and ask them whether this Bill pretends to legislate in the direction that the hon. gentleman said we should legislate. The hon. gentleman referred to the different trades of the country in his report and I will read you the concluding paragraph of that report, which refers to sugar and groceries, so that you will see what the evils are that they wish to remedy. The report says:

"Thus facts prove this Grocers' Guild, with its several conbinations, to be obnoxious to the public interest, in limiting competition, in enhancing prices, and by the familiar use of its growing and facile powers tending to produce and propagate all the evils of monopoly. Certain dealers are refused admission into its ranks, others are admitted and afterwards expelled, others again are placed under its ban, who, from conscientious scruples or in a spirit of independence, refuse to join them. Merchants who have been buyers on equal terms and with equal facilities as other merchants, suddenly find themselves under the power of this combination.

"Thus establishments, which in some cases are the growth of half a century of toil and honorable dealing, and rich in valuable experience and public confidence, are threatened with extinction No reasonable excuse, much less justification, exists for many of these arbitrary acts and agreements. The wholesale grocery trade had been for many years in a flourishing condition; failures were almost unknown. The alleged demoralisation of the sugar trade was but the same condition of this trade that had existed for many years owing to the custom of selling sugar at a low rate of profits. The reason given for fixing prices on many other articles was that they were being sold at too small a rate of profit. Fixed profits were agreed upon and afterwards increased, and in no instance lowered, though values generally had fallen.

"It was seen that an association formed at first to arrange uniform terms of credits and discounts, and to prevent the dating ahead of invoices, &c., soon and rapidly extended its operations to more ambitious schemes. The power used, cautiously at first, soon grasped with a firmer hand, and at length. 'the simple plan that they may take, who have the power,' governed the operations of these associations."

In reference to the coal combinations the report says:

"Thus the public is presented with the extraordinary spectacle of a mercantile association arrogating to itself powers conferred upon law courts alone, with, in this instance, the judges in the case virtually condoning perjury by the acceptance of fines to be divided amongst the importers. This phenomenon is not the less painful or less objectionable in character, from the association which perpetrates it being distinguished by the respectable title of 'The Coal Branch of the Toronto Board of Trade.'

"Their management of public tenders is worthy of attention as an illustrative of how popular confidence is betrayed. When tenders are asked for supplying coal in Toronto for Dominion Government buildings, Ontario Government institutions, Toronto water-works, public schools, charitable institutions, the General Hospital, &c., a meeting of the 'Coal Branch' is called and the price is fixed which the party inviting tenders is to pay, and the privilege of filling the contract is awarded to the member who offers the highest premium or bonus. For instance, in 1886 for the privilege of filling the Ontario Government contract of about 2,500 tons, a premium of $1,500 was paid. The same contract, including some wood, was sold in 1887 for $1,399. The premiums thus paid are divided among the importing members in the same way as the fines. But in order to lull public suspicion of combination, and that the parties to be supplied were not obtaining the coal at its fair market value, other members of the branch put in tenders at higher prices.

"Citizen consumers in like manner pay, not competitive prices, but such fixed prices as the combination chooses to extort."

On the coffin-makers and undertakers' trade they remark:

"The inevitable result of this exclusive control is exorbitant charges to bereaved families; and wherever the hand of affliction most frequently falls the more oppressive the burden of this combination becomes."

On the biscuit and confectionery trade they report:

"From the evidence, it seems clear that the result of the combination is to keep prices at higher figures than are justified by the price paid for the raw material, and altered condition of trade, brought about by the introduction of new and improved machinery.

"It was found by comparison with United States price lists, that Canadian goods are in some finer and fancy varieties 20 to 30 per cent. higher than goods of equal quality on the other side of the line.

And they wind up by reporting:

"The Committee find that the evils produced by combinations such as have been enquired into, have not by any means been fully developed as yet in this country, but sufficient evidence of their injurious tendencies and effects is given to justify legislative action for suppressing the evils arising from these and similar combinations and monopolies."

Now, Sir, that was the report the Committee made on the large amount of testimony they took; and the hon. gentleman, having made that report, introduced into this House early in the Session a Bill purporting to strike at these evils and remove them if possible; and that Bill, as my hon. friend beside me has remarked, if defective in construction, inartistically drawn, and going perhaps too far—drawn perhaps by some person who did not understand the law on the subject—seemed at any rate to be honestly framed to strike at the evils reported upon. In that Bill it was provided that any person who combined to grant to any other person who was a party to the combination any facility for the purchase, sale, transportation or supply of any article, which facility was denied to any other person, should be guilty of a misdemeanor, and further that any person, who denied to a person who was not a party to the combination, any facility which was granted to those who were parties to the combination, should be guilty of a misdemeanor. Then the Bill went on to declare that any person who unreasonably enhanced the market price of an article, or unduly restrained the traffic in any such article, or limited or prevented the production, manufacture, sale or transportation, or prevented or restricted competition in the production, manufacture, sale or transportation of such article, should be guilty of a misdemeanor. That was at any rate an intelligible Bill; you might either support it or oppose it; but what did the hon. gentleman do? He got it referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee;

and, without discussing it or offering one word in support of it, he introduced a new Bill similar to the old one only in the title, had it reprinted, and brought it before the Committee; and not one of the offences which he reported against, which he said there should be legislation to prevent, and which he proposed to deal with in his first Bill, is referred to in this new Bill at all. Therefore I say that the Bill is a fraud, in ostensibly holding up to the public the proposition that it is dealing with the evils which the first Bill was designed to prevent. No one can deny that it does not deal with or punish any one of these offences. It has been argued by the Minister of Justice that this Bill declares or defines the common law. To some extent it may do so; but it does not declare that the doing of any act, or the leaving undone of any act, shall of itself constitute a misdemeanor; it does not punish anyone for doing or omitting to do anything; it does not strike at the evils which the report pointed out; it merely says that those who do unlawfully certain things shall be guilty of misdemeanors. They are guilty of misdemeanors now. The difficulty before was in defining what was lawful or unlawful. Any conspiracy made between two persons to do any unlawful act, or to prevent any lawful act being done, in restraint of trade, was a misdemeanor. The Bill does not say that any man may or may not do such and such a thing; it merely says, if he does anything unlawfully, he will be punished. That is merely relegating the matter back to the indefiniteness of the common law, and leaving the judge to find out what is lawful or unlawful. In a book recently published on the criminal law, the author says:

"The definition shows a conspiracy to be an agreement to do an unlawful act. It is the indefinite meaning of this word 'unlawful' that gives to the crime of conspiracy its wide extent. The widest discretion is entrusted to the judges in whose power it seems to be thus to declare criminal, combinations to do almost anything which they regard as morally wrong, politically or socialy dangerous or otherwise objectionable."

The indefiniteness which existed before exists now; it is not touched or attempted to be touched by the Bill. The evils which existed before exist now; they are not legislated against, and no attempt is made to legislate against them by the Bill; it leaves the law exactly where it is now. The Bill, therefore, is a fraud; it deceives the people in making them believe that you are legislating on the subject when you are not, but you are evading the subject. With this report before them on the existence of these evils, it became the duty of the Government to take up this subject, and bring in a proper Bill to punish and suppress these evils, which not only exist, but which the Committee say are growing evils, and will, in the near future, become intensified. Now, Sir, why does the hon. gentleman propose the Bill? What good does he expect to accrue from it? Are the public going to be protected by it? No; they will be just where they were before. They will have to bring a prosecution and prove exactly what they did before, to the satisfaction of the judge, that the offence which they are prosecuting any person for, is an unlawful act against the common law. The Bill does not alter or facilitate the proceedings in any way; all it does is to minimise the punishment which the common law imposes on those guilty of an unlawful combination. I I submit to the House that the hon. gentleman has gone back on his report; he has been either afraid or ashamed of it. I submit also that it was the duty of the Government to take this matter up, and even now I think they ought to deal with it. It is too important a matter to be dealt with hurriedly by a private member, and the Government ought on their responsibility to introduce a Bill next Session dealing honestly and fairly with the evils pointed out by the report of the Committee.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not much surprised at the course of hon. gentlemen opposite. I find the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) first promising his support to a measure of this kind and afterwards working side by side with the opponents of the Bill—those men who have formed those illegal combinations and who came down in great force to defeat the Bill. They did not come down to defeat the old Bill, which the hon. member for P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) says had some merit, but they came down before the Banking and Commerce Committee at its last meeting, with a great array of lawyers from Montreal and Toronto, and with amendments carefully considered, to legislate this Bill out of existence. If this Bill is so innocent and harmless why should those people have gone to so much trouble and expense to defeat it. We find the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) taking a position to-night. Before this we did not know exactly were to find him. He spoke in Committee against the Bill, and then when it came to a vote he had not the courage of his convictions, and turned round and voted in favor of it, and I would not be at all surprised to find him repeating the operation this evening. So far as the harmless character of the Bill is concerned, if you compare the two Bills, you will see that they both seek exactly the same end, and the advantage of the present Bill over the other is this: The first Bill created another criminal Act, and it has been said by those who opposed it, and it may be said with some truth, that its provisions were too severe. We contended they were not, and that the courts would decide on that point. The courts would have to give their decision, and it might happen that their decision would make the Act a good deal more severe than we had intended it to be; but by the amended Bill, we have exactly the same remedy and nothing is left uncertain. It is in accord with the common law. As the Minister of Justice has said, the common law is not very much known outside of the legal profession, and many of these merchants who were acting in this way, not knowing the common law, and many who found out they were acting in contravention of the law of the land, went out of these unlawful and illegal combinations when they found the common law was against them. This new Act does exactly and more effectively what was aimed at in the original, and, therefore, I hope that this House will pass the Bill. The report of the Combination Committee of last Session has never been contradicted, the facts stated in it have never been even attempted to be controverted by any of those gentlemen who belong to illegal combinations, and the report shows conclusively that the evils complained of do exist, and that those illegal combinations are becoming a great power. It proves conclusively that they are robbing the people and following the line of the immense trusts and combinations in the United States, and I do not agree with those gentlemen who propose that we should leave the matter over for a year; but I say that legislation is imperatively demanded now. We should act now while we have the power and not wait another year, when those combinations will have increased in strength and the Canadian Parliament will find it a much more difficult matter to legislate with regard to them. I trust this Bill will pass, and any slight amendments can be made in Committee.

Mr. MULOCK. I think that the Bill in question, whilst it may not meet all the requirements of the case, may very fairly be passed, if only as an experiment or warning. Certainly, whatever may be the case, there is necessity in my judgment for intervention to protect the consumers of the country. We have seen in the last few years gigantic institutions and corporations forming combinations to enhance the cost of the necessaries of life, and I see very little distinction between what is called in the criminal law, larceny, and the result of an arrangement which obliges the unfortunate consumer to transfer from his pocket to that of the wealthy producer an unnecessary amount of money in order that he may maintain life.

Mr. ELLIS. That is the result of protection.

Mr. MULOCK. It may be the result of protection, as the hon. member for St. John suggests. I am not now seeking for the cause of it. We have the disease and it is our duty to seek for a remedy.

An hon. MEMBER. Free trade.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend behind me says free trade; but the Government of the day control our trade policy, and we are obliged to seek a remedy elsewhere. We are told by the hon. the Minister of Justice that we are in no way interfering with the common law, except by reducing the punishment and providing a different mode of punishment. To that extent I think the Bill is an improvement. A measure which is too severe defeats itself, and even if we were making no new law, the fact that we are by legislation emphasising the existence of the law may meet the case, and it may never be necessary to put the law in force. If it should turn out that this law is a mere echo of the existing law, except so far as punishment is concerned, that does not take away the existing law; that does not make lawful what was unlawful before. I am not aware what the law is on the subject, and I doubt if many people are. Certainly the law of conspiracy is a most abstruse one, and a conviction under it will be no easy matter. Even if a conviction should take place under this particular Act, the punishment would not operate very hardly on those unlawfully engaged, if, by a mere accident, they are engaged in unlawful combinations. I regard it as a most delicate matter to interfere with legitimate trade. What is a combination? Where is the line to be drawn between what is a lawful and what is an unlawful association? These are, I think, very delicate questions, and will be found to be shrouded in mystery whenever we have a case in the courts. Nevertheless I think that the passage of a measure such as this, even if it does but leave the law where it stood, and reduces the punishment, will have a beneficial effect. The judge has it in his discretion to say what the punishment shall be. It is not necessarily imprisonment, for I can conceive many cases in which a judge would hesitate to find guilty a person charged with the offence because of the severity of the punishment which he will be compelled to enforce. In this case if it should happen that a combination is technically illegal, but that there has been no *mala fides* on the part of the defendant, the judge can exercise that discretion with which he is clothed by the Act, and his sentence will be a nominal one. If, on the other hand, he is convinced there was an attempt on the part of the defendant to violate the Act, he will be sentenced proportionately to the offence. Therefore, to the extent of making the punishment discretionary, there is a better chance of enforcing the existing law than there would be of leaving the law as it stands at present. For these reasons, I am prepared to support the passage of this Bill, even if it is open to the objections which have been raised, and which I think have been well taken to a certain extent, namely, in regard to its not declaring what is the existing law. After we have had some cases decided under it, such as have been decided under the Bucket Shop Act, and have found out the weak points of the measure, we may be able to amend it. Therefore, I am in favor of the action of the Government in preventing an existing evil so long as they do not deal with the matter in a more radical way.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am sorry that I was not in the House when the second reading of this Bill was proposed. The Bill has my full sympathy, and I am very glad that it has been introduced for the purpose of preventing a system which is taking root in this country. When we look at the history of the United States, and see the evils which have arisen there in connection with these combines, I think we will decide that it is high time that something should be done here to prevent the implanting of these evil and pernicious systems in Canada, which result in giving to those who are producers the advantage which should be obtained by the consuming public. In the State of New York, a commission was appointed to find out the results of these combines. After the commission had sat for six or seven weeks, the chairman reported to the House that the commission would require to take up a permanent residence in the capital of the State, as it would take years to ferret out the extent to which combines existed in that State; that Alps upon Alps of combines existed which were fleecing the people of that State from day to day and from year to year. We know that in other States, combines have existed. When we take into consideration several of these combines, we will see at a glance the necessity of taking action in the interest of our consuming public. Take the Standard Oil Co. The capital stock of that company is about $90,000,000. That stock is worth to-day $164 to the $100 in the market. Last year that Company distributed $20,000,000 amongst the stockholders after paying a dividend of 10 per cent. quarterly. Take also the Cotton Seed Oil Company, which had a capital stock of about $48,000,000. That also make enormous profits. It was formed for the purpose of keeping down the price of cotton seed. Before the combine was formed, the cotton seed from the south was worth about $7 a ton, and about 700,000 tons were crushed each year. Ever since the formation of that combine, the price has been going down, until now it is worth about $4 a ton instead of $7. That company has made enormous profits in consequence of that combine. There are many other combines which have taken root in the United States, and the fact is that combines in that country have succeeded to such an extent that it seems as if everyone was interested in a combine. When those companies approach the legislatures, almost every man sitting in the House is either directly or indirectly interested in a combine, and consequently they cannot be reached. In Orange County, in the State of New York, the farmers formed an association for the purpose of trying to break up a combine for the sale of milk in the city of New York. They subscribed $20,000 in order to fight the milk combine. After they had fought that combine for thirteen months and had spent $20,000, they found they had to break up their association, and the combine exists to-day. It takes the milk from the farmers at its own price, and sells it to the consumers for double the price which is paid to the farmers. All those people in this country who are disposed to take advantage of such organisations will undoubtedly transplant that system to this country, and ultimately our people will be subject to a system of fleecing by these combines which will impoverish them more than they are impoverished under the present system. It is not too soon to adopt some measure to counteract this evil. I sympathise with the hon. member who introduced this Bill, and I am only sorry that it is not all that was expected. I hope it may meet the views of the country, and may put a stop to the combines which exist in Canada. There is not, for example, one undertaker in the Dominion who is not a member of a combine. The remains of our departed friends cannot be carried to their last resting place except under the auspices of a combine I know men who have tried to enter the business of undertaking, but they found that before they could do that they would have to get the signatures of the three nearest undertakers in the section of country in which they lived, consenting to their becoming members of the Undertakers' Association, before they could get the materials to enable them to carry on their business. It is preposterous that the laws of this country should allow the people to be fleeced by such organisations. If this Bill does not fully reach the evils which exist, I hope that next year amendments will be moved to secure to the people a free

and independent exercise of their rights, without being trammelled and fleeced by associations which are no better than disgused robbers. I stated, when the hon. gentleman was pressing his Bill before the Committee, that I was sorry to see such an array of lawyers appearing to prevent the passage of the measure. No doubt they have tasted the advantage of the organisation of combines, because if that were not the case they would not have taken the trouble to be there to prevent the passage of the Bill. No doubt they have begun to realise the advantage of these organisations, judging from the attention which they gave to this measure, and from the fact that they brought an eminent lawyer from Toronto for the purpose of throwing dust in the eyes of the Committee in order to prevent their adopting the Bill. I was very glad to see, however, that the Committee adopted the principle of the Bill. I am not a lawyer, and I am not capable of seeing the defects in the Bill to which reference has been made, but I hope it will meet the case, and if it does not, I hope the Minister of Justice, or someone in his place, will follow it up and make amendments next Session so as to release the people from the extortion of paying a fixed price for all these articles which they consume. Take the case of the sugar combine in the United States. The United States consume 2,800,000,000 pounds of sugar a year. There was a combine formed a few years ago to raise the price of sugar, and almost every manufacturer in the United States joined that combine. At that time sugar was sold for $5.93 per hundred pounds. It rose immediately afterwards to 6½ cents a pound and to-day it is selling at about 7 cents. The result of that organisation has been that sugar has been raised in the United States about $10 a barrel. When we consider the enormous consumption of sugar in that country, we must see the enormous amount which is made by that combine, and we are all pretty well acquainted with the evils which result from such a system. This Bill is only intended to give effect to the sentiments of the country in this regard, and to the report which has been submitted to Parliament. By adopting that, we will render the country a great service by preventing the introduction, the existence and the growth of institutions which are established only to rob the public out of their just rights and liberties.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no subject which has engaged the attention of this House during the present Parliament so important as the one now under consideration, and the evils the outcome of which this Bill is introduced to remedy. The rapidity with which combinations, trusts, monopolies and other institutions of man's invention, have been organised and have grown during the last few years, not only on the continent of America but also in Europe, is most alarming. Capital is piled together, men are associated in society who delegate their rights to others so as to evade the law, until to-day, in almost every line of life, magnificent institutions are controlled by, and great interests are centred in a few hands, and the important interests of the producer on the one hand, and the consumer on the other, are sacrificed by these combines. A very able American writer who has looked over the subject carefully, asks, what is the object of combines? We have heard a good many gentlemen, who are themselves interested in combines, who came before the Committee of Banking and Commerce and asserted that the object of these combines in Canada is not for evil, but only good, that they are harmless in their nature, that they allowed men not only to associate their capital together, but to bring their united intelligence to bear upon some object for the purpose of carrying on the same lines of commerce more economically than they otherwise could, and thereby give the best result of their labor to the country. Is that the object of those gentlemen who have formed combines on the other side? I have in my hand an ably written little pamphlet by Mr. William W. Cook, an eminent lawyer in New York, who has gone very carefully over the subject, and he says:

"There can be no denial of the fact that a 'trust' is organised to do away with competition. Without that result it is a failure; with it it is a success."

Now, competition is the only guarantee we have that the article produced will be given to the people at the least possible price. We only need look at the success that has attended these organisations throughout Canada and the United States, and European countries; we need only look to their success to know that the aim they have had in view has been accomplished, and the result has been, as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) very rightly stated, to bring back millions of capital to the pockets of those parties who are engaged in these combines:

"The modern 'trust' is a monoply in its purposes, its plans and its culmination. It is a combination that strikes down all competitors. The parties combine to control the market and to control it without competition."

He goes on to say:

"To all these the public at each end of the industry, the producer and consumer, is, and is intended to be, in a certain sense at the mercy of the syndicate or combination. The main purpose, management and effect of all upon the public is the same, to wit—the aggregation of capital, the power of controlling the manufacture and output of various necessary commodities. The acquisition or destruction of competitive properties all leading to the final and conclusive purposes of annihilating competition and enabling the industries represented in the combination to fix the prices at which they would purchase the raw material from the producer, and at which they would sell the product, refined or useful, to the consumer."

Now, if this is the object of these combines, and their success, I think, is the best proof that it has been their object, we might ask: Do they injuriously affect competition? This same author, who has given a great deal of attention to this subject, says most unmistakably that they do affect competition. Speaking of the sugar trust he says:

"85 per cent of the sugar refining business, formed a combination or trust. The remaining refineries, being two in San Francisco, two in Philadelphia, one in Boston and one in St. Louis, representing altogether 15 per cent. of the business, did not take part."

What was the result?

"By order of the 'trust' two refineries in Boston have been closed, two in New York, two others have been temporarily shut down, and still others have had their production decreased one-fourth. Refined sugar has advanced in price from ¾ to 1 cent a pound since the 'trust' was formed. Refined sugar was worth in February, 1887, 5·93, but in February, 1888, was worth 6·88.

"The average price of granulated sugar in 1887 was 6 cents, but the average price during January, 1888 was 7 1/16 cents. Competition has practically disappeared. The San Francisco sugar rarely gets further east than the Missouri River, and never competes east of Chicago The object of the 'trust' is frankly stated to be to 'limit the production.' Mr. Havemeyer, the great refiner and leader of the 'trust' stated that refined sugar in America costs the consumer about 2⅜ cents a pound more than in England, or about $10 per barrel."

Now, that is unmistakeable evidence that the object of the trust has been attained by the combination of these capitalists. In various other lines we find the same condition of things exist. I said that trusts and combines to-day are growing with startling rapidity in this country. Why do I say so? Because I find that last year no less than three different committees were appointed, two in the United States and one in Canada, to look into this question and see how far the law could control them. What is the result of that? I take the commission that was appointed in New York, and I find that although they only sat for a short time, they examined into the Standard Oil Trust, represented by no less than 39 companies, representing over $50,000,000 of capital. Then we have the Sugar Trust, representing nearly $50,000,000 of capital also. They examined also into the Milk Trust, Labor Trust, the Rubber Trust, the Cotton Seed Oil Trust, controlling 85 companies, the Envelope Trust, the Elevator Trust, the Butchers' Trust or Combination, the Glass Trust and the Furniture Trust. All

these are only a few that were examined into by the commission that sat last year in New York. It is surprising to see with what rapidity and in what great numbers trusts have sprung up during the last few years in almost every line of manufacture. I have before me the same author, who goes on to speak of the Standard Oil Trust, and I find that in the State of New York there are 14 companies practically amalgamated into one, controlled by a few individuals; in the State of New Jersey, 3; Pennsylvania, 9; Ohio, 4; Kentucky, 1; Maryland, 1; West Virginia, 11; Illinois, 1; Minnesota, 1; Missouri, 1; and Massachusetts, 2; Maine, 1; Iowa, 2; in all 41 companies, controlling a capital of over $50,000,000. In not a single State is there that live competition that is the best guarantee that the consumer gets what he buys at the lowest price at which it can by manufactured. These great institutions, some of them having a backing of $50,000,000 behind them, have devised means to evade the laws of the country, and they have been succesful in almost every instance in evading the law; and it is to-day one of the important requirements, not only of the State but of the Federal Government, to devise a law that will reach these combinations. They have been taken up under the common law, under the Companies' Act, and under various laws, but up to the present time they have not been successfully combatted. I take the next important trust, the American cotton seed oil trust. I find that 85 companies are amalgamated into one, and instead of the manufacturers paying $24 a ton as formerly for the raw material, $4 a ton is paid, and still the producer on the one hand is obliged to receive a pittance for the raw material he sells, and the manufacturer is able to sell his article at a higher figure than when the producer of the raw material received double the value he does now for his product. Some say we have a gigantic issue on hand, and the question is asked as to how we can combat it. Some hon. gentlemen opposite say that this may be done by free trade. We have the experience of the Americans who are endeavoring to combat these trusts. What do they propose? Do they propose free trade? If free trade were a remedy, we would expect to find combinations only in protected countries. If so, we would expect to find them existing to a large extent in the United States. It is true they are to be found there; but it is equally true that they date back as far in history as 1674, that they have existed in Portugal, Spain and England, and on taking up a paper to-day I observed that a gigantic salt trust has been framed on this continent in connection with the English salt trust, by which it is hoped to control the output of the two countries in that product. This goes to show that these trusts are not only to be found in countries where protective tariffs exist, but also in countries which have a free trade policy. I find the following paragraph in a New York evening paper:—

"New York, 19th.—An afternoon paper says F. B. Thurber and Erastus Wiman are the chief promoters in this country of the projected salt trust. Associated with them are a number of prominent English capitalists controlling $25,000,000."

This Mr. Wiman is the celebrated and patriotic gentleman who is so much interested in Canada to-day. This combination has gone so far as to endeavor to control the salt product of the United States as well as England, and there is danger that Canada may fall under a similar combination, and I venture to say that salt will be advanced from 75 cents a barrel to $1 or $1.25. Not only, then, do we find these combinations in countries enjoying a protective tariff, but they are equally prosperous in free trade countries such as England. We find them also engaged in lines of business that are not affected by any tariff. We have the gigantic combination controlling elevators in America, also the milk trust, but in neither of these lines can a tariff affect the situation, seeing there is no duty on either. I have here a summary of the means proposed by the various States to remedy this evil. There are some gentlemen on the other side of the line who hold that these combinations can only successfully be worked where a high protective tariff prevails, and accordingly they propose to do away with protective duties; but there are comparatively few who assail the combinations on that ground. Several remedies are suggested for the punishment of those engaged in combines, trusts and monopolies, as follows: First, making them illegal and possibly those who violate the provisions of the law, reporting them. Second, for admitting free of duty all articles or goods of manufacture or produce which are controlled or affected directly by such trusts, combines or monopolies. Third, a third party introduces a Bill to appoint a commission to enquire into these trusts, combines, &c., whose duty would be to report to the president from time to time, the results of their enquiries, and that when 60 per cent. of the article or product was affected in price, or limited in output by it, to provide punishment for the offence. Fourth, a fourth Bill is to impose a tax on merchandise, manufactures, commodities or products, manufactured, produced, purchased or held by said parties, equal in amount to 40 per cent. of the value of such commodity. And that no allowance of drawback shall be given on any goods so held or produced under these provisions. Fifth, to provide for placing on the free list,—3 Bills. To define trusts and provide for punishment,—16 Bills. To tax the products of trusts, &c.,—1 Bill. A large number of Bills have been introduced into the different State Legislatures with a view to suppress trusts, and many members of those legislatures and members of Congress entertain views in harmony with the view laid down by the Minister of Justice and the member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who has endeavored to frame a Bill for the punishment of these parties. In the United States 14 or 15 Bills have been introduced to meet the evil of trusts. None, however, have successfully met the case, and these trusts are steadily spreading, and we have the highest legal opinion in the country that the only successful way of combating them is by making known to the consuming population the nature of the monopoly and the extent of the evil, to build up a public sentiment showing the necessity of the law, as a public opinion was built up behind the Railway Commission so strong that it would not tolerate the evils another hour. When we do that in this case, Parliament must place an Act on the Statute-book to punish those offenders. It is by giving the people information on this subject that we shall build up public sentiment. I have shown that efforts have constantly been made to evade the laws by combinations and trusts in every country. In Canada the same thing prevails to-day. On the other hand, it is said that this is a monstrous proposal. There is one argument in connection with the matter which has not been pointed out by hon. gentlemen opposite who have said that this Bill is harmless. If it were harmless, it is strange that its passage through Committee should have been fought every stage by interested parties. But whether it is harmless or not, we desire to hang it up as a warning to the public that these iniquitous arrangements will not be tolerated in this country, and we are prepared to fight these combinations by legislation. Again, we ask from what quarter does the opposition come? Does it come from the producers or the agricultural class? No; they are largely in favor of the Bill, because they are injured by combinations. Does it come from the consumers? No; but it comes from parties interested directly or indirectly in the combines or trusts. One of its strongest opponents has been the Toronto Board of Trade, and yet between 50 and 60 of those gentlemen are interested in combinations, and some of the members who came down to tell Parliament why we should not interfere with harmless combinations were the very men who are receiving large profits from

those combinations. They said that the sugar trust did not not effect any interest; but a retailer of sugar in my village said he was satisfied that if the combine did not exist he would be able to sell it to his customers one cent or one cent and a half less than at present. The trade is controlled by the sugar guild and the grocers' guild, and the retailers must pay their prices. Then there is the oatmeal combine. At one meeting they raised the price 35 cents a barrel, at the next meeting 25 cents a barrel. The next meeting they raised it 30 cents a barrel and it is said that each man was bound to sell only a certain quantity from his mill. If he sold less than that quantity the combine gave him 30 cents for every barrel less than the quantity allotted to him, and if he sold more he paid the combine 30 cents for each barrel over the amount, which went to keep mills in some other parts of the country idle. The result was that seven or eight of our important oatmeal mills were kept idle, even in some localities which I am informed paid a large bonus for the erection of those mills, so that the price of oats might be enhanced to the farmers of the locality. The machinery of those mills was left idle and rusting because of those combinations, and, as a practical benefit which has already resulted from the introduction of this Bill, I see that only a few days ago the oatmeal millers combine was dissolved by mutual consent. They knew this law was being put on the statutes, they were afraid it would reach them and so they dissolved. We find also that many men who a few years ago were interested in combines are now in a hurry to tell the people that they are not connected with them at all, and that they want fair competition in their line of trade. We have this feeling shown by the manufacturers of binding twine, by the oatenmeal millers, and by those engaged in several branches of manufactures. I do not care how little this law reaches the combines, if it reaches them at all; if it punishes one man in a thousand I hold that it is time that it should be put on the statutes I say that the feeling against combines is growing so strong in the country today, that whatever hon. gentlemen may be inclined to oppose this Bill now, in a year hence he will not dare go back to his constituents and say: I was one of the men who opposed putting a law on the Statute-books to punish those men engaged in combines and trusts. At this late period of the Session I do not wish to take up the time of the House further then to express the hope that this Bill will become law. If after experience we no not find it is effectual in reaching the combines, it will be our duty from time to time to amend its provisions so as so reach them, until we have not only a law against combines that will reach all, but also a public sentiment which will sustain that law and cause men who contemplate joining such associations to see the impossibility, in the face of that public opinion, of carrying out their nefarious designs. We must deal with the matter until we have a public sentiment which will enforce that healthy competition which is the only fair guarantee to the consumer on the one hand and to the producer on the other.

Mr. McCULLA. I believe it my duty to raise my voice in support of the measure now before the House. I have the honor to represent a farming constituency and I can thoroughly agree with the gentleman who has last spoken that there is a growing feeling on the part of the people whom we represent that we should legislate against, and suppress those combines. I know that this feeling is becoming very prevalent in the country because I have had many communications from our farmers enquiring as to the likelihood of this measure becoming law, and expressing anxiety that it should be placed on the Statute-book. The people are thoroughly aroused against those combines; they know what they have suffered from the coal combine, the undertakers combine, the salt combine lately, and the other combinations and conspiracies which were to a certain extent filching the money from the pockets of the honest farmers and artisans of this country. I would also express my belief that the insurance combine is as bad as the rest, if not the most iniquitous. I can give you an instance of the injustice of the insurance combine in my own town. Up to the year 1885 we had no fire protection there whatever and in certain seasons of the year when there was most danger from fire the river flowing through the town would dry up. The town of Brampton set to work and at a large large expenditure they secured one of the best fire protection services in the country. We have water works there now which cost something like $90,000 and we have 50 hydrants in the town with 60 pounds pressure on each hydrant. In fact within the last ten years not $2,000 have been lost by fires in the town; yet notwithstanding all this our insurance rate to-day is just as high as when we had no fire protection service at all. That is unfair and unjust to the business community of our town, and I hope that the Bill so far as it affects insurance companies will remain a part of the law. I have always been a supporter of the National Policy. I believe it is a policy which is in the interests of the country, because by it we foster and support our own industries and manufactures, give employment to our own artisans and as a result create a home consuming market for our farmers. While I am a strong supporter of the National Policy and while we have promised our farmers and our consumers that they would have the benefit of home competition—that competition which would reduce prices; and that the protection put on would not increase the price of any commodities that we require—I believe, Sir, at the same time that while we should protect our people from outside interference in trade we must protect our consumers and give them the benefit of the greatest amount of free trade in the home market that we can. I believe we must have free trade in our own markets on all the articles people wish to consume, and I hope the measure now before the House will become law. I know that the people in the section of the country I have the honor to represent are strongly in favor of this measure and of its becoming the law of the land.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not think that there are any hon. members of this House who will not admit that combinations are a bad thing and should be repressed. Whether the Bill that is now before the House is sufficient for that purpose or not I do not know, but I think it is a step in the right direction and ought to receive the support of the House. It must have amused the House, however, to hear the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) denounce in such eloquent terms the oatmeal millers, the elevator combines and the cotton seed men while he had not one single word to say about the combine that he himself is a member of. One of the greatest combines in this country to-day is the medical combine. That hon. gentleman in eloquent terms denounced every other business man and every other manufacturer in this country because they were forming combines, and with almost tears running down his cheeks he denounced the enormous crimes that were being committed, while he forgot all the time that he was a member of one of the greatest and most arbitrary combinations that exist in Canada to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to tell the hon. gentleman that there is no combine good, bad or indifferent among medical men.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a trades union.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not think that the House will agree with the member for East Grey there. I regret that the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) when he introduced this Bill did not include the medical profession and I can assure him that if he had introduced a provision to make them regulate their profession a little better than

they do, that he would have received strong support and that it would have been the most popular measure that had ever been introduced in this House. With all due aspect to many hon. friends around me I think the legal profession ought also be prevented from combining and I think the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) made a mistake in not including them with the doctors. I believe that a little wholesome legislation in restraining the lawyers would not be amiss at all.

Mr. LAURIER. You may have law suits then.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. gentleman says I may have law suits then and if I have I am prepared to defend myself, but I do think that a mistake was made that this Bill did not include those two professions which I believe are very close corporations. It did amuse me, if it did not amuse the House also, to see the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) with tears running down his cheeks dilating on the enormous crimes that the poor oatmeal millers and some few other manufacturers were perpetrating on the people of the country. I may tell the hon. gentleman that taking all the oatmeal millers in the country into consideration, I do not believe there is a single one of them who has made any profit during the last few years. I am not interested in the business at all, but I do know that with the thousands of dollars they have invested in property, with all the employment they give, and the ready market they furnish to the farmers, I do not think there is a single branch of manufacturing industry to-day which is in such a depressed condition as that of the oatmeal millers; and I think that, instead of spending all his wrath and indignation on them, the hon. gentleman ought to have reserved a little for the corporation which he is a member of.

Mr. COLTER. This question is a very important question, and I am very much pleased to see it taken hold of so generally on both sides of the House. It is important for this reason: It is well known that the great mass of the people are suffering from some cause, and that cause is the fact that they are overcharged for the various commodities which they are obliged to buy. It is true, this evil is due in the main to these combinations and trusts, which the hon. member for East Grey alleges are growing to the detriment of the people. Now, it is well known that the facility for forming these combinations increases as the scope is narrowed; when we have the production of certain commodities limited to a few individuals, it is easy to bring about a combination; and I feel satisfied that the only way in which these combinations can be effectively met is by having the duties very much lowered on many of these articles which are the subjects of these combinations. Now, the people who have voted in the past in favor of a high protective policy are now complaining, and they have no just reason to complain. They are simply reaping what they have sown, and they demand that they shall be protected to a large extent from the consequences of that which they have brought upon themselves. They have asked for something tangible from this House. I am not at all satisfied with a great many remarks which have been made by hon. members. Some say, let us pass this measure, and if it is not found effective, like the Bucket Shop Bill, let us then amend it and put it into better shape. I submit that that is not proper or just. We should not send forth from this House crude and unworkable legislation, and I feel satisfied that this Bill will not meet the just demands and requirements of the people. They are asking for bread, and some hon. gentlemen propose to give them a stone. Some hon. gentlemen have argued as though a conspiracy to limit facilities for transportation, to lessen production, or to increase prices, is unlawful; but that is not what this Bill says. It goes further, and says there must be an unlawful combination to do this. By introducing this word "unlawful," you simply revert to the common law, as has been alleged on this side of the House and has not been denied on the other side. The hon. member for East Grey presses for the adoption of this Bill, and he says that in the United States they have resorted to the common law, and that they found that effective.

Mr. SPROULE. No, they passed a Bill only last week in Illinois to change the common law.

Mr. COLTER. It was alleged that they had resorted to the common law and to other legislation as well, and that those attempts had proven unsuccessful, although the parties making them had spent large sums of money and had exposed themselves to risk in prosecuting these cases. We have to consider that if we put a defective Bill on the Statute-book, and anyone tries to bring these combinesters to book and fails, he may be sued for malicious prosecution and mulcted in heavy damages, and we have a right to see that defective legislation does not pass this House, but that the people will have something to protect them effectively from the abuses of which they complain. This Bill simply continues that which exists at present. It does not make it an offence to conspire to restrain production, transportation or manufacture, and to enhance prices in that way; but these things, to constitute offences, must be done unlawfully. The whole effective power of this Bill is the common law, and it has been said by many that the common law is obselete, and to some extent uncertain; therefore we are only giving to the people something uncertain, and only likely to end in disastrous failure. I am heartily in accord with the principle of such a measure as the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) and other hon. gentlemen opposite seem to desire; but I do not wish any apology for such a measure, as this Bill is. Therefore it is highly desirable that this House should see that the measure which is passed this Session shall be such as will meet the requirements of the people. This House will be made ridiculous if this measure should be tested and proved abortive; it would be simply trifling with the people; and they might become discouraged and say: It is of no use to resist these combinations in the hope of preventing the attacks they are making on our rights and liberties. We do not wish to discourage the people, and therefore I submit that this Bill should receive much more careful consideration than it has received. It has been said that certain combinesters were very much interested in thwarting this Bill. That is true; they were interested in thwarting it in its original shape; they were afraid it might be made effective; but now we find them perfectly at their ease; they do not fear this Bill, and they have no particular reason to fear it; and if this measure is passed these gentlemen will go on and do in the future as they have been doing in the past. Now, the remarks of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) were very pertinent indeed. There must be something to make this Bill definite if we wish to make it effective. It is not definite. By the Bill these combinations are unlawful only by reason of the common law, and as the common law has proved unavailing to meet those evils in the past, it must necessarily prove unavailing under this Bill also. I have no faith whatever in the moral effect such a Bill is likely to produce. If these people are making money by oppressing the mass of the people, moral considerations will not influence them in the slightest; we require something stronger. They are not going to be frightened by any brave words we may use; we must have something to punish their offences definitely and thoroughly. I am not disposed to keep the House any longer in discussing this Bill. I simply wish to put my views on record, in order that if the Bill should not realise the anticipations which hon. gentlemen on the other side expect from it, they will feel that they themselves are to blame, and the country will hold them responsible for such legislation.

Mr. GUILLET. I am a little surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Colter). That hon. gentleman attended the Banking and Commerce Committee on the occasion when large deputations, representing the combines appeared before it to oppose this Bill. They came to oppose, not the old Bill, but the present Bill, and they opposed it because they know it will deal effectively with the combines and punish such associations severely. These deputations went away very much disappointed, and loudly declaring their indignation. A great deal of ridicule has been endeavored to be thrown upon the Bill because it provides that unlawful acts should be punished. It was well explained in the Banking and Commerce Committee by the highest legal authority in this country that the word "unlawful" was necessary in order to prevent the law being applied to proper and innocent restraints of trade. The Minister of Justice explained that under this Bill unless the word "unlawful" were inserted, if a railway company withdrew one train service a day, while still giving ample accommodation by running two trains a day, it would be liable to the penalty simply because it withdrew that unnecessary train. In the same way, under this section with regard to limiting or lessening the manufacture or production, if the word unlawful were not inserted, any individual producer or importer or vessel owner or grain dealer would be liable to the penalty if he chose to close down his industry or refrained from selling his grain, or laid up his vessel. The manufacturer or the individual has a right to do what he likes with his own industry and capital. It is only when combinations exist that they become unlawful in the common law, and, therefore, that word must be inserted in order to prevent individuals, in the exercise of their right, from being punished.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. ELLIS. It is objectionable to make a difference between a corporation and an individual. It it true a fine is imposed on a corporation much larger than on the individual, but I think the Act ought to be so drawn that if a private member of a corporation conspires, he should be treated in the same way as any other individual. The result of this section will be that a rich corporation can carry on its business without being subject to imprisonment like the individual. It would be easy to alter the Bill so as to make the individual responsible, and not make our legislation so much in favor of corporations at the expense of the individuals.

Mr. WALLACE. The penalty of the individual is not more than $1,000 and not less than $200, while that of a corporation is not exceeding $10,000, and not less than $1,000. The penalty for a corporation is much higher, but there could not be imprisonment in its case as in the case of an individual.

Mr. EDGAR. In order that the mover of this Bill may have an opportunity of showing whether he really desires to lessen the punishment for the crime of conspiracy, I will move an amendment to increase the term of imprisonment to a term not exceeding seven years, and it is not now exceeding two years in the Act. That would leave still the minimum of $200, which the Minister of Justice seems to think a restrictive provision. I move to insert the word "seven" in place of "two," in line 26. That will bring the penalty back to what it is in the Revised Statutes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no desire on the part of those who are in favor of the Bill to reduce the penalties of the law; but, as I said before, the enactment which prescribes an imprisonment of seven years for conspiracy would never, by any judge, be applied to conspiracy merely in restraint of trade. If an hon. gentleman can put a case in which a person who has offended against the provisions of this Bill would be sentenced to seven years in the penitentiary, I would very much like to hear it. In an offence of this kind the offender would be liable to a heavy pecuniary penalty, with the alternative of imprisonment for a period not exceeding two years.

On section 4,

Mr. COLTER. I would suggest that it might be advisable to have these actions brought before the Superior Court Judges in Ontario instead of before the County Court Judges, in order to have the law uniform.

Mr. WALLACE. I beg to move that the following be added as section 5:—

The foregoing provisions of this Act shall not apply to the exercise of any handicraft or the performance of labor, but, subject to such exception, it shall be construed as if section 22 of the Trades Unions Act had not been enacted.

Mr. TISDALE. This Bill has been before the Banking and Commerce Committee, and I think we ought not now to amend it. This amendment may create a good deal of discussion, and the promoter should know his own mind. Many amendments were suggested in the Committee, and several members of that Committee are not here now when we have an important clause proposed, which may involve a great deal of discussion.

Mr. WALLACE. I think every member of the Banking and Commerce Committee is a member of this House and should be here if required. I believe this is a clause which will meet with no objection from any member of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not see any necessity for this clause. The Bill refers to any combination unlawfully formed to do certain things. As I understand, the Trades Unions may lawfully do certain things, and this only deals with what is unlawful.

Mr. EDGAR. It is impossible, when a complicated section like this is read from the Chair, to understand it at once, without looking into the law.

Mr. TISDALE. If this amendment is pressed, I shall move that the Committee rise and report, unless we are able to see the application of it. It is true, as the mover says, that the other members of the Committee might have been here, but this is a new proposal by the promoter of the Bill, and I cannot judge sufficiently of the effect of it with out having an opportunity of looking into the law. It may be quite a proper provision, but I am unable to say whether it is or not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not agree with my hon. friend that there is any obligation to pass the Bill simply as it comes from a Committee. The Committee on Banking and Commerce is a very important one, but there is nothing to prevent any member from making suggestions to improve the Bill in Committee of the Whole, nor should any member absent himself under the impression that the Bill may not be amended. This is not a new provision, because the last clause of the hon. gentleman's Bill, as it was first introduced, was as follows:—

"Nothing in this Act contained shall be construed to modify or affect in any manner chapter 131 of the Revised Statutes respecting Trades Unions."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was necessary in that Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Quite so, but the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) is here making it perfectly plain that the provisions we are enacting shall not interfere with the right of workingmen to agree among themselves as to the wages for their labor and handicraft, and that the Bill

shall otherwise be simply declaratory of the common law, and shall not be interfered with by that particular statute.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Harbors and Rivers, Nova Scotia..... $7,650

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Digby, $1,650. What is this vote for?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is a revote of the last amount, and is to pay contractors. This was a pier or a block that was built at the end, and the pier itself was improved.

Harbors and Rivers, New Brunswick..... $2,692 60

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Here is an item of $355.60 for the River St. John, River Des Chutes to Woodstock and above Grand Falls; also River Tobique; what is this for?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to pay the balance of the expense incurred during the year for the improvement of the channel on the River St. John, by removing boulders, snags and other obstructions between the River Des Chutes and Fredericton, and above Grand Falls. The first half is for navigation, and the remainder for removing obstructions. Wing dams have also been built and tow paths repaired.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). There is no navigation on that part of the river now. A few years ago tow boats and steamers ran to Grand Falls, but now the river is bridged at that point. Three miles above Grand Falls is the American boundary. Has the American Government contributed anything?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. SKINNER. I think the money has been expended for the purpose of improving the river for driving logs. I am not very familiar with it, but by reason of some professional engagements I have been enabled to learn that improvements were required to be made for the purpose of handling lumber, and such improvements have been made.

Mr. GILLMOR. Does my hon. friend suppose that every one that has to drive logs down a stream comes to the Dominion Parliament to get aid for clearing up the stream? Do we vote money here to enable a man who cuts and hauls logs on the upper St. John, to clear the boulders out of the way so that he can drive his logs down the river? No such thing as that was ever heard of anywhere. No money has been voted to clear the boulders out of the St. Croix River, nor any other river in New Brunswick. The hon. gentleman certainly cannot advocate such a use of public money as that.

Mr. SKINNER. The hon. gentleman need not turn to me about advocating it. I am not advocating the expenditure of this money that has been made upon the river. So far as that matter is concerned, the River St. John drains the whole range of country for several hundred miles, and it is to the interest of the general public, and of the lumbermen, that they should be enabled to send their logs down the river.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If this money was expended for the purpose of improving the river for the convenience of lumbermen, I most decidedly object.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no doubt that one object was to improve the river for the convenience of those having logs to drive down the river.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). About 20 years ago steamers went up as far as Woodstock, but since the railway has been built, these boats have all left the river. Occasionally a boat comes as far as Woodstock, but above Woodstock they do not go, because there is a bridge at that place and there is another bridge at Andover. There is no such thing as a navigation of the river. There used to be tow boats on the river, but they also are practically out of use. I do not see myself what navigation there can be. I believe that between 20 and 40 years ago a small steamer ran up above Grand Falls. I do not know what works at Edmundston could be used for except for driving logs. On the Tobique River there is no navigation. I cannot understand for what purpose these sums are to be expended.

Mr. HALE. The money is intended for the improvement of the tow path on the Tobique River. Tow boats are still used there and also above Edmundston, and they have been used up to last fall on the Little Madawaska. This expenditure is not for the purpose of driving logs, but for the improvement of the tow path and clearing the channel at these two points.

Mr. MITCHELL. I desire to bring before the Minister a matter in connection with my own county. I approve of the vote now under consideration for the improvement of rivers, and the experience of the member for Carleton (Mr. Hale) is quite in accordance with my own experience in regard to towpaths on my own river. I made a modest request three years ago, when I was in better favor with the Government than I am to-day, and when I overlooked a great many of their enormous iniquities and voted for them fairly well, that they should appropriate an amount for an improvement of a wharf at Neguac. I have asked the Minister of Public Works for this improvement, which is among his own compatriots, and it is for improving the facilities for landing from a little freight and passenger steamer that runs from Chatham to that place. I have asked for $1,200 for this work. I have been told by the Minister that he would place the matter before Council and endeavor to have it passed. I am afraid hon. gentlemen opposite wish members to vote for them whether they are right or wrong, and especially when they are wrong. I have been very moderate in my demands and have been four years pressing this little honest claim for an improvement to be carried out among a colony of Acadians, who were among the first settlers in the country. I notice that all these items are for expenditures to be made in constituencies represented either by members of the Government or their supporters. The first vote, River St. John, is in the constituency of the Minister of Inland Revenue; that for Point du Chesne, Shediac, is in the county of Westmoreland, whose representative supports the Government; that at Grand Anse is in the county of the hon. member for Gloucester, and that at Belliveau village is also in the county of the hon. member for Westmoreland. I am satisfied that if this matter rested with the Minister of Public Works himself, the amount would be granted. I am told, however, there is an obstacle in the Cabinet, who is put there to stop grants, the Minister of Finance. I may remind him, however, that the Session is not yet closed, and that I want this little vote. It does not amount to much and it would be a just act, and I can get certificates from numbers of members on both sides of the House that the condition of the landing in that locality should be improved. The aid should be given if only to show that the Government approve of the few votes I have given them. If members are only to get money when they vote for the Government, I can say that I have in former times, as well as recently, voted with them, and some pretty tough votes they have been. I trust the amount I have asked will be placed in the Supplementary Estimates. It is not an amount of millions for a Chignecto Ship Canal, or for a Short Line Railway, or for steamship subsidies, but it

has what those proposals have not, the element of justice, and I hope the sum will be placed in the Estimates.

General repairs and improvements in the Maritime Provinces..... $3,350

Mr. FLYNN. I call to the notice of the Minister of Public Works the condition of the breakwater at L'Ardoise, in the county of Richmond. The upper part of the breakwater has been carried away, and the work is now in a dangerous condition for the fishermen. I trust the remaining portion of the work will be either removed or the whole structure will be rebuilt.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The note here says that the damage caused by the storm can be repaired for five or perhaps eight thousand dollars.

Mr. FLYNN. Has the hon. gentleman any idea of repairing the pier?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say now. I will take a note of what the hon. gentleman said, and I will consult the chief engineer and lay the matter before my colleagues.

Mr. LAURIER. Does this vote complete the work on the Rivière Ste Anne?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; that completes the work. I may explain that we have not been in the habit of putting these small items in the Supplementary Estimates, because the custom was that when there was a vote amongst a large number of items, provided the whole amount was not exceeded, the Auditor General allowed the special vote to be supplemented out of the others; but now he objects to that, and I do not say he is wrong. He says that each vote for each work should not be exceeded, and if we have to exceed it, then we must ask for a special vote.

Mr. LAURIER. Are these works constructed by contract or days' labor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As a rule, they are by contract.

Harbors and Rivers, Ontario..... $10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is Tolsma Bay, and what is this revote of $2,700 required for?

Mr. DAWSON. If I may be allowed to explain. It is a little bay between the Lesser Manitoulin and the Greater Manitoulin, and it is the route by which vessels come in from the Great Lake to the north channel of Lake Huron. A little wharf has been put there at which vessels can lie over during night in stormy weather, and that is what this money is for.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I spoke to the hon. Minister this Session, and I also wrote to him, with reference to the winding ground on the River Sydenham at Dresden, and the hon. gentleman said that it was under consideration and that he would submit an estimate to his colleagues; I do not see any in these Estimates.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These are for the current year, I will not forget to lay this matter before my colleagues.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman had some work done at Point Edward last year. Will he say whether it was completed or not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think it is completed. If it is not completed, we will complete it.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not see anything in this vote for the improvement of the navigation of the Trent waters. I would like to know from the Minister of Public Works if we may expect anything in that direction this year.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must ask the hon. gentleman to wait until the Supplementary Estimates come down for the year commencing the 1st of July.

Mr. MULOCK. But these Estimates will not apply to this year. If we have to wait to the 1st of July it means that nothing will be done this year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It does not mean that. Sometimes, if the work is a pressing one, we may undertake it before the 1st of July, taking care that the contractors will wait for their pay until we have the amount of money at our disposal.

Mr. MULOCK. Does not the Government consider the Trent Canal works very pressing?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no doubt they may be; but when the Minister of Railways is in his place he will tell you.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is the Minister of Railways?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The First Minister.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Am I to understand that the hon. gentleman intends to rebuild the pier at Portsmouth Harbor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

New dredging plant..... $5,000

Mr. MITCHELL. I would call the Minister's attention to the fact that for a number of years—it occurred chiefly while I was a supporter of the Government—the hon. Minister sent down a dredge annually to the Miramichi River to deepen the channel from 18 to 22 feet at the opening of the bar. I am informed by gentlemen interested in the port that the whole trade of the port has changed in the last few years. Instead of the business being done in wooden vessels drawing 16 or 17 feet of water, they have largely disappeared and it is done by steamers drawing from 20 to 22 feet. The channel has been cleared, largely by the offorts of the Minister of Public Works, for which I thank him very much, but there is inside the river what is known as Gordon's Flats, a point which these large vessels find a great difficulty in passing. A dredge, such as we had there before, would remove the difficulty in a fortnight or a month, and give these steamers the deep water necessary. Gentlemen connected with the trade have informed me that in making the charters for their vessels, they have to load them free on board. The effect of that is this, that the steamers coming there are so large that they have partially to load at Chatham and send down a portion of their cargo in barges. Our people in the spruce trade, in order to compete in Europe with the supplies from the Baltic, have to work very close to avoid all possible expense, and a very small outlay of the time of a dredge would save them a great deal. I understand that the hon. Minister is sending a dredge down to the Restigouche River, and if the hon. gentleman would allow her to give a fortnight or four weeks of her time to complete the work I call his attention to, it would be a great boon to the people.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. What depth?

Mr. MITCHELL. The same depth as the bar, an addition of two or three feet to the present depth. The deepening of the bar of the Miramichi has been maintained, it remains as it had been left by the dredge, and it has been a great boon to that part of the country, and a great saving to producers of lumber. I trust that the hon. gentleman will send a dredge there as early as possible during the summer to spend two or three weeks or as long as it is necessary to do that very small work.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will make a note of it, and attend to it.

Bridges, Ottawa City, over the river Ottawa, the slides, the Rideau Canal and approaches thereto.. $3,600

Mr. LISTER. Why is this charge made for building bridges in the city of Ottawa ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These bridges were taken over by the Government, under an arrangement with the city of Ottawa some years ago, which was laid before the House, and they have to be kept in repair.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not see why we should do this work any more than we should build bridges in London over the River Thames. The people there have their own bridges to keep up, and I do not see why the Government should do any more for the city of Ottawa than for any other city in the Dominion. It seems to me monstrous that a large portion of the municipal expenses of Ottawa should be charged to the country.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The slides are artificial channels made by the Government for the purpose of facilitating the descent of timber, and the Government derives very large tolls from those slides.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is this to be said, that the River Ottawa is the dividing line between the two Provinces, and we have always had to sustain the bridge over that river, and I presume, as regards it, that the Government are quite right in doing what they are doing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I take it that this vote has nothing to do with the Suspension Bridge between the two provinces, but that the bridges over the Ottawa referred to are those which span the small streamlets in the neighborhood of the slides.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; this includes expenditure on the Suspension Bridge between Ottawa and Hull. We had a special vote, as the hon. gentleman will remember, of $35,000 I think, for the rebuilding of that bridge, and we have asked for a revote of that amount, because the contract could not be executed at the time we took the vote; but in the meantime we have to keep up the present structure, perhaps even more carefully than before, as we do not like to have any accident whilst we are rebuilding the bridge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this for that bridge ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is, and also for the bridge over the slides, and the bridges over the canal.

Mr. ELLIS. It seems specially objectionable that we should maintain what are practically streets in the city of Ottawa. We cannot get a bridge for a harbor like St. John without contributing an equal amount, and yet the Government here pay the expense of keeping up what are practically highways in the city of Ottawa, and the other day the mayor of the city and members of the Council called on the hon. gentleman, and asked him to build a street to the Experimental Farm. Unless one raises his voice in protest against such things, they will go on increasing with complex power.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have not heard any reason why we should give this. In no other part of the Dominion is Dominion money expended for local improvements.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was an agreement made some years ago between the Government and the municipal authorities by which these works were to be taken under the charge of the Government, and the bridges, as well as Wellington Street, were to be kept up by the Government. The reason was that we have very large property here which does not contribute a single cent to the city, and the city could not make up the deficiency in the revenue and keep up these streets and bridges at their own expense. They and the Government thought, and Parliament assented to it, that there should be compensation of some kind in order to do our share in that respect. Instead of paying taxes, which the Government do not pay, we undertook to keep up those bridges and the street opposite our buildings, from the bridges down to Bank Street.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is another reason. This being the capital of the country, we should certainly do a little extra for it; but the capital generally sends two good supporters of the Ministry, and I really think this vote ought to pass.

Mr. McMULLEN. I must enter my protest against the extravagant expenditure in the city of Ottawa. On the street in front of these buildings we spent last summer over $7,000. We keep up all the roads around Parliament at the expense of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman says the grounds are exempt from taxes. I would like to know if Parliament Hill and Major's Hill do not virtually form a park for the citizens of Ottawa. The city has no park except this which we supply them. Major's Hill Park costs $10,000 a year, and in addition to that we pay rent for the water used in and around the Parliament buildings. We also pay an enormous amount for gas to the city, and in one way or the other we contribute an enormous amount which goes to the benefit of the city. I have no doubt that the deputation which waited on the Minister of Public Works and pressed very strongly on him the necessity of the Government building a road to the Experimental Farm, will, backed by the Minister of Agriculture, have their request gratified, and next year a vote will be submitted to Parliament to build a macadamised highway to the Experimental Farm for the benefit of the citizens of Ottawa. As the hon. member for St. John has said they cannot get a small grant for public improvements down there, unless they grant a corresponding amount themselves, and in some cases they cannot get a grant at all, while any amount of money is spent by this Govesnment in local improvements in the city of Ottawa. No doubt, however, this is done as a mark of gratitude on the part of the Government for the kindness and consideration of the people of Ottawa in returning two supporters of the administration to this House.

Mr. PERLEY. I am quite surprised to hear hon. gentlemen complain of the advantages the people of Ottawa derive from these improvements. If those hon. gentlemen were here all the time, I assure you, Sir, they would hear complaints from the taxpayers of Ottawa that the Government did not contribute their share to the city expenses. It must be remembered, that these Estimates do not cover anything new, but are similar to those which have been granted for years, and that the amount put down in the Estimates is simply the contribution of the Government as its proportion of the expenses, which was arranged for years ago. The bridge over the Ottawa River is Government property and not municipal. The bridge over the slides is Government property. The bridges over the canal are Government property, and so is Major's Hill Park; and there is no reason why the citizens of Ottawa should pay for all these improvements, while no taxes are paid by the Government for what they own in the city. It is ungenerous in hon. members to complain of this expense. So far as the public park is concerned, it is visited more by visitors than by citizens; still the citizens, I hope, appreciate the advantages they get from it. With regard to the Experimental Farm, the city of Ottawa should not be required to make a very expensive highway out to that Government property. It is only just that the Government should contribute towards making a good road out to the Government farm. The Government owns the farm, and certainly it is incumbent upon the Government to do that. The officials of the Government do not contribute to the taxes of the city of Ottawa. They are exempt from taxation, but they get all the benefit of the municipal taxation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Do they not pay water rates?

Mr. PERLEY. They pay taxes on real estate, but they pay no income tax.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the Experimental Farm within the city limits of Ottawa? Why should the Government build a road to the Experimental Farm? The city of Ottawa is not losing any taxes by that farm, because it is not within its limits. The Government has been doing a great deal for the city of Ottawa, and still they have the brass to ask the country to build a road out to the farm. I suppose that, next, the county of Carleton will say that we should construct certain country roads through that county, and, no doubt, in view of the agitated condition of that county at the present moment, if the First Minister should have to run there again at the next election, they will have all the roads they want.

Mr. PERLEY. I do not think the question of the Model Farm is included in this vote at all.

Mr. LISTER. I think the Minister of Agriculture should have stated the intention of the Government in this matter.

Mr. CARLING. I have not seen any item in the Estimates for this purpose, though I have seen something written about it in the newspapers.

The CHAIRMAN. It is all out of order.

Mr. LISTER. In reference to the public park, I do not know that members of Parliament avail themselves of it very much; and in reference to the bridges, I doubt whether, being under the jurisdiction of the municipality of Ottawa, they belong to the Government. However, if there is an agreement between the Government and the city that they are to be kept up, I suppose they have to be kept up. I think this city of Ottawa is pretty greedy. If it were not for the Parliament buildings being here, if it were not that Ottawa is the Capital of the Dominion, I think it would still be the village of Bytown. It is the fact of its being the Capital of the Dominion which brings people here, and causes large expenditures to be made here, and I think the city of Ottawa is a little exacting as far as the Government is concerned. The corporation are constantly asking for the construction of buildings and streets, and the expenditures for keeping them in repair, and now it is said that they are going to ask for the building of this road to the Model Farm.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is quite natural that the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Perley) should be gratified at any expenditure made in this city. We have discussed similar items in regard to expenditures in or near this city every year, but no change whatever has been made. The only way to test public opinion on the matter, I think, is to do what I propose to do on Concurrence, which is to move an amendment to these votes. The expenditure for the sidewalk in front of the new building was, I think, a proper one, because it was in front of our own building, but that is a very different matter from the expenditure on the Major's Hill Park and on other localities which have been criticised. I shall take the opinion of the House on Concurrence.

Surveys and Inspections $5,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What is this for?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is to cover the balance of the year, and to have enough to go on with to the end of the current year.

Gratuity to the widow of the late William Turner, seaman on steamer *Newfield*, drowned while landing coal at Cape Race..... ..... $264

Mr. FOSTER. I move that this item be dropped.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has this been paid to the widow?

Mr. PERLEY. Yes; it was paid out of unforeseen expenses.

Construction of lighthouses, &c $8,000

Mr. TUPPER. This is in consequence of the vote for lighthouses being short by this amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are no new lighthouses?

Mr. TUPPER. No.

Mr. LISTER. I suppose, in the new Estimates, the hon. gentleman will have some provision for the new range lights in the County of Lambton?

Mr. TUPPER. I submitted the list of those the other day.

Steam communication with the Magdalen Islands. $3,158 34

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is that expense incurred?

Mr. FOSTER. That is done under contract, and the amount last year was not sufficient to cover it.

Mr. KENNY. I desire to say that the service as it is presently performed is exceedingly unsatisfactory to the residents of the Magdalen Islands. The boat, the *Beaver*, is a very inefficient one and too small. The equipment on board is very limited and inferior. It happened last fall that in order to get a late mail to the Magdalen Islands, it was necessary to send a steamer from Halifax. I believe the contract will expire during the year, and I hope that, when it is renewed, care will be taken to supply a better steamer.

Mr. FOSTER. The contract ends at the close of navigation of this year. Fraser & Haliday have the contract. I have heard a good many complaints about it, and will take steps to see that a better service is provided.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. An additional vote of $3,158 is a very large excess of the original vote of $7,800.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How is the subsidy payable?

Mr. FOSTER. So much a trip, I think. The subsidy paid here is $11,000. She makes weekly trips. The service is between Georgetown, Souris, the Magdalen Islands and Gaspé.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A definite vote was taken in the Estimates in the current year of $7,800 for steam communication, and he has not clearly explained how $3,158 more can be needed.

Mr. FOSTER. She has already been paid more, and that part has been paid, I think, by the Post Office Department.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) with regard to the boat. She is actually unsafe. This large subsidy is really more than the boat is worth.

Mr. FOSTER. The contract is running and must be carried out.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If the hon. gentleman will take a portion of his subsidy and give it to the service that I pointed out to him the other night, between King's County and Pictou, it would be very much more useful.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) According to statements made in the press, she is not kept in as efficient a condition as she ought to be.

Mr. FOSTER. She has passed inspection and must be safe.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I fancy she is not kept as the contract requires she should be. I think some inspection should

be made by some officer in reference to the complaints that are made.

Mr. FOSTER. I will make a note of it.

To provide for the payment to Mr. James King..... $2,960

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is an item to which, I think, the attention of the Committee ought to be called. Here we find a claim of 14 years standing, adjudicated on by a Special Committee of our House, and recommended. It does appear that this kind of thing is extremely inexpedient. Of all bodies, with all respect to my hon. friends who may have sat upon that Committee, I believe Special Committees of this House are the very worst to whom to refer claims against the Government. Whatever the merits of this case may be, I doubt extremely the expediency of settling any of those claims through the medium of Special Committees of our House. The matter ought to be opposed in the interest of the Government itself. If these things are entertained at all, they should be settled by reference to the Judge of the Exchequer Court, or some judge of the Supreme Court.

Mr. FOSTER. I quite agree with my hon. friend. However, this Committee did sit on this claim, examined it and reported in favor of it, and it was thought best to pay it.

Indian Affairs, Ontario and Quebec, to cover expenses incurred by Inspector Dingman while acting as one of the three Commissioners appointed to investigate the Township of Dundee land matter $100

Mr. McMULLEN. I see this man Dingman got $1,877.50 last year. He is down as Inspector of Licenses in the Indian Department with a salary of $1,739. Why is it thought necessary to grant this increase ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is not an increase, but it is to reimburse money paid out by Mr. Dingman during the time the commission sat. I have the details of the account here, which was submitted by Mr. Dingman, and which have been paid.

Mr. McMULLEN. He is Inspector of Indian Agencies, is he not ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. When men are employed by the country and paid respectable salaries, I cannot understand why they are allowed to charge extra when they are called upon to do any other little work. Here we have an individual from the Indian Department an engineer, who was asked to survey the location of the Printing Bureau, and he has charged extra for locating that building, simply because it is out of his department.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is no increase in salary, but it is to cover amounts paid out by Mr. Dingman. I can give the hon. gentleman the items if necessary.

Mr. SCRIVER. That is not necessary. I was present when the Commission sat, and I know that Mr. Dingman has made no charge. I have seen his account and I can testify to its correctness. While not saying anything about the principle, with respect to this particular matter I may say that Mr. Dingman while engaged on the Commission sat for long hours, late in the evening and early in the morning, and was entitled to some extra compensation.

Mr. McMULLEN. He got $240 in addition to his salary of $1,600.

North-West Mounted Police..... $80,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the cause of this very large demand ?

Mr. FOSTER. This is necessary to meet an accumulation of arrearages which have been gathering up year after year, the expenditure sometimes not covering the amount for th year. Having looked over the matter this year and found that these arrearages existed, I thought it would be better to bring down a vote for the whole amount and wipe them off.

Mr. McMULLEN. The accounts of the North-West Mounted Police were brought down by resolution before the Public Accounts Committee. There has not been an opportunity for investigating those accounts, but I have gone through them. I find that in 1887, from 14th March to the 7th September, James O'Brien, of Montreal, supplied 5,163 pairs of riding breeches at $5.56 per pair, being a total of $28,428. It is strange that with a force of only a thousand men they should require in one year that number of breeches, a quantity equivalent to 5 pairs per man. Altogether Mr. O'Brien drew $32,313. Messrs. Dowall & Miller, of Halifax, supplied 2,164 serge coats, at a cost of $7,436. R. J. Devlin, of Ottawa, supplied 87 fur coats, at $21.50 each, total $1,870. Were tenders asked for these articles ? James Hall & Co., of Brockville, supplied 1,783 pairs of gauntlets, at $2,151. T. Code, of Perth, supplied 7,024 pairs of socks, at 30 cents per pair. F. Cole, of Berlin, supplied 9,074 pairs, costing $2,945. I also notice we have paid for moccasins and boots $12,640. An inspection of the accounts leads to the conclusion that the most gross extravagance has prevailed in the management of the force. In almost every item we see charges of a ridiculous character. For instance, 70 cents is charged per gallon for coal oil in several places. Robert Watson, of Ottawa, who inspected 5,160 riding breeches, spent 80½ days in doing so, and charged $10 a day, or $815. The department also purchased a large quantity of duck pants, for I find an item, M. Shorey, 1,500 duck pants, at 90 cents per pair. Singular to say, the first delivery was made on 21st September, which was after the hot weather. Then, 2,000 blacking brushes were bought from the Napanee Brush Co. Millyard & Harris, of London, furnished gold braid and regimental trimmings, &c., for the sergeants' clothes, at a cost of $1,429. There was a person employed in Regina by Mr. McCulla, on 23rd November to inspect 162 pairs of boots. He charged $10 a dozen for inspecting them, or $135; and for three sample shoes he charged $5 a pair; and altogether he drew $150 for inspecting 162 pairs of boots. Any hon. gentleman who will go to the Public Accounts Committee room can examine the accounts, and he will find the statements I have made to be absolutely accurate. There are quite a number of other items which I could give to the House. I find that the hon. gentleman bought 75 fur coats at $22 each, and that he also bought a large quantity of fur coats in New York at $25 each. It appears very strange to me that he should have sent an agent to New York to buy fur coats when I fancy they could have bought them as cheap if not cheaper in the North-West. I have examined these accounts carefully and they show that the grossest extravagance exists in the management of the North-West Mounted Police. It appears to me that from the price paid for everything that it is a perfect godsend to the people in the North-West that there is a Mounted Police for they get enormous prices for everything they supply. I find that in some places 8 cents a pound is paid for flour. 12½ cents per pound for salt, 14 cents per pound for sugar and in one case $8.90 was paid for 100 feet of lumber. All these items show that the grossest extravagance is connected with the North-West Mounted Police. It is quite clear that every man in Ontario who has got a factory and who calls on the First Minister or some one else and makes a demand, gets his contract. For those thousand policemen in the North-West last year they bought 7,000 pairs of socks and over 5,000 pairs of riding breeches. I would like to have some explanation from the Minister as to how it

came that he gave such an enormous order at this enormous price of $5.67 a pair, to James O'Brien, of Montreal. He also paid $10 a day amounting to something like $815 to a man for the inspection of those articles when they were bought.

Mr. MACDOWALL. With regard to the item the hon. gentleman mentioned——

Mr. McMULLEN. We want an explanation from the Minister.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I have not been in the House, but I heard part of what the hon. gentleman said. I may tell the hon. gentleman that flour is naturally very expensive in the North-West, there are a great many posts that are very far removed from the line of railway, and whatever the flour costs at the place where it is bought the freight has to be added on to it. Let us take the Mounted Police station at Victoria for instance. Flour has to be brought from Winnipeg across the country to Edmonton, and then to Victoria and Saddle Lake at a very great expense. I believe that $8 per bag of 100 lbs. is not too dear for flour in the remote districts of the North-West, and I think that the farmers in that section of the country would think it is too cheap because everything they require in order to produce this flour is so very dear that they cannot produce it at the same price as you can down here. I think that it will be admitted that seven pair of socks a year is not too much for a man to wear out, if we expect the men to keep themselves clean and decent. This question of flour is a live one in the North-West. I do not think the price paid is too high.

Mr. MITCHELL. If I understand the matter rightly the hon. gentleman who has just sat down is very anxious to get a railway built to Prince Albert and one of the strongest arguments which I have heard him use and which has enlisted my sympathies in favor of his scheme is that the farmers after raising their wheat have no market for it and cannot utilise it because of the absence of means of transport. If flour is so expensive and difficult to obtain in that section of the country it appears to me that a railway to Prince Albert, the residence of my hon. friend, will depress the market as the farmers will not be able to get such high prices as they do now, and that in consequence it will be an injury to the North-West. I regret that my hon. friend has brought forward that argument about the expense of the flour and the difficulty of getting it. I understood that the county my hon. friend represents is the most fertile in the North-West and that all you have to do is to tickle the ground and the wheat grows in such abundance that the farmers have to stop growing it as they cannot get a market for it. If the statement the hon. gentleman now makes is true I cannot see any necessity for that railroad which he interested me so much in. I cannot understand the incongruity of the hon. gentleman's position.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I feel that it is necessary to give a few words of reply to my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) who has so justly appreciated the difficulties that the farmers labor under for want of a railway. I suppose that he knows the North-West, and that he is aware that Victoria and the points I have mentioned are at least 500 miles away from Prince Albert. This being the case I presume it will be a sufficient answer to my hon. friend that my remarks do not alter the question of a railway to Prince Albert?

Mr. DAVIN. I may give one fact to my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) about flour. Flour and other provisions are called for by tender, and I happen to know that a prominent firm in Regina is supplying the Mounted Police at the present time at a loss of about $1 a barrel. The head of that firm took the contract when the flour was high, and flour has fallen and the consequence is he has lost.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear! Explain?

Mr. DAVIN. Well, that is my first bull. I should have explained that he took the contract when flour was low and flour has risen, and the consequence is he is losing on every bag of flour he supplies to the police.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Flour is intended to rise.

Mr. DAVIN. I know it is when you put yeast in it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. Minister explain how he came to buy such an enormous lot of riding pants?

Mr. DAVIN. If I may be allowed. This merchant took the contract when flour was at a certain rate. Now he has to pay higher for it; he has to pay a larger price for the flour he supplies the police now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that now the difficult question of flour may be said to be solved by the joint labors of the members of Assiniboia and we should have this interesting question of these riding inexpressibles disposed of. It does appear to me, if my hon. friend has stated the account correctly, that very considerable extravagance has been committed, and that some explanation should be given.

Mr. FOSTER. This is an item which I think my hon. friend will agree with me did not warrant the bringing up of the questions referred to by the hon. member for North Wellington. The only explanation which would have been thought necessary was to show the reason for this extra sum being voted. I should have thought these explanations would have been in order when the main vote was under consideration; consequently, I have not got them here; but I will find out about the breeches, and will bring down all the information that can be got.

Mr. HAGGART. In reference to the items the hon. gentleman has brought before the House, he has hardly been fair. If he had quoted the price of flour delivered to the Mounted Police at Qu'Appelle, he would find that it can be got much cheaper there than at any other part of the Dominion; but he takes a few barrels of flour delivered at a distant point, 500 miles from the railway, and speaks as if the flour delivered to the Mounted Police cost $16 a barrel. He knows perfectly well that the flour delivered along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway is cheaper than in any other part of the Dominion. As to the socks, they are supplied by tender. With regard to the breeches, it does seem to me an extraordinary quantity to be used by the Mounted Police, and I think he is probably in error in that case as he was in the others.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In the account rendered by James Brown we find charged 3,046 pairs of riding breeches at $16,935.

Mr. HAGGART. They may go into stock and be used the next year?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On the 20th of June, 987 pairs of riding breeches are charged; again 407 pairs, and on the 26th of August 673 pairs, making 2,067, at a cost of $11,492. If you add these figures together you will find that my hon. friend has stated them pretty accurately. There is no use of turning the discussion off on flour; that is an insignificant item, we are not troubled about that; but on the face of these accounts there appears to be a great deal of indefensible extravagance, and the item should not be passed without some explanation of it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This gives me an opportunity of making an explanation which I promised to the hon. member for Kent in reference to flour. He asked a question in re-

gard to 19,000 sacks of flour which he found charged in the Public Accounts at a rate which would bring the average price up to a high figure. For this flour there were 21 places of delivery. At Duck Lake, which is pretty far north, there were 678 sacks at an average of $2.82 per sack; at Battleford, 937 sacks at $3.03; at the Blood Reservation, near Fort McLeod, $2.49; at Victoria, $3 50; at Edmonton, $3; at Birtle, near the railway, $1.85; at Moose Mountain, $2.30; at the Assiniboine Reserve, about twenty miles from the railway, $1.90; at the File Hills, $2.05; at the Touchwood Hills, $2.25; at Onion Lake, one of the most inaccessible points, $4.10; at Peace Hills, 150 miles north of Calgary, $3.70, and so on.

Mr. McMULLEN. Tell us about the breeches.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think the Minister who has charge of the Mounted Police will be able to explain that matter. There are two different kinds of breeches, cloth breeches and cord breeches, and every man gets his two or three pairs every year; and this charge may be for two seasons' issue.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This item of James McCullough for inspecting boots requires explanation—inspecting 162 pairs, $135, and inspecting three samples, $15. This is copied from the original account to the Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I think there cannot be very much discussion over the breeches, because the Mounted Police force, although by courtesy called a thousand, are something more than a thousand. You must remember that this force is composed of mounted, not dismounted police, and anyone who is very much in the saddle must know that breeches do not last forever. If you take the number of pairs of breeches charged for and divide them amongst the number of men, you will find that there would be only one pair of breeches per man for three months; and if you consider that the men are frequently in the saddle, I do not think there can be very much complaint, if the breeches are cheap.

Mr. BOWELL. You will find the explanation of this item is simply this, that they lay in stock clothing as they do in the Militia Department.

Mr. MULOCK. A bad precedent.

Mr. BOWELL. It is absolutely necessary, as we have a large number of men constantly on duty, that you should have a supply on which to be able to draw when necessary. When the Minister under whose charge the Mounted Police are is here he will explain all about this item.

Mr. FOSTER. We will allow this item to stand.

500 copies of Parliamentary Companion at $2 each.. $1,000

Mr. FOSTER. It has been customary for the publisher to receive a vote, and this year he went upon that assumption and incurred the cost of putting the work in type, as he had not been notified that another practice from the usual one would be followed. We considered it only fair to give him the usual vote.

100 copies Vol. 4 of Jugements du Conseil Souverain, $3 each $800 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is a work published by the Quebec Government. It is very presentable as an exchange for works of foreign governments and libraries.

Mr. LAURIER. It is a most valuable work from a historical point of view.

To aid in the publication of 6th Vol. of Le Dictionnaire généalogique des Familles Françaises.

Mr. FOSTER. I will drop this vote. It will be found in the Supplementary Estimates for next year, and the volume will not be published until the year commences.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think this is a most valuable work, prepared by the late deputy of the Department of Agriculture and Statistics.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. By one of the officers.

Mr. MITCHELL. I got an amount of information many years ago in relation to that work which astonished me, and as a matter of caution to English-speaking residents of the Dominion, it ought to make us pause and think what the end of this country is going to be. That work contains the statistics of the completed French families, which is a matter of the deepest interest to the future of the country. One of the most learned men I have met who was a visitor here during the time of the *Trent* affair, as he was interested very largely in statistical matters, I introduced to Mr. Taché, then of the Department of Agriculture, and he got a lot of information from him as to the statistics of French families. He came to dine with me afterwards—it was between Christmas and New Year's—and he gave me a lot of information which he had derived from the book published by the officer of Mr. Taché, which made me consider that it was a most valuable publication. He said that I would be surprised to learn what the proportion was of the French Canadian completed families as compared with other nations, and that the conversation he had had with Mr. Taché had tended to elevate the French Canadians above anything he had thought of before. He said, I have been a war reporter during the Franco-German war, and I have visited almost every country in Europe, but the information I have received to-day shows me that there is no race like the French Canadians as a reproductive race. The average family in France is two, in Ireland five.

Mr. DAVIN. We sometimes go thirteen.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am speaking of the average. England and Scotland average 4½, the United States not over 4, Russia about 4, Norway and Sweden about 5, and so on. He enumerated every race on the continent of Europe, but, in regard to the French Canadian race, he said the average was 10.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Only 10? There must be some mistake.

Mr. MITCHELL. I say it is to the credit of that race that this is the fact, whatever the cause of it is.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. It may be a subject of laughter for some hon. gentlemen, but it is a very serious matter for us, the English-speaking people of this country, when we only produce an average of four, and the average of the French families is ten. What is the natural result? Where will we be in fifty years? They will have driven us out, unless we marry French women; I, therefore, think that there is not enough put in the Estimates for a sufficient number of copies of this book. I recommend that the Minister should put a sufficient sum in the Estimates to supply at least one copy to all the English-speaking members of this House.

Gratuity to W. H. Griffin, late Deputy Postmaster General $5,000

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). It appears that Mr. Griffin has retired from the service with the very good pension of $2,240. It is true that he has been in the service for a long time, but for a considerable portion of that time he received a salary of $3,800—$3,200 as Deputy Minister, and $600 extra. I think this requires some explanation as to how it is that Mr. Griffin is to receive this extra amount of $5,000. I have been a member of this House for two years, and I have had occasion to visit that department, but I never saw Mr. Griffin to my knowledge, or, if I did, I had very little business with him. It was

the secretary of the department, who is the present deputy, who was doing all the work, though Mr. Griffin was drawing the salary. I think this is one of the votes in regard to which the House should be very careful before committing itself to such an expenditure. When some other gentleman is retiring, he will expect $5,000 or some other sum as a gratuity, and I think, in the interest of the House as well as in the interest of the Government, it would be well to strike out this vote. I think it is a very bad precedent to set.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Griffin was superannuated on the 1st of July, 1888. He was then 76 years of age, and he entered the service in 1831, so that he had served over 57 years. I have been very often in that department when Mr. Griffin was deputy, and I never knew him to be absent from his post. Latterly he was very old, and perhaps was not as capable of performing his duties as he had been, and consequently they were performed by the secretary of the department. Mr. Griffin was appointed secretary of the department in April, 1851, when it was handed over by the Imperial authorities to the Canadian authorities.

Mr. McMULLEN. At what salary?

Mr. HAGGART. He then received $2,000 a year. That increased in 1855 to $2,400, as long as he occupied that position. In June, 1857, under the Civil Service Act, he was appointed Deputy Postmaster General. At Confederation, he was appointed Deputy Postmaster General of the Dominion at the same salary. For some years before Confederation, he was receiving $600 a year, in addition to his salary, as a member of the Board of Audit. That ceased at Confederation. In 1878, he was appointed chairman of the Civil Service Board, at a salary of $400. This ceased in 1882, when the present Civil Service Act came into force. The Civil Service Act provides that the minimum salary of a Deputy Minister shall be $3,200 and the maximum $4,000. Mr. Griffin's salary never exceeded $3,200, notwithstanding his long service. When Mr. Meredith was superannuated, his allowance was calculated on the average of $3,200 with the addition of $400 as chairman of the Civil Service Board, and he received $2,520 a year as a retiring allowance, while Mr. Griffin, notwithstanding his long service, has only $2,240. In most of the other departments, the deputy receives the maximum salary of $4,000 a year, notably in the Inland Revenue and the Customs Department. Under these circumstances, considering the small comparative amount which Mr. Griffin had received, the Government thought it proper to recommend the House to make a gift to him of $5,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I agree with the hon. member who brought this question up (Mr. McDonald). I admit that Mr. Griffin was a valuable officer, that for many years and on many occasions, I always found him at his post, but he was fairly remunerated for his services during the time he was there, and I think this proposition to give him $5,000 on his retirement, is the introduction of a principle which may be found to be very dangerous in the future. If under some especial circumstances the Government were called upon to deal with a public officer, we might not have taken exception to it. But if, as in this case, without any recommendation than his further services, for which he was fairly remunerated, the Government took the responsibility of paying this $5,000, I do not see how they can avoid having applications from other deputy heads when the time comes for them to retire. They have laid down the principle that an officer who has been there a long time, when he retires, has a certain claim upon the Government beyond his superannuation allowance. We saw the other day that a public servant in Prince Edward Island who had been in the service for 30 years, and had contributed to the superannuation fund, was dismissed by the Minister of Customs without any retiring allowance or superannuation. I think you are dealing with another civil servant in a different manner, and under circumstances which do not justify it. The greatest objection I take, is the precedent that is going to be established. I protest against this new departure; it is a dangerous one for future Governments, no matter of whom they may be composed.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the granting of this money is establishing a bad precedent. We sometimes distinguish between men. A few years ago, when Mr. Patrick left this House, after being in the service for 51 years, this House refused to vote him anything, although a great many thought he was well entitled to it. The man for whom we are now asked to vote $5,000 has been in the service 57 years, and during that time he must have drawn close upon $125,000 from the Treasury of Canada. He has been paid, I think, a fairly good salary during that whole time. Men in other lines of life have to take the risks and losses of business, and many of them, on arriving at the same age, have very little to fall back upon. There also seems to be a disposition at the present time to add to the number of years, for the purpose of making a larger superannuation allowance. This is a growing evil, and it is high time we put a stop to it.

Mr. MULOCK. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). The Postmaster General gives the long service of Mr. Griffin as a reason for granting him a bonus in addition to his retiring allowance. Now, if you are to retire a man 20 or 30 years earlier than you have done in this case, when he has a good many years of his life left, then there might be some reason for giving him a bonus. But in this particular case you have paid him his full salary as deputy head until the date of his retirement; now, you are paying him the full superannuation allowance, and in addition to that you are granting him a bonus which, according to the table of annuities, must exceed anything that he could be allowed were you to retire him on the basis of the highest salary he was ever receiving. The Postmaster General appears to justify this vote on the ground that at some period during his servi e, this officer has been in receipt of some special salary. Am I right?

Mr. HAGGART. Partly.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there any other reason why he should be treated exceptionally? He is retired on the basis of the salary attached to that office. You are now taking the case out of the general rule and giving him the bonus in addition to his regular superannuation. I understood the Postmaster General to base it on the fact that at a certain period of his life, once before Confederation, he had for a short time enjoyed some special positions. Are these the only reasons the Postmaster General can give?

Mr. HAGGART. He was not superannuated, he did not get his superannuation allowance on $400 and $600. There is another reason. There was an arrangement made with him, and a special re-arrangement of the offices, by which two salaries were saved to the country on his retirement, one of $2,800, and one at $2,400.

Mr. MULOCK. This officer before Confederation enjoyed some special advantage worth to him $600; that lapsed. Subsequently for three of four years, he was on the Board of Civil Examiners at $400; but at no period of his life did he ever draw these two special sums of $600 and $400 in addition to his regular salary.

Mr. HAGGART. The whole three were current at the same time.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister did not say so before? I think he is mistaken on that point, one lapsed before the other took place.

Mr. HAGGART. In 1867, and for some years prior, he had $600 a year, and in 1878 he had $400.

Mr. MULOCK. When did this $600 lapse?

Mr. HAGGART. In 1867, and the $400 began in 1878, and ended in 1882.

Mr. MULOCK. So what I judged to be the case is correct, that at no period in his life did he enjoy these two extra sums and the regular salary attached to his office at the same time. Now, are we to understand that whenever during the lifetime of an officer of the Government, we choose to give him some special sum of money, that that, at a remote period of time, is to form a basis for a bonus?—because that is the principle involved. If you look through the Public Accounts you will find that we are constantly taking advantage of the services of an officer and giving him some special fee for some special service. But that is presented to us as a temporary affair, and in due time the special service drops and the fee attached to the special service drops. Are we to understand that at the expiration of his services we are to look back to some period of his life when he had a special fee, and to make that the basis of superannuation? It has been laid down in this House as a fixed principle that we shall not recognise obligations of this character existing prior to Confederation. He was not an officer of many of the confederating Provinces which will be taxed to pay this amount. He was at best an officer of Upper and Lower Canada. I cannot assent to the doctrine of the Postmaster General that special services, however valuable, entitle him to a bonus. For 12 years he did not enjoy the amount referred to. For the short period of 4 years he was entitled to $400 a year, and for that sum it is now proposed to pay $5,000. Mr. Griffin is 78 years old at least now, and according to the tables of annuities his expectation of life cannot be more than 3, 4 or 5 years. I am sorry the Postmaster General should have inaugurated his régime in this manner. No doubt he had done it from his tender heart, but I am bound to warn him that if he yields to such demands many similar demands will be made on the public treasury.

Mr. HAGGART. The arrangement was made before I became Postmaster General. I am informed that it was made on account of this officer's long and valuable services during fifty-seven years, and although he might have demanded a higher salary than he received, he never asked for a larger salary. I suppose if he had pressed his claim he might have received $4,000 a year, and although he was one of the best servants of the Government he received only the minimum of his class.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is not quite speaking by the book when he says a deputy head receives $4,000.

Mr. HAGGART. The deputy heads of Inland Revenue and Customs each receive $4,000 a year.

Mr. LAURIER. I would be the last man in the world to treat ungenerously an old and faithful servant, but there are also some principles of justice which cannot be lost sight of. Mr. Griffin was a most valuable servant, but everyone must admit that for his services he received ample compensation. We all desire that the officers of the Government shall be paid liberally, and they are paid liberally. No doubt Mr. Griffin gave faithful service, for which he was well paid, and he now has a pension for the rest of his life of $2,240 a year. Surely that should be sufficient, and there can be no reason to justify this House in being more generous in this instance than in other instances, and if that door is left open, claims will come in, and if that precedent is adopted no end of demands will be made.

Mr. HAGGART. Under these circumstances I ask that this item be allowed to stand.

To indemnify the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company for costs in the suit of The Queen vs. The Company $10,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Full information with details of the account should be furnished in connection with this item. It has also been stated that the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company have made a demand on the Government for damages. This was an important case between the Ontario Government and the Dominion. The Dominion Government, in the interest of some of its friends, defended the case on behalf of the St. Catharines Milling Company. After being heard in our Canadian courts the case was taken over to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and the decision was given. The result is that we are called upon to pay a large sum for law costs.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This amount is to pay the balance of the costs incurred in the suit. A claim for damages has been presented, but I am not prepared to ask a vote at this Session. The matter is forming the subject of enquiry, but it has not advanced sufficiently far to enable me to say whether any part of the claim can be properly entertained or not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What were the total costs?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. About $16,000, which include $5,000 paid to counsel in England.

Mr. COLTER. Has the Minister any detailed statement of the costs?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They have been taxed as between solicitor and client in the Supreme Court here and in the High Court of Justice in Ontario.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who were the counsel engaged?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Several counsel were engaged, and the hon. gentleman knows some of them. Mr. McCarthy's firm acted for the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company, with other eminent counsel in England; and Mr. Blake's firm acted on behalf of Ontario, and Mr. Mowat as well.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Blake was not paid by Canada.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; nor was Mr. McCarthy. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the Public Accounts of Ontario, he will find information in detail as to some of the counsel employed. I have given him information as to our own counsel. I may refer him to the accounts here as to the other counsel engaged in the case. When the item was under discussion last year, I remember the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) calling my attention to a striking discrepancy in the payments which were made in this suit by the Ontario Government as compared with those which were paid by the Dominion Government, and I stated to the hon. gentleman that I was convinced he was mistaken if he supposed that the amounts that had been charged in the Public Accounts up to that time were payment in full on the side of Ontario. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Ontario Public Accounts for 1888, he will find a list of 15 or 16 gentlemen, several of them professional gentlemen, and the services for which they charged in that year alone amounted to upwards of $20,000.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would ask the Minister who was the counsel in this case?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have already stated who were the counsel.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not catch what you said.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I stated the case, as far as the St Catharines Milling Company is concerned, was in the hands of Mr. McCarthy's firm.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is it Mr. McCarthy, the member?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The member for Simcoe. Mr. Ferguson was also employed, together with the counsel in England usually employed by the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not know whether the amount is too much or not, but I do think it is an infringement of the Independence of Parliament Act to have a gentleman occupying so prominent a position as Mr. McCarthy occupies with the Government of the day, and a representative in this House, receiving fees out of the public funds of this country for services performed, I presume in the public interest, for there is no other justification for the money being voted by this Parliament. I saw at a very early period of the Session a very extraordinary motion placed on the notice paper in relation to Dr. Robertson, a gentleman on this side of the House, for having performed a service in the cause of humanity, and for which he received the very trifling sum of $13 or $14 from the Mariner's Fund. That motion asked that Dr. Robertson should be disqualified from sitting in this House because of this, and if that was a good ground for making that motion I do think that the sum of $16,000 taxed for Mr. McCarthy and his firm is a good ground for having a charge of disqualification against him. I do not propose to make any motion in the matter, but I propose to call public attention to the impropriety of a gentleman occupying a seat in this House receiving fees from the Administration for services performed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Without discussing the policy of that course at present, I may ask the hon. gentleman to correct himself as to one or two of the details of it. The sum paid to Mr. McCarthy's firm was by no means $16,000. The hon. gentleman probably did not hear me when I said that of that sum $5,000 was paid in England alone, besides disbursements to other counsel and necessary disbursements connected with printing which were very heavy. Mr. McCarthy was not employed nor was his firm employed by the Government. A lease, of what was claimed to be Indian lands, was given to the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company and the Ontario Government claiming that the lease was void sought to restrain them. It became a question of the ownership not only of the tract of land which was under lease, but of an enormous tract otherwise in the Province of Ontario. The question was simply whether the Government would indemnify their lessees for the expenses of that suit or let the lessees retire and then contest a similar suit with the Ontario Government. The former course was preferred. The conduct of the litigation has been from first to last entirely in the hands of the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company. They chose their own counsel; the Government had nothing to do with the employment or choice of counsel or with the instruction given to counsel, and so far as I know they never gave any intimation to the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company, even, that they would be responsible to make good any loss otherwise than for the mere cost of litigation. That is all I know of the history of the case. It was well under way and under appeal before I took office, and the Government had assumed the costs.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would just say that I think in future it would be much better for the Government if they would conduct their own lawsuits and conduct them in their own name under their own direction and their own responsibility for the course they might pursue. In the case of Mr. McCarthy I do not think it was right for the Government to go on with that suit when a member of Parliament was engaged in the case and likely to derive fees from it, which this are to come out of the public treasury if the case was if successful. I do think it was wrong for them to go on with that suit, and I hope that we shall not see the like occurrence again. Whether the receiving of this money is

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

sufficient to disqualify Mr. McCarthy I do not know and I do not care, for I would be sorry to see Mr. McCarthy lose his seat in this House, but I do think that it is an improper thing for the Government, to practically subsidise—for that is what it means—any gentlemen who support them in this House and who receive from the public treasury money which the policy of the Legislature says is an improper proceeding.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why, if these costs were incurred by and in the name of the St. Catharines Milling Company and they alone, should there be any understanding from the Government that they were to be reimbursed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not say that there was not any understanding that they were to be reimbursed as to costs; I said that there was no understanding that they would be recompensed as to damages. They were to carry on the suit, and if they had withdrawn from the suit and given up their lease the Government certainly would not have agreed to indemnify them—I mean as to damages; but the Government at an early stage of the case, considering that their title was involved in a great tract of land otherwise than under lease, did agree to indemnify them as to costs.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then the remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland are more than borne out. Although not technically; practically there has been a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act.

Mr. CAMPBELL Are we to understand that the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company did not pay any of the costs at all. Did they pay any portion of the costs?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I presume not.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did I understand the Minister to say that the Ontario Government payed $21,000 costs. Was that over and above the amount taxed against the Dominion?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was not over and above the costs taxed against the Dominion. They were for various disbursements as the case went forward. Some part will be included in the costs payable by the Dominion—if any are—and some part not.

Mr. McMULLEN. They taxed all their costs against the Dominion; at least a very large proportion of them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are not all taxable.

Mr. McMULLEN. How much is it that are not taxed against the Dominion?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know.

Mr. McMULLEN. I stated the amount, and I think that if the hon. gentleman will turn up the facts he will find my statements about correct.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The amount which the hon. gentleman stated last year was something like two or three thousand dollars. The details to which I referred just now are sums paid since the hon. gentleman discussed the question; for instance, $1,800 for Mr. Mowat's expenses to England to argue the case, and he went over to argue it after our discussion last year.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Does $5,000 include all the counsel's fees paid in England?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; the $5,000 was paid to the English counsel and solicitors.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know what position the St. Catharines Milling Company have assumed towards the Dominion? Besides this vote of $10,000, I am credibly informed that a very large claim is being preferred by that company for damages.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I explained that a large claim had been preferred. No part of it so far has been recognised; it is under investigation still; there will be no vote asked for it this Session, and so far as I know there will be no vote asked at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman thinks, then, that we are not legally liable.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We are clearly not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In that case I suppose we may accept the assurance of the hon. gentleman that nothing at any rate will be done without the authority of Parliament. It would be excessively objectionable if any sum were handed over to this company without full discussion in this House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may have been hasty in saying that there is no legal liability. My impression is at present, from the investigation I have given to the matter, that we are not legally bound to pay any sum; but whether legally bound or not, there will be no payment made without the authority of Parliament being taken.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is time the litigation between the Province of Ontario and this Dominion should cease. We have had it going on now for ten years. Every little incident by which the Dominion Government could annoy and badger the Ontario Government has been taken advantage of to hamper that Government in its local affairs. They commenced with the Mercer Escheats case, which the Ontario Government fought successfully; then we had the license case, which this Government had to pay the expenses of. We had one contest after another until this case came up, in which the Government shielded themselves behind the St. Catharines Milling Company, and the country has to pay all the costs. Last year in going over the items, we found that we spent over $80,000 in law costs in one way or other. It is earnestly to be hoped, since we have reached a conclusion in this case, that this interference in the local affairs of the Province of Ontario will be stopped. A large amount of money has been thrown away, just because of the spleen of this Government; there was nothing to be gained by the course they took, but because they gave some of their friends timber leases in that section of the country, they felt bound to keep them in possession of them. I think the past history of these contests with the Province of Ontario, has at least taught the Government of this Dominion that they have met a person in the Premier of Ontario who is able to hold his own; in every one of these cases he has fought and received the endorsation of the courts. I am quite satisfied that if hon. gentlemen opposite had to pay the costs out of their own pockets, they would not be so ready to rush into litigation of this kind. I am glad, however, to see that the case has ended in a manner which has left Ontario in possession of her rights and has added one more laurel to the many of that belong to the Premier of the Province.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. gentleman will not be thanked by his friends for mentioning some of the cases he did. In regard to the Mercer Escheats case, I think he forgets that it was undertaken by Mr. Fournier under the Mackenzie Government, and the present Government had to follow it up until the case was ended.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I take a different view from the hon. member for North Wellington on these questions. I think the course the Government has taken has been one which is likely to preserve the independence of the Local Legislatures, by referring all disputed cases to an independent court. It has always been the boast of Canada that our judges are independent men, appointed for their attainments. In the same way the Privy Council is thoroughly independent of the Dominion and Local Legislatures; and when any question is in dispute between a Province and the Dominion, the fairest way for both is to have it decided by these independent judges. Besides, if the hon. member looks into the facts, he will find that the Dominion has gained about half a million dollars, and the Province of Ontario has undertaken to support the Indians in that country. Both in justice and in experience the Dominion has gained.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not aware the Government consider that they achieved a triumph in this case. In fact, the vote under consideration shows that they did not, because the costs do not generally fall on the successful party.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There were no costs imposed.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand a portion of this money is to indemnify the Milling Company for its costs. The Minister of Justice says that the Dominion Government, as a sort of surety, became liable to pay these costs. It is clear to my mind that had the plaintiffs, the Government of Ontario, not made good their claim, and obtained a perpetual injunction restraining this company from cutting timber, the property of the Province, we would not have had this claim in the Public Accounts. The decision was adverse to the contention of the St. Catharines Milling Company, and therefore to the contention of the Government who were their sureties in this case. I conclude from that, the decision has been against the Dominion. Every reasonably minded mind would so conclude, although the hon. member for Saskatchewan says otherwise, and I am afraid this country will find it unfortunate that in this, as in many other cases, the Dominion has had the worst of it. To come back to the remarks of the Minister of Justice who says the Government agreed to become liable for these costs —I presume to save the company harmless—it is upon the construction of that agreement that we become liable for the money. It that is the case, before we vote this money, the papers rendering us liable should be laid on the Table.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are no papers so far as I know. I have never seen any. At an early stage in the litigation, I understand the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company, being served with process, came to the Minister of the Interior and asked him to defend the suit. He declined to do so, but told the representative of the company that the company would be obliged to go on and defend the suit as private suitors, but that, inasmuch as the Government was interested in the result, he would bear the cost of litigation. I am sure there is no bond. I do not know of any agreement in writing, or of any writing on the subject. The St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company went on with the suit and incurred the costs. I do not think hon. gentlemen need feel at all uneasy about the result of the case as indicated by the mere circumstance that we have expenses to pay, because if they will look into the Public Accounts of Ontario they will find, not only thousands of dollars voted year by year, but the amount in the last year, ending 31st December, 1888, was upwards of $40,000 paid in costs, and that does not close the account. There is no use discussing as to what the decision in that case was, nor do I want, on the discussion of an item like this which has been incurred at the instance of one public department, to go into a controversy with the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) or any other member, as to the merits of the litigation between the Province of Ontario and the Dominion. If we thought proper to do so, perhaps we could review with some satisfaction the result in the case before us, but I presume everybody knows what the effect of the judgment was. It was that while the property, which was the immediate subject of that suit, was decided not to belong to the Dominion of Canada, but to the Province of Ontario, the expenditure which the Do-

minion Government had been obliged to incur, as holders of that property, was held to be payable to the Dominion of Canada, by the Provincial Government, and the appeal to the Privy Council was besides amply justified by the fact that on an important question like that, involving thousands of miles of territory in the Dominion of Canada, valuable in the extreme, the Supreme Court of this country was al most equally divided as to where the right was.

Mr. WATSON. I was very much surprised to hear the argument used by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. McDowall), who said it was a good thing for this Government to force a Province into a law suit, and a law suit which has cost the Province of Ontario over $30,000. I come from a Province that has had some trouble from the Dominion Government and am decidedly opposed to the Government forcing any Provincial case into the courts. It is a matter we should be thankful for in the Province of Manitoba that we had the courts to appeal to, and fortunately the courts were in our favor. But it is not simply the costs that are to be considered in these matters, but the feeling that is engendered between the Province and the Dominion Government, and any disturbance of that kind is injurious to the whole country.

Mr. MACDOWALL. As the hon. gentleman has alluded to me I would say that the Dominion Government is justified in putting its confidence in the judges, who, both sides of the House will agree, are men of honor and capacity, and I think any case brought before them will be properly decided.

Mr. WATSON. It is the Government I find fault with and not the judges.

Mr. MACDOWALL. You have to consider that the Government stands in the same light as an individual, and have to defend their rights in the same manner; and if two legislatures find they cannot agree, they cannot do better than refer their difficulties to the judges, who, everybody must admit, are independent and able men.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I wish to make a remark or two arising from the statements of the Minister of Justice in comparing the cost which Ontario had to pay with ours. In the first place this Government takes the property of Ontario.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Sold the property of Ontario, and then compels the people of Ontario to tax themselves $21,000 to maintain their rights in the court, and then takes the money contributed principally by the people of Ontario to fight against the rights of that Province.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman puts this as if it were a perfectly plain case, but he must remember that, out of five judges on the bench of Supreme Court, two —and those not the least in eminence—decided that the Dominion was right and the Province was wrong. When the case went to the Privy Council, the Province was sustained as to its proprietory rights, but not as to one of the results which is supposed to flow from that. Besides, this was a case in which, as trustees for the Indians, the Dominion Government were bound to stand up for their rights against any claimants, either the Province of Ontario or anyone else.

Mr. MULOCK. This particular question was known as a *lismota* long before the Government created the particular interest which they did; and, in this case, the Government, deliberately and of malice aforethought, leased this property to the St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Company, after full warning that the Ontario Government claimed that they were entitled to the land. It the Dominion Government had desired to have the point of law settled, they had a very simple means of doing so. They could have had a special case submitted to the courts.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It would have cost just as much.

Mr. MULOCK. No; it would not have cost as much, and we would not have had the consequential claim with which we will have to deal before long. If the Dominion Government had wanted to have that matter settled, they could have had a special case submitted to the proper courts, but, not only did they lease this particular property, but they issued leases all over the disputed territory. In fact, it was made a matter of triumph on the part of the Premier. He announced that he was right on all constitutional questions, that he had spent a lifetime in learning constitutional law; and he awarded this disputed territory to his various camp followers without any valuable consideration. I think the amount charged was $5 a square mile, when the Ontario Government, if I remember rightly, was receiving $400 a square mile. This Government proceeded to waste that property, and now the Minister of Justice says that they were the trustees of the Indians, and that, to protect the helpless wards of the Government, they had to follow this property into the courts in order to discharge their duties as trustees. When did they wake up to their duties as trustees? How much did they get from this St. Catharines Milling Company for the lands of their wards? $5 an acre, I suppose?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, there were dues and other things besides.

Mr. MULOCK. The amount they got was not one per cent. of the value.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will not find anyone who knows the locality to agree with him.

Mr. MULOCK. The Ontario Government used to get 75 cents, which I think was afterwards raised to $1 a thousand feet for that timber.

Mr. MADILL. The Dominion Government got that, and these people had to build a mill besides.

Mr. MULOCK. Those are not the terms expressed. The Dominion Government leased that at $5 a square mile rental, but there is no comparison between the lease made by the Dominion Government and the ordinary leases of the Ontario Government.

Mr. MADILL. I disagree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MULOCK. We will meet again on this subject, and I advise the hon. gentleman to look at the terms of the lease and to see what the advertised terms are under which the Ontario Government sell their timber limits. I think he will find that there is no comparison between the two. The terms of these leases show that the Dominion Government have been guilty of the grossest extravagance, that these limits were not sold in an honest open way by public tender, but they are sold in a secret way to the favorites of the Government, to their camp followers, who are thus rewarded for political services, and unfortunately they get these leases of limits which are much more valuable than the amounts they pay for them. The Minister of Justice has to seek for something to justify the action of the Government by referring to the wards of the Government. It would have been better it the Government had conceived a correct idea of their duties in that regard many years before, but they had to find some excuse, they hunted around for an excuse for the unfortunate attitude they had assumed, and now they are trying to obtain this money to pay to the St. Catharines Milling Company on the ground that they had to defend the wards of the Government. The Minister of Justice told us that he did not know whether there was any bond or deed or anything in writing to bind the Government

to pay these moneys. He said the St. Catherines Milling Company came to the Minister of the Interior. Well, the corporation did not come. Some individual must have come; and does the hon. gentleman mean to say that transactions of this magnitude, involving the rights of the Crown to a vast property, rights not only to this territory but to other territories throughout the Province, are to be determined by a desultory conversation between some member of a corporation and the Minister of the Interior, and that there is nothing of record to show us what action the Government proposed to take? Were the Government bound by these proceedings? When did the Government agree to be bound by the judgment in that case? When did the Government intervene? The Government intervened at some time, but when was it? I think it was when the case was before the Privy Council. It was not in the interlocutory motion before the Chancellor of Ontario. The Dominion Government did not appear when the case was argued at the trial. When did they agree to have the country bound by the result, because until they intervened, everything was between the private suitor and the Province of Ontario? Surely it will not be pretended by the trustees of the Indians that they bound this country by some verbal communication, which no one in this House knows anything about, to pay the costs in a suit which turned out unsuccessfully for them, that they bound the country to abide by the decision in regard to miles of territory which were not involved in the suit, and yet not a minute of any kind was made to show the people that they did so agree. There was nothing to show the terms on which that suit was being conducted, nothing to show that we were to profit or lose by it, to be bound by it or not, and yet, when the decision is over, we are told that notwithstanding all that has happened, we are to pay some $10,000 more. Before this item is passed there ought to be laid upon the Table of this House every communication that has passed between the Government and the St. Catharines Milling Company, showing what position they took, and what obligations were entered into, and whether this suit was conducted as a test case as well as to protect the interests of the defendant. From the time it became a test case, then I admit that the Government were bound to pay the cost. But until it intervened and assumed the part of a suitor, the country is not responsible.

Mr. SPROULE. Both the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) endeavored to make a case against the Dominion Government because they contended for the rights of the Dominion, and they said that the Dominion Government was annoying the Provincial Government, that they were fighting everything. Now, I think these hon. gentlemen forget that the very system of which they complain, was carried out by their own friends from 1873 to 1878, that of giving leases in the disputed territory, which system was afterwards carried out by the succeeding Government. It was recognised by the Mackenzie Administration that the Dominion had a right to that timber, and to give leases; and if they gave leases, they were obliged to protect the rights of the leaseholders. Afterwards, the St. Catharines Milling Company becoming leaseholders from the Dominion, they were entitled to look to the Dominion for the protection of their rights, when these rights were disputed by the Province, the Dominion had to look after their rights. The contention is to-night that the present Government is responsible for the questions that have arisen in dispute between the two Governments, when in reality the present Government were only carrying out the system of leases adopted by their predecessors.

Mr. MULOCK. When were these leases made?

Mr. SPROULE. That is a matter of indifference; I know that leases were running in 1874, in 1875, and in 1876, and that some of them are in operation to-day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think the hon. gentleman is conversant with the facts to which he refers. If he will look at those leases he will see that the Dominion Government, and the Government of the Province, agreed that a certain line should be regarded as a conventional line, and the western boundary for the time being, until the real boundary was properly ascertained; and that all titles of leases and everything else west of that line should be granted by the Government of Canada, and all east of that line should be granted by the Province of Ontario. That principle was recognised by their predecessors in office, and the correspondence shows that both parties were of opinion that if the boundary proved to be further west, it would be the duty of Ontario to confirm any title that the Government of the Dominion might have issued prior to that period; and if the boundary was found to be located further east, it would be the duty of the Dominion to confirm any title that the Province of Ontario might have issued east of that conventional line. That understanding was entered into on the ground that the right to issue the titles of the property would be in the Government, within whose limits the property was situated. So that the doctrine of the purchase of an Indian title would give to the Government of the Dominion a title to the property, was an after thought, it is one that had possession of no one's mind prior to that period. That was well known by what happened in British Columbia. When the Government of which the present Premier was the head entered into negotiations with British Columbia to admit that Province into the Union, the Government assumed that the paramount interest of the Crown vested the title of that property in the Government of British Columbia, and not in the Indians, although the relation between the Indians and the Indian title in British Columbia was precisely the same as it was in Ontario and in every other Province in the Dominion; and yet the Government assumed at that time that the titles of the property of British Columbia that had not yet been surrendered by the Indians, was in the Crown and not in the Indians, and that the Government here, in obtaining surrender from the Indians, did not acquire any control over the property surrendered.

Mr. SPROULE. If they did not, why did they give leases for 20 years?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What leases does the hon. gentleman speak of?

Mr. SPROULE. The lease given by the Dominion Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The first leases were issued in 1871, for it devolved upon my predecessor, Mr. Laird, to carry out some of those leases. The hon. gentleman can get the necessary information that he asks for from his Prime Minister. The parties who obtained the leases required a certain time to cut timber, and the man who builds a mill expects to get timber limits sufficiently extensive to enable him to run his mill until it is worn out, or for a period of 20 years. The hon. gentleman would have no difficulty in finding out that fact from the Minister of the Interior, who is now sufficiently informed, no doubt, to give him the necessary information. I may say that the Government of Ontario are content with the settlement, so far as I understand. I hold in my hand the decision of the Privy Council. The question before the Privy Council was an appeal from the decision of the Supreme Court. The majority of that court held that the property belonged to the people of Ontario. The hon. gentleman, through the St. Catharines Milling Company, appealed, and that appeal was not granted, and all the Privy Council could do was to dismiss the appeal.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not propose to enter into the details of this case. The hon. member for North York

(Mr. Mulock) has intimated that we are to have another day upon this question, and therefore, as it is nearly 2 o'clock, I refrain from repelling his statement that deliberately regardless of the rights of the Province of Ontario and of the rights of the Indians, whom we are bound to protect, the Government, of malice aforethought, as he says, granted this lease to the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company. When the day which the hon. gentleman shall select arrives for the trial of this matter, I will bring the evidence and read it to him, and satisfy him that his statement is refuted. I have, however, to say that in the assertion he made, that this great territory was parcelled out among the camp followers of the Government, he is entirely mistaken. I think only two leases or licenses were given in this territory by the present Government, and the hon. gentleman will find when the statement is brought down that his observations as to the improper management of the territory are entirely baseless. As regards the content with which the Ontario Government regards the decision, I may say that I believe the Government of Canada is also equally content, and it is well that both should be so, as they cannot go further.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If my memory serves me, we had a list of about 50 licenses granted by the Government laid on the Table of the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not in the disputed territory, I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. 50 or more in the disputed territory. Are we going to understand from the Minister of Justice that there are no papers, correspondence or documents or demands made by the collector or by any agent or legal firm in their behalf for indemnification?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Claims have been made from time to time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No correspondence with respect to these costs under discussion?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The costs were sent to the department for taxation, and they have been paid from time to time. I believe there is no correspondence with respect to the Government assuming these costs. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) who pressed that point was reminded that from the time this litigation commenced down to the present, the Government have distinctly assumed the cost, and amounts have been annually voted.

Mr. MULOCK. When a vote was taken my impression is that the First Minister stated that the department had entered into a certain agreement with the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company. Unless the Minister of his personal knowledge is prepared to state differently, I place my recollection against his uncertainty, and I say there is correspondence in which the Government said they had incurred some responsibility.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. From 1886 we have taken votes for this purpose, and it was on the definite ground that we incurred liability for costs.

Mr. MULOCK. When we are asked to pay $10,000 the documents which fix our liability should be placed on the Table.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no document whatever.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman has said there is a liability.

Mr. TAYLOR. The correspondence in this matter was before the Printing Committee—there was nothing but cheques.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no papers to produce. I have stated what has taken place. As regards my department, there is no agreement and no instructions from the Minister of Justice. In 1886, when asked to insert a vote in the Estimates, I inquired of the late Minister of Interior what had taken place with respect to this matter. I have already told the Committee just what he told me: that when a protest was served on the St. Catharines Milling Company they came and requested that he would undertake the defence of the suit. He declined to do so, but he told them that if they would go on and defend the suit, the Government would indemnify them as to the expenses.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister only speaks for his own department, he knows nothing of the Department of the Interior. Are we to understand that costs involving $20,000 or $30,000 are to be incurred on an unrecorded conversation between a stranger in the department and a member of the Government. This is surely an exceedingly careless way of doing business, and the Department of the Interior will not admit that such has occurred. I can hardly think that this was the case, loose as the Department of the Interior is. As I am satisfied there is sometimes some correspondence, I move that the Committee do now rise and report progress.

Motion negatived.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend is reasonable in his suggestion than an examination should be made for papers. It is more than probable that some remarks were made, as he has indicated, and my hon. friend's recollection is pretty good, and the Minister of Justice may not have been in the House at the time when this matter was brought up.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am stating the matter as it was stated to me by the Minister of the Interior who incurred the liability. It is impossible to say now that no correspondence exists, but I am morally certain that such does not exist. This matter does not, however, depend on the construction of any agreemeent, because for four years we have paid amounts and Parliament has voted the money. To say that we should now refrain from voting this sum (on any construction of writings), more than one-half of which has been directly incurred by the Dominion Government for counsel and solicitors in England, would be to ask us to put a refinement upon written papers with a dishonest result. If any such papers are found they shall be produced, and I shall ask my hon. colleague to make an inquiry into the matter.

To meet cost of litigated matters $4,114 26

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How do you come to ask for that vote?

Mr. TUPPER. It is to meet the taxed costs and disbursements in suits that have been instituted in connection with the seizures of vessels for the infraction of the fishery laws both in Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. For instance, for the seizure of the *D. J. Adams*, $479.87; the *I. M. Doughty*, $1,367.41; the *Warren M. Doughty*, $45.67; the Behring's Sea seizures, $1,400; the *Argonaut* seizure, $184.08; court fees of judge in the case of schooner *Argonaut*, $19.47; and some other similar expenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think this ought to have been put in a different form, as nobody could see from this item what it referred to. There are several of my hon. friends who are specially conversant with these matters, and who would have made a point of being here if they knew exactly what this referred to. If it passes now it may involve a somewhat protracted discussion on Concurrence.

Mr. FOSTER. Let it pass now and it can be discussed on Concurrence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Let it be understood that it will be discussed in Concurrence.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The Minister will bring down the bills I suppose?

Mr. TUPPER. I have no objection to bring down the taxed bills.

To pay moiety of expenses incurred in connection with the Survey of the River St. Lawrence $13,571.83

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this vote for the survey of the St. Lawrence to be a fixed vote?

Mr. FOSTER. No; it will take about two and a half years yet. It was done at the suggestion of the Boards of Trade and the British Government who pay half the expense.

Mr. WATSON. What is the nature of the supplies furnished to the half-breeds for which $6,000 is asked to recoup the Mounted Police?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Last spring representations were made in reference to the destitution among the half-breeds in Saskatchewan, Battleford and Prince Albert. The appeal was made at a time of the year when we could not send supplies ourselves, and the police were asked to give what assistance they could out of their own supplies. The supplies were mostly of flour and bacon.

Mr. WATSON. This is to be paid to the police stores and not to policemen outside of the regular stores?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This was issued from the police stores and it is to repay them for those supplies.

Mr. WATSON. The Government stores?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. I would say while on this vote that I see by the press that Gabriel Dumont is up in that district again calling meetings and urging the people to claim a compensation. I would like to ask the Minister if he has any information as regards that?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have no official information. I know nothing as to what has occurred since Gabriel Dumont arrived there. I know nothing except what appeared in the papers, and I fancy that what we have seen in the papers is exaggerated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope so.

Customs—Miscellaneous $9,443 82

Mr. BOWELL. Of this amount $6,500 is required to pay the costs incurred in the suits which were taken to the Supreme and other courts. The sum of $2,781.82 is to cover half the expense of maintaining the yacht *Cruiser* on the upper lakes during the last season, the other half being paid by the Fisheries Department; the yacht coasts principally along the shores of Lake Huron and Georgian Bay. Then, there is a sum of $162 to be paid as a gratuity to a young man named Ambrose, who while working in the bonded warehouse in Montreal met with a severe accident by which he was laid up some 90 days, and by which his foot was so badly injured that he had to have part of his heel taken off.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Have the Government been informed at all whether a duty will be charged on Canadian cars going into the United States, as reported?

Mr. BOWELL. No; the Government have no information of that kind. I judge from the reading of the report, that the regulation applies exclusively to cars taken into the United States for local use. It may possibly have arisen from the practice, which has prevailed for a number of years, of cars which have gone into the United States remaining there for a long time, and being used in local work. In this country the same thing happens, and some years ago I issued an order to stop it, but finding that it was mutual on both sides, the order was withdrawn. Whenever cars are imported into Canada by a company for exclusive use in the country, they have to pay the duty, and it is the same with cars passing into the United States.

Post Office expenses $63,600

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a large item here of $63,000.

Mr. HAGGART. It was found that the car accommodation on the Canadian Pacific Railway was not sufficient, and by an arrangement between the late Postmaster General and the company the accommodation was increased one-half. That makes the sum nearly $85,000 a year to be paid to the company in addition to about $170,000 paid now.

Mr. WATSON. Under this item for postal service I wish to call the attention of the Minister to the unsufficiency of mail service by the Canadian Pacific Railway on what is known as the Glenborough Branch, a road running some 110 miles from Winnipeg. I am not objecting to the amount for Manitoba, but I am finding fault with the Government for not having seen fit to give another mail to the Glenborough Branch. I submit that when there is a railway service passing several towns, through a well settled country, to an important town like Glenborough, the hon. the Minister should be able to furnish a mail service three times a week, and give the people of that town an opportunity of answering correspondence within a reasonable time. As it is a person corresponding from Winnipeg with another in Glenborough cannot obtain a reply within eight days. There is not an hon. member who would criticise the Government for giving that efficient service.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Last Session we had a discussion with reference to a claim pending some time against the Canadian Pacific Railway for the use of some cars. There was a claim made by the Canadian Pacific Railway for hauling cars down to the Intercolonial Railway—the Onderdonk stock—which was paid. At that time, it was stated that there was a claim of $10,000 or $15,000 against the Canadian Pacific Railway which was not paid. Has that account been settled?

Mr. FOSTER. I will make a note of it and obtain the information.

For Militia expenses in connection with the Suppression of the Rebellion in the North West—Governor General's Warrant $50,000

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Amount required to meet expenses in connection with the rebellion in 1885, revote of part of lapsed balance of 30th September, 1888, $50,000; balance of vote on 30th June, 1888, $83,121.29; expended to 30th September, 1888, $1,757.94; leaving a balance on 30th September, 1888, lapsed on that date, of $81,363.35; expended 1st October, 1888, to 1st March, 1889, on authority of Governor General's Warrant, by Order in Council of 17th October, 1888, $26,566; probable amount required to pay claims up to 30th June, 1889, $23,500; estimate of amount required, $50,000. There may be further claims presented which are supplementary, amounting to about $15,000, but they are not included in the above statement.

Mr. MULOCK. Does that include the allowance for the York and Simcoe Battalion?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This amount is to be taken out of this $50,000. We will have sufficient out of this amount for claims that we know of.

Mr. MULOCK. How much is to be paid those men?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I could not say now. I can give the hon. gentleman a copy of the claim sent in.

Mr. MULOCK. Has it been passed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman knows that the First Minister said that the amount would be paid. There is no question at all about it.

Mr. MULOCK. What amount?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have already said I have not got the claim, and, from memory, I could not tell the hon. gentleman; but it is very easily ascertained.

Mr. MULOCK. Has the amount of the claim been assented to by the Government?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman was told by the First Minister that the claim which has been sent in by the battalion to the Government would be paid. It is impossible for me from memory to speak as to the figures, but I can bring down the amounts. I can only repeat what the Prime Minister has stated, that that amount shall be paid.

Mr. MULOCK. Of course that does not specify any amount at which the claim may be fixed, but simply means that the Government will pay what they deem right. I want to know what the amount will be. Perhaps the Minister will give me that statement to-morrow.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes; I said I would.

Mr. MULOCK. There is quite a difference between paying these men on the basis of 1885, and paying them four years after. It must be borne in mind that the First Minister was speaking of an uncertain amount. He did not say how much he was going to pay each man, and, as some of the men in Battleford were paid $15 apiece, some in Winnipeg $25 apiece and some in Toronto $8.15 apiece, there does not appear to be any fixed standard of pay.

Resolutions reported.

RAILWAY CONTRACTORS AND EMPLOYÉS.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell) has asked me if I would bring to the attention of the Government the fact that he has a Bill on the Order Paper No. 53, which stands for a second reading, and that there is no chance of its being reached in the ordinary way during this Session. The Government have permitted two gentlemen to get their Bills placed on the Government Orders, and I would ask if they would allow the Bill of the hon. member for Glengarry to be placed on the Government Orders for consideration in the same way.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sorry that the member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell) has not had an opportunity of taking the sense of the House on the second reading of this Bill, but I hardly feel free to make the promise to place it on the Government Orders. I explained personally to the introducer of the Bill that, according to my humble opinion, it would not be one which we would have a right to pass. I admit the commendable motives which the hon. gentleman has to give every protection to the laborers on railways, but, as the Bill imposes civil liabilities on railway companies, it appears to me that this measure is beyond our competence, and for this reason, though it is a matter of public interest, I do not feel free to promise to put it on the Government Orders.

SEIZURE OF THE *ADAMS*.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will ask the hon. gentleman to give me an answer on that subject to-morrow. May I ask the Minister of Marine if he will bring down to-morrow the papers in connection with the *Adams* case? They are very short, and I should like them to be down to-morrow, as I have something to say on that subject.

Mr. TUPPER. I will bring them down when they are ready.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is a very unsatisfactory answer, and a very flippant one, and considering the importance of the subject——

Mr. TUPPER. I shall not bring them down before they are ready.

Mr. MITCHELL. I want to have them when they are ready.

Mr. TUPPER. They will not be brought down before.

Mr. MITCHELL. If that is the way the Minister conducts his business, he may find that he will not conduct it as readily as he thinks.

Mr. TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. "Hear, hear"—Yes, the Session is not through yet.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2:30 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 23rd April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 147) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act (from the Senate).—(Mr. Dewdney.)

FRENCH VERSION OF THE *DEBATES*.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I wish to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee to the delay in printing the French version of the *Debates*. Instead of improving, matters are growing worse and worse. The English version has now reached the 1469th page, and the French version has not reached the 400th page yet, that is, it is more than 1000 pages behind the English version. Matters are much worse than they were four weeks ago, when we first complained. I would like to know what is the cause of this delay?

Mr. DESJARDINS. (Translation.) I will explain to my hon. friend that after representations had been made to the House respecting the delays which had been incurred in the printing of the French edition of the Debates, the Committee met and instructed the Chairman to write to the printer and require from him the reasons of the delay. After giving certain excuses, he concluded by saying that the temporary nature of the printing establishment did not admit of his proceeding faster than he was at present doing, because he had not sufficient type, but he hoped that in the next Session, the staff being complete in the new building, he would possess all that was necessary, and would be in a position to print off in accordance with the rules laid down by the Committee, that is to say, within the three days following the publication of the corrected English edition. My hon. friend knows that the translation is not made on the daily issue, but upon the corrected copy, which necessitates at least three or four days further delay before the translators can have the *Debates*; and the following three or four days are spent in the translating and printing off. This year the printer has declared it to be impossible, in the present state of the printing office, to fulfil the required

conditions. At the present moment the printing is done with the type leased from the old office of McLean, Roger & Co. I am informed that next year the printer will have all the type necessary, and that the printing office will be so ordered as to meet all the demands upon it. But I must say that all possible diligence has been used by the Committee in order to obtain a more satisfactory state of affairs than the present one.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). The chairman's explanation exposes a most extraordinary state of things. We have expended some $300,000 on that Printing Bureau, and it appears that it is in such an inefficient state that it cannot do the printing of this House as it used to be done up to last year; and now we are told that, in order to have the French version of the *Debates* printed in time to be of some use to the members of the House and the public, it would be necessary to purchase some more printing material. There is one point to which I would call the attention of the chairman of the Committee. If the Printing Bureau has type in sufficient quantity to print the English version, I do not see why it cannot print the French version also. I can tell the House that the French version this year will be of no use whatever. It comes so late that the expenditure is a pure waste of money, and we shall not find a single individual who will refer to those French *Debates*. Newspapers cannot have them in time to make them of any use to their readers, and the general public do not read those debates; so that if they are of no use to the French newspapers, and of no use to anybody else, I do not see for what purpose they are to be printed. I like very much to have the French *Debates*, but I do not like to see a waste of money, and it is nothing more nor less. If we cannot have these *Debates* earlier, we had better dispense altogether with the French version.

Mr. DESJARDINS. (Translation). I think that the hon. member is laboring under a false impression. He is probably ignorant of the rule laid down in the matter of the publication of the *Debates*. The daily edition ought to contain all the speeches which have been delivered, and exactly as they have been delivered, whether in English or French; such has been the settled rule since the commencement. The corrected pages of the English version and of the French version should be bound up into a volume and preserved as a record. So that the reason why there are not more French speeches published in the daily editions is that that language is not so much used; in all other respects the two languages are subject to the same treatment, in accordance with the rules made by the committee and adopted by the House.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). That is not what I complain of. I take the last copy we have. We have now reached the 23rd of April, and the French version has only reached the 27th of February. I ask any member of this House, who will take the trouble to read the *Debates* when they are two months old? Nobody will take the trouble to consult them.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—ENQUIRIES.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the acting leader of the Government to the request I made last evening for information from the Minister of Marine, to bring down papers in relation to the claim of the Messrs. Adams for the loss of their vessel. I received a reply from the Minister of Marine which to me seemed rather impertinent. It may be wrong to use a term of that kind in the House, and therefore I do not use it with regard to him, but were it outside, I would consider it an impertinent answer to a proper question for information which I have a right to get.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot raise a debate on that point.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not raising a debate. I am speaking now to a question of privilege. It is my privilege in this House, as representing my constituents, to ask for information to which they are entitled where their interests are involved. I asked for it in a civil manner and did not get a civil reply, and I now ask the acting leader of the House if he will bring down those papers, because I want them before we go into Supply.

Mr. TUPPER. I attempted to rise, when the hon. member for Northumberland interrupted me, and made the remarks he has made. To those remarks personally, I have nothing to say, but I desire to lay on the Table of the House, a return to an Order of the House of Commons, dated the 1st April, 1889, for copies of all papers in connection with the claim of the Messrs. Adams, for the loss of their vessel.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very glad the young man has come to his senses.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I asked some time ago, for surveys or reports of the short line from Harvey to Moncton. When will those be brought down?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The leader of the Government is absent, but as soon as he comes in, I will enquire from him whether he has those papers, if any exist, and he will be able to answer my hon. friend.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Also any correspondence between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway, with regard to that short line.

COPYRIGHT ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved third reading of Bill (No. 101) to amend the Copyright Act.

Mr. EDGAR. Before this Bill is read the third time, I have a few observations to make. I was, unfortunately, absent when it was read the second time and went through Committee, but I have read the *Hansard* report of the debate, and I am very glad to see the position the Minister of Justice took with reference to our constitutional right to enact legislation of this kind. I had, as the House is aware, given notice of a motion for an Address to the Imperial Parliament, with a view of having Imperial legislation enacted, making it perfectly clear that Canada had a right to legislate on the subject of Copyright law, even if it should affect the rights of English holders of copyright under the Imperial Act of 1842. I gave that notice because I was aware that, in 1872, when the Parliament of Canada had passed, I think unanimously, an Act dealing with this subject in the direction of the present Bill, the Act was reserved and was not allowed in England on the ground that it was held to be beyond the constitutional powers of the Canadian Parliament. I am very glad, indeed, to hear that the Minister of Justice holds the opinion that we are entitled to legislate in the direction, if necessary, of repealing the Imperial statutes which were enacted before 1867, so long as the subjects relate to matters within the jurisdiction of Canada. Well, I hope the Minister of Justice is right. I was only too glad, after having heard his views, to let my motion for an Address drop, in order that we might bring squarely before the Home Government, the question as to Canadian rights in the matter. I am sure on this side he will be heartily supported in his contention, because I think it is part of our political creed that we must seek to obtain for the Dominion full Dominion rights, and that we must give to the Provinces full provincial rights. In fact we want Home Rule in Canada as regards England and Home Rule in the

Provinces as regards the Dominion. I am very glad that the Minister of Justice, on two notable occasions this Session, has adopted the views which the Opposition have always held on this point. Now, with reference to the Act which the hon. the Minister of Justice proposes to amend, I must say that I would much rather have seen the Act of 1872 brought in again. That Act gave to Canadian publishers and printers the right to reprint and republish British copyrighted works in Canada, although the English Copyright law was held to cover Canada, and did not interfere with the existing right of the Americans or any foreigners, to introduce in this country foreign reprints of any English copyrighted works. It has been an inestimable boon to Canada that we have had the right, in spite of the English copyright, to introduce and sell in Canada foreign reprints of English copyrighted works. That right was only, I fancy, practically used by the publishers in the United States, who have been willing to pay, or go through the form, at any rate, of paying 12½ per cent. author's tax, as well as the Customs duty of 15 per cent. upon books, and thus enabled our reading public to have works published at a reasonable price in Canada which their fellow-citizens in England are paying enormously high prices for. Now, the proposed Act of 1872, as I recollect it, did not prevent those American reprints coming in, but it gave what certainly was right and proper; it gave to Canadian publishers and printers the right also to reprint those English copyright works upon paying to the British author or owner of the copyrights, the author's tax. That enabled us in Canada to have more competition in cheap books. It gave us the right to have the American reprint, and to have the local Canadian competition, as well, superadded to that, and, as they had the protection of the duty of 15 per cent. upon books, I think it was a very fair thing to expect that they would be satisfied with that, and I know that the publishers always, until lately, said they were satisfied with that measure of protection. This Bill, as first introduced, made much the same provisions, except that the Government were authorised to shut out the American reprints altogether. That was the only portion of the Bill that I did not quite like. I think it could be fairly contended that, with a protection of 15 per cent. at the frontier, Canadian publishers ought to be able to hold their own against American publishers. I know that the results of the high protective tariff we have here make it somewhat difficult for Canadians to do that, because the Canadian publishers point out, with some show of reason, that they would only be protected by the duty at the frontier of 15 per cent. on the manufactured book, while they have to pay 25 per cent. on the paper they import from the United States, so that 15 per cent. on the manufactured article is not enough to protect them when they have to pay 25 per cent. on the raw material. In that respect they are in very much the same position as the millers of Canada say they are placed in by the National Policy, that they are injured rather than benefitted by it. Still, that is scarcely a reason why American reprints should not be allowed to come in. I think that the duty on the raw material for the publishers should be reduced to such a figure as will allow them to compete with the American publishers. That, as I have explained, was the way in which the Bill was introduced, and, like the Act of 1872, it undertook to provide against existing English copyrights, as well as English copyrights in the future. I have a copy of the Act of 1872 here, and it is quite clear what the effect of that was. It referred to works "of which the copyright has been granted and is subsisting in the United Kingdom," and it legislated against them and permitted their republication here under certain conditions. I find that an amendment has been introduced into this Bill since it was first printed, providing that it shall not apply at all to existing copyrights. That really brings the Bill down to almost nothing, because English copyrights last for

42 years, or for seven years after the writer's death, if he lives longer than 42 years after copyright is granted, so that nearly all the important modern works which are copyrighted in England are not affected by this Bill at all, and no Canadians can republish them. Of course, gradually, in time, as new publications come out in England, the provisions of this Act as to licensing Canadian publishers to reprint them will come into force, but we will not have that great stimulus which I think we would have had to the publishing trade of Canada, if we were allowed to compete with the Americans in reprinting the English works, and I do not see that the English author could complain either. I think it would be to his advantage, because it is provided by the Bill that the English author shall receive 10 per cent. upon the retail price of the work as published in Canada, as an author's tax. Surely, he would suffer no harm if the Canadians did not publish his work, and if they do publish and pay him 10 per cent. on the retail price, he will get a very handsome return indeed; and I believe that all the English authors, unless they have made some arrangement with American publishers about reprints, would be glad to receive this subsidy from Canada. I cannot see any reason why the Government have shut the Canadian publishing and printing trade out of the great benefit they would derive from publishing these existing works. In 1872, this Parliament passed, I think unanimously, the Act which applied to a certain extent a retroactive effect, but offered to the English authors a full and ample compensation for the interference—as it undoubtedly was—with their vested rights. By making this amendment, the Government has very much reduced the advantage to the Canadian publisher. I think it would have been more reasonable, instead of leaving out the provision as to the Bill being retroactive, to have allowed American reprints still to come in and to compete with Canadian publishers, in respect, at least, of such works as have been copyrighted in England. That would give the authors the double chance of the Canadian author's tax and the American author's tax which is collected at the frontier. I would draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to these points, and also to this further point. In the first section of this amending Bill, provision is made—simply, I think, re-enacting the old provisions—as to what persons may take out copyright in Canada. It is provided that any persons domiciled in Canada or any part of the British possessions, or any citizen of any country which has an international copyright treaty with the United Kingdom, may take out a copyright. When that Act was originally passed in 1875, that provision was probably right enough, because at that time the Berne Treaty had not been entered into. That was entered into 1887, and eight countries were parties to that treaty—seven besides Great Britain—France, Spain, Germany and so on. That is an international copyright treaty with Great Britain, and, under the terms of this Act, any citizen of any of those countries—France, Spain, Germany and so on—can come into Canada and take out a copyright or a translation of a copyrighted work, and the treaty, the Minister of Justice will recollect, does not apply to Canada in any other respect, because the proclamation has not been issued by England, or at least I hope it has not, including us in that treaty. Therefore, we have no benefit from that treaty. No Canadian can go to France—I think it is a great pity that the poet Frechette cannot go to France and take out a copyright there, but he cannot do it under the treaty. But any French or any German author can come into Canada to-day, under the Bill as it stands, and take out a copyright, because there is an international treaty between the United Kingdom and those countries. So, I think, that in order to avoid that difficulty, which is a real and not imaginary one, a word or two should be inserted in that part of the Act after the words "United Kingdom," in the third line, so as

to make it read thus: "a citizen of any country which has an international copyright treaty with the United Kingdom in which Canada is included." That would make it fair, and I dare say that is what the Minister of Justice had in his mind when he drew the clause.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sorry the hon. gentleman was not in the House when the Bill was in Committee; in fact, had I known that he was out of the city, I would have deferred to move the Bill a little later. I was aware he had taken an interest in this subject, and was desirous of hearing his views upon it. I think the hon. gentleman is not strictly accurate in his reference to the Act of 1872. I have what purports to be a copy of the Act that was passed, and while it is true that it provides for the republication in Canada, under license, of works of which the copyright is existing, still it provides for the prohibition of foreign reprints. The Bill as finally passed, I think, contained this clause:

"From and after the passing of this Act the importation into Canada of foreign reprints of works of which the copyright is existing in Great Britain, and which have been registered here for republication in Canada, shall be and is hereby prohibited."

Now, it is true that it would be desirable, in the interests of the book manufacturers in Canada, that their rights should be extended, so as to enable them to reprint works which are under existing copyright, but I think that would be legislation of a very questionable character. I think we are going to have, in connection with this Bill, an important constitutional question to settle with the Colonial Office, and that we shall have, in settling that question, to meet the disadvantage of having against us what has been a very powerful influence in Great Britain heretofore, the influence of the Copyright Association of that country, which is in the interest of the authors of the United Kingdom, and that we would be at a great disadvantage in settling that question if we had upon the face of the Bill that which would be regarded in the United Kingdom as an interference with vested rights. Under the existing laws of the United Kingdom, the authors who have secured copyrights have acquired what they conceive to be a valuable property, a property valuable even as regards Canada. I think it does not militate against that argument to say that we would provide for the payment of an excise duty for them, as for future copyrights, under this Bill; because, although we would be allowing them compensation by that excise duty, we would be taking away from them, against their will, what they conceive to be their property, lawfully acquired under the laws of the United Kingdom. If they consider the compensation which an excise duty would give them an adequate compensation for their rights, there can be no difficulty in their making a voluntary arrangement with the Canadian publishers by which the publishers will receive from them the right to reprint in Canada, and allow them a payment equivalent to that which is provided for in the Bill. If they do not regard it as an equivalent for their rights in Canada, secured under the statute of the United Kingdom, they surely ought not to be deprived by forcible legislation of that which they do not desire to part with. As to what the hon. gentleman says in reference to the limitation in the first clause, I quite agree with him that it would be desirable to make that change; and with your permission, and that of the House, I will move that the House go into Committee again for the purpose of amending the first section in that sense, so as to add the words "in which Canada is included."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before we go into committee on the Bill I would like to call the hon. gentleman's attention to some other objections which appear to me to be worth some consideration. The constitutional question has so overshadowed the other questions that the details of the Bill did not receive the consideration of the House at large which I think they deserve, in view of their importance to the general community. The practical effect of the Bill will be that any person can obtain a copyright for his works in Canada hereafter, but subject to a condition that he shall reprint and publish the work in Canada within one month after it is published elsewhere. Now, the practical effect of that will be to deprive them of the right altogether. One month seems to be too short; they will hardly have time to make up their minds whether they ought to publish in Canada or not. But the effect of it is more observable when we turn to the other section of the Act which makes provision for licensing publication in Canada in case a copyright in it is not taken out. It seems to me that the effect of the fifth section will be this, that, after the license is granted, the Governor General in Council, being satisfied that the work is in course of being printed, may prohibit the importation. Now, what will be the effect on the reading public? We know, as a matter of fact, that a large portion of the people of Canada are a reading people, and that for years back they have had the privilege of reading the reprints of the best English works published in the United States at a very low figure. Now, if this prohibition is agreed to, and a publisher in Canada satisfies the Government that he is about to bring out a work in Canada which is not copyrighted here, out at once goes a proclamation prohibiting the importation of reprints from the United States. There is no doubt that the result of that will be very largely to enhance, to the reading public, the cost of the works — it is alleged by some 40 or 50 per cent. If that is so, it is going to be a very serious tax upon the public. I must confess that the argument of my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Edgar) seems to be very strong, that the trade ought to be sufficiently protected by the duty which we now have upon foreign reprints from the United States, and if that protection is not sufficient, the Government might propose to increase it somewhat. But absolutely to prohibit and to give a monopoly to the licensee of the Canadian work, will be so largely to enhance the price that the public may, under certain circumstances, be fleeced. I really think that if we go back into committee the Minister might deem it a point important enough to justify us in giving it a thorough discussion there; and that if the House gave the matter its attention, it would come to the conclusion that the general interests of the public are not sufficiently protected, and that the trade will have practically a large monopoly, the result of which will be to compel the reading public to pay very much more for their reading matter than they have been accustomed to pay heretofore. That course would be a very unpopular one, and, apart from its unpopularity, it is one that would be very much to be deprecated, because the very wide opportunity which people now have to read the best books of the age, which they can obtain at low figures, would be curtailed. This Bill, important as it is, did not receive, owing largely to the absence of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), that attention from the House which its importance deserved, and I trust that if the Government accede to the proposal to again consider the Bill in Committee, they will consider these points again.

Mr. DAVIN. If I were at all certain that the Bill could bear the interpretation of my learned friend who has just spoken, I should certainly oppose the Bill. Nevertheless, I cannot look at the Bill with the favor manifested by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar). There is considerable searching of heart, I may tell the Minister of Justice, about this third clause, and no doubt when we go into Committee he will be able to satisfy us with regard to the meaning of it. Some of the publishers think that the third clause will give a monopoly to a person or to any number of persons being a body which they consider describes a company. On the other hand, it seems to me that the

clause is open to the interpretation, that not only one person but any number of persons may obtain from the Department of Agriculture a license to publish those books. If that be so, it will get rid of the fear of monopoly. From the point of view of the author in London, it seems to me it will place him in this position, that he will be forced, in his own interests to come into the hands of a number of persons here in Canada; he will be forced to do so, because, if he does not place himself in their hands and get his books published here within one month, anybody may pirate his books; and from that point of view it will be worth while considering whether one month is sufficient time or not. But the chief thing I am anxious about, is whether this Bill will place the reading public, and those persons who are speaking to me in relation to the latter, the newspaper publishers, at a disadvantage. If this ring of publishers in Canada were to so act that they could get hold of the book, charging probably 10 or 20 cents more than we now get them for, and selling them at a much dearer rate to the newspapers, then the public would decidedly suffer. But I am not at all certain that, under the third clause, newspapers could not come in and get a license from the Department of Agriculture, and, if so, it would be interesting to know how the excise would act in regard to the newspapers. When we get into Committee I shall watch carefully the clauses as they are considered.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This Bill is in many respects an important one, and there are conflicting interests, and the question is which interest we shall undertake to most favorably consider. We are not exactly in the position of the people of the United Kingdom, because this country lies side by side with a great English-speaking nation having the same literature. The interests of the publishers would depend very much more on our being able to establish free intercourse with the neighboring republic in publishing matters than in undertaking to establish for our publishers an exclusive market in Canada. We never should sacrifice the general public interests to the interest either of the author or of the publisher. The interest of the general public in this question, as in all others, ought to be regarded as paramount, and any steps taken that will have the effect of increasing the cost of publishing works which circulate among the people will diminish the number of readers of those works in this country. There are thousands, I may say tens of thousands of our population who have the opportunity to read cheap republications of English works, that are of very great importance and that tend to improve the taste and extend the area of the reader's information, that in fact make our people a much more literary and cultured people than they otherwise would be, and you will seriously affect their opportunities for culture by any step being taken to promote the interest either of author or publisher at their expense. It seems to me that while it is all very well to secure to the publisher in this country the right of republishing English copyrighted works, it is also a matter of the first importance that we should not exclude the American editions of those works from the Canadian market. This should not be done, but, on the contrary, we should seek to obtain free trade between the two countries in the matter of literary works published in one or the other country, subject to any duties that may be imposed for the purpose of giving to the author a royalty upon the work he has produced.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The remarks which the hon. gentleman has just made are altogether against the principle of copyright, and therefore it is impossible that I can amend the Bill in any way that will suit that hon. gentleman. With respect to the points to which the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has called attention, I may say that it was distinctly explained in Committee, and I think the Bill carries that meaning on its face, that licenses should not be in any way a monopoly, or be given to any one person or any limited number of persons. The Bill was amended in Committee to its present form in order specifically to declare that the Minister shall grant licenses to any person or number of persons from time to time. With respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), and the points he has urged in regard to the shortness of the period for republication in Canada and the possible advantages that might ensue, I may say that that subject has been very carefully considered indeed, and the dalay in having the Bill printed was due to the fact that it was considered desirable to give more than usual consideration to this, which is really a very complicated subject. I do not apprehend the evils to which the hon. gentleman has referred. I explained, as fully as I could on the motion to go into Committee, the point which he has now raised, but I suppose he was attending more to the constitutional question which he had in view and perhaps lost my explanation. My explanation was briefly this: that if we are to have a copyright system for Canada at all, if we are to have the republication of works copyrighted abroad, we must make some effort to keep the market for the Canadian publisher. That is an essential feature of the copyright system. We have already upon our Statute-book the principle of interim copyright, by which foreign reprints are prevented from being introduced here for one month, and we have now adopted the same principle as regards the time for republication in Canada by the copyrighter, and the time for taking out a license to publish in case the copyrighter does not cause his book to be published here. From the information we could obtain we thought that a month was not too a short time, because, in relation to all the works which are now republished, and which are likely to be published in Canada for years to come, a month is ample time. But, besides that, it now happens, even in relation to that class of works, that an English author makes arrangements with a Canadian publishing house, or an American publishing house if he wants to republish it in the United States, to have his work going through the press of the two countries simultaneously. One of the publishers gave me an illustration of that fact in connection with a work recently copyrighted in the United Kingdom and published simultaneously there and here. He said that he had upon his shelves thousands of copies of that book, awaiting a telegram that the book was issued in London, when he was to issue it in our market here. The same thing takes place in the case of authors who avail themselves of the extremely lax copyright laws of the United Kingdom, and who qualify, by a temporary residence, to take out copyright there. They publish in the United States and England on the same day, secure copyright in the two countries, and, as I mentioned to the House on going into Committee, they secure against our people the Canadian market, while we have no right of getting copyright into theirs. The fact, therefore, is that, as regards the shortness of time, it will not militate against that class of work which is likely, for years to come, to be republished in Canada. As regards more elaborate works, if our population and reading public should become so large as to justify the republication of heavier works, the system of publishing in both countries will be adopted by English authors who think it worth while to secure copyright in Canada. The probability is that an author will prefer to have his rights secured by the excise duty which we will collect for him. As to the suggestion made with regard to the importation of foreign republications, the hon. gentleman will see that it is quite futile to have a Canadian copyright system if we allow the free importation of foreign works. Even if it were but for a

month, 10 cent, 15 cent and 20 cent editions from the American press would completely take possession of the Canadian market and would make the labor and enterprise of the Canadian publisher completely fruitless at the end of that time. It is true that to some extent this system will be an experiment. I have the belief that the Act will be allowed to go into operation; and this much is certain: that if we have secured that point we will have accomplished a good deal in the interests of our people. We will have established the right to legislate with regard to this whole subject, and at a future time Parliament can act with perfect freedom as to the method of improving this Act. We will also have the opportunity of considering the regulations as to the excise duties and the licenses, which will be made with great care.

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to the amendment suggested or passed, I do not know which, to the original Act of 1872, excluding the American reprints altogether, I do not think that it added much to the wisdom of the legislation. There seems to be a good deal of force in the objection that a month is too short a time to allow an English author to copyright in this country. The objection the Minister raises to making the time longer is that the country might be overrun with cheap American reprints, which would destroy any object in the author copyrighting. Why could not that be met by making an express provision that we should allow three months to the English copyright author to copyright here, and that American reprints should not be admitted until the expiration of that time? I think that would meet the difficulty that has occurred to the hon. the Minister of Justice, and I believe that it would make this law much more popular among the copyright authors in England, which seems to be the object of the Minister of Justice. Besides, it would be a good deal fairer on the face of it. In England it is "publication" that is required by the Copyright law; and the American author can get his book copyrighted in England, although it is printed in America, by publishing simultaneously in London and in the United States certain copies of the work. That cannot be done here because "printing" is necessary, and therefore, as I read the law, a month is a very short time to have it printed in Canada. The illustration that was given by the hon. Minister to show how hard it was upon the Canadian publishers that American authors should take out English copyrights and obtain possession of our markets is quite true, and it showed that it was right for us to make this Act apply to American authors who have already taken out copyright patents in England, and therefore cut out Canada. This practice is even harsher on Canadians than the Minister of Justice has mentioned. Take, for example, Marion Crawford, the American novelist, who, I understand, copyrights his books in England. He probably comes to Montreal or Niagara and lives there for a short time to establish his domicile in British possessions, for the sole purpose of getting his book copyrighted in England. Therefore, he controls Canada by that English copyright, as the Minister has stated; but, more than that, he has obtained the American copyright, and no one else in the United States can reprint that book and send a cheap edition into Canada. The readers of his works in Canada well know that by reason of his having the American copyright, as well as the English, he controls the Canadian and American markets, and you cannot get a copy of his smallest work for less than $1. Now, the provisions of this Bill still leaves this advantage to Marion Crawford and all those other American authors who have heretofore copyrighted in England and in the United States. I think that this is a great hardship. If the Minister does not see his way to correct it this Session, I hope he will do so in another Session.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. Minister, whether the practical effect of this Bill be, as has been stated, to increase the cost of books to readers in Canada? If so, I think it is a measure that should be carefully considered. Canadians are a reading people, and if we are going to increase the cost of literature to them, I think we are taking a very serious step. If it only protects authors in their rights, that is another question; but if it is going to have the effect of shutting out American reprints, such as are largely imported and generally read in this country, I think it is a step in the wrong direction.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. With regard to that, the opinion given to me by those best qualified to speak on the subject is that it will not have the effect of increasing the prices of general reading matter. It will certainly cheapen many publications which it is impossible to get now, by enabling them to be republished in Canada by our own publishers; and it is provided in the Bill, and will, of course, be provided in the regulations, that in default of the republication taking place in Canada the prohibition against foreign reprints will be revoked. There is one observation which I had intended to make in reference to the last remarks of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), and I will take the liberty of making it now if you will allow me to do so. The hon. gentleman, in answer to my observations, stated that a month was too short a time within which to make the publication, and suggested that the objection would be met if we made the time three months, and during that period allowed no importation of foreign reprints. That would be a pretty equal division of protection between the author and the publisher, but the reader during the three months would be unable to get access to the work. I think, on the whole, that would not work well.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The present Bill only applies to books copyrighted in future. With regard to books now under copyright, of course they cannot be published in this country, and I would ask whether it would not be advisable that the license should be extended to include books already copyrighted?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A few moments ago I submitted to the House that it would be unwise, when we are endeavoring to get control of this question, to burden the Bill with provisions which would seriously interfere with vested rights in England. These authors have obtained rights under the law of England, and in some instances they have sold those rights with respect to Canada to American publishers and others, and to say that those rights should be done away for the mere compensation of the excise duty that would be paid to the author, would, I think, aggravate the objections likely to be raised against the Bill. We are not making matters any worse, but are leaving the law as to existing copyrights in its present position.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1890; and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 22nd April, 1889.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the Supplementary Estimates be referred to Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

COMBINATIONS IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved third reading of Bill (No. 11) for the prevention and suppression of combinations in restraint of trade.

Mr. CURRAN. I have an amendment to offer to this Bill which will necessitate our going into Committee. My amendment is as follows:—

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of considering the following amendment:

"An appeal shall lie from any conviction under this Act to the highest Court of Appeal in criminal matters in the Province where such conviction shall have been made, upon all issues of law and fact, and the evidence taken at the trial shall form part of the record in appeal; and for that purpose the court before which the case is tried shall take note of the evidence and legal objections."

As the House will see, there is no attempt to attack the principle underlying the Bill in the amendment I propose. I merely ask that in this matter, which is of very great importance to the whole community, more especially to the manufacturing and mercantile interests of this country, such provision will be made as will enable the public to feel secure with reference to the judgments that may be rendered under this Act. The interests at stake are of the very greatest magnitude, and a trial may take place, perhaps, before a tribunal which has not had very much experience in matters of this kind. I, therefore, ask that, not merely in questions of law, but also upon questions of fact, there should be an appeal to the highest court of criminal jurisdiction in whatever court the conviction has been obtained, and that, for the purpose of ensuring an appeal upon the facts of the case, the court before which the trial takes place shall have full notes of the evidence given and the objections raised during the course of the trial. I think it will strike most hon. members of this House that the proposition is a very reasonable one. It is of the greatest importance that we should get the opinion of the highest tribunal in the Province in matters of this kind, and although it may seem somewhat strange that we should also ask that an appeal be given upon questions of fact, still, in a matter of this kind, the whole of the facts should be submitted to the highest tribunal. I understand that there is some objection to this, on the ground of its being an innovation upon the practice which has hitherto prevailed and which now prevails in ordinary criminal cases, but it is evident that this legislation is not of the same nature as the ordinary provisions made against the commission of crime. The law of the land, as it stands in England to day, the statutory law, makes it impossible almost to indict any person engaged in a trade combination, and that has been the principle underlying our own legislation up to the present. The attempt is now made to prevent combinations of all kinds in respect of trade, and the whole question is virtually one of fact, because the court will have to determine, upon the nature of the evidence, whether there has been a combination or not, and it is upon the facts that the courts of appeal should be called to pronounce. I think that the proposition is reasonable in its character; it interferes in no way with the working of the Bill, but makes the Bill more effective by giving greater security to the public and to those interested in the carrying on of large business or works. Under those circumstances, I am satisfied the House will receive my proposition with favor.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has spoken of his amendment as being a reasonable one. I think, with great deference to him, that, although he has made it appear plausible, that it is not a reasonable one. The system as regards appeals, speaking generally of the different Provinces, is this: that a case may be stated by the trial judge for the opinion of the whole bench, and there is an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada on the question reserved, provided the judges differ in opinion. There is also in some of the Provinces, a remedy, by writ of error, to review legal defects. I submit to the House that while this is the case as regards all crimes in the calendar, including crimes which involve the forfeiture of life, and including many crimes which are punished with far more severe punishments than those in this Bill, it is unwise to make provision for special procedure in any class of offences of this kind. If it is reasonable that we should give greater liberty of appeal in criminal cases, the general law of appeal and procedure should be amended in that direction and not one class of offences made appealable and another not.

Mr. EDGAR. I think that if we are going to pass this Bill at all, we ought not to encumber it by provisions such as the one suggested by the hon. member for Montreal. We should make it as simple as possible, and not put too much in the hands of the lawyers.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to the amendment which was made last evening to the Bill in Committee, and which was not very clear in its meaning, I have since tried to understand it. It seems to me, that the legislation affected by this last amendment, is by far the most material in the whole Bill, and it has undoubtedly the effect of reducing the force of the Trades' Unions Act to a very large extent. The Government, who have taken the responsibility of this Bill, should explain whether or not this is the case. The Trades' Unions Act would be of very little use, if it were not for the protection thrown around the members of Trades' Unions by section 22 of the Act. That section provides:

"That the purposes of any trade union shall not, by reason merely that they are in restraint of trade, be deemed to be unlawful so as to render any member of such trade union liable to prosecution for conspiracy or otherwise, or so as to render void or voidable any agreement or trust."

I think the House will agree in the opinion that that clause in our Trades' Unions Act is the only one that could prevent trades unions from being indicted and punished for conspiracy in respect of restraining trade in many different ways. And the amendment to this Act repeals, in fact, that provision altogether, except as to the exercise of any handicraft or the performance of labor. I do not want to make any motion about it, but I desire to let the House understand, as far as I can make it out, what the effect of that provision is, and to let the Government and the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) take the responsibility.

Mr. CURRAN. It would be far better for the hon. gentleman to make some proposition, so that we might know really what he does mean.

Mr. EDGAR. This is a Government Bill.

Mr. CURRAN. Not as I understand.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

EXTRADITION.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 84) to extend the provisions of the Extradition Act.

Mr. LAURIER. When this question was, the other day, before the House, the Prime Minister stated that he would consider the propriety of deferring the consideration of this measure to another Session. I hope that the hon. gentle-

man has not altogether made up his mind to go on with it this Session. I can only repeat what I said the other day, that the measure is a very important one, it must take a good deal of time for consideration, it does not seem to be urgently demanded as yet by the public, it has not been as fully considered by the public as it might have been, and perhaps, under the circumstances, the hon. gentleman will think, as I myself believe, that the public interest will not suffer if the consideration of this measure were further deferred.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The subject has been considered, and it has been decided to go on with the Bill. I think it is unnecessary that I should now discuss the principle of this Bill, of which the Government approve, and they think it would be desirable to have it adopted. The Bill was introduced some nine or ten weeks ago, and I think it meets with the general approval of the House, so far as I have heard it spoken of, excepting some details to which exception has been taken, but those are not matters, it seems to me, in regard to which there should be any very long discussion.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose either the mover of the Bill or the hon. gentleman who introduced it will give some explanation of it.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). In asking leave to introduce this Bill I made a brief statement of the reasons why I thought it necessary that the law in respect to extradition should be amended I will not now repeat what I then said, but it may not be amiss to point out once again to the House that because of our peculiar geographical position, in view of the fact that, between our southern boundary and the Isthmus of Panama there are contained some seventy millions of people, with some of whom we have no extradition treaty at all, and with others of whom we have only a very narrow extradition treaty, and in view, furthermore, of the fact that, for a long term of years, we have indulged in the hope that the existing treaty, which is almost fifty years old, between our country and our neighbors to the south, would be replaced by a better and more comprehensive treaty, hoping for a long term of years that the attempts which we learned through the press were being made to replace the Ashburton Treaty by a larger and better treaty would be successful, it has not seemed urgently necessary, up to the present year, to take any step in the direction of this Bill; but I think every good Canadian, I am sure every hon. member of this House who is following with interest the course of the Extradition law, learned with very deep regret that a Bill which was drafted, more than two years ago, by the English Foreign Secretary in Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet and the American Minister in London at that time, Mr. Phelps—the so-called Rosebery Phelps Treaty, which was known to have been lying in a state of suspended animation for more than two years, and which, I think, last February, came before the Senate of the United States, was thrown out. When we learned that that Bill, for whose success we had waited so long, had been rejected, I think it occurred to many Canadians that it would be wise for us to defer no longer, hoping for a relief from the existing evils through the agency of a treaty, but to see whether we could not by legislation get, at all events, a partial measure of relief from those evils under which we are groaning. All along the border counties of Canada at present, as many hon. members who come from these counties know, there is a floating class of criminals largely made up of burglars and thieves, from the neighboring republic, who are now being shadowed by the police of their own country, because they have sought refuge here in the absence of any law of this kind. If this law were to go into force to-morrow, a great many of these criminals would be taken away from our territory back to their own country, to confront the majesty of the law which they have violated. Independently of this, there would also be a relief from a very grave menace to the property and to the lives of Canadians, and the morality of Canadian business would be secured if these people were sent back. There is another class of criminals whom I may term commercial criminals, who have caught more of the public attention, men who have wrecked great monetary institutions in foreign countries, and, knowing that Great Britain had with their country, no extradition treaty which would cover their case, have fled northward and made their homes in our cities. I think they are a very terrible and actual danger. They corrupt the morals of our young Canadian merchants. They come here openly and wantonly, flaunting their ill-gotten gains, and corrupt and taint the morals of our young men. That is what we hope to do under this Bill, and I desire to call attention to this as the essential principle of the Bill, and nothing else in the Bill, in my judgment, is essential, all the rest is matter of detail, all the rest could be easily amended without affectiag the vital principle of the Bill, and therefore this is the sole matter to which, in asking for the second reading, I care to direct the attention of the House. The new principle of the Bill is that we shall undertake to do, under statute, things that up to this time, we have been doing under treaty; that, going beyond the lines of a treaty, we shall declare to the whole world our willingness to give up to all nations—even where we are not bound by any treaty—certain classes of criminals when they are asked for by foreign states whose laws they have violated. There are some advantages of proceeding in this matter by statute rather than by treaty. First of all, when we proceed by statute, the matter is entirely in our own hands. We have not to wait till Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States, until Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the French Republic, until Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the Swiss Confederation, for intance, may have agreed upon a treaty. We can deal with the matter promptly ourselves. There is a second element of advantage in dealing with this matter by statute rather than by treaty; that is to say, if in our judgment there be any abuse of the law—as in the experience of the past, England has thought that foreign nations have abused the extradition law—we can terminate this matter of surrender without any friction. It will be in the memory of many members of this House that twelve years ago, in the famous Winslow extradition case, the relations between Great Britain and the United States were strained for a number of months by reason of the fact that the English people, under the old Ashburton Treaty, were unwilling to surrender the forger Winslow without certain guarantees being given. We know how deplorable the state of things was during six months. It is mischievous, it is dangerous to have such a state of things brought about again, and if we proceed in this matter by statute we have the matter entirely in our own hands, and we can put an end to the statutes whenever we like under the section of the Bill which gives power to the Governor in Council, by proclamation, to suspend the operation of the Act. If we think it wise and judicious, for any reason, to terminate the operation of the Act, we can do so without friction, without danger to the *entente cordiale* between two great nations. There are objections, I know, to the method of proceeding by statute. We have all heard the objection taken that in this matter we are giving away everything, and we are getting back nothing. I think that objection is founded upon a misconception of the facts. We are giving away nothing of value, but we are ridding ourselves of a great nuisance, of a great evil If I felt that we were giving away anything of value to our people, I would be as unwilling to proceed in this direction as any member of this House; but I cannot agree to the view that we in Canada are giving up to any foreign power anything of

value, when we say to them that hereafter we do not wish it to be as it is now, that when fugitive criminals come from the south northward to Canada, upon our frontier line they find the doors swinging inward to allow them to run through, and that when the avenging officer of justice follows upon their track, the door is shut and barred against him. We are willing to say that if the officer of justice following these fugitives can come before our courts, and make out a *prima facie* case, we will give these men back, provided their offences are not political; we are willing to say that these men shall be taken back to their own country for trial. We are not making a criminal law, we are not defining a new crime, we are not adding a new penalty to any existing crime—we do nothing of that kind at all, but we are simply saying to foreign peoples whose criminals have fled here: We will allow your officers to come to the boundary line and take these men back that they may confront the majesty of the law which they have violated. I do not think it necessary to deal at this stage at length with the details of the Bill. It may be that objections will be taken to the details of the Bill. As I said before, I repeat that the principle of the Bill is this simple one, that it is in our interest, that it will cleanse the Augean stable, it will drive out of this country a very mischievous and dangerous class of men, it will clear our good name, it will make us all the more proud of our country, if we put upon our Statute-book a declaration to all the world that we do not desire that our country shall be made hereafter a den of thieves; that while we desire that the same asylum shall continue to be offered to people who are entitled to it, we do not desire that this country shall become a refuge for those who are guilty of flagrant or flagitious crimes. In submitting this Bill I calmly appeal to the intelligence of this House, to the patriotism of the members of this House. I believe every one of us on both sides have but one desire, and that is to preserve the good name of his country. We have all a desire to put on the records a statement of our willingness to give up those who have no right here, and I believe that nothing but good can come from giving up flagrant offenders to be tried by the courts and to be confronted by the law of the country from which they have fled. I may say, in conclusion, that the Bill proposes that the existing Extradition law which has been upon our Statute-book for twelve years, which has been operative in this country for rather more than six years—the statute that, I think, was carried through this Parliament when the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) was Minister of Justice, and with which we have now six years, acquaintance—the proposal is that the provisions of this Extradition Act shall be applied to certain classes of criminals from countries with which we have no treaty, and that countries with which we have a treaty, shall not be independent altogether of the operations of this Act, but that we may only surrender a criminal to such a country if we, in our judgment, think it right so to do.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the Bill was mainly intended to reach a class of criminals who have committed crimes against commercial law, that Canada was overrun by fraudulent bankers and people of that class who have committed a breach of trust. Will the hon. gentleman tell me under which schedule of those he has attached to the Act, he hopes to reach any one of this class of people? I have looked over it, and while I am in favor of the general principle of this Bill, without expressing any opinion upon the retroactive clause, I fail to see that his schedule embraces this class of offenders at all. I have compared his schedule with the schedules of existing treaties between Great Britain and most European countries, and I find he has omitted very many of these crimes which are embraced in those treaties. To some of these I shall call attention when we go into Committee, because I think they should be added to the chedule of this Bill. But the most serious defect that I find in the Bill is that I do not think that it reaches the class of people that the promoter desires to reach, that is, those who commit fraud in the capacity of a banker agent, factor, trustee, or director or public officer of a company. I beg to know if the hon. gentleman has had that in view, or if there is any section in his Act which will reach these people?

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I think the Bill will include all those whom we desire to get rid of. These are matters that can be discussed in Committee.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). There is one crime which I do not see mentioned in the schedule, and that is fraud in a bailee. My hon. friend has not put that crime in his schedule. I think the people he desires to reach would not be touched by the Bill as it stands at present. We should take very good care also that the parties who are surrendered should not be tried for any other offence than the one upon which they are demanded. There was the Caldwell case some years ago, concerning which difficulty arose where the party was extradited for one offence and tried for another. He was acquitted, and the question was never raised. With respect to the retroactive clause, I think that will require very grave consideration at the hands of this House.

Mr. SKINNER. The House should hesitate before it goes into Committee on this Bill. In my opinion it should be referred to a Special Committee for examination and report. The Bill is very crude in its provisions, it does not meet the requirements of the law, it will not carry out what the hon. gentleman wishes to accomplish, and it will end in confusion and really make the law worse than it is now with respect to the very particulars in regard to which the hon. gentleman seeks to amend it. I repeat that it should be referred to a special Committee, to be reported upon, before it is further considered.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It is important that a condition should be inserted in this Bill, so that a person extradited should not be tried for any other offence than that for which he was extradited. The Extradition Act provides, that a person shall not be extradited for any political offence, and the Minister of Justice must satisfy himself that it is not for a political offence. We should here provide a clause, that this Act shall not be used for the purpose of taking a person back to the United States, for example, to try him for a crime not within this statute. Either some undertaking should be given to the Minister of Justice that this is not being done, or some discretion should be exercised by him, so that he may provide that a man shall not be tried for other offences, because when a man gets into a foreign country, we cannot interfere with the proceedings. We should be careful not to place ourselves in the position which the Imperial Government occupied, under the Ashburton Treaty, in the Winslow case.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will see that that is one of the evils inherent in the legislation before the Committee. Under a extradition treaty agreed upon between the two great nations a clause is generally introduced making provision that the offender shall not be tried for any other offence than that for which he was extradited. We cannot make provision in this Bill to cover the point. If the House chooses to proceed on these lines and enact that, whether an extradition treaty exists or not, parties having committed the offences named in the Act

may be extradited, there is no security that, after they are taken back to the United States, they will not be tried for other offences. The whole Bill is open to that objection, that it may be used for political oppression, that a man may be taken from this country charged with having committed an alleged offence covered by the Act, and yet he may be tried in the United States for an entirely different offence, even for a political offence. If this be so, our boasted freedom of asylum for political offenders will be at an end.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I quite agree with the hon. members who have just addressed the Committee as to their unwillingness to surrender a fugitive, who has an asylum here, to a foreign state, with the result that he may be tried in that foreign state for offences different from the charge on which he was surrendered.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Even for a political offence.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). Yes, even for political offences. But hon. members will observe that in the latter part of the Bill there is a provision which would make such a result impossible. It is evident to everyone who has followed the Winslow case, to which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) alluded, that it was regarded as being somewhat a breach of good faith to have extradited a man on one charge and tried him on another. I quite agree with what the hon. gentleman has said on that point, and the drift of opinion was against what the Americans claimed the right to do in that case. It is clear that, if the Americans should undertake to adopt that course, it would be a breach of faith, and it would lead to an immediate suspension of the Act, there being power given to the Governor in Council to suspend it by proclamation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no mutual obligation or agreement.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). It is unreasonable to suppose that an American court, with that knowledge before it, would abuse our comity and goodwill. They have no rights in the matter. We have perfect power and control over it, and it is unreasonable to suppose that, knowing our Executive has power in one hour to suspend the operation of the Act, they will strain and abuse our comity.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This would be like locking the stable door after the steed was stolen. What the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) suggested would be a breach of faith. If a treaty is made between two nations, it is an honorable compact to which both nations are parties. But here we simply pass a statute by which we give authority that certain things can be done. The Americans are not parties to it, because there is no agreement made. They will get the fugitive back and will then say they will try him for what offence they please. When he is taken to the United States all our power over him ceases, and no treaty rights follow him, as in the case of a treaty. When he is there he will be amenable to the jurisdiction of that foreign country for any offence whatever, and the court would be bound to try him. It is not, therefore, a question of international law at all. Now, again, there would be another conflict between the Extradition Act and this Bill. The 14th section of the Extradition Act says:

"No fugitive shall be liable to surrender under this Act if it appears (*a*) That the offence in respect of which proceedings are taken under this Act is one of a political character; or (*b*) That such proceedings are being taken with a view to prosecute or punish him for an offence of a political character."

And the 15th section says:

"If the Minister of Justice at any time determines (*a*) That the offence in respect of which proceedings are being taken under this Act is one of a political character; (*b*) That the proceedings are, in fact, being taken with a view to try or punish the fugitive for an offence of a political character; or (*c*) That the foreign State does not intend to make a requisition for surrender;—He may refuse to make an order for surrender and may, by order under his hand and seal, cancel any order made by him or any warrant issued by a Judge under this Act, and order the fugitive to be discharged out of custody on any committal made under this Act; and the fugitive shall be discharged accordingly."

Now it seems to me that the Minister would have, even under this statute, to exercise the discretion vested in him by the Extradition Act, and that the 14th section would still remain in force even though the Bill now before the House passes into law. If the fugitive were tried for an offence for which he was not sent back it would be no breach of international law or no breach of faith as between the two parties, and therefore it seems to me the Bill has got to be changed in this direction. If I understand the hon. gentleman, his object is that a party should not be extradited for one offence and tried for another.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). That is so.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). There should be something in this Bill by which such a thing should be prevented. At present there is no possibility of preventing it if a party is extradited or sent back under the Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would be quite impossible to make any provision which would be a condition or contract between any executive officer in any State of the American Union and the Government of the country, for the several States are not allowed to enter into such compact, nor would any such compact be recognised as binding upon them. The proposition of the Bill is one that only can be carried out as a matter of comity, and if any State at any time undertakes to try a person for one offence while he had been extradited for another, it is quite clear that all the Government of this country could do would be to refuse to make any further surrenders; but that any compact can be entered into I do not think is at all possible. The old practice between the State of New York and some of the eastern States and the British Provinces bordering upon these States, was to provide for mutual surrender of fugitives from justice. This was done before any treaty or compact was entered into between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Kingdom, but this practice was put an end to by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Holmes against Jennison, 14 Pet., 540 Supreme Court Reports, United States. I will just read a note of Mr. Bigelow on that decision:

"The question of surrendering fugitives from justice from the Provinces bordering upon the different American States is one that for many years, while no treaty powers existed upon the subject, became of the first importance. It was at first attempted to induce the national Government to act in the matter. But this it uniformly declined to do. It therefore became matter of mere discretion between the Executives of the conterminous States, to be settled in each particular instance according to the circumstances. It was never supposed, until the decision in the case of Holmes, that the general Government, while declining to act of itself, and while no legislative provisions upon the subject existed whereby it was required to act, or could afford any adequate redress, would presume to interpose any obstacle in the way of the States disposing of such escaped offenders in any way they might deem proper. But while all this was conceded by the Supreme Court at Washington, and while it was conceded that it was entirely competent for the States, under their general powers, to regulate their own police, to remove from their territory every description of offenders who, in the judgment of the legislature, are dangerous to the peace of the State,—it seems to the Government that the fact of expelling a murderer or a robber in such a direction and in such a manner as to secure his apprehension and punishment in the Province from which he escaped, and where he had been guilty of the offence, amounted to 'entering into an agreement or compact with a foreign power.' It is certain that this practice, which existed for many years by a kind of courtesy between the governors of the conterminous Provinces and States, was never supposed to infringe upon this or any other provision of the United States constitution, or to interfere in any degree with the international relations of the two countries, until after the decision in the case of Holmes. Since that the question has been regarded as one exclusively under the control of the national sovereignty."

It is, therefore, very clear that no compact or arrangement can be entered into by any State of the American Union with the Government of this country under any condition put in an Act of Parliament which would bind them to try

a person that was an offender, or accused of an offence, of that crime, and that crime only for which he was extradited. I do not very well see with whom the Government of this country could enter into a compact, after the decision of this case of Holmes *vs.* Jennison. The only parties that could constitutionally enter into such a compact with us, would be the Executive Government of the United States, and it could not be the Governor of any one of the States. That decision of the Supreme Court puts that out of the power of any such Governor, and while we may make provision for the exclusion of these criminals from our territory by way of abating a nuisance, we can hardly enter into a compact for their protection elsewhere after they have been driven out from here. We may regard them as most undesirable persons; we may refuse to furnish them any asylum, but I do not well see that we can say where they shall go or to whom they ought to be given up. Would it be an offence against the sovereignty of the United States to undertake to say by your legislation that such an offender shall be surrendered, not to any officer of the United States, but to an officer of any State who may choose to apply for him? Could it any longer be treated as a mere police regulation between the Government of this country and the Government of any adjoining State? I do not think so. After the highest court of the neighboring republic has decided that that cannot be done, can we very well make special provision for the surrendering of these parties to any other persons, or can we make any provision to say that they should be tried for these offences, and these only, for which they are extradited? It is true that since the discussion took place between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Kingdom upon that subject, there have been several decisions of the United States, and the judiciary of that country have generally concurred in the view of the Extradition Treaty taken by Lord Cairns, that the person extradited should be tried for the offence with which he was charged in the foreign country, and no other, without his having been given an opportunity of returning to the country in which he had sought refuge. But this is a wholly different matter. It seems to me that the only course open to us is to provide for the arrest of those parties, and their expulsion from the territory. I do not see how you are going to arrange for the surrender, unless that arrangement is made with the Government of the United States; and then you have practically a treaty, though perhaps not surrounded by the solemnities of a treaty which is formally entered into and signed.

Mr. SKINNER. I would like to draw the attention of the Committee to the recital, which appears to make it sufficient for any person to be merely charged with a crime, in order to be surrendered, without any proof being required to show that the charge has any foundation in fact. Nor does the proviso require a *prima facie* case to be made out against the alleged offender. My contention is that the recital does not carry the law far enough to make it necessary that the crime should be proved *prima facie* before the alleged criminal is surrendered. Then, with regard to the provision that the Extradition Act shall apply, as some hon. gentlemen have remarked, if there were a treaty, whereby actual arrangements were made, and whereby the doctrine of comity, as between two sovereign States, were extended to this Act, that matter would be met; but a statute in which you declare that you will proceed as if there were an extradition treaty, when there is not one, would simply be impracticable, in my opinion, and could not be carried out. Therefore I think this recital is crude, is not correct as a matter of principle, and will only fail ineffectual, and paralyse the purpose which the person who drew the Act intended. As has been remarked, in order to send criminals away to another country, hitherto, a treaty has been necessary, and it is not so easy as may appear to make an Act whereby those criminals may be surrendered. It is easy enough in our courts to deal with the offences as if they were committed here; but in the case of offences which have been committed abroad, I hold that the Act is wholly inefficient. The doctrine of comity and the question of international law have been lost sight of in the drawing of the Bill. It needs to be taken hold of, and thought out, and made applicable to the extraordinary circumstances we are in, of dealing with criminals who have not committed their offences within this jurisdiction, but have come from another jurisdiction, and are to be delivered up for the purpose of being tried in the country from which they have come. I am not opposed to this Act; I am in favor of it; but I am satisfied that it would not do to put a crude, inartistic and unscientific Act of this kind on our Statute-book, which could not be carried out, but which would only lead to confusion, and would fall short of what the hon. gentleman desires, and rightly desires, to establish in the relations of this country with other countries in regard to criminals. I, therefore, think that this Bill should be submitted to a Committee, which would devise a proper Act which would carry out the intentions of the mover of the Bill.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). Three or four objections have been taken to the Bill, but I am persuaded that they are imaginary. Under several of the treaties with foreign countries which provide for extradition, we have no guarantees such as hon. gentlemen opposite are asking for. If they look over the text of the treaties now in existence, they will find that some of them have not those guarantees; we have simply the good faith of the foreign countries to reply upon. What have we to rely upon when we make the simple declaration that we will give up a burglar? We rely on the good faith of the courts who try the man on the charge of burglary, that they will not try him for a political offence. They know very well that if they did so, that would be an end of the matter; they would kill the goose that laid the golden eggs. There is no law that could not be made absurd, if you assumed that the persons charged with the administration of it were a set of rascals. I do not charge the Executive of our neighbors to the south, or of Mexico, or of other countries to which this measure would apply, with bad faith. By the first section of the Bill, the provisions of the Extradition Act are made part and parcel of this law. I desire to call the attention of the Committee to some provisions in our Extradition Act which seem to me to offer excellent guarantees against the dangers that have been dwelt upon. First of all, in sub-section 3 of the 9th section, it is provided that where the fugitive has been caught and brought before the Extradition officer, magistrate, or judge, it is the duty of such magistrate to receive any evidence tending to show that the crime of which the fugitive is accused or alleged to have been convicted is an offence of a political character, or is, for any other reason, not an extraditable crime, or that the proceedings are being taken with the view of prosecuting him for an offence of a political character. Then we come to the latter stage of the proceedings. Supposing a man has been taken up and application made for his release on *habeas corpus*, and the sitting judge has remanded him to prison until the Executive issues orders for his surrender, turn to section 15 and you will find additional guarantees, in case there should be a suspicion that the man has been arrested on one charge and is likely to be tried for a political offence. In such a case the evidence of this suspicion can be brought to the notice of the judge and of the Minister of Justice. Section 15 says:

"No fugitive shall be liable to surrender under this Act if it appears that the offence in respect of which proceedings are taken under this Act is of a political character, or that such proceedings are being taken

with a view to prosecute or punish him for an offence of a political character, he shall not surrender the accused."

I desire to call the attention of the Committee to the 15th section, which provides:

"If the Minister of Justice at any time determines—(*a*) That the offence in respect of which proceedings are being taken under this Act is of a political character; (*b*) That the proceedings are, in fact, being taken with a view to try or punish the fugitive for an offence of a political character."

These two provisions bear upon this matter and give excellent guarantees. Assuming that we are dealing with honorable men and honorable courts of justice, I think the objections so strongly taken by my hon. friend, who, I am glad to see, is in favor of the Bill—and I hope we shall be able to so word it, that every hon. member in favor of it, will find his objections removed—I say, assuming that we are dealing with honorable judges, it is not likely that, with a vigilant executive officer, this danger which is apprehended can occur. The prisoner is likely to know, whether or not there is some concealed purpose of this kind in his arrest, and if he does know, the Act of 1877 provides abundant guarantees. As to the danger of a man being taken across the boundary line on a charge named in the list of crimes, and tried for another crime, I quite agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that we cannot in Canada, not being a State, make any compact or international arrangement, or obtain any national guarantee as to good faith. But, although that be true, I can only give the hon. gentleman the same answer that I have already given. I do not see that the danger apprehended is a real and grave one, for the reason that at this very time when our extradition relations are governed by treaty, we have several treaties in which there is no guarantee that the accused will be extradited for one offence and not tried for another. We know, as a fact, that does not happen, and if it did, a strain would be put on the treaty, which would lead England to suspend it In the English statute relating to Extradition, it is most explicitly declared that, as far as England is concerned, she will not bring over to her country a prisoner on one charge and try him on another. She cannot compel France, or Germany, or Italy to observe her rule; but we know that if a foreign state, having an extradition treaty with England, wished to extradite on one charge and try on another, England would do, as she threatened to do in the Winslow case, suspend the treaty. As a matter of fact that danger has not been found to exist. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) seems to think the Bill is not artistic; he seems to think it is not based on a regard for the principle of international law. If the hon. gentleman had his attention called to the fact that the Bill follows closely in the line drawn by the foremost criminal lawyers under the reign of Queen Victoria—drawn by the Commission of which Lord Cockburn was chairman and Sir James Fitz-Stephen, secretary—he might be disposed to change his opinion. The central principle of this Bill is the principle recommended in that report, drawn by the greatest criminal lawyer who now speaks the English language. The very danger which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Ellis), and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), forecasted, is forecasted in that report of the Royal Commission of 1877, and the suggestion given in that report to meet that difficulty is the suggestion that there shall be lodged with the Executive of the day power to suspend the operation of the Act by proclamation, if the nation to which so handsome, generous, and manly an offer was made would be unwise enough to abuse our comity and try a man on one offence when arrested on another. If the Bill is not in accord with the principle of international law, I find myself in most excellent legal company, and rely with some degree of confidence on the strong opinion expressed by those able lawyers that this executive power offers ample guarantees against the dangers apprehended.

Mr. MULOCK. I am afraid we have rather a poor guarantee if we have to depend upon the honor of some nations. I would just call to mind a circumstance that I think is rather against the security it is said we have here. Hon. gentlemen will remember the excitement that prevailed in Canada when efforts were made to extradite the prisoner Anderson, and immediately following the failure of that movement, an application was made to extradite to the United States another refugee who had taken refuge in the Province of Upper Canada; and on that occasion the Court of Queen's Bench rather unwisely gave an order for the extradition of the prisoner before the American war had concluded. The prisoner notified the courts here that this charge on which he was being extradited was a mere sham, made with the object of punishing him for his supposed connection with the war, and he declared that if he were extradited, the feeling was so strong against him that he doubted if he would get even a trial, and that more likely he would be handed over to be lynched. Nevertheless, owing to the strained feeling that existed between Great Britain and the States at the time, our courts did give an order for his extradition. The prisoner was taken across the line, and had no sooner reached the State of Michigan than he was lynched. They did not even go through the form of trying him, but handed him to the mob. That was done, it is true, at a critical period, but it involved just such consequences that might follow here,—the abrogation of the treaty.

Mr. TISDALE. Is that the case of the negro?

Mr. MULOCK. No, it was not Anderson that was extradited. I have forgotten the name. But the hon. gentleman from Albert (Mr. Weldon) says that, if, in this case, the country which got the prisoner were to try him for any other offence, the Act would be suspended. That might also have been said in regard to the Extradition Treaty, that it might have been suspended, but it did not happen to be suspended. Of course, there was excitement at the time, but, I think, the security suggested here, that the Act being open to suspension will compel the exercise of good faith, is a very poor security in some cases.

Mr. TISDALE. I would ask the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) if there is any precedent for this; whether all the other cases are not under treaties, and whether any State has passed such a law as this?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The old Province of Upper Canada did.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). The State of Mexico gave up a forger.

Mr. TISDALE. Yes; but I am asking in regard to a statute law of this kind.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I do not know of any precedent except that to which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) refers.

Mr. TISDALE. If we pass this law, and a foreign State does commit a breach of faith, what is to prevent it from taking the prisoner from the court and trying him for some other crime? That is one of the points we should carefully consider. I am in favor of this measure if we can work it out properly, but I do not want to do anything which would interfere with the right of asylum. If a criminal, a thief or a robber, is sent to a foreign country because we do not want him, we do not ask for any undertaking, to protect the right of asylum, should the Executive of the foreign State take him out of the hands of the court and try him for another offence. It is on that ground that I asked if there was a precedent for such legislation as this, because

all the other matters are matters of common law. Of course, if it were a reciprocal thing, it would be different.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to revert to the question which we were discussing. I think the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) is slightly astray in informing the House that, under the extradition treaties now made between nations, there is no clause put in preventing a person being tried for a different offence from that for which he is extradited.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). Not in all, but in some.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Under the 1842 Treaty between Great Britain and the United States, there was no such clause, but in the Winslow case the question came up, and Lord Derby refused to allow the prisoner to be extradited, unless the pledge was given that he would not be tried for any other offence. However, in the United States, treaties are considered as part of the law of the land, and the Supreme Court there, as late as 1886, determined in the case of Rauscher that, under that treaty, he could not be tried for any other offence than that for which he was extradited, and that on the ground that the treaty was part of the law of the land. A great deal of difficulty arose out of that Winslow case, and the result is that in all the treaties of late years, an express clause has been inserted by the different contracting parties to the effect that a criminal shall not be tried for any other offence, which shows how important this matter has been considered. In the treaty between Her Majesty and the King of Italy, Article VII says:

"The accused or convicted person who has been given up shall not, until he has been liberated, or had an opportunity of returning to the country in which he was living, be imprisoned or subjected to trial in the State to which he has been given up, for any crime, or on any charge other than that on account of which the extradition took place."

That clause, or a similar one, identical in effect, and almost the same in language, has been inserted in all modern extradition treaties.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In the treaty between Her Majesty and the King of the Netherlands, the same article occurs.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). Can the hon. gentleman find it in the treaty with France?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes; I think so. In the treaty between Her Majesty and the Emperor of all the Russias, made in 1886, the same clause occurs, and I have gone through all the modern treaties, and, as far as I have seen them, this clause is contained in them all.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I could not find it in the treaty with France.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it is there. It occurs in the treaty between Her Majesty and the King of Sweden and Norway, the 7th article. Every treaty I have come to is the same. The hon. gentleman sees that, even under the Treaty of 1842, we have that guarantee, because it has been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States that you must not try the man except for the offence specified in the treaty and for which he has been extradited, and they decided that on the ground that the treaty forms part of the law of the land in that country; but no such ground will apply if we pass this law; and, when we consider that all modern civilised nations insert express clauses to this effect in extradition treaties, it shows the importance which all Christian nations attach to this principle, and the danger we are running in legislating in this way without some protection of a similar kind. The question is so important that perhaps the hon. gentleman might report his Bill and consider it. There might be some means of meeting the objection. The hon. gentleman called my attention to the French treaty. Article IV of that reads as follows:—

"The present treaty shall apply to crimes and offences committed prior to the signature of the Treaty; but a person surrendered shall not be tried for any crime or offence committed in the other country before the extradition, other than the crime for which the surrender has been granted."

That is the Treaty of 1876. I think the hon. gentleman will find that my statement is correct. I have gone through six or seven modern treaties and I find the same provision in each. I was aware that the Treaty of 1842 did not contain that provision, but I have shown that the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of William Rauscher gave the same guarantee, because that decision was that a treaty is part of the law of the land, and the Supreme Court construed it in that way. Inasmuch as the treaty with the United States is part of the law of the land, they construe it to mean that you shall not try a man except for the offence for which he has been extradited.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). The matter has been carefully considered. The Bill was not hastily drawn, and this particular point received a great deal of consideration. I think I cannot give a better answer to the danger that the hon. gentleman has pointed out, than to re-read the paragraph I read some weeks ago, from the report of the Royal Commission on the whole subject of extradition. They recommend that the matter should be dealt with in this way, by statute:

"We would therefore suggest, that extradition treaties with other states, which appear to be practically of use only for the purpose of ensuring reciprocity, should no longer be held to be indispensable, and that, while the power of the Crown of entering into extradition treaties with other nations, as now existing by statute, should still be retained, statutory power should be given to the proper authorities to deliver up fugitive criminals whose surrender is asked for, irrespectively of the existence of any treaty between this country and the state against whose law the offence has been committed. It is as much to our advantage that such criminals should be punished, and that we should get rid of them, as it is to that of the foreign state that they should be brought within the reach of its law."

There were distinguished men on this Commission—Lord Cockburn, Sir W. Vernon Harcourt, Sir Fitz-James Stephen and Lord Selborne. It was not acted upon for the reason that shortly afterwards England had the good luck to have complete treaties with every important state except one, and that nation was so far away that she did not feel any need for it. An hon. gentleman on my left asked the question: Why are we pioneers in this legislation? It is because we are in the most peculiar position of any community in the world. England has complete extradition treaties with all her neighbors, containing a large list of crimes. But here we have a very imperfect treaty with the United States. Under the Ashburton Treaty, murderers, forgers, pirates, robbers and persons guilty of arson who come over from the south can be taken back again, but there is no provision for the very large class which this Bill provides for. If England had been able to get a treaty with the United States, like that which the hon. member read between England and France, and England and Belgium, there would be no need whatever for this Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman sees that the plenipotentiaries of England and the United States did agree on a treaty similar in its lines to the one existing between Great Britain and Germany, and Great Britain and France. I want to call attention to the fact that the diplomats of these two countries inserted a special clause, notwithstanding the decision of the United States courts, to the very effect we are speaking of. A clause in the Treaty of 1886, which the Senate declined to ratify last year, provided that extradited criminals should not, until after having had an opportunity of returning to the State to which he had fled, be detained or tried for any offence prior to

his surrender other than the extradition crime upon which the surrender was granted. It seems to me that all great countries see the importance of this protection, and have inserted it in their modern treaties; and unless the hon. gentleman can suggest to the House some mode by which we may have a similar protection afforded under legislation of this kind, I think it would be dangerous to proceed.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). There is one real danger, and that is, that a man may be taken out of this country for a crime named in this Bill and tried for a political offence.

Mr. SKINNER. Why don't you provide against that?

Mr. WELDON (Albert). There was a debate in the House of Lords on the Winslow case, and Lord Cairns declared—and there was an enormous weight of legal opinion with him—that it was an unnecessary effort to insist that the man should not be tried for a charge other than the one for which he was extradited, provided there was no invasion of the right of political asylum. If my memory is right, I have seen in the English *Hansard* a great weight of opinion in that direction, though I think that Lord Selborne was against Lord Cairns on that point. There were many able lawyers whose opinions were expressed in that debate to the effect that we need not concern ourselves too much, that we need not be too anxious in insisting upon that point, which was the point Lord Derby insisted upon in negotiations with Secretary Hamilton Fish. I do not think that it is an alarming thing that a man who is taken across for burglary should be tried for arson.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The point raised by my hon. friend shows the importance of having this question guarded. We find, notwithstanding the report of that Commission which my hon. friend has read, and which report Parliament did not act upon, that Parliament preferred to have treaties. Lawyers generally desire to act by statutes, whereas statesmen desire to act by treaties, according to the comity of nations. It is an important fact that in nearly all modern treaties there is an express clause which protects parties from being tried for a political offence. For instance, a man is resident in Canada who is wanted badly in New York for an offence created by the statute of that State. If the man is guilty of the offence mentioned in the schedule, we cannot refuse to let him be taken over. While the parties are here they have a certain amount of protection within our borders. We say if they commit a certain crime we will surrender them for that purpose. We stand in a different position under a statute than we do under a treaty.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman must remember that he is not dealing with the Government of the United States at all. The Government of this country will be dealing with the several States of the Union, and there is not that guarantee, there is not that safeguard, that we would have if we were dealing with the Federal Government. To my mind it is a very objectionable feature of the Bill that there is no provision made for protecting persons against being tried for an offence other than the offence for which they have been extradited.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). The Extradition Act does not deal with the States.

Mr. LISTER. I know that, but the Act you propose here is to extradite criminals that do not come within the provision of the Extradition Treaty. In so far as the United States are concerned, unless you are dealing with the United States under treaty, you are dealing with each State of the Union, and the honor of the United States Government is not pledged to carry out what the hon. gentleman stated, viz.: they would try a man for the offence for which he was surrendered, and for no other offence. The Bill is objectionable also because it is retroactive in its effect. I doubt if any modern treaty can be found which is retroactive.

Committee rose, and, it being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee)

On section 3,

Mr. LAVERGNE. I object to the 2nd paragraph of the 3rd section of this Bill. As a matter of principle I think that the clause which provides that the Bill shall have a retroactive effect is very objectionable for several reasons. I could quite understand if this legislation was proposed for the purpose of affording some relief to some party without injuring some other party, and it might be admitted on that ground; but when it is intended to cover offences which may have been for years forgiven, if not forgotten, it is vey unfair, improper and unwise. On the faith of our laws a man comes to this country believing that he will find an asylum here. He settles down and becomes a good citizen; he often becomes the father of British subjects; his family becomes connected very often with respectable families; and it would be most unfair, and it would be an infringement of acquired rights, for a person from a foreign country to come and accomplish his arrest and his extradition. In many instances, persons who have been tried and discharged would be exposed to be re-arrested and compelled to undergo a second trial, or even a third, or fourth trial in this country. I might illustrate this by a case which happened in Quebec four or five years ago. This case is reported in the Quebec Law Reports at page 165 of the 10th volume. He was brought up a second time, and the case is reported at page 17[illegible]. He was brought up a third time, and the case is reported at page 177, and he was also brought up a fourth time, and the case is reported at page 194. Since that time this man has paid all his creditors, and obtained his discharge from them. No one is interested in prosecuting him now; but if this Bill should come into effect that man will be blackmailed by any one who chooses to do so. He has no means, but he had very rich relations in the United States, and the first thing that would be done, and it would be sure to occur, would be that he would be blackmailed almost every day, and he would live in trouble the rest of his life. That man might be liable under this Bill to be tried again, although he has been tried four times under our actual extradition laws, and discharged every time. For these reasons I hold that it would be very unjust, unfair, and a breach of acquired rights, to permit such a clause to remain part of the Bill. How many cases would the clause cover? It might cover five or six, and for the sake of laying hands on five or six offenders, it is proposed to do an unjust act and to infringe on acquired rights. I move in amendment:

That the second paragraph of section three be amended by omitting the words "whether such crime was" in the second line, and the words "before or" in the third line of the second paragraph of the third section.

Mr. CURRAN. I think the Committee should be unanimous in concurring in the views expressed in the amendment proposed by my hon. friend. The cases of hardship that would arise if it were passed in its present form, would be very numerous indeed. The objects mentioned as inducing this House to pass this Bill would all be attained by the measure without inserting this retroactive clause, to which objection has been raised. I know some cases in which the clause would operate with extreme

harshness if it were enforced in the shape in which it is proposed. I am satisfied that if we show our desire to prevent parties coming into this country who may have been guilty of the offences which are aimed at by this Act, it will convince our neighbors that we are not desirous of having an accession to our population of persons who have been guilty of the offences complained of. The public sentiment of Canada is against those persons finding a refuge here; we do not wish that Canada should be an asylum for boodlers or persons who have been guilty of breaches of trust, and frauds which have become notorious and which are a standing shame. But nearly all hon. gentlemen with whom I have had any conversation on this subject, are of opinion that it would be far from just to let the Bill remain as it is with regard to this matter, and they believe that this retroactive clause should be expunged. I hope my hon friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) will at once relieve the anxiety of the House on this point, and declare his intention to drop this retroactive clause so that we may proceed with the Bill and get through in a very short time.

Mr. TISDALE Will the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) drop that part of his Bill?

Mr. WELDON (Albert). There is no doubt that if we make a good rule for the future we have done the most important half of the work. There seems to be an almost universal opinion, so far as that opinion has been expressed in the House, that the principle as laid down in this Bill for the future is a salutary one. With reference to this section, which I think is somewhat misdescribed as a "retroactive section," I should like to say a word. I feel very strongly that we are not doing all the good that we may safely and reasonably do if we do not go a little further than merely shut the door in the future against those incoming criminals; but that we should drive out from our country, so far as we may, all the vagrant offenders who are here. Hon. members have said that a retroactive law is an unjust law and that retroactive criminal legislation is unjust legislation. I agree to that; but the element of injustice is in making a thing criminal and punishable to-day which was innocent at the time the so called criminal action was done If a man did a thing not knowing there were penal consequences and that subsequently, legislation attaching penal consequences was enacted, then the injustice would come in, and I agree that if this Bill had such provisions it would be in its essence retroactive, and would be bad. We are not now making a criminal law; we are not defining a crime, we are not now saying that an act shall be a guilty act which was not guilty when the offence was committed. They who burned houses, they who committed burglaries, they who robbed banks and they who wrecked railway trains, knew when they committed these crimes that they were crimes and we are not now legislating to make them more criminal. By accident these criminals escaped the officers of justice and crossed the boundary line and all we say is that when a *prima facie* case is made out against them "let them go back." Hon. members speak of this retroactive principle as if it were a new one, and as if it were not an established law of the country. They speak of this retroactive principle as if it were not already embodied and a part of the law as between Canada and the United States in the Ashburton Treaty. Let me remind the Committee that almost the very first criminal who was arrested under the Ashburton Treaty, was a Scotch women named Christiana Gilmour, whose crime was committed before the date of the treaty. At this very hour as between Canada and almost all highly civilised states with the exception of one state—as between Canada and France, as between Canada and Italy, as between Canada and Germany, as between Canada and Brazil, as between Canada and Austro-Hungary, as between Canada and Belgium, it is true that the very moment the treaties with these countries were confirmed laying down the extradition law between Canada and them; that under the operation of our extradition statute, criminals from Germany, Austria, Brazil, Italy and the other countries, who had been lurking in Canadian cities before the date of the treaties immediately fell under the ban of these treaties in respect to crimes committed before the treaty, and were subject to extradition. Therefore the principle of retroactive legislation in this respect is not a new principle. It is the existing principle of law governing our relations at this very hour as between Canada and almost every civilised state. Why should we depart from that good practice? Why repeal in this matter the law that was wisely passed by this Parliament in 1877? Why depart from the good example that the English Parliament set us in 1870 and made clearer still by the amending Act of the Imperial Parliament in 1873? I desire to remind hon. members of this House that in 1873 the English Parliament in amending the Extradition Act made clear the rule that the operation of the treaties thereafter to be entered into in so far as England was concerned was to be retroactive. With the permission of the House I will read that section of the Imperial Act of 1873 amending the Act of 1870 which contained that provision. Sub-section 2 of this Act says:

"And whereas doubts have arisen as to the application of the said section to crimes committed before the passing of the principal Act, and it is expedient to remove such doubts, it is therefore hereby declared that—a crime committed before the date of the order includes in the said section a crime committed before the passing of the principal Act, and the principal Act and this Act shall be construed accordingly."

We see, therefore, in this Act, which was passed in 1873, that in the British Isles and in Canada, so long as that Act governed Canada, it was true that in the specific treaty we made with Austria a few months later, in the treaty with Belgium made four months later, in the treaty with Denmark made a year later, in the treaty with France made three years later, in the treaty with Luxemburg made seven years later, in the treaty with Russia made thirteen years later, and in the treaties with Scandinavia, Switzerland, Uruguay and the other countries which I need not name; it came about that the very moment these treaties were entered into, French, or German, or Belgian, or Italian criminals, or criminals from other countries, who were lurking in London in the absence of the treaty fell under the bann of the treaty, and the moment the ratification of these treaties came to London that moment those criminals fled like leaves before the wind in autumn. This, then, is not a new principle, and hon. gentlemen are asking us to depart from a principle well established in the existing law. I recognise this case of hardship which the hon. gentleman speaks of. I think it touches the feelings of all of us, but we can only say that one of the most lamentable consequences of crime is that innocent parties are liable to suffer. Take one of those parties who committed crime eight years ago and who fled to Canada and has been doing well ever since. Take his brother in crime who fled to the mountain wilds of Idaho in the American territories and it touches our sympathies that the blackmailers, or officers of justice, or whatever you may call them should follow that poor fellow into the American territory and bring him back. For that hardship there is no remedy, and the elements of hardships are the same here. The facts are that no legislature upon this earth has been so extremely sensitive in guarding the right of asylum as the English Imperial Legislature, but when they had occasion to amend their Extradition Act, I desire to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that they amended it, not in the direction of making its retroactive clauses weaker, but in the direction of making those retroactive clauses stronger. We have evidence here, from the practical experience of that very

delicate and very sensitive Legislature about guarding the rights of asylum, that a case of hardship has not arisen as a consequence of their legislation in this respect. I think hon. members seem to be affected by the appeals to their sympathy. I do not think it is wise to appeal too much to our sympathies. There are other sympathies that might be aroused. I might, if I wished, refer to the victims of the crimes of those who seek a refuge in Canada. I might refer to the helpless women and children thrown on the streets as a consequence of these crimes, but I will not go into the sympathy part of the argument, and I will confine myself to the legal aspect of the question entirely. I rely upon the legal merits of the case, and the legal considerations which I have advanced, and I rely strongly on the fact that the English Legislature has not moved in this direction, but in the opposite direction. I do not think it is necessary for me to make any longer statement at present with reference to this matter. I think the dangers which hon. gentlemen opposite have conjured up are imaginary dangers. I think, as a matter of fact, in the case of these crimes of long standing, that the parties interested in the prosecution of them have forgotten all about them. We know that this is true in our own country, that criminals who have not fled beyond the borders, if they become good citizens, are rarely disturbed. Therefore, I do not think the cases which have been conceived will arise. But the class of men whom we wish to get at are the class of men whose cases do not touch our sympathies; they are men who come to this country with their hands full of plunder, men who have caused unutterable anguish and distress in many cases in the countries from which they have come; and I ask the House not only to do a good work for the future, but also to drive out of the country the flagrant offenders who are here. This country surely does not wish to have these people here. What good can they do? What benefit can we derive from men who have broken banks and wrecked railway trains? During the last five years there seems to have been a carnival of crime on this continent. How much money these men have brought here, I do not know, but we know that they have carried a great deal, and I think it is money that is doing very little good to this country. Therefore, I am extremely unwilling to accept the suggestion of my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), who supported the principle of the Bill, for which I thank him most warmly, unless better reasons are given than those which have yet been advanced, to withdraw this sub-section 2 of section 3.

Mr. DENISON. Notwithstanding what the hon. mover of the Bill has said, I am opposed to having this Act made retroactive. Whether these men have behaved themselves well or not since they have been here is not a question we are to consider, They sought an asylum in Canada at a time when they might have sought an asylum elsewhere. While I take this position, I am heartily in accord with the Bill. I think it much to be deprecated that men of this class should come from the other side to settle in our midst. It is a bad example to our young men to see these persons giving in luxury on their ill-gotten gains; but I think the Act should not be made retroactive.

Mr. TISDALE. I think the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) hardly showed a parallel case in regard to the law he spoke of as that relates entirely to treaties. We are passing a statute; we have no control over the individuals at all after they leave our state and go into any foreign country; so that the law he speaks of as being retroactive under the treaties, while to a certain extent applicable, applies to a different state of affairs from that existing between this country and the United States. I can remember cases extending as far back as thirty years ago, when people came to this country for many of the offences which he wishes to make them liable to be tried for now—people who have settled down in the country, have gathered families about them, and who, if they did commit the crimes alleged against them, are now in every way respectable and desirable members of society. I mention that, not simply as a matter of sympathy; I say it is a matter of justice that those people should not be disturbed. Moreover, while the hon. gentleman wishes us to experiment in legislation to a certain extent on matters of such importance, surely he ought not to press us to go so far as that, because he himself admitted this afternoon that there is no precedent for this legislation. I am in accord with the spirit of the Bill; I think we should be protected, if we can get proper protection and we apply it reasonably; but I had no idea but that the hon. gentleman when asked to do so would withdraw this retroactive provision. I did not expect that he would get up and attempt to defend it at any length. I was quite prepared to hear him state the reasons why he inserted that clause in the Bill. If he adopts the suggestion which has been made I think he will shorten the discussion, and satisfy the feelings of the House. This feature of the Bill is a most dangerous one. Anyone who knows anything about the history of many of these people who have come to this country in the last fifty years will agree with me that it is so. It goes through every class of offences which are indictable, such as false pretences, threatening letters, petty embezzlements, thefts of $50, &c. These are the classes of crimes which it would have these people tried for—people who have come to the country, made respectable connections, and settled down into good citizens. Even if they were guilty, surely a life of respectability for that length of time has condoned them. I say no country in the world has adopted this kind of legislation, and no respectable legislature, in my opinion, should be asked, in the case of a new law, to take all these risks, because the hon. gentleman has wedded himself so strongly to it. I regret that he is not willing to be influenced by the protests which have been made by both sides of the House, by gentlemen who have had experience in this country, and who know something of the state of affairs in Ontario at any rate. I want to see the Bill pass, but I do not wish to see it pass in such a form that it may become an engine of wrong and of discredit to people who, whatever they have been in the past, are respectable people to-day. The United States say to us that they are not going to have an Extradition Treaty. We are teaching them, and I think in a proper way; but seeing that no country has ever tried this experiment, it is surely far enough to go to legislate for future crimes, and not to make the measure retroactive.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think I will attempt to improve on the speech of my hon. friend who has just sat down. He gives utterance to exactly my own sentiments on this subject. The Bill proposes to take a step in a direction which, as he properly says, has not been travelled over before. The expressed object of the mover of the Bill is to teach the Americans, at all events, that if no Extradition Treaty exists between the two countries, the fault is not the fault of Canada; and I think when we have gone so far as to place on our Statute book a law which gives to the executive of the country the power to deal with questions such as are stated in the Bill, and to hand these men—who are charged with certain offences—over, we are taking a step in advance of anything that has been done before by any state that I know of. I entirely agree with my hon. friend that if men have come into the country ten, twenty, or four or five years ago, we are not going in a free country like this to condemn people before their trials. If these people have settled in the country, have had their families, have lived respectably, and, whatever their antecedents may have been, have become good citizens, I think it would be an act of extreme hardship to pass a statute retroactive in its operation, and calculated to place

these men under the ban of a law that did not exist when they came and accepted the hospitality of Canada. I am not going to take up the time of the House discussing it, because it has been so ably discussed that I think I would only be taking up time unnecessarily in so doing, but I will say that the hon. the mover of this Bill ought to be satisfied if this House is willing to concede the principle of his Bill and accept its details excluding the third subsection and not press this retroactive clause further.

Mr. WALLACE. I think one of the best features of the Bill is this very clause. The principal object of the Bill is to purify our country, and if you permit those robbers, and boodlers and plunderers, who are now to be found in every city of Canada, demoralising the young men of this country by flaunting their ill-gotten wealth in the faces of the people, to stay here, the principal objects of the Bill will be defeated. I, therefore, think we should retain that clause. Those men are not wanted in this country, and if the Bill passes with this clause in it, there will still be ample time for them to clear out.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman speaks about purifying the country, but when he remembers that, according to a recent estimate, there are 188 rascals in this House to 13 saints, he has got a very formidable task before him. Now I think that the Government in this matter are undertaking to abdicate their functions. The Government have put this Bill on the Orders of the Day, and are now leaving the Bill and the hon. gentleman who has charge of it, to take care of themselves. If there is any question which the Government ought to have a policy, it is a policy relating to the administration of public affairs. Many years ago a discussion took place in the House of Commons, England, between Sir Robert Peel and Lord Macaulay, then Mr. Macaulay, as to how far the Government ought to undertake to control legislation, but there was one point on which they were agreed, and that was that every measure relating to the proper administration of justice and every measure relating to the administration of any one department was a proper measure for the Government to take charge of and to exercise control over. Now, this is a measure essentially of public administration which affects the administration of justice in this country. We are told that there are in Canada a large number of persons who are fugitives from justice, and who belong to this class of criminals. It is true they have not offended against our law, but they have offended against the law elsewhere, and after the hon. gentleman has brought his Bill before the Committee, and the House has entered upon its discussion, the Minister of Justice, who is supposed to take charge of measures of this sort and to exercise a controlling influence over them, has, so far, not taken any interest in the matter at all. So far as I am concerned, I do not intend to assume the responsibility that rests on him, and I think that is the intention of the House generally; and it seems to me that if this Bill is to be amended, if it is to go through the Committee and become law, it should be under the control of the House, guided by the Minister of Justice. Now, this much is clear. From the statement that I have read to the House, the opinion expressed by Mr. Bigelow, based upon the decision of Holmes *vs.* Jennieson, we will never have a requisition, under this Bill, from the United States. They have decided that the States have no right to enter into any contract or arrangement with any foreign power or state, they have decided that this matter belongs to the Government of the United States, and is to be exercised only under a treaty or compact with the foreign state; and that being the case, we are never likely to have any requisition under this Bill, although we may indicate our good intentions by passing it. I am not objecting to a Bill on this subject put in proper form, but I am objecting to our undertaking to discharge here the duties that ought to devolve upon the Administration.

Mr. SKINNER. I know of two cases of parties who came to Canada, one about twelve years ago and the other about ten years ago, who committed offences under what might be called commercial crimes referred to in this Bill. Since they came to Canada they have lived respectable, honest lives, so far as we know, and have brought up their families in Canada. Their children, to my knowledge, do not know why the parents came here or why they should be in Canada at all, but have simply grown up in the community where they are as others have. Yet if this retrospective clause becomes law, those two families will become at once desolate. The hon. gentleman says the parents may never be arrested, but there would be the knowledge that they might be arrested, and he knows that nothing can have a more injurious effect upon a citizen than to know that he may hear the tramp of the policeman at his door at any time, and that his family may thus become destroyed. The hon. gentleman says that is appealing to sympathy, and he says he has nothing to do with sympathy, but is acting on the abstract principles of justice. I do not call dealing with the question in this way appealing to sympathy. I say it would be a greater crime to destroy those families than to commit some of the crimes mentioned in the schedule. Therefore I ask the House to hesitate before they adopt this retrospective clause, which will affect parties who have grown up in our midst under such circumstances. The hon. gentleman has referred, in support of his Bill, to treaties which, he says, were retrospective in their operations, and to a certain extent he is correct, but not wholly. I think that he will find that the treaties to which he refers cover the more malignant class of crime, such as murder, burglary, and so forth, enumerated in them. But in this Bill the hon. gentleman has included every possible crime that can possibly be committed under the statute law of Canada, or under the common law of the country. Therefore, he is going much further than did those treaties. Had these treaties gone as far as his Bill, they would never have been made retrospective. I do not say that I would object, so far as the grosser and more malignant crimes are concerned, such as murder, to support a retrospective clause; but when we come to consider commercial crimes, crimes committed under perhaps extenuating circumstances and the perpetrators of which may not be so bad as those who committed the crimes such as murder, and so forth, and the perpetrators of which may, by a course of repentance, have in a measure atoned for them, and by leading proper lives have become good citizens, have brought up good families, ornaments to the society in which they live—we ought to pause before putting forth our hand and sweeping away with one fell swoop all the rights, liberties and privileges of innocent people, children and women, and bring desolation on them too terrible to describe?

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I did not think it worth while discussing the list of crimes until we come to them, but the hon. gentleman says that the treaties with Belgium, France, Italy and other countries contain a much smaller list of crimes than these. That is an inaccurate statement. I will read the list of commercial crimes contained in one treaty. They are as follows:—Counterfeiting or altering money, or uttering counterfeit or altered money; forgery, or counterfeiting, or altering, or uttering what is forged or counterfeited or altered; embezzlement or larceny; obtaining money or goods by false pretences; crimes by bankrupts against bankruptcy law, fraud by bailee, banker, agents, factor, trustee or director, or member or public officer of any company made criminal by any law for the time being in force; threats by letter or otherwise with intent to extort. The list of crimes contained in the treaty with Belgium are very much the same as those contained here—counterfeit-

ing, and the cognate crimes; larceny and the cognate crimes, offences against the bankruptcy laws, and so on. When we come to the list of crimes in this Bill, there is an amendment which I will suggest. There is a limitation which has been accidentally omitted from one of the items in the list, and, when that has been made, I think the hon. member will find that, instead of this list of commercial crimes being larger it is narrower than that in the treaties to which I refer.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I propose to insert an amendment embodying a suggestion from an hon. member across the floor, which will, I think, remove an objection which was taken at an earlier stage of the Bill, namely, to secure that a man may not be surrendered by Canada to the officers of a foreign state and be tried for some offence other than that for which he has been surrendered. The object of the amendment is to put a section in the Bill that the Minister of Justice shall not be empowered to surrender a criminal unless, in the requisition which comes from the foreign state asking for such surrender, there shall be an undertaking that the person so surrendered shall be tried for the offence for which he is surrendered and no other. I therefore move this:

This Act shall not authorise the issue of a warrant for the extradition of any person to any State or country in which, by the law in force in such State or country, such person may be tried after such extradition for any offence other than that for which he has been extradited, unless an assurance shall first have been given by the executive authority of such State or country that the person whose extradition has been claimed shall not be tried for any other offence than that on account of which such extradition has been claimed.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I would suggest the insertion of the words "in pursuance of this Statute," because the treaty is still in force.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). Yes.

On schedule,

Mr. TISDALE. I move that after the word "larceny" be added the words "to the extent of $200 and upwards." We do not want men to be carried over on trivial charges. I think it is $50 in the treaties, but it seems to me you ought to make it a little more important than that. We do not want them taken over for thefts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would not make that change.

Mr. LISTER. The state demanding the extradition, pays all the extra expense. It is no cost to this country.

Mr. TISDALE. It might lead to the gratification of spite. But I will not insist.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would suggest that after the word "abduction," "indecent assault" be included.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). There is no objection to that.

Threats by letter or otherwise, with intent to extort.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I know that offence is mentioned in many of the treaties, but it does appear to me that it may be made an engine of oppression. It certainly is not a very heinous offence in many cases. I do not think it is really judicious to put it in.

Mr. TISDALE. I think we should at least strike out the words "or otherwise."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would almost press the sense of the House upon that. I think it is carrying it a little too far. On the border states where a great deal of business is transacted by different people, an enemy might make use of this clause to punish another person where there is very little offence indeed.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). The offence might be removed. The Government should have power to proclaim that such items as, in their judgment they think best, should be struck out.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Surely we are not going to delegate to the Government legislation of this kind. Surely this is a matter above all others where the House should formulate its own judgment.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I differ from the hon. gentleman for the reason that we are dealing with many countries. When you are dealing with this matter by treaty, you can adjust your treaty to existing conditions in the various countries. For instance, Great Britain might make a different list of crimes with Spain than with Denmark. But now you are making a law that will contain a list of crimes applying to all nations. We should give the Government some power of choosing what offences should be named when the Act applies to the United States on the one hand, and to Mexico on the other, such discretion as plenipotentiaries should exercise.

Mr. BLAKE. The Government has not any discoverable opinions on this Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would move to strike out this section.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not know whether it was designedly or not, but the hon. member has omitted from this schedule the very class of offences that he said he introduced the Act to cover. He says we are making an asylum for bank robbers, swindlers, fraudulent trustees and the very class which is inserted in every extradition treaty made between nations, is omitted altogether. I have copied out the words which I find in all other treaties, and I move that they be added:

Fraud committed by a bailee, banker, agent, factor, trustee, or member or public officer of any company or municipal corporation, made criminal by any law for the time being in force.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I gladly accept that amendment.

Mr. TISDALE. Does the hon. gentleman propose to retain the crime of perjury in the list?

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I withdraw it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suggest that the following be inserted: "Any malicious act done with intent to injure persons in a railway train."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I suppose that will be covered by section 21.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That covers a vast class of undefined offences, which I do not think it desirable to have in this Bill.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). When we come to section 21, I have an amendment to make which will limit the offences to those declared to be felonies under the Act.

Mr, LISTER. I call the attention to section 13, "arson." The definition of arson according to the common law is very limited.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is construed by statute.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In regard to the amendment I suggest, I may say that I took it from the schedule of crimes contained in the several treaties.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not raise any objection to the insertion of the words suggested.

Mr. TISDALE. Why are the words "municipal law" added in a subsequent section? Those words are not in any of the treaties.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I can give an illustration. If I mistake not, by the laws both of England and the United States the slave trade is piracy, although the carrying of slaves is not piracy by the law of nations.

Mr. TISDALE. Section 21 raises a question too large to consider to-night. The five Acts there referred to cover I suppose at least 150 pages, and to say that we are going to incorporate them in this Bill and to declare that the offences therein contained shall be misdemeanors is asking too much from this Committee. I will give an illustration. It is made a felony by one of these Acts to destroy a poll book. We do not want to send some one back to the United States on account of an election row. I give that as an example which I noticed on glancing at one of the Acts a moment ago, and it forces me to the conclusion that these Acts should be carefully examined before we pass this clause. We have largely extended the list of extraditable offences, and the hon. gentleman might be satisfied with the progress made. I do not think we should pass it in this general shape. I think we should make a list of the crimes.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I will withdraw section 21 of the Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I move that the Committee rise and report the Bill. In doing so I wish to advert for an instant to an observation made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) with reference to my duty on the subject of a Bill of this kind. I was satisfied that the hon. member for Bothwell was in a jocose mood when he referred to me and desired that I should express an opinion on this Bill, and I would have continued under that impression had it not been for the observation which was subsequently made indicating that it was impossible to ascertain the opinions of the Government on this Bill. When I moved that the Speaker should leave the Chair, at the request of the leader of the Opposition, I made a distinct statement on that subject. I said that the hon. member who had the Bill in charge would explain it to the Committee and I was moved to that by the knowledge that the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) had taken a great interest in this subject, and had given it a great deal of very careful study, but I coupled with that the statement that the Government approved of the Bill, and thought it a Bill of much public importance, and, in consequence of that, had moved it to the Government Orders.

Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—EXPORT DUTY ON LOGS.

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

Mr. CHARLTON. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Government and of the House, to a matter that has been repeatedly brought to their notice by influential delegations of the second greatest industry in this country. I refer to the export duty upon logs. The attitude of the lumber trade of Canada, with regard to this question at the present time, is one of very great unanimity and the removal of the duty has been urged upon the Government from all quarters in this Dominion. I rise here to-night at the solicitation of the Lumbermen's Association of Ontario, the largest lumbermen's association of this Dominion, to bring this matter publicly before the attention of the Government as it has been repeatedly brought to their notice by private representations. The Lumbermen's Association of Ontario took this matter into consideration on the 7th day of of February last in Toronto. The question was fully debated before that association and the result was that certain resolutions were passed with but two dissenting voices in the entire association. A deputation was appointed to wait on the Government here and an interview was arranged for on the 23rd February. That deputation included representatives from the Lumbermen's Association of Ontario as well as a large deputation from Quebec and a large deputation from the Ottawa valley. They came here and held a preliminary meeting at the Russell House and at that meeting the question was again fully debated, and the resolutions passed by the Ontario Lumbermen's Association were sanctioned by nearly a unanimously vote; five members I think voted against the resolutions and expressed the desire that the duty should be reduced to $1 per thousand feet. The deputation waited on the Privy Council in the afternoon and it is needless to say they were received with the utmost courtesy. It was estimated that some $25,000,000 capital invested in the lumbering business was represented on that deputation that waited on the Government. Subsequent to that interview with the Government, deputations from Quebec, deputations from Toronto, deputations from the Ottawa valley, and from various parts of Canada waited on the Government, and memorials were presented to the Government by the Quebec Board of Trade, the Toronto Board of Trade, and a large and influential deputation of the latter body waited on the Minister of Finance with reference to this matter. Now, Sir, the feeling evinced by the lumber trade, represented by these delegations show most conclusively that the lumbering interests of Canada are very sensitive on to this matter. I propose to enter into this matter very briefly and to state the reasons why the feeling is such on this question. We have a lumber tariff in this country, and the United States imposes a duty on our own sawn lumber. The American duty is $2 per thousand feet and the Canadian duty 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, so that as far as reciprocity in lumber is concerned we stand on an equality with the American Government. However, we levy an export duty on logs and the American Government does not, so that we have more than reciprocity in this respect. While at the present moment our export duty is $3 per thousand, the American Congress is debarred by constitutional restriction from imposing any export duty whatever. When the duty was raised to $3 per thousand last winter, it provoked a good deal of ill-feeling in the United States, and it led to an examination as to the relative amount, of the export of logs between the two countries. I believe the American Consul here was the first to examine our Trade and Navigation Returns in regard to that question, and the statement he made seemed to be incredible. It was found, however, on an examination of the returns, that his statement was perfectly correct. The examination revealed the fact that the export of logs from Canada to the United States from 1880 to 1888, nine years, was $2,351,339, while the imports of logs into Canada from the United States during the same period was $4,309,850, or nearly double our exports to the United States; and this takes no account of that vast trade from the State of Maine down the River St. John to St. John, N.B, which does not appear at all in our Trade and Navigation returns. Of the volume of that trade we have only estimates. An estimate made by a gentleman who is familiar with the business puts it at from 50 to 100,000,000 feet of spruce, pine and cedar per annum, and the value of the trade at $700,000 per annum; so that it amounted to $6,300,000 during the period of nine years. That would bring our total imports from the United States during that period up to $10,619,850, or four times the value of the export from Canada to the United States. The trade with St. John, a large trade in the Rainy River Valley, and the trade between the State of Minnesota and Manitoba furnish the greater amount of the logs exported from the United States to Canada.

The movement in the United States in reference to this matter has assumed a form which inspires the lumbermen in this country with some degree of apprehension as to the consequences. Our export duty on logs has before this time

attracted attention. When the Mills' Bill was framed, it placed lumber on the free list, except in the case of countries imposing an export duty. In the case of such countries the lumber remained at the old rate of $2 per thousand feet. The Senate Bill introduced last winter reduced the duty on lumber 50 cents a thousand feet, to apply to countries not imposing an export duty. So that under either of these Bills, had they become law, we would have suffered from the imposition of an export duty, so far as our export trade in lumber is concerned. Now, it is said, I do not know with what degree of truth, that when the Senate Bill was considered in Committee last Session at Washington, but for the existence of the export duty in Canada, our chances would have stood well for a reduction of the duty to $1 per thousand; but that the existence of that export duty prevented a reduction of more than 50 cents per thousand. The most dangerous feature of the matter, however, is the action taken by the lumber trade in the United States in connection with this increase in the export duty. It was at once seized upon by the lumber trade as a reason for demanding from Congress an increase in the lumber duties, and the demand was also a general one that a provision should be adopted in the tariff which would provide that, the lumber imported from any foreign country levying an export duty, should be subjected to a duty equal to the amount of the export duty. I have here a blank form of a petition which was extensively circulated, and I believe extensively signed, and forwarded to Congress from the States of Michigan and Wisconsin; and the clause in this petition relating to the export duty is as follows:—

"That in case any foreign country shall impose an export duty upon logs, shingle-bolts or other kinds of wood, that may be designed for, or used as, the raw material of any American saw-mill, mill, or factory, than the sawn lumber, shingles, or other manufactured product of such kinds of logs, bolts or wood, as may have an export duty imposed upon it by such country, shall, when imported from such country, be subject, in addition to the regular duty provided by law, to an additional duty equivalent to the amount of such export duty, and that such additional duty shall be imposed upon any article that might otherwise be upon the free list."

Now, Sir, if the prayer of that petition were granted, under the present condition of things, the duty on lumber would be $5 per thousand on lumber imported into the United States from Canada—the regular duty of $2, and the plenary or added duty of $3 per thousand, so long as our export duty should be enforced; and I think I may safely say to the Finance Minister that I do not think he would long retain an export duty of $3 per thousand on logs if there were a provision in the American law adding that much to the import duty on lumber from Canada. It is this feature of the case which inspires the lumbermen of this country with alarm, and the additional feature that the existence of this export duty is used by that vast and influential lumber interest in the United States as the most potent argument within their reach to influence Congress to resist any reduction in the lumber duties, and to demand, if possible, an increase of those duties. The *personnel* of the American administration is now much more favorable to their interests than was that of President Cleveland. We have in place of Mr. Bayard as Secretary of State, Mr. Blaine, a gentleman from the lumber State of Maine, who is thoroughly conversant with this question, and thoroughly in sympathy with the lumber interest of that State. We have, also, in place of Mr. Fairchild, as Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Windom, from the State of Minnesota. These facts place their interests on a much more favorable basis than they would have stood upon under Mr. Cleveland's Cabinet; and it is morally certain that the continuance of the present export duty, or the continuance of any export duty, will have a most powerful bearing on this question, When Congress comes to revise its tariff at its next meeting, the existence of that duty will powerfully influence Congress in refusing a reduction of the duty, and possibly will result in increasing it. The interest demanding this is a very powerful one. We have the lumber States of Maine, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, California, Oregon and Washington, and we have the vast lumber interest which has recently grown up in various parts of the South. These interests will make common cause, and they ask no better weapon to be placed in their hands than the existence of this export duty, which they will appeal to for the purpose of rousing prejudice and animosity, in order to obtain that which cool and sober argument would fail to secure

The idea that we are in anywise protected in this matter—that the Americans must have our lumber, and that the producer pays the duty—is the one that no lumberman in Canada takes any stock in. This country does not export to the United States one-thirtieth of the quantity of lumber the United States produce; for every thousand feet we export to them they produce thirty thousand of their own, and our small export to them can scarcely affect in any degree the vast production or the price in that country. The extent of timber in the south is practically limitless, and that business has recently sprung into existence. There is a belt of pine from the centre of Virginia, through North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana having an average width of 100 miles; and besides Texas and Florida have very extensive forests of pine, and it is said that there is enough pine in that region to supply the United States for centuries, because the timber renews itself every thirty or forty years, and there being no severe winters, the season or growth extends over the entire year. The woods are not subject to the devastation of fire as they are in Canada and other northern parts, because the fire can go through these woods, through which you can drive a waggon easily in any direction, there being no undergrowth, without injuring the timber. A vast amount of capital is being invested in this region. Michigan men and Wisconsin men are establishing mills and producing lumber there, the railway accommodation has been constantly improving, and the competition against Canadian lumber is, therefore, constantly increasing. That competition is driving Canadian lumber out of the markets of Philadelphia and Boston and other seaboard cities of the States, and is also rapidly gaining favor in the markets of Chicago, Buffalo, Cleveland and Albany. In certain grades of lumber the markets will be entirely supplied from that district. One of the largest Ottawa lumbermen, Mr. Booth, told me the other day that, in certain lines of 10-inch stocks, which he had been in the habit of selling in the United States, largely for the purpose of being stripped into wainscoting, the price last year averaged $2 per thousand feet less than he could get in former years, and the prospect for the sale of this lumber is still worse this year—all due to the competition of the southern lumbermen. This competition is gradually encroaching on the markets in the north, which hitherto we regarded as our own, and our better pine is besides rapidly giving way to the yellow poplar lumber of the south, which is usurping its place. In consequence of this competition, the prices of our best clear stuff pine in New York, Albany and other markets have decreased from $4 to $6 per thousand feet board measure within the last three or four years. So that we are meeting a competition which is fiercer and more troublesome than any we have hitherto met, and hence our lumbermen desire that the export duty, which has produced but very little revenue and which threatens to entail serious consequences upon us, far greater in magnitude than the benefits we derive from it, should be removed. Now, if we could secure a reduction in the American tariff of $1 per thousand feet on our sawn lumber, which the southern pine is driving out of the market, it would be a very great boon indeed to the lumbering interests of this country, but if the duty be advanced $1 per thousand feet, it would be a very great disaster for these

interests. It would not only affect the lumbermen, but the bankers, merchants, farmers and laborers of this country, because almost every business in Canada is intimately connected with the great lumber interest of this country. The prayer and desire on the part of our lumbermen acquainted with the situation is that our export duty may be removed.

I will show how small the financial results of this duty have been to this Government. We have collected upon pine logs exported since 1867 a total amount of $118,424, being an average of $5,382 per year. The total amount of duty collected upon spruce logs has been $141,273, or an average of $6,421 per year. The total amount of duty upon logs, shingle bolts, and everything upon the list exported since Confederation has been $259,677, or an annual average of $11,804; and the average duty on pine which we have collected since 1881 has been but $3,135; and from 1881 to 1885, under a duty of $1 per thousand feet, the average annual amount collected was $1,634. Yet in the face of that diminution, indicating an almost extinct trade, the export duty was put up to $2 per thousand feet; and then, as if there were a necessity for a further increase, it was put up to $3 a thousand feet, the only effect being the producing of irritation on the part of the Americans, the attracting of their attention to the relative and greater volume of their log export to Canada as compared with the Canadian log export to the United States and the threatening of disaster to the lumber trade of this country. The total value of the export of pine logs since 1867 has been but $595,000, an average of $27,000 a year, and the total value of spruce logs exported since 1867 has been $6?8,000, or $28,565 per year. The total value of all exports of logs, subject to export duty, shingle bolts, pine and spruce logs, pine, oak and spruce, has been but $1,224 000 since 1867, or an annual average of $55,630. That average since 1880, under the duty of $1, has fallen to $43,000 per year; and from 1867 the total value of our export of everything upon which an export duty has been levied, bolts of all kinds, logs of all kinds, for these twenty-two years, is only one-seventh as much as the sawn lumber export from Canada for one single year. Yet this duty threatens to have the effect of increasing the duty imposed by the United States on our lumber, or at any rate, to prevent the reduction that we might hope to obtain, and this threatens to destroy this export trade.

I am not going to accuse the Government of having imposed that duty through any desire to injure any interest in Canada I know this duty was first imposed at the solicitation of a portion of the Canadian lumber interest, and increased at the same solicitation, and increased the second time at the solicitation of that same interest. I am willing to give the Government the credit of having acted in good faith and with the desire of meeting the wishes of the trade, but certainly last fall the Government increased the duty to $3 without examining sufficiently the desire of the trade throughout the country. I am not here, however, to charge the Government with having acted with any desire except to promote the interests of the country—but the lumber trade has changed position in this matter. We know this last increase of duty to $3 a thousand feet has attracted attention to the matter in the United States, an attention which has revealed a state of the log trade which we ourselves were ignorant of, and has been used by the lumber interest of the United States to resist a movement for the reduction of the American duty and to cause it to be replaced by a movement to retaliate which may lead to disastrous results. It is these reasons that influence the lumber trade to ask the Government to reverse the action which at their solicitation the Government took. It is threatened with disaster, and it is solicited with a great degree of unanimity that the Government will remove this duty and promote a better state of feeling between the two countries. Should this be done we will be placed in a better position to secure concessions with regard to the American lumber tariff which otherwise we would not secure. I do not know that one Government has a much better record in regard to this duty than the other. The Mackenzie Government has a somewhat better record than the other Government, because it refused to abolish the duty which was imposed, I believe, anterior to Confederation, and was continued by the first Government after Confederation. When that Government went out of power, and my hon. friend to my right (Sir Richard Cartwright) became Finance Minister, the Government refused to abolish the duty entirely, but they made two important concessions. They abolished the duty on round oak logs, and they made a ruling as to the classification of timber which was in accordance with common sense and the requirements of the trade. That Government decided by departmental order that logs subject to duty should be sticks of timber up to 18 feet in length, and that round timber upwards of 18 feet in length—masts, spars, piling and that class of timber—should be exempt from duty. That abolition of the duty on logs over 18 feet minimised the evil by removing the duty on a class of timber used for the same purposes as square timber, and not designed for sawn lumber. The Lumbermen's Association, on the 7th February last, adopted a resolution which set forth the reasons which probably actuated the Mackenzie Government in making that change. The first resolution was as follows:—

"That the export trade in long round timber is an advantageous one for Canada. Timber of this class is not exported for the purpose of being converted into ordinary sawn lumber. Its preparation and delivery at the point of shipment involves the expenditure of more money in Canada, as a rule, than the conversion of the same timber into lumber would do. It is used for the same general purposes as square pine timber, and the waste in squaring the timber is avoided. The round timber trade is at least as desirable as the trade in board or waney pine, in the preparation of which the hollow butted, the shaky, and the knotty portions of the tree are left in the woods to rot, while in the preparation of long round timber, small hollows in the butt end, and the rough portions of the tree in the top are not cut out of the stick. There is at least as little reason for the imposition of an export duty upon long round timber as there would be upon square pine or board pine."

For this reason, the association sets forth that, in the classification, at least, a distinction should be drawn between long timber and short logs which are designed for sawn lumber.

I need not remind the Government that this movement, this desire which has been expressed by the trade for the removal of the duty is strictly non-political. I do not stand up here as a member of the Opposition, but as a representative of the lumber trade, and I place before the Government these considerations as bearing upon a great interest in this country in which men of all politics are engaged and in regard to which they have petitioned the Government. The deputation, large and influential in point of ability and wealth, which waited on the Government in regard to this matter, was composed of men of both parties, and I do not think there was any deputation in reference to this matter which has waited on the Government during the present Session which was confined, in its *personnel*, to members of one party alone. There is one further consideration which I will press upon the Government. I consider it a moral certainty that the action of the American Congress, when it next meets, will be such as to compel this Government to abrogate this duty.

Mr. HESSON. They cannot do it.

Mr. CHARLTON. They cannot do it? It is only a year ago that the Minister of Finance asked for power to abrogate the duty by Order in Council, the reason given being that the Mills' Bill, which had then been introduced in Congress and was likely to become law, might affect a country which had an export duty and had not the power of removing the duty, and he asked for power to remove the duty if it was found to be necessary. It is owing to that request made by

Sir Charles Tupper that the Government may, if they choose, abolish this duty to-day. If the threat of a duty of $2 a thousand would lead the Government to ask for that power, would not a duty of $3 a thousand on lumber have the same effect upon the Government? Certainly it would. It is absurd to imagine that, if the Americans enact in their next Tariff Bill that they will retaliate by imposing a duty on lumber from Canada equal to the export duty which we place on logs, this Government would be so blind as to subject the country to such inconveniences and such loss rather than abrogate the export duty on logs. Congress has clearly shown what its action would be. The Mills Bill would have made it to our advantage to abrogate the duty to the extent of $2 a thousand feet on all the lumber we exported to the United States. The Senate Bill would have made it to our advantage to the extent of 50 cents a thousand feet. The universal prayer of the lumber trade to the Government is that, in view of the fact that the import of logs from the United States to Canada is four times greater than the export of logs from Canada to the United States, the duty should be repealed, as the result otherwise will be to imperil our interests in this matter.

This revision of the tariff in the United States is to take place next winter. Revisions of the tariff in the United States are not made very readily or very frequently. The last revision was made in 1883, and, when the next revision is made, we may reasonably suppose that it will stand at least during the life of the present Administration, or for the next four years. It is a matter of very great importance for us to place ourselves in the best possible position to secure concessions in regard to the American lumber duty. The removal of the export duty for the present year will make very little difference. No stock has been got out for export last winter, and none can be got out now The Government can afford to wait developments, but the wish of the lumber interest is that the Government should take off this duty so as not to increase our difficulties by inducing the Americans to increase their duty on timber. We want the best chance we can have for the reduction of the duty to $1 a thousand feet, if not its removal entirely, and the trade prays the Government not to stand in the way of the realisation of the hopes of the lumber trade by keeping this export duty, which operates to a greater or less extent in the direction of depriving us of the advantages which we would derive from its removal. Without moving any resolution in regard to this matter, I say that I have been requested by those engaged in the trade to make this public statement of the matter. I do not know that I have said anything to my hon. friend the Finance Minister which is new in that case. It is a little over two months since one of the most influential and wealthy deputations that ever waited on the Government waited upon them in the Privy Council Chamber, and the members of that deputation feel that they are entitled to an answer, that the importance of the question warrants them in expecting an answer as to the view the Government take of their representations and their petition. In this view I present these remarks to the Government, and especially to the Minister of Finance, with the reminder that if the export duty is not removed, and Congress, at its next session, either retains the present rate of duty or increases the amount, the lumber interest of Canada will not entertain feelings either pleasant or friendly towards the Government that refused their rersonable and urgent request.

Mr. FOSTER. I listened with a good deal of interest to the statement made by my hon. friend, in not all, of which of course, I can agree with him. The policy of having an export duty on logs is not, as my hon. friend said, a new one; it has been the policy of this country for a long series of years, no doubt adopted because of good reasons, and retained for those same good reasons. Within the last few months, as my hon. friend stated, the export duty was increased over and above the former rate, and that was done for various reasons, and at the instance of no class of men more than of the lumbermen themselves, who, in an almost united body, approached the Government and brought the strongest arguments they could to bear upon the necessity and advantage to this country of increasing the export duty upon logs to $3 per thousand. Now, as my hon. friend says, the representatives of the lumber interest have seen things in a different light, and have approached the Government in large and influential deputations, asking them to take off the duty or to lower it. The chief argument of these gentlemen has been the argument which my hon. friend has used to-night, that is, the probable danger or fear that the pursuance of this course of policy will have the effect, in the country south of us, of inducing them to enact legislation which will make it more difficult for the lumber of this country to find access to the markets of the United States. I think my hon. friend, in presenting the case, has probably strengthend the hands of those parties in the United States who have a direct interest in not allowing Canadian lumber ingress into that market. He has taken a great deal of pains to show that year by year of late the area of competition from the south towards the north, with our lumber, has been constantly increasing, that they have come up each year further and further towards the northern limit, and have met certain classes, at least, of Canadian lumber in markets so far north as New York and Buffalo, and other cities along that line of parallel. Well, Sir, this has been pointed out by my hon. friend in strong and vigorous language, and the manner in which he has pointed out the strong interest that the producers of this lumber in the United States have in this competition, and the success they have had in the competition so far, I think, will have the effect of arousing that interest in the United States and producing just exactly what my hon. friend says he deplores—a united effort upon the Congress to enact legislation which shall not only not allow Canadian lumber to go into the United States at a less rate of duty than at the present time, but will, if possible, have that duty raised in order to give them a greater chance in the competition which my hon. friend says they now carry on up to these northern limits with so great a success. At this late period of the Session, and with a deal of work before us yet to be done, and which we hope to get rid of within a few days, I do not intend to go into a long discussion of this matter. The Government have, by the power that Parliament has given them, within themselves the ability to lower or to heighten the duties within certain limits, and the Government taking all interests in its consideration, and taking into consideration as well the very strong representations which have been made to them by the lumber interest, under this fear of future possible legislation which they say haunts them, and which I dare say is present with them, being interested in so great an extent as they are, I say the Government having all these representations of the different interests, have been considering the matter and are still having it under consideration, and having it in their power, I have no doubt they will act as they consider best under the view of all the circumstances, for the general interest, not excluding the lumber interest of the Dominion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is very much to be regretted that the Government cannot give a plain answer to a plain question. They have had two months to consider this matter, and all they have got to tell my hon. friend and to tell the great interest of which he is a member and for which he speaks, is that they are considering the matter still. The Government's duty is to tell the House before it separates what they have decided to do. It is apparent, judging from the language of the Finance Minis-

ter, that they cannot make up their minds what to do, and I think that the lumber interest will do well, and its representatives in this House will do well, to see that the Government do answer before they leave.

Mr. SPROULE. Coming from a part of the country interested in lumbering operations, and having some knowledge of the business there, I think it would be decidedly against our interest if the export duty was taken off lumber. I know the hon. member who brought up this matter to-night has carried on operations largely, I think upon the Georgian Bay, and he knows as well as I do that it has been a great business for several years past to cut down the pine in our country and take it away to the United States. A few years ago we had mills on Canadian soil which employed a large number of men, these mills have now been transferred to the American side and the lumber is manufactured over there that used to be manufactured in Canada. The result is that whereas the men engaged in that business used to consume the pork, the flour, the wheat, and the butter raised by our farmers when that lumber was being manufactured here, now those articles are got from the State of Michigan and our farmers have not the benefit of supplying them. Our people are strongly against taking off that export duty on lumber because our forests are being depleted rapidly. First class lumber is growing dear. You cannot get dry lumber in that country for less than $36 per M. ft., and we need all the lumber we have for the wants of our people. If it is important for us to have the American market, nothing is more likely to induce the Americans to keep up their tariff on lumber than for us to take off the export duty upon logs. They are endeavoring in one way or another to take the logs across and manufacture them in their country. I think we should prevent that, as much as possible, because every additional man to whom we give employment in the manufacture of lumber in our country, is an additional consumer of the products of the agriculturists in the country.

Mr. BARRON. To the motion that you do now leave the Chair, I beg, Sir, to move an amendment. The amendment I propose is one which deals with a transaction, the like of which, I think, has seldom ever graced, or I should more properly say disgraced, the executive of any legislative body. The transaction I refer to is that of the Government selling, or I should perhaps more properly say giving away 79 square miles of valuable timber limits to a gentleman, now a member of this House, for the nominal sum of $316. There would have been wrong in this transaction had the property been of the ordinary property belonging to the Crown, but it is infamous in a degree when the fact is recalled that the property so disposed of was part of the public domain of this country and belonged to a small band of Indians, in regard to whom the Premier of this House, who is directly responsible for this transaction, stood in the position of trustee, and over whom he stood as guardian, they standing towards him in the position of wards. Now, in order that this House may thoroughly understand this transaction, and in order to explain the case upon which I arraign the Government opposite, I would ask hon gentlemen to accompany me in their memories back to 1850, and in their imaginations travel with me as far as Sault Ste. Marie. At that place and that year the late Peter Robinson was employed to make treaties with several different bands of Indians inhabiting the shores of Georgian Bay, Lake Huron and Lake Superior. He made successful treaties with all the different bands inhabiting those localities. A part or portion of the treaty was that each band should have a specific portion of the land. There were very many different bands of Indians, each of which got a particular portion of land allotted to them by this particular treaty, but there was a band known as Shawanakeshicks band which, though allotted a reserve, did not until a few years ago have their reserve laid out for them upon the ground. It may not be important that the House should know these particulars, yet, perhaps, I may be permitted to explain that this band of Indians has not, until within the last 3 or 4 years, had their land or reserve laid out for them, while all the different bands had within two or three years after 1850 their lands laid out for them. Some have supposed the reason for not laying out Shawanakeshicks reserve, to be that the particular land reserved for this particular band, the timber belonging to which was nominally given away or nominally sold to the hon the junior member for Ottawa, was because the reserve was so far inland from the shores of Georgian Bay that the surveyor employed at that period did not find time to go and lay out that reserve. On the other hand it is supposed that the reason was the uncertainty in the description of the reserve. Speaking from memory, and therefore subject to correction, the description of the reserve was some such description as this: Shawanakeshicks Band, a tract of land three miles square between the waters of the Whitefish River and Wanabitesebe, seven miles inland. Inasmuch as the distance between Whitefish River and Wanabitesebe is something like seventy or eighty miles, it can easily be understood how difficult it was to exactly locate the piece of land under this treaty three miles square. And then again the particular village inhabited by this particular band was very much further inland from the shores of the Georgian Bay than seven miles, something like twenty miles, and thus an uncertainty arose as to where this particular land or reserve was to be located. But within the last three or four years this particular reserve was laid out for this band, and here I may say that it was fairly and accurately laidlaid out. It was laid out by Mr. Abrey employed by hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not mean to refer to the question of the accuracy of that survey, although the courts have held lately that it was not located accurately; still there is no point in that in my case against the Government. But hon. members will kindly bear in mind that, although the treaty was made as far back as 1850, it was not until the last three or four years that this particular reserve was laid out for this particular band of Indians. At an earlier period the Government of the Province of Ontario surveyed all the lands on the north shore of the Georgian Bay, including the lands covered since by this particular reserve, into what were known as timber berths with a view of selling the timber on those particular berths, and in the year 1872 the Ontario Government sold the timber on the berths on the north shore of the Georgian Bay, including the timber upon the area subsequently known as this reserve. It may be said that, inasmuch as that tract was then known, the Ontario Government did wrong in selling the timber as they did in 1872, in laying out the land as reserves in 1872; but I want to show, and I can show conclusively, that when the Ontario Government did that which they did in 1872, sell the timber on the berths, which have since been covered by the Indian reserve on which the timber was sold to the junior member for Ottawa for the small sum of $316, they had no knowledge whatever of this particular reserve. To prove that fact I shall read two letters. I do this because it might appear that there was some conflict between the two Governments, the Dominion Government and the Government of Ontario. It might be said that the Government of Ontario was doing wrong when it sold the timber in 1872, having laid out the timber berths previous to that year; but if I can show that the Ontario Government at that time knew nothing whatever of this reserve, then I think any accusations against that Government should be withdrawn, and I think I can show that successfully. Not only at that time did the authorities at Toronto know nothing about the Indian reserve, but the authorities in the Department of Indian Affairs here knew nothing whatever of the location of that

reserve. To prove that I shall read the two letters to which I, a moment ago, referred. The first is dated the 24th July, 1879, and is addressed to T. H. Johnson, Assistant Commissioner, Crown Lands Department, Toronto. It reads :

"SIR,—I have the honor to request that you will be good enough to furnish this office with a copy on tracing linen, of the plan of the reserve occupied by Chief Shawanakeshick and his band, between Whitefish River and Wanabitesebe, and numbered 6, on the schedule of reservations made under the Robinson Treaty of 1850

"(Signed.) L. VANKOUGHNET,
"*Deputy of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs.*"

It will be seen by that letter that the Dominion Government at that time, in 1879, had no map, and as a matter of fact, there was no map in existence, showing the locality of this particular reserve. This Government knew nothing about it, and they applied to the Government of Ontario for information in regard to the question. The reply they got was this :

"DEPARTMENT OF CROWN LANDS,
"DEPUTY SURVEYOR GENERAL'S OFFICE, 1st August, 1879.

"SIR,—In reply to a letter of the 24th ult., requesting copy of plan of Indian Reserve No. 6, between Whitefish River and Wanabitesebe, I have to inform you that no plan of such reservation appears of record in this office. I enclose plan of north shore of Lake Huron, showing all Indian reserves covered by the treaty of 1850, plans of which are of record in this office.

"T. H. JOHNSON,
"*Assistant Land Commissioner.*"

This letter is addressed to Mr. L. Vankoughnet, Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. From these letters it will be seen that the Government of Ontario, when prior to 1872 they laid out the lands on the north shore of Georgian Bay into what were known as timber berths, and then sold the pine timber thereon, did not know anything whatever of the existence at that time of the reserve. But although that was the case, it cannot be said that when the Dominion Government surveyed the Indian reserve, they knew nothing at all of the timber berths laid out by the Government of the Province of Ontario, and to prove that the Dominion Government—and I do this in order to trace up step by step the knowledge possessed by this Government of what took place by the authority of the Province of Ontario—had some such knowledge, I bring in this point, although it is not a very important one, but I do it for the purpose of showing step by step that the Government opposite knew all that went on so far as the Government of the Province of Ontario was concerned regarding these particular berths. Now, the letter signed by Mr. James Phipps who is the Indian Agent at Manitowaning addressed to the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs is dated the 30th March, 1883, and is as follows :

"SIR,—I have the honor to state with reference to previous correspondence on the subject of the reserve claimed by the Whitefish Lake Indians that I have taken every opportunity of meeting with the Chief and the most intelligent Indians of the band to ascertain from them the boundaries of the reserve, claimed as having been in their occupation at the date of the Robinson Treaty, and now enclose a sketch showing the reserve claimed, which will comprise part of the following townships as laid down in a map issued by the Crown Land Department of Ontario, dated August, 1880, Nos. 69, 70, 75, 76, 77, 83, 84 and will contain about 50 square miles."

Those were the berths laid out on the map issued by the Ontario Government in pursuance of the survey they made, so that this Government knew at the time they laid out this Indian reserve within the last three years, that the Government of the Province of Ontario had previously surveyed it out into timber berths. This Government having laid out that reserve we next find that the hon. the junior member for Ottawa appears on the scene.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. BARRON. I am asked to name the hon. gentleman but perhaps it would be out of order if I should do so. I do not think it is very difficult to understand who is the hon. the junior member for Ottawa. It is not Mr. Perley. The next thing we find is an application from this gentleman for the timber on this particular reserve, covering an area as was stated in this House by the hon. the Minister of the Interior in answer to my question, of 79 square miles of timber limits, and that application is dated on the 13th October, 1885, and is addressed to the Minister of Indian Affairs. Let me say here that I am proving all that I say by correspondence brought down in a return of this House in pursuance of a motion made by me, either last Session or the Session before. This is the application that I refer to:

"OTTAWA, 13th October, 1885.

"The Minister of Indian Affairs, Ottawa.

"SIR,—We the undersigned hereby make application to obtain privilege of cutting timber on an Indian reserve situated on the north shore of Lake Huron and known as the Whitefish Indian Reserve.

"The accompanying sketch colored red will show the territory applied for.

"Yours respectfully,
"JOSEPH RIOPELLE & CO."

Before I go any further I wish to say that although a sketch accompanied this letter to the Department of Indian Affairs, when the return was brought down there was no such sketch included. It may be said that "Joseph Riopelle & Co." does not mean the hon. the junior member for Ottawa, but here we have a letter of his of 11th, November 1885, referring to this application in these words:

"OTTAWA, 11th, November 1885.

"To the Minister of Indian Affairs,
"Ottawa.

"HON. SIR,—I take the liberty to remind you of my application for license to cut timber on an Indian reserve.

"Will you please let me know the result of your conclusion in this matter, and much oblige

"Your obedient servant,
"H. ROBILLARD."

Now, the hon. the junior member for Ottawa, having put in his application, then Mr. Vankoughnet, the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, writes to Mr. Phipps, the Indian agent in charge of this band of Indians owning the timber on the reserve, and urges him to see what can be done in getting from the Indians a surrender of their claims to the timber. This is the letter that Mr. Vankoughnet writes:

"OTTAWA, 23rd October, 1885.

"JAS. C. PHIPPS, Esq.,
"Indian Superintendent,
"Manitowaning, Ont.

"SIR,—I enclose, herewith, for early report, copy of an application, dated the 13th instant, from Messrs. Joseph Riopelle & Co., of Ottawa, to obtain the privilege of cutting fallen, dead and green timber on the Indian reserve at Whitefish Lake.

"I have to request that you will report your views to the department on this matter; 1st, as to whether there is more timber fit for lumber than the Indians will require for their own purposes on the reserve, and, if so; 2nd, whether the Indians are likely to agree to the same being sold by the department for their benefit. 3rd. What bonus in such event should, in your opinion, be asked for the timber."

I emphasise the last words "what bonus in your opinion should be asked for the timber," because it may be that the department will set up the defence that they are in the habit of selling all pine timber lands, especially in the North-West, at the nominal sum of $1 a square mile, and therefore that they did not want to depart from that rule in this particular case. Here it will be seen that so uncertain were they as to what price they should ask for this particular timber limit that they asked the Indian agent at Manitowaning to express an opinion as to what price they should ask for this particular limit. In pursuance of that letter Mr. Phipps, the Indian agent at Manitowaning, proceeded to the Indians at their reserve, and I have heard said, with the assistance of friends of the hon. the junior member for Ottawa, he got from the Indians the surrender of the pine timber on this reserve. He writes as follows of the surrender :—

"INDIAN OFFICE, MANITOWANING,
"12th July, 1886.

"SIR,—I have the honor to report my return from Sault Ste. Marie, having gone there with Joseph Faille, an Indian of Whitefish Lake Band, chosen by the Council of the band for the purpose of making the affidavit to the surrender required by section 37, sub-section 2, Indian Act, 1880.

"I enclose herewith the surrender of the timber on the reserve."

The following is the surrender signed by the Indians, of the 79 square miles of timber to this Government:—

"We, the undersigned chiefs and principal men of the band of Indians owning the tract of land known as the Whitefish Lake Indian Reserve, or Reserve Number 6, in the schedule of reserves under the Robinson Treaty, being a majority of the male members of the said band of the full age of twenty-one years, habitually residing on or near the reserve in question, duly assembled at a council of the said band called for the purpose and according to the rules of the said band, and held in presence of an officer duly authorised by the Honorable the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs to attend such council, acting on behalf of the whole people of our said band, do hereby release, surrender, quit claim and yield up unto Our Sovereign Lady the Queen, Her heirs and successors forever, all and singular the whole of the merchantable timber on the said reserve in trust, to be sold for the joint benefit of the said band on such terms and conditions and as to Her Majesty's Government of Canada shall seem proper; ten per cent. of the bonus derivable from the sale of the said timber to be divided among the said band, the remainder of the proceeds to be invested for our sole joint benefit and for the benefit of our descendants in such manner as to the said Government of Canada shall seem to be most conducive to the interest of our said band.

"In witness whereof we, the said chiefs and principal men, have set our hands and seals unto this instrument, at Whitefish Lake Indian Reserve, this first day of July, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six."

Then follows the signatures of the Indians. The conditions of the sale as regards the proceeds to be divided among the Indians are stated in the surrender. The price, as the Minister of the Interior told us the other day was $316 and 10 per cent. of that is $31.60. There are about 100 Indians in this band, and this would be about 31 cents each for the Indians, whereas the hon. the junior member for Ottawa, if my information is correct, got no less than $50,000 for this very timber limit for which the individual Indians only got 31 cents each. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is almost unnecessary for me in this House to tell the members, many of whom are lumber manufacturers, that to sell 79 square miles of timber limits on the north shore of the Georgian Bay for the sum of $316 is nothing more or less than giving them away. I will appeal to the hon. the senior member for Ottawa if what I say is not correct, that these limits, if worth anything, are worth from $50 to $100 per square mile. I appeal to the hon. member for Russell if it is not a shocking transaction that these limits should be sold to a supporter of the Government who was then soon to be a member of this House for the nominal sum of $316, and that the Indians should be induced to sign a surrender by being told that they would get about 10 per cent. of a bonus when all they would get between them would be $31, while the hon. member for Ottawa pockets from $45,000 to $50,000 out of the transaction. Let me show you what the value of these limits really is. In the year 1872 the Ontario Government, as I have stated, laid out all this tract of land into timber berths with the view of selling the timber thereon. This Indian reservation has been laid out on a portion of berth No. 69; Messrs. Francis Bros. purchased the reservation and operated upon that berth last year—one eleventh part of the whole of this Indian reservation. Now, I have a statement here, given to me by wood rangers who went there with the view of inspecting the quantities of timber cut and the quantity remaining on this eleventh part of the whole reserve, and what do they report? They report that there was taken off that portion last year by Francis Bros., 230,800 feet of square timber, which, at $80 a thousand, would amount to $1,862.40. Then, there was 1,821,300 feet, board measure, cut off, which, at $3 a thousand, would give $5,463.90. Then there was 453,325 feet, board measure, in the rough, which, at $1.50, would make $682.78. So that there was last year $8,009 worth of timber cut off one-eleventh part of the reserve, which was sold to the hon. gentleman for $316. But there was more left upon it. These wood-rangers report that there are 7,000,000 feet left upon this one-eleventh part, which at $2 a thousand, would be $14,000 worth still standing. Altogether, on that one-eleventh part, or 7 square miles, owned by Francis Bros. and partly worked by them, was timber worth at least $22,000, and the hon. junior member for Ottawa gets the whole 79 square miles for $316. But I will give some further information. Now, I know, because of the gentlemen who own that berth 69 are clients of mine, and they refused $30,000 for it; the proportion covered by this Indian reserve would be worth $7,500. Then, berth 70 was examined by a Mr. Macdonald, a wood-ranger, and he made out that there were on it 40,000,000 feet, which at $1 a thousand would be worth $40,000; the proportion covered by this reserve would be worth $13,333. Berth 84 was worth $60,000, and the proportion covered by the reserve would be worth $10,000. Then, berths 75 and 83 were sold to Messrs. Sadler & Dundas, of the town of Lindsay, for $40,000; and the other day Mr. Flavel of that firm told me that he was offered $90,000 for those two berths. The proportion of these two berths covered by the reserve, would be $10,000. Now, leaving out altogether a large portion of the reserve, regarding the value of which I cannot speak with any authority, and leaving out two out of the seven berths, we find that that property was worth $40,833, for which the hon. junior member for Ottawa gave $316. But I have another proof. I have told the House that, in 1872, this property was sold by the Ontario Government, when, as every hon. member in this House knows, timber berths were very much depressed in value; they also know what was realised at that time from those timber berths at a public auction? Did the hon. gentleman opposite put them up at public auction? Nothing of the kind. Did he call for tenders? Nothing of the kind. He merely had the application of the junior member for Ottawa for these timber berths; he proceeded, as I have shown, to get a surrender from the Indians, and he practically gave it to the junior member for Ottawa for $316 without any competition whatever. Now, what was got by the Ontario Government for all these berths in 1872, except one, which was not sold? The sum realised was $19,305. But it is not fair for me to quote these figures alone, because the reserve does not cover all that was sold in 1872; but I will give the amounts that were realised for the proportions of the berths covered by the reserve. In 1872 the very property sold in 1886 to the hon. member for Ottawa for $316, was sold for the large sum of $8,675, leaving out altogether the whole of one berth which was not at that time sold, but which has since been sold, in 1885, for $100 a square mile. Now, I think I have shown enough to satisfy this House that a gross outrage has been perpetrated, not only on the good fame of this country, but on this particular band of Indians. It may be said by hon. gentlemen opposite: Oh, they knew nothing about the value of these timber limits; their dealings are so extensive all over the Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific that they have not time to worry themselves about such a small matter as 79 miles of timber limits, notwithstanding that the Premier of this country was sworn to do his duty to these Indians, over whom he presided at that time as Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. I have shown that this property was worth from $50,000 to $75,000. Now, I will bring the fact right home to the Government, to prove beyond any doubt that the Government had information that this very timber limit was very valuable, and that they were told to send a man to inspect it, by no less a person than the Indian agent himself at Manitowaning, Mr. Phipps. In 1885, a short time before the hon. member got the limit, Mr. Phipps wrote this letter.

"SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of official letter dated 23rd inst., instructing me to report on the application of Messrs. Joseph Riopelle & Co.——"

And the House must not forget that Riopelle & Co. have been identified as the junior member for Ottawa, —

"—to obtain the privilege of cutting fallen, dead and green timber on the Indian Reserve at Whitefish Lake. I beg respectfully to state that, although I am not well acquainted with the reserve in question, yet I am satisfied from what I have seen that it contains a large quantity of pine timber, much more than the Indians will be likely to require for their own purpose."

That letter was in the possession of the Government and yet, knowing this opinion of the value of the timber lands in that reserve, they sold the limit to the junior member for Ottawa for the paltry sum of $316. The letter goes on:

"I have every reason to believe that the Indians would be willing to agree to the timber being sold by the department for their benefit. The chief stated to me his intention of coming to Manitowaning this fall, and I shall be able then to ascertain his views upon this point. The value of the dead and fallen pine should be, in my opinion, realised as early as possible, as that description of timber deteriorates rapidly. As for the timber, any opinion of mine without a more perfect knowledge of the quantity would be almost guesswork. I would suggest if the Indians are willing to surrender that an examination be made by an experienced lumberman."

Was that done prior to selling this limit to the junior member for Ottawa? If it was the report should have been brought down at once, but it was not.—

"Although a large portion of the reserve has been burned over there still remains a large quantity of pine which if realised to the best advantage would be of great benefit to the Indians. The reserve being now easily reached by Canadian Pacific Railway *viâ* Sudbury, the expense of sending a competent man to make an examination of the timber would not be very great.

"JAMES C. PHIPPS."

There it is suggested that the expense of sending a man to inspect this property and report upon it would not be very great, by reason of its proximity to Sudbury, or to some other station on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have mentioned the fact that there was a sale in 1872 by the Ontario Government, and if our Government here had desired to do what was right and proper, they would have said to the Ontario Government: You sold those limits in 1872; give us the money that you realised, with interest; give us the ground rent that you realised, with interest, and we will assume the sales to your licensees. Had that been done, nobody would have been hurt, the Ontario Government would have had to give up the money to which it was never entitled; the Ontario licensees, many of whom were supporters of the right hon. gentleman, would have been protected in what was supposed to be their rights, because they were innocent purchasers without any notice of reserve and the Ontario Government were innocent vendors. If that had been done, the licensees of the Ontario Government would have been protected and the Indians would have had not less than $18,889.50. That course would have been fair and just, because this Government could have said to the Ontario Government: You have sold property which does not belong to you, and the Indians would have had the sum of $18,982.50, made up in this way: The amount of bonus that the Ontario Government got in 1872 was $8,675; the interest on that at 6 per cent. would give $7,280; the ground rents since then, paid for this particular reserve, were $1,952, and the interest on that would be $98½, making altogether the sum of $18,889.50. That would have been a proper and just course for this Government to pursue; but they had to meet the exigencies of one gentleman, the junior member for Ottawa, who would have been left out in the cold had they adopted the course I have mentioned, and who would not have got the nice little sum of $50,000 for this Indian timber land, for which he gave the Government $316. It may be said that the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite did not know of the Ontario sale before selling to the hon. member for Ottawa, but that they did is shown by a letter written by Mr. Vankoughnet to Mr. James Johnson, Commissioner of Crown Lands at Toronto, dated the 10th July, 1886:

"I have recently learned incidentally that your department has sold the merchantable timber upon the whole or the greater portion of the Indian reserve at Whitefish Lake."

So that this Government knew that the Ontario Government had previously sold the timber on this particular reserve in 1872, and if they had acted honestly and applied to the Ontario Government, instead of having only $316 to divide among the Indians, they would have had no less a sum than $18,000. My hon. friend behind me asks if the Ontario Government proposed anything of that kind. I will read, to establish that, the letter written by Mr. Johnson, which is dated the 1st August, 1883, addressed to Mr. Vankoughnet, and is in these words:

"I am directed to call your attention to the following: It appears that Provincial Land Surveyor Abrey is about to make a survey of the Indian reserve at Whitefish Lake, Lake Huron, for your Department. This department not being aware of any Indian reserve there, has this season sub-divided townships 70 and 77 as numbered on the topographical map of north shore of Lake Huron.

"On this plan the Indian reserves are colored red, and the department was under the impression that all Indian reserves were laid down thereon.

"Under these circumstances, I am to suggest if it would not be advisable to instruct Mr. Abrey not to make the survey at present, as when the plan and field notes of these townships are in the office, an arrangement may be made with your department satisfactory alike to the Indians and the Indian Department, whereas if Mr. Abrey makes a survey with the present indefinite information as given in the treaty, complications might arise, owing to the influx of settlers along the Canadian Pacific Railway."

That is signed by Mr. Johnson, Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands, Toronto.

Mr. DEWDNEY. What date is that?

Mr. BARRON. That is dated the 11th August, 1883. Now I would like to know from the junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Robillard) how much money he did get for this?

Mr. ROBILLARD. I got nothing at all. I had no interest in it more than the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. BARRON. Who had? The Government got $316 from the junior member for Ottawa, and the property was sold to him, or it was sold to Riopelle & Co., and the hon. gentleman was one of that company, and he certainly realised some of this booty out of the sale to Francis Bros. If I am not altogether misinformed, he realised something between $45,000 and $50,000. The hon. gentleman shakes his head.

Mr. ROBILLARD. I say it is false.

Mr. BARRON. Well, I suppose I am bound to take his statement inside this House, but, if I were outside this House I do not think I would take his statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BARRON. It has been suggested—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. BARRON. Withdraw what?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It is a very offensive statement.

Mr. BARRON. I say I am bound to accept the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The hon. member said he would not take this statement outside of this House. That is unparliamentary.

Mr. BARRON. I am bound to accept the statement of the hon. member inside this House, but it is very extraordinary that Riopelle & Co., one of whom was himself, should have got this money from Francis Bros., and he, the junior member for Ottawa, should not have got anything at all. However, it is perfectly apparent that somebody made a big pull out of this, and the Indians got $316 for property which I think I have successfully proved to this House is worth $50,000 or $60,000 or $75,000. Now, who was the one who was directly responsible

for this transaction? It was no less a person than the Premier of this country, who was the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. Scarcely was the ink dry upon the letter sent to the junior member for Ottawa saying that this was sold to him at $4 a square mile——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Read the letter.

Mr. BARRON. Here is the letter, addressed to H. Robillard, Esq., M.P., Ottawa, and dated 7th October, 1886:

"SIR,—I have the honor to inform you that the timber limit comprising the Whitefish Lake Indian Reserve has been awarded to you. The limit contains 79 square miles. The bonus is $4 per square mile, or $316; ground rent, $1 per square mile, $79; license fee, $4; total, $399."

That is signed by W. Plummer, for the Deputy Minister of Indian Affairs. I did not think it was necessary for me to read that letter in view of the statement made by the Minister of the Interior a few days ago when I asked him a question the answer to which was, out of his own lips, that the pine timber on this reserve, 79 square miles in extent, was sold to Mr. Honoré Robillard for $4 a square mile. The person who was directly responsible for that transaction, as I said, was the Premier himself, who was then the head of this particular department which was guilty of what I consider a most outrageous transaction. Scarcely was the ink dry upon the letter which gave that property to the junior member for Ottawa before, in the self same year, the hon. gentleman wrote these sympathetic words regarding the Indians:

"The Indians are in the meantime not encouraged by the delay to extend their improvements, and they are by bitter experience convinced of the fact that game and fur-bearing animals, which in years gone by afforded them an ample means of supplying their needs, are fast failing them, as settlement advances and the sound of the woodman's axe and the shriek of the locomotive terrify the much valued moose, the timid red deer and the coy wild fowl, and hurry them to regions inaccessible to these hunters who are too poor to purchase sufficient supplies to carry them so far as their eager propensities for the chase would tempt them. Thus they return to Lake Temogamingue, their home, and which was the home of their ancestors from time immemorial, disheartened from their failure in the chase, and sitting by the camp fire, as they gaze on the empty kettle, they brood over the long delay in their recognition of their just claims to their patrimony, but gratified amid it all, as their superintendent pathetically remarks, 'at knowing that the Department is doing all that it can for them in the matter.'"

That is signed by "John A. Macdonald," and is the report for the very year in which this timber limit was sold to the junior member for Ottawa.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is John A. Macdonald?

Mr. BARRON. He was the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, and at the foot of this report, he says that the department is doing all that it can for the Indians in the matter. The way in which the department does that is to sell this valuable patrimony to the junior member for Ottawa for this nominal sum. The hon. gentleman says he did not make anything out of it, and I suppose I am bound to accept that statement. What in the name of common sense did Riopelle & Co. buy this property for if it was not to make something out of it? Why did he first send out an application for Riopelle & Co., and then in order to give force to the application, send afterwards the application in his own name—Honoré Robillard? Why does the Deputy Minister of Indian Affairs write to Honoré Robillard giving him this property for the sum of $4 per square mile? If I was to look for a cause I would find it in the journals of the House at Toronto. The junior member for Ottawa is of French descent. We all know that in the year 1885 there was great agitation throughout the country owing to the ill-treatment of the half-breeds of the North-West. Mr. Meredith, in the Ontario Legislature, thought it was his duty to bring in an amendment, to the Address which was brought down, regarding the volunteers who went to the North-West. He knew very well that it would be a great feather in his cap, if he could only get the junior member for Ottawa, whose feelings ought to be and were justly with his fellow-countrymen on the banks of the Saskatchewan—if he could get that hon. gentleman to support him in his amendment to the Address. The junior member for Ottawa did vote with Mr. Meredith. But there was another amendment moved by Mr. Fraser, the end of which was this:

"And this House now hopes and trusts that peace and tranquility having been fully restored, it may be found consistent with the public interest to extend the merciful consideration of the Crown to those who are now undergoing imprisonment for offences connected with, or arising out of, the rebellion."

The men who were undergoing imprisonment for offences arising out of the rebellion, were countrymen of the hon. gentleman opposite, and he voted against that amendment in the Local House. If we were to look for the motive which guided the Government in lining the palm of the hon. gentleman, we would probably find it in the fact of the sacrifice of fealty to his countrymen he made when he voted against that amendment of Mr. Fraser. Now, I think that I have shown that this transaction is a most discreditable one; I have shown that the Ontario Government sold limits, in 1872, off this very reserve, for $8,000 odd; I have shown that the Dominion Government sold the whole reserve in 1886 to the junior member for Ottawa for the sum of $316; I have shown by the agreement signed by the Indians that they were induced to sign it by the knowledge that they were going to get 10 per cent. of a cash bonus, but they were not told that this 10 per cent. would be a paltry $31, or amongst 100 Indians, 31 cents each; I have shown by the statement of the wood-rangers the enormous value of these reserves; I have shown from a statement of a member of this House that it was worth an enormous sum of money. I do not care whether Mr. Robillard or anybody else made any money out of it; my concern is with the fact that the Government of the day have been most negligent in the discharge of their duty towards this band of Indians; and I say nobody who views this subject fairly, and who claims that the same code of honor should prevail in this House that he practices in private life—I say no one can for a moment fail to condemn this transaction. Therefore, I appeal to all the members of this House who discountenance an unworthy act in private life, to condemn the same act in public life, and I have no hesitation in asking them to vote for the amendment which I shall now read:

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—"Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved, That it appears from a Return laid upon the Table of this House, that the Government of Canada, in the year 1886, acquired from the Band of Indians known as Shawanakiskic's Band ' a surrender of the Indian title to the merchantable pine timber of the Whitefish Lake Indian Reserve, or Reserve No. 6, in trust, to be sold for the joint benefit of the said band on such terms and on such conditions as to Her Majesty's Government of Canada should seem proper, 10 per cent. of the bonus derivable from the sale of the said timber to be divided among the said band, the remainder of the proceeds to be invested for their sole joint benefit and for the benefit of their descendents in such manner as to said Government of Canada should seem to be most conducive to the interest of said band."

And it appears that at and prior to the time of the sale thereof, hereinafter mentioned, the Government of Canada had been officially advised that the said reserve contained "a large quantity of valuable pine timber fit for lumber much more than the Indians would be likely to require for their own purposes."

And that in consequence of the reserve not having been surveyed or laid out until recently, the Government of the Province of Ontario had no means of knowing of the existence of said reserve, and having no such knowledge, proceeded in the year 1872 to sell, and did sell, the pine timber thereon for several thousand dollars, all of which was well known to the Government of Canada prior to their selling the same, as hereinafter appears.

And that it further appears from said Return that the Government of Canada, without conferring with the Indians of said band (or any them) as to the price to be obtained for said pine timber, or in any way whatever enquiring as to their views or wishes regarding the same, and without communicating to them, or any of them, as to the sum of money for which they proposed to sell said pine timber, sold and disposed of the same, covering an area of 79 square miles, at a private sale, without competition of any kind, to one Honoré Robillard, now a member of the House, and a supporter of the said Government, for a nominal sum of $316.

And it appears that the said pine timber is, and was at the time of the sale thereof, of a value in excess of the sum of $50,000, and, by reason of the aforesaid facts, the Indians have been grievously wronged, and the trust they reposed in the Government of Canada has been violated and misused.

That in view of the facts aforesaid this House expresses its disapproval of the sale of the pine timber for the nominal sum of $316 and of the manner in which it was sold, and this House declares it to be a gross violation of the trust reposed by the Indians in the Government of Canada, and it is the duty of this House to record its condemnation of the transaction.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman did not give me some information of the particular class of land in respect of which he gave notice, I believe to the Finance Minister, that he proposed to move a vote of censure on the Government for having sold, as he said unjustly. It is well known that I have had not time to enquire into the matter, and am not in a position to answer him as I would like to do. The hon. gentleman has given a very clear history of the transaction from the start, and I have no doubt that it is a pretty correct one; and from it there is no blame, so far as I can see, attaching to the Government for the manner in which they have dealt in this matter. It appears that the Ontario Government in 1872 sold lands which did not belong to them. Whether at that time they knew such was the case, is immaterial. They did sell lands which subsequently proved to belong to the Indians. Some 14 years, I think, after that, the Government found that the timber which had been sold by the Ontario Government was in the same position as the land. No timber up to that time had been touched upon this reserve. Applications were made for this timber and the usual course was followed, the course which is followed to-day when applications are made for timber. The agent was asked to obtain the surrender from the Indians of the property sought to be dealt with. In this case the agent did as the law requires; he met the Indians, and in council they appear to have surrendered the timber on their reserve and authorised the Superintendent General to deal with it. It appears that during the time between the sale of the timber and when the case was dealt with by the Department of Indian Affairs, the timber had very much deteriorated in value on account of the fires which swept throughout that country. It was also found, when this timber was being dealt with by the department, that the cloud placed upon its title by the sale of the Ontario Government naturally depreciated the value of the property. The Ontario Government had not insisted on the working of this timber land and it remained in the same state as formerly except that the fires had run through it, and the party who was sent to report on the timber and who ran the boundaries of the reserve reported that the fires had done much injury to the timber and that a great deal of it was small and of an inferior quality. This was the report laid before the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, and it was upon that report I presume the sale was made. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barron) has endeavored to show what the Indians would have received if they had taken the course which he has suggested, when it was found that the Ontario Government had sold the property which had belonged to them. The hon. gentleman has stated that if they had taken that course the Indians would have made $18,000 out of the property. I think I shall be able to show that the Indians will make over $30,000 out of the property. The conditions of sale so far as the department was concerned were these: The Government charged at the rate of $1 per thousand feet board measure for the timber cut on the reserve, in addition to the bonus paid down at the time, which was at the rate of $4 per square mile.

Mr. BARRON. I draw attention to the fact that the Ontario Government have corresponding dues for every 1,000 feet cut. There is no saving.

Mr. DEWDNEY. $18,000 has been stated as the amount that the Indians would receive for this property. The ground rent is also $3 per square mile. There was a regulation made increasing this amount from $1 to $3 in 1887. The Ontario Government, as the hon. gentleman has said, has charged 75 cents per 1,000; we charge $1.

Mr. WALDIE. They charge $1.

Mr. DEWDNEY. At that time it was 75 cents. However, they did not receive anything because they did not cut a stick of the timber. I desire to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact, that up to the present moment we have derived from ground rent and dues in timber not less than $5,420, which, in addition to $316 paid for a bonus, brings the total to $5,736. There is still the greater portion of this timber remaining, and we shall realise from this property within a short time, if the dues come in as they have been coming, from $25,000 to $30,000. These funds are placed to the credit of the Indians and under the terms of the Indian Act, they will receive 10 per cent. of them. I may state that not only was the report made to the Superintendent General at the time the sale was made, to the effect that a great deal of the timber had been burned, but it was also advanced that, unless something were done with the timber, further fires would destroy the whole of it, and it was that report which influenced him in dealing with the timber, in order that the Indians might derive some benefit from that property. I do not propose to enter further into this matter. The long résumé which the hon. gentleman gave from the date of the treaty down to the present time has very little to do with this question. The hon. gentleman blames the Government for having, as he thinks, treated unjustly their wards. It is an accusation which is a very serious one, and from my experience of 10 years with the Indians of this country, I think this is not the case. Everywhere, so far as my information goes, the Government have promoted and secured the rights of the Indians. I have occupied these few moments in order to show as far as I am able to do so, and I believe it to be the fact, that the rights of the Indians have been protected and promoted in a much higher degree than the hon. gentleman considers, and they will derive more money from their property than they would have received from it if the course had been taken which the hon. gentleman proposes.

Mr. COLTER. I am very sorry that it has been proved, and proved so conclusively, that the Indian Department has been managed so much to the disadvantage of their wards, and I was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman who has just sat down not make any apology whatever, but endeavor to justify the conduct which has been pursued. When this land was conveyed by the Indians to the Government in trust, to be sold and applied for their benefit, there certainly was an obligation resting on the Government to protect the rights of those whose guardians they were, as it was the duty of an ordinary trustee to manage any estate committed to his charge properly and economically for the benefit of the *cestni que* trust. It has been proved, proved most conclusively, and it has been done out of the and mouth of the Minister, that there has been a large sum of money, amounting to not less than $18,000, and in fact it might have been very much greater if the property had been sold at this time, absolutely lost to the Indians, and yet it is said there has been no wrong done to the Indians in this transaction. One would suppose, to hear the remarks that were made, that the Government and Superintendent General seemed to be afraid that the Indians would squander their money and property, and the Government, in order to save them from that temptation, squandered it for them in this way. The department, I think, is very censurable, and if our Indian affairs are to be managed in this way in the future it is clear that the Indians should know it, and that the white people should also know it. The Indians occupy a very peculiar position in this country. They have certain rights and certain

responsibilities, and it must be remembered that the people were under very great obligations to the Indians in the past. At all times have they proved to be loyal, faithful and true, and when they have been proven to be such towards the Government there is, even if there was no legal obligation, a very strong moral duty resting on the Government, and the department which manages their affairs, that the confidence which has been given so liberally in the past by those Indians should be kept inviolate. If it be proved, as has been proved in the case, that their property is squandered in this improper way, squandered without any just excuse, squandered even when the officers of the Government report that this property is very valuable, and squandered for a mere song, then the Indian should no longer repose confidence in the Government nor should the public repose faith in the administration of the guardianship which has been imposed upon the Government. There was one excuse made by the Government which certainly was a very thin excuse indeed. It was said that in consequence of this property being sold by the Ontario Government that there was a cloud on the title and that it was a little misty, but I thought the explanation itself was a little misty, for the Government did not attempt to realise in any way a larger sum for this property. They knew that they could have realised a larger sum; they knew there were persons under obligation to the Ontario Government to pay this larger sum of money, and yet they wilfully abstained from taking advantage of the opportunities which presented themselves to benefit the Indians in this case. In my opinion that was a shameful proceeding and such a proceeding as must disgust the people of this country and the Indians of this country with the management of the Indian Department by the present Government. We have many more instances of this mismanagement going on from day to day. We have for instance the Government claiming to be a guardian to these Indians, we have the Superintendent General claiming to be a father to these Indians (but in many cases he is only a stepfather, or a stepmother as the case may be); we find all through that our Indians have heavy expenses imposed upon them for which they get no adequate return. We find for instance among the Indians, some of whom I have the honor to represent, that there are heavy permanent burdens unnecessarily imposed upon them. Take the Six Nation Indians, who, on account of their loyalty, left the United States and came to his country. They were settled on valuable lands and these lands were sold—not in this way it is true, for we had better management at that time—these lands were sold at from $4 to $6 an acre 40 or 50 years ago and the proceeds were applied for the benefit of those Indians, and a large sum of money has been put into the public Treasury in trust for their benefit, and we find that to-day these funds of the Indians are being squandered. We have also in that vicinity the Mississaugas, a very small band numbering only 245. They were under the same management as the Six Nation Indians until a year or two ago and then it was found necessary to make a place for a supporter of the present Government and an additional agent was appointed at a salary of $600 a year to superintend these 245 Indians. This band comprises very intelligent Indians, and they need no agent at all to manage their affairs. Nearly all of them can read, and most of them can write as good a hand as almost any member of this House. I doubt that there are any Indians in the Province of Ontario so advanced and so intelligent as they are, yet an agent has been recently appointed to supervise them as stated, but, in reality, he was appointed to find room for a Government supporter. We have also a physician for those Indians who is paid $250 a year, while many of them do not employ that physician at all. These Indians have a choice of physicians just as well as white men, and many of them employ and pay their own physicians, yet we have this man appointed at $250 a year, and there is very little consideration rendered in return for that expenditure. We have also, among the Six Nation Indians a physician recently appointed for political purposes at an expense of $2,600 a year; at least there is that much spent in connection with the appointment. These Indians numbering 3,362 had a physician previously, not an old man but a man who was able to do his work well and the Government superannuated him at an expense of $500 a year paid out of the Indian fund. The Indians are taxed for paying these doctors while they employ their own physicians in Caledonia and Hagersville. Some of them in fact employ no doctor at all, but this burthen is imposed on them and their means are filtered away in this manner. I believe that there is a gross outrage in this and that the time is near at hand when the Government will have to cease squandering this money which they have in trust. I do not want it to be said, and the Indians would not allow it to be said, that it was right to squander their money as was done in the case of the sale of this timber limit. I had hoped years ago that we had heard the last of these transactions, but it seems that they are to be continued by the Government, and that even when they are brought before the attention of the House and the charges have to be admitted as true, no excuse is given by the Government except to turn around and say: "It is right for us to give away property worth $18,000 for $316, the difference for the ground rent will be very little, there is a ground rent charged every year by the Ontario Government of $3 and it is just the same here." We see this money absolutely squandered and no excuse given for the squandering of it except that the Indians have nothing to complain of. If a job of this kind had been perpetrated on one of the Ministers you may depend upon it there would be complaints very soon, and the Indians have just as good reason to have their rights protected and maintained as any gentleman who sits on the Treasury benches.

Mr. LISTER. The charge made against the Government by the hon. member who moved this motion is a serious and grave one, and it calls upon the Government, represented by the Minister of the Interior, and upon the hon. the junior member for Ottawa to make some explanation. I wish to ask the hon. the junior member for Ottawa whether that Joseph Riopelle mentioned in the correspondence is the present member for Bonaventure. The hon. gentleman refuses to answer, and we may take it for granted fairly that Mr. Joseph Riopelle, his partner in this nefarious transaction, is the present member for Bonaventure. Sir, the representation or explanation made by the hon. the Minister of the Interior is a confirmation in full of the charge made by the hon. gentleman who has proposed this motion. He supports it by the statement that no blame is attachable to the Government for the sale of these lands; that they instructed the agent of the Government to obtain from the Indians a surrender of the timber, but does not the hon. gentleman remember that at the time they instructed the agent to obtain that surrender from the Indians the agent informed him that the timber upon this particular reserve was of very considerable value?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He said he knew nothing of it. It was only from hearsay.

Mr. LISTER. It was not hearsay, because a letter was produced by the hon. gentleman who moved this motion, from the Governement's own agent on the reserve, notifying the Government that this was a valuable property and asking them to send up some competent person to make a valuation of it with a view to its sale. The hon. gentleman said that fire had run through it, and it was of comparatively little value; yet a moment afterwards he told us that the ground rents amounted to $5,736; and he also tells us that

there are many dollars to come out from the sale of timber on this very reserve. The statement he made was a refutation of his statement in the first place that the timber on the reserve was not valuable. It is known to everybody interested in the timber business in this country, that the limit the Government sold to Robillard, be he a member of this House or not, was one of great value indeed, and that the present holders of the limit would not accept $100,000 to-day for it, a limit which was sold by this Government, in violation of their sacred trust, to a political supporter, for a paltry, contemptible sum of $316, and his vote it may be. What do we find? It is of very little importance to go into the early history of this transaction. Suffice it to know that the Government held this reserve in trust for the Indians, and it was their duty, like any other trustees before selling or disposing of that land, to satisfy themselves of its value, and to take such steps as were necessary to obtain the highest possible price for it. Did they do so? No, Sir, they deliberately violated the trust reposed in them by the Indians, and sold to a political supporter the timber upon a valuable reserve for a merely nominal price; and I ask that hon. member now to say what disposition he made of the timber he bought from the Government on that occasion? They went to the Indians without informing them how this timber was to be disposed of; they obtained from them a surrender of it; the Indians, believing that the Government would do whatever was necessary to obtain the highest possible price for the timber, yielded to the solicitations of the agent, and executed to the Government a surrender of their right. That timber limit is situated in the centre of the most valuable timber limits in this country; timber limits surrounding it to the south, to the north and to the east, have been sold by the Ontario Government for years past; and persons engaged in the trade knew that it was one of great value indeed. And what did this Government do? They did not invite tenders from any person. The public did not know that the timber was for sale at all; but the Government made a secret and private sale to a political supporter for the sum of $316. Contrast the conduct of this Government with that of the Ontario Government. The Ontario Government for years past has been selling timber limits on the north shore of Lake Superior and the Georgian Bay by public auction, after having been advertised for months previous, and what has been the result? We find that in the last sales in 1887, the Ontario Government realised from one limit $2,000 per square mile of a bonus, instead of $4 per square mile; and limits in the immediate vicinity of that sold to Mr. Robillard realised from $1,000 to $2,000 per square mile. In addition to that, the Government receives the annual dues, as this Government does. In 1872, as has been stated by my hon. friend, the Ontario Government sold a portion of this very reserve for $8,675; and this Government knowing that sales have been made by the Ontario Government, made this sale without ever consulting that Government, knowing that if they had done so the Ontario Government would have surrendered up to this Government all the money they had received from this reserve, together with interest, which would have given these Indians $18,000 or $19,000. Yet the Government thought proper to sell it to the hon. junior member for Ottawa for $316. That hon. gentleman received a title to it from the Government. What has he done with it? He is not the owner of it now; how long did he own it before he sold it? Whom did he sell it to? What did he receive for it? If he did not buy it for himself, whom did he buy it for? Who was he the go-between for? What has become of it? We know that to-day the timber is owned by the Francis Bros., and it is held for an enormous sum of money. You find that prior to the last election one of the charges made against the Government was that they sold the whole timber wealth of the North-West Territories to political supporters without competition. But we never dreamed that the Government would pursue a course different from the course pursued by the Government of Ontario with regard to the timber limits in the Province of Ontario, for which they must have known that high prices could have been obtained. They have betrayed a sacred trust which the Indians have placed in them, and which they as trustees were bound honestly and honorably to perform. It is scarcely credible that a gentleman occupying the high position of the First Minister as Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, should have so far forgotten himself as to make such a sale, and it is not creditable to the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Minister of the Interior to rise in his seat and make such a statement as he has done. Not only in regard to timber limits has the Government been unfaithful to their trust, but in the selling of islands in the Georgian Bay and Lake Superior. We find that when gold was discovered on the island known as Sultana Island in the Lake of the Woods, the Dominion Government at once laid claim to that island without having a survey made, and included it in the adjoining reservation; and they sold that island to Messrs. McMicken and Kennedy, client of Hugh John Macdonald and Stewart Tupper. We do not know what price the Government received for that island, but we do know that it was sold to political favorites, and that the bargain was negotiated by a son of the High Commissioner and a son of Premier of Canada. We know that Sultana or West Island, in the Georgian Bay, was sold for $2,500, without any tenders being invited or notice given to the public; and we know that immediately after the sale for $2,500 that island was sold for $15,000. Lacoche Island, in the Georgian Bay, was sold by the Government without inviting tenders, without the public knowing that the island was for sale to Mr. Buehner, of Welland. The Government claim they had the right to sell the island because they said it formed a part of the Indian reserve. It is contended on the part of the Ontario Government that it never formed part of the Indian reserve, but that this Government, for the purpose of acquiring possession, caused a survey to be made and included it in the Indian reserve on the mainland, whereas, in point of fact, it never was the property of this Government, but was always the property of the Ontario Government, and not included in the original survey of the reservation. In this way, the property of the Indians, about which the hon. member speaks so affectionately, is being squandered away from day to day. If the statements made by the hon. gentleman who proposed this resolution are true—and the Minister admits they are—in substance and in fact, then the conduct of the Government has been disgraceful in the extreme and should receive the censure of the House.

Mr. ROBILLARD. I merely rise to say a few words so as to place myself right on this question. In the first place, the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution is no doubt interested in the matter because there was a dispute on account of this land having been sold by the Ontario Government, and I see by the public accounts of Ontario that he has claimed some $1,500 expenses from the Ontario Government. He ought, therefore, to be well informed on the subject. The parties claiming want to show that these limits are worth a big price, because they have a claim against the Ontario Government for a large amount. I just mention this in passing. The facts are these: I was then an M.P.P., not an M.P. Messrs. Riopelle & Co. were friends of mine, and they have nothing to do with the Mr. Riopelle in this House. They are a firm in the city of Ottawa, and are not members of this House. They are Liberals, and particular friends of mine. At least I know some of them, but not all. I know Mr. Riopelle, and one or two of the firm. The Francis' I do not know at all. I

suppose Mr. Riopelle is still with them, although I do not even know that. I never saw the limits. These parties asked me to render them a service—they had done pretty much the same thing for me before—so that, as an act of gratitude on my part, I asked Sir John Macdonald about that Indian reserve. I asked Riopelle if the proposition was a legitimate one and an ordinary one, and he said it was. I know nothing of these things because they are not in my line. I wrote out the application, which was signed Riopelle & Co. I went to Sir John and I suppose he thought I was one of the company. I did not say whether I was or not, because it was through my influence I hoped to benefit Riopelle & Co. I was at the time in the House at Toronto. These people had written to me to urge Sir John to grant the license, and I wrote to him in my own name. I did not know these letters would come before the House. I am telling you the naked truth. I was either at Toronto or Baie des Chaleurs when the license was given, and to the best of my knowledge I was at the latter place. When the hon. gentlemen talk about my refusing thousands of dollars, I cannot help feeling amused. I never saw the limits, but I saw in Mr. Riopelle's office a report from a man named Colton, who is known as one of the best explorers of limits we have. I remember reading his report. He says there was timber sufficient to make one raft, and two-thirds of the limit were lakes and water and a great deal burnt. But I paid no particular attention to it, as I was not concerned in the matter. So I have been amused all along about the wealth I was making. I am only sorry it was not so. As far as I know the transaction was as legal as any other. I have seen a report from the Indian Department stating there was nothing in that section but poor timber and a large portion was burnt. That timber report can be seen. I paid to get it from some of the employés of the department. There was some little timber fringed on the edges of the lake where the fire had stopped. I was not interested in the company more than what I have said. They were Liberals and thought they could not get the limit without using my influence. I never made anything out of this sale, and I know nothing at all about the property.

Mr. LAURIER. The title was in your name and it was resold and you did not know of it?

Mr. ROBILLARD. The title was transferred. I suppose, naturally, Sir John thought I was one of the company, and I wrote in my own name to urge this, but the application was made by Riopelle & Co. When this license came in my name I had already transferred it. No money passed hands. They may have transferred it, or sold it, for all I know. I have always laughed at this because I am innocent, and I am only sorry that I am not as wealthy as it was supposed I was. Of course, I was then a member of the Local House. The hon. gentleman in speaking of my vote in Toronto speaks of something that is foreign to the question. I could easily justify my vote. True, I am of French origin, and a pure one at that, but, above all, I am a Canadian. I took that stand in the House at Toronto, and my feelings never went so far as to lead me to say one of my countrymen was right when I knew he did wrong. I condemned Riel, but not the half-breeds, because I thought they were tools in his hands. An amendment was moved by Mr. Fraser, and it was easy to see that, having voted on the one, I would stultify myself by voting for the other. I could not see the amendment, and could not say what was coming on. I have seen the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Barron's) name appearing in the Public Accounts of Ontario for $1,500, and therefore he ought to know something of this case. I see his name appearing for $1,500. That is the hon. gentleman who made this motion. It is in the Ontario book. However, I suppose he did work for that. I only mention it to show that it is not simply from pure devotion to his country that he did this, but that he got well paid for it. However, I suppose he earned his money. I have nothing else to say.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I listened attentively to the explanation offered to us by the hon. the Minister of the Interior. That explanation did not meet one single solitary fact brought forward by my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Barron). My hon. friend's allegation is that the Government, acting as trustees for this band of Indians, sold for $316 property which, to his knowledge, was transferred by the purchasers who paid the $316 to other parties known to him, for a sum varying from $45,000 to $50,000. Now, if that be so, no human being can doubt that a most gross fraud was perpetrated on the Indians of that band by and under the direction of the Government whose sworn duty it is to defend them. That is as clear as daylight, and the Minister of the Interior did not venture to deny the statement that property which was sold by the Government for $4 per square mile had changed hands within three months—or within three weeks for aught I know, at all events in a very short time—at an enormous advance, hundreds of times as great as the amount which was paid.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I did not know it, and I do not know it now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman was informed that it was so by my hon. friend from North Victoria, who stated in his place, as a matter known to him, that this property was sold at an enormous advance. It may be that the hon. gentleman was not aware of that, but what right has the Minister of the Interior or his colleagues to plead ignorance in this matter? It was their bounden duty, as trustees for the Indians, to take every possible means to inform themselves in regard to it, and to have, as their own agent advised, that property examined and inspected, and to put it up to public tender, instead of selling it in this hole-and-corner fashion. If any injustice has been done them, it has been due to their own neglect of the commonest precautions which any man of business would take. It was well known that the Ontario Government had obtained large sums of money for timber lands sold in that immediate vicinity. It is known to everyone—in Ontario at least—that the Ontario Government have obtained from $1,000 to $2,000 a square mile for the sale of timber limits situated close to this. All that the hon. gentleman ventured to plead was that certain stumpage dues were reserved, from which the Indians would derive a benefit. Very well, but it is very clear that, supposing the Government had chosen to accept the sum due by the Ontario Government, they could have got $18,000 instead of $316 for these Indians, and every penny of these stumpage dues, which the hon. gentleman says will amount to $30,000, would still have been received. But, if it is possible to get dues amounting to $25,000 or $30,000 for these 79 square miles, it is clear, from the Minister's own showing, that this was a very valuable property, and it is clear that, if it had been put up to public auction, there is the strongest probability, looking to the sales in public and open markets which have taken place, that a very large sum, probably exceeding $50,000, could have been obtained for this property. If the Minister or the Government have any spark of honor in them, they will trace out this transaction, they will find out what this property was sold for, and will give the information to the House. If the statement made by hon. friend is correct, these Indians have been grossly wronged, they have been defrauded by the action of the Government of Canada, by the action of the Superintendent General, and by the action of the Minister of the Interior for the time being. They have been defrauded of precisely the difference between $316 and whatever sum was subsequently realised by the

resale of those properties. That is plain and clear, and I venture to say that there is no court of equity in the world which, were these gentlemen dealing in their private capacities as trustees, would not make them refund every penny, principal and interest, out of their own pockets.

Mr. WALDIE. Before this subject is decided, I desire to place a few facts before the House in regard to this sale. This portion of the territory was much larger and more valuable than it was considered to be in 1872, and the sale of a portion of it was made by the Ontario Government. The Ontario Government sold blocks of six square miles for a sum larger than the amount stated by the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution. Subsequently, when Mr. Abrey, a Dominion Land Surveyor, surveyed this territory, it was found to contain 79 square miles, and, although a license to cut timber on it had been sold by the Ontario Government many years previously for $18,000, it was sold by the Canadian Government for $316. I think it was sold without proper care being taken. I do not suppose that the gentleman who presided over that department knew of the value, but the value was there, and the Indian agent there advised the Government to make enquiry in order to find out what the value was. If that advice had been followed, I do not believe the Government of the country would have sold the license to cut timber for any such sum of money as they did, but they would have got thousands where they got tens. As far as I can learn—and I have some knowledge of that territory—there has been no fire there since 1872 which has lessened the value of the timber. I have seen a large portion of the logs cut upon those limits, and they were cut from green timber and were of excellent quality. As to the sale by the Ontario Government, they only sell the license to cut, as the Indian Department did, for $4 per square mile. In 1888, the Ontario Government raised their dues from 75 cents per thousand feet to $1, which is just the amount of dues required by the Indian Department. The Ontario Government also raised their rental from $2 per square mile to $3, so that it it had been sold on as favorable terms as the Ontario Government were selling, the Indians would have the same revenue from dues and from rental as they are now receiving. In addition to that they would have, I think, safely $30,000 of premium for licenses to cut upon this territory. There is no doubt that it was a wrong principle to adopt. I am glad to inform the House that, if the information that I have received is correct, the Indian Department have not pursued that mode of disposing of their timber property since that time. I believe that the French River Indian Reserve was sold at public auction since the date of this sale to Robillard and Riopel. It was sold by advertisement at Manitowaning. I think it was sold at the wrong place; it might have brought more money if it had been sold in Ottawa or Toronto, but it was sold after due advertisement; and if that course had been pursued in the case of the Whitefish Reserve, it would not have been disposed of for $316.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have no reason to doubt the statement made by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Robillard). No doubt he has done what members often do, he has used his good offices for a friend who had called upon him, and has made application to the Government and secured this limit on favorable terms. The trouble with this business, the trouble with all transactions of this kind, is the vicious system adopted by the Government. The Government ought never to part with a piece of public property of this kind except upon conditions that would secure for it the best terms and the best sale possible. The system that should be adopted in all cases where the Government has property to dispose of, is to secure by public advertisement a sale to the highest bidder on the best terms obtainable. We have had a good deal of discussion on this point. Some two or three years ago I pointed out, after extensive investigation made, that some hundreds of Orders in Council had been granted for timber limits in various parts of the Dominion, covering an area of some 25,000 square miles; that these limits had been given to friends of the Government, to members of this House and the members of the Senate, to relatives of members of this House and to relatives of members of the Senate. The whole system is utterly vicious and indefensible. The Government ought to adopt the system that is pursued by the Province of Ontario, and wherever it has a timber limit to dispose of, or any other property to dispose of, it should advertise that property for sale and accept the highest bid for it. In every case it would thus secure more money for the property.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think the explanation made by the Minister of the Interior clearly shows that this property was sold far below its value. He reckons that the dues amounted to $20,000, which would indicate that there must be twenty million feet of timber there, which, at a bonus of $2 per thousand, would be worth $40,000. The Minister has conclusively backed up the statement of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron) as to the value of those limits. The member for Ottawa now, who was not then the member, is not chargeable for any crime in connection with this matter. This is a charge that is made directly against the Government of having sold a limit worth $50,000 for the sum of $316; a limit which is held in charge for the Indians whose trustees the Government of Canada are, who were to be responsible and faithful and diligent in the interest of Indians, and see that their rights were protected. It is against the Government that will perpetrate such an act and squander money that belongs to the Indians, that the hon. member moved and very properly moved in regard to this matter. I cannot understand how anybody in this House can justify the conduct of the Government in selling these limits for a price below their value. I do not hold the gentleman who is now representing Ottawa responsible for this, unless he votes to condone conduct such as this, then he becomes a party to the transaction, and is deserving of the condemnation that should fall upon the Government who are so unfaithful to all the rights of the Indians and so utterly derelict in their duty in administering their funds. I am a little astonished that the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) is not in his place in the House to raise his voice against the sacrifice of the interests of the Indians of this country. He has on the Indian peninsula a large number of Indians, and I am astonished that while their interests are being bartered away in another section of the Province of Ontario, that hon. gentleman is not in his place, raising his voice in condemnation of an act which, of itself, is sufficient to condemn the Government for their conduct in this matter. I am also astonished that the Minister of Customs does not rise in his place and condemn this act. I do not understand how it is that the Minister can sit silent and see the interests of that class of people bartered away as they have been in this transaction. I am a little astonished that other members in this House do not rise in their places and condemn this transaction. It is something that is, in my opinion, very indefensible, and it is but one instance out of many in which the public domain has been bartered away for the purpose of pleasing or conciliating the friends of the Government. It is about time that these things should stop; it is about time that the public domain should be honestly administered. It is time that the members supporting the Government should look to these things and see that they are not repeated. I certainly think that the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) deserves the thanks of the House for the manner in which he has presented his case. He has proved this case so well that the Minister of the Interior had to admit that, in the main, he is correct. The utterances of the Minister of the Interior have corroborated

his statement as to the value of this domain. When we see that hon. gentleman showing such a painstaking desire to get at the facts, I think he is entitled to the thanks of the House for the trouble he has taken in elaborating the case. Although it is not pleasant for the Government to look at it, still the hon. member has discharged a very important duty, which should entitle him to the thanks of the country. Other people are interested in the administration of this fund as well as the Indians. The white people are very anxious that the funds of the Indians should be properly administered. It is the boast of our people that the Indians are protected in their rights, but if it is shown to the Indians that their rights are bartered away, are given away and squandered to political partisans of the Government, it will create discord among the Indians, and lead to mutiny and all the consequences that may arise and which are so much to be dreaded in every community. Fair play and the protection of the rights of the Indians is what we expect, and when the Government are derelict in this duty it behoves this House to vote their condemnation.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When the time arrived for this House to consider the question as to whether certain of the bands of Indians had not advanced so far as to be entrusted with a larger measurement of the management of their own affairs than had hitherto been accorded to them, we were told by the Government that it would be a very unsafe thing to allow them such management, and that to give entire management of their affairs into the hands of the Indians would be fatal to them. I ask hon. members if they think any body of Indians, the least progressive band you can imagine in Canada, could have been led or induced to carry out a transaction so utterly ruinous in its nature as this which was performed for them by their trustees. Why, I think this is a case in which the House cannot hesitate to condemn the Government for what they have done. The Government sold property which, according to the price stated by the Minister of the Interior, and taking the amount which would be realised from stumpage, was worth at least $40,000, for the small sum of $316, and this was done by the trustees of the Indian fund, and the Minister making this announcement in the same breath stated that it would be an unfit thing to trust the Indians with the management of their own affairs. I think no more need be said than what has been said to show the gross violation of the interest of the Indians that has taken place, and I trust that a circumstance like this will never be repeated and never again be brought to the attention of this House. The Indian community has a great deal to complain of in regard to the management of its affairs, but I trust that this case and other cases will make the Government more careful in the management of Indian affairs.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Barron:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Gauthier,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Mitchell,
Barron,	Godbout,	Mulock,
Beausoleil,	Guay,	Neveu,
Béchard,	Hale,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Holton,	Perry,
Bowman,	Innes,	Platt,
Brien,	Jones (Halifax),	Préfontaine,
Campbell,	Landerkin,	Rinfret,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Lang,	Robertson,
Charlton,	Langelier (Montm'ncy),	Ste. Marie,
Chequette,	Langelier (Quebec),	Semple,
Colter,	Laurier,	Somerville,
Couture,	Lavergne,	Sutherland,
Davies,	Lister,	Trow,
Dessaint,	Livingston,	Turcot,
Doyon,	Lovitt,	Waldie,
Edgar,	Macdonald (Huron),	Watson,
Ellis,	McMillan (Huron),	Weldon (St. John), and
Fiset,	McMullen,	Wilson (Elgin).—62.
Fisher,	Meigs,	

Mr. LANDERKIN.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Audet,	Ferguson (Renfrew),	Mills (Annapolis),
Barnard,	Foster,	Moncrieff,
Bergeron,	Freeman,	Montplaisir,
Boisvert,	Gigault,	Perley,
Bowell,	Girouard,	Porter,
Boyle,	Gordon,	Prior,
Bryson,	Grandbois,	Purcell,
Cameron,	Guillet,	Riopel,
Cargill,	Haggart,	Robillard,
Carling,	Hesson,	Roome,
Carpenter,	Hickey,	Ross,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Hudspeth,	Rykert,
Cimon,	Jamieson,	Shanly,
Cochrane,	Joncas,	Skinner,
Cockburn,	Jones (Digby),	Small,
Colby,	Kenny,	Stevenson,
Corby,	Kirkpatrick,	Taylor,
Coulombe,	Labelle,	Temple,
Curran,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Thompson (Sir John),
Daly,	La Rivière,	Tisdale,
Daoust,	Laurie,	Tupper,
Davin,	Macdowall,	Tyrwhitt,
Davis,	McDonald (Victoria),	Vanasse,
Dawson,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wallace,
Denison,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Ward,
Desaulniers,	McKay,	Weldon (Albert),
Desjardins,	McKeen,	White (Cardwell),
Dewdney,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilmot,
Dickey,	Mara,	Wilson (Lennox), and
Dupont,	Masson,	Wood (Westm'land)—91.
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),		

Amendment negatived, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee).

Unprovided Items..... $465,890.18

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. While it is true that we find the details respecting these items in the Auditor General's Report, a good many of them are unsatisfactory. There is an item of $62,000, unprovided expenses, on the Intercolonial Railway alone. Considering how late we sat last Session, it looks like very great carelessness on the part of the Department of Railways that they should not have obtained an appropriation sufficient to have covered all the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway. That does not appear to me to be any excuse for the department being so seriously in error. They ought to have known better what sums are required for the Intercolonial Railway. When we sit here to within a few weeks of the end of the year it is very objectionable that the expenses of the road should exceed by such a large sum the total vote unless there were some special reason which the Minister of Finance may explain. If there is not this reason the item cannot be allowed to pass without comment.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt there is a special reason which has been mentioned in the warrant, but I am unable to give it to-night, but I will bring the information down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When the hon. gentleman comes down with such an item as this he might reasonably be prepared with some information upon it. I find again that, under the head of Civil Government, $7,280 are unprovided for in the Privy Council. That is a very large amount and is utterly disproportionate to the ordinary expenses of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will remember that, according to the conversation which took place across the floor of the House, each item has now to run by itself. An item that is not expended lapses, and those overexpended are to be provided for by way of warrant.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not take the exception to the smaller Estimates, but the hon. gentleman will see that a mistake of $7,280 out of a total of $26,000 is a very large percentage. Of course, in larger departments we could understand this, but in this small department a deficiency should not have been found.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I see an item of $2,240 for diagrams for the Budget Speech. This is a piece of utter extravagance.

Mr. FOSTER. There are no diagrams in the speech this year.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). They are utterly useless.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the country will say so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes; and I believe that five out of six of the hon. gentlemen who support the Government will say so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I really think that this is a very extravagant item, and very small value is got for the expenditure. As I pointed out before a great many of these diagrams are utterly incorrect. One would not object to a reasonable charge for them, but this seems very extravagant.

Mr. FOSTER. These have not been repeated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is to the credit of the hon. gentleman. It is understood, I suppose, that the hon. gentleman will bring down this information which we ask for with regard to the extra expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway and other matters?

Mr. FOSTER. I shall.

Amount required for the repair of roads on Ordnance Lands at Grand Falls, N.B..... $700

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Are there any settlers on these ordnance lands? I understood that the present town of Grand Falls was on the ordnance lands, and that where this money is supposed to be expended there are very few settlers. Nearly $2,000 has been expended on roads there, and I have not been able to ascertain what all this expenditure is for. I have always understood that the land was wilderness land.

Mr. FOSTER. I will make enquiries.

Mr. ELLIS. How are the lands managed? Is there a caretaker of them?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I know of none.

Mr. ELLIS. My impression is that there is a keeper who gets $200 a year, and who does nothing, and that $700 a year is expended on the roads, and there are no roads.

Trent Canal—Repairs and working expenses..... $1,350

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do you propose to do with this vote?

Mr. FOSTER. I find a memorandum of sums required for completing the landing pier at Lakefield, and repairing roads at Buckhorn. I presume it is for that.

Mr. BARRON. Might it not be to clear away the obstructions at Cameron Lake, which I have spoken of?

Mr. FOSTER. May be it is.

Mr. BARRON. There is no use of humbugging about this business at Cameron Lake, because the Government is humbugging about it. The locks are there, but they are useless without the removal of this obstruction. There are two boats in the lake which cannot get down, and boats in the lower lake which can go as far up as the lock, but no farther; the railway bridge is in the way, and there is no swing bridge to let barges or vessels through, and the whole navigation is completely stopped. The Government were told of this matter two years and a-half ago, but they have not done a single thing.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is perfectly monstrous to ask us to pass a vote which the Minister does not know the object of. It ought either to be struck out or stand over. While on this item I would like to enquire what is going to be the policy of the Government in regard to this canal system? The Minister of Public Works was a little shy the other night, but intimated that he would be able at some future time to answer this question. The Government had a distinct policy with regard to the Trent Canal before the election. It was going to build it right off. Has that policy been changed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. I never said a word about that. It was the First Minister who spoke about that.

Mr. MULOCK. The item stood over because the hon. Minister of Public Works did not know what the policy was, but he said the First Minister would probably be able to tell at the next meeting.

Mr. FOSTER. I quite remember that this item was fully discussed between the First Minister and my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Barron) a week or two ago, and I do not see the utility of discussing the policy of this canal two or three times over. If hon. gentleman object to this vote we can strike it out.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is making a little capital at the expense of my hon. friend. He merely asked what improvements were included in that item.

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps it would be as well when the hon. gentleman is attributing motives that he should have the whole story. The hon. gentleman to my left told the hon. member for North Victoria that he really was not aware what the item was for, but that it would probably be expended for the object the hon. gentleman had in view. The hon. gentleman for North Victoria at once said: Strike it out. He evidently has great interest in the canal, or he would not feel desirous of having so many repetitions of the same thing.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I want to attribute no motives. The hon. member for North Victoria pointed out that his objection was not to this work, but he thought the House ought to know in what way the money was to be expended.

Mr. BOWELL. His suggestion was first to strike it out.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the hon. gentleman wants to strike out any item, we will give him as many items to strike out as he desires.

Mr. STEVENSON. The item is for taking boulders out of the lake, and fixing the waters. The engineer asks that the money be given for that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Finance Minister knows quite well that it is the business of every Minister to be prepared with information on any item touching his department in Supply.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think there is anything very wrong in objecting to pass any item, when there is no explanation given of it. I have an interest in this matter as a representative of a part of the country which will be affected by it, and the Government has many times in years gone by declared its firm allegiance to this scheme. I have been on deputations with large bodies of citizens from the territory which is supposed to be served by this canal, and I have heard members of the Government, and notably the late Minister of Finance, declaring an undying faith in that structure, and I am now surprised to find the Minister of Customs admitting that there has been a change of policy.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say so.

Mr. MULOCK. At all events, it has become a question of doubt. Prior to 1882, the Government announced publicly that this canal policy was a fixed policy of the Government, and that they were going to connect the two waters. They pretended to have all the surveys, and to know the whole cost of the work. One of the largest deputations that ever visited this city was one which came in

1883 to press this scheme on the Government. I was present on that occasion, and only the Railway Committee room was able to accommodate that deputation. Perhaps the Minister of Customs was present?

Mr. BOWELL. I was.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the hon. gentleman heard the Minister of Railways at that time announce the policy of the Government. The elections were on, the scheme had not been pressed far enough, and it was necessary for the Government to announce whether they would go on or not, and after the little make-believe jobs had been gone on with the Government were brought face to face with the serious aspect of the case. In order to cover their retreat, they issued a Commission a year and a half ago to determine that question, but no report has yet been made. Where are the Commissioners? Is this going to remain over for all time? I presume there will be another election in 1892, or perhaps the Minister can tell us when it will be?

Mr. BOWELL. To-morrow.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the election, we will probably have the report. Is the report ready to be presented to the Committee?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not ready.

Mr. MULOCK. Has it been received by the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. It was stated the other night that the report had not been presented.

Mr. BARRON. Now that the whole of the Estimates have been brought down, I see that there is no item for Cameron Lake. The hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) can get an item of $1,600 put in, but because I am an opponent of the Government nothing is put in for this very necessary work. At the next election, I suppose the people will be told: If you oppose Barron, this work will be done. I impress upon the Finance Minister the importance of this matter. Let the Government send somebody up to see the truth of what I say, because at present the whole business is being stopped because this work is not carried out.

Mr. STEVENSON. I suppose the hon. gentleman refers to the bridge. No doubt there is an attempt to get a swing put in there, but I understand that the Grand Trunk have submitted a plan to go below the locks altogether. I know there is a great deal of ill-feeling in reference to that matter. This is above where I live, but I have impressed upon the department the necessity of this bridge, and I have been assured that the Grand Trunk were going to do it, and I believe it will be done. As far as it is in my power, I will impress upon the Government the necessity for that work.

Intercolonial Railway—Repairs and working expenses $500,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I suppose this is the difference between receipts and expenditure?

Mr. FOSTER. It is the working expenses.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am sorry the Government anticipate so large a deficiency.

Mr. FOSTER. This is for 1888-89.

Mr. MULOCK. That is considerably more than the $360,000 deficit.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a part of the entire working expenses of the year 1888-89.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It seems to be a very large margin, unless something extraordinary happened to cause an extra expenditure of half a million of dollars, for working expenses on a road where the number of miles and the number of employés are perfectly known, and where consequently the expenditure could be estimated closer than that. I think the House should know the reason for this extraordinarily large additional amount.

Mr. FOSTER. The estimate was $2,900,000, and that was found insufficient to run the road, so that this amount had to be got to carry it on.

Mr. MULOCK. What do you expect the deficit to be after you have destroyed the line with the Harvey and Moncton branch?

Mr. FOSTER. We will wait till the line is destroyed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The expenses for locomotive power, stations, &c., and general charges foot up $3,268,464 for the year ending June, 1888, whereas the estimate was only $2,900,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It shows there was an insufficient estimate for the year.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite clear that when the Short Line is finished the traffic on the Intercolonial Railway will fall off considerably. We know that the line has been a source of an enormous loss to the country for several years. In order to reduce that sum to the lowest possible amount the Government have been charging to capital account items such as heating and lighting cars and snow fences.

Mr. FOSTER. For the plant and nothing else.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Finance Minister that was here two years ago said the Intercolonial Railway was then sufficiently protected by snow fences, and that they always charged to expenses the replacing of any snow fences that were worn out, and they did the same in regard to cars that were worn out. Still we find that a large amount has been charged to capital account for snow fences and for lighting and heating cars.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Am I to understand that the Minister estimated the working expenses for last year at $2,900,000, and the expenses for the last year were $3,268,000 on the Intercolonial Railway, besides the Eastern Extension, that this $500,000 is required to cover the difference?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Inspection of Weights and Measures. $1,835 22

Mr. McMULLEN. R. A. Hughes, salary from 5th October, 1888, $600. Who was Mr. Hughes' predecessor?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Hughes is at Windsor, a new appointment.

Mr. McMULLEN. There must be a new division.

Mr. FOSTER. I fancy the country is parceled out into divisions. This is an assistant inspector for that division.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Edward Kelly, salary from first December, 1888, at $500. In whose place was Kelly appointed.

Mr. FOSTER. In the place of Ryan, who was promoted.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who is the Inspector of Weights and Measures?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know, but the returns will show the hon. gentleman. The Inland Revenue report is brought down every year, and it is now on the Table of the House.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Will the hon. gentleman state the reason why it was found necessary to appoint an assistant inspector?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the district was too large for the officers at that time at work.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Has the gentleman appointed had any previous experience in the public service?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know.

Royal Labor Commission..... .... $10,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is this a final payment? How much has the Commission cost altogether?

Mr. FOSTER. There has been spent $64,572, accounts for printing and other accounts yet unpaid, $13,000, making $77,572, which is supposed to be the final amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. None of us, I fear, have been able to examine the evidence, except so far as it was contained in the newspapers. Last year I called the attention of the Government, and of the First Minister particularly, to some remarkable statements made, more particularly respecting child labor, and I demanded from him then a statement as to what policy the Government intended to adopt with respect to putting a stop to abuses which were alleged to exist, and I was then promised that next Session the Government would have digested the evidence and made up their mind as to what was to be done. I desire now to know whether the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Justice is able to state whether the Government has come to any conclusion. Some of the statements pointed to very great abuses indeed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When the hon. gentleman brought up the matter last Session, the evidence had not been fully taken. There was, however, a discussion principally as to the hours of labor and the employment of child labor. The Government have come to no conclusion on the report, for the reason that it was impossible, considering the stage at which this report and evidence was presented, to examine the report and evidence in time to prepare any measure for this Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am sorry to hear that, because, after what fell from the First Minister as to the atrocious abuses which seem to have occurred with respect to the employment of children in many of the factories, I did hope that that particular branch of the subject would have been dealt with. The evidence showed that little children were employed for periods of time that no grown man could work without serious injury. It is a disgrace to our civilisation and to humanity that such a state of things should be permitted to exist in this country. If it should turn out that the Dominion Government had no power in the matter, and if the Minister of Justice had so declared, I could have understood why the question had not been taken up, but if such cases come fairly within our power to regulate the criminal law, it seems to me that the Government ought in all conscience to have taken steps to prevent such occurrences in future.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Some of the abuses, no doubt, would come within our control. The employment of children in factories is already provided for in the criminal law, and all that was required was a systematic inspection of factories in order that such abuses should not occur; in fact all that is required in these cases is to have the existing laws enforced and not new ones enacted. In regard to these matters, the public were very much excited by the evidence which transpired about the time when the hon. gentleman mentioned the subject last Session. The evidence was not then fully taken; to some extent the evidence then taken was qualified, and we have had information that the publicity of those facts at that time has led, to a great extent, to the suppression of the abuse. Still, in order to found any legislation of a satisfactory kind on the report or on the suggestions of the labor organisations and the labor commissioners, it is necessary that the documents should be given careful perusal.

North-West Mounted Police..... .... $80,000

Mr. FOSTER. The explanation in respect to boots and leather goods is simple. It appears that instead of the word "days" the hon. member for North Wellington read the word "dozens," and Mr. McCullough in his statement mentioned inspection of boots and leather materials 13 and a-half days at $10 a day, $135.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is Mr. McCullough?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. McCullough is the gentleman who inspected the articles made from leather.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is his occupation?

Mr. FOSTER. He is a leather man of some kind. He resides in Ottawa. He inspected 4,986 pairs of boots, of which he rejected 160 pairs; he also inspected stable halters, blankets, straps, hobbles, &c., in all, 11,371 articles, for which he received $135, and I think he did good work for it. It will be seen that the cost for inspection was one cent for each article, or two cents for a pair of boots. With reference to the clothing, they find it desirable that a year's supply should be kept in store, and the surplus stock of 1885 was so depleted after the rebellion that they are restoring that stock at the present time. They have now a full year's supply of boots and stockings, and a half year's supply of breeches. Each policeman gets three pairs of riding breeches in a year, four pairs of socks and two pairs of stockings. He also gets seven pairs of long boots and two pairs of short boots in five years. The service is particularly hard on the clothing, as the men are a great part of the time in the saddle and the wet grass is very hard on the boots. A policeman is allowed, in lieu of the riding breeches, two-thirds of the price when he supplies shapps for his own wear.

Mr. McMULLEN. With regard to this question of examination I showed the account that was placed in my hands to the hon. Minister, and the clerk upstairs pronounced the word "dozens" as well as I did myself. It certainly looked very much like dozens instead of days. I understand that this inspection was made in Regina and I would like to know if a man was sent there to make the inspection.

Mr. FOSTER. The man lives here and the inspection was made in Ottawa.

Mr. McMULLEN. $10 a day is a large sum for an ordinary shoemaker to receive. My opinion is, as I stated before, that there has been gross recklessness in connection with those supplies for the Mounted Police. We have 2,783 pairs of gauntlets at $1 50 and $1.08 a pair, and I would like to know where all those gauntlets go to.

Mr. FOSTER. They go into stock just the same as the clothing, and I think the reasons are all in favor of keeping a supply in stock.

Mr. McMULLEN. When we consider the fact that we supplied 5,163 riding breeches at $5.60 a pair, I think there must be a nigger in the fence somewhere. They should be bought a good deal cheaper than that.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows that for that service you must have cloth of a special kind and that it is expensive.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the cloth is so excellent I do not see why a man could wear out three pairs of riding breeches in a year.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that is too many for a man who is in the saddle every day in the year. My hon. friend would wear more than three pairs of breeches frisking around those seats on the opposite side.

Mr. DENISON. They would wear out six pairs if the stuff was not good.

Mr. McMULLEN. They must be very good breeches to cost so much money.

Mr. FOSTER. They are good.

Intercolonial Railway—chargeable to capital.....$291,500

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is the increased accommodation at Halifax for increased elevator capacity ?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has not looked into the figures, or he would find that about 578,880 bushels were put through that elevator.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How many were put through last year ?

Mr. FOSTER. Last year was not so good a wheat year. I think 71,373 bushels went through last year. This vote is to provide a pile foundation for a sugar shed at Halifax. The contract for the building is let for $5,022 ; the cost of the piles was estimated at $1,050; other materials, $1,550, and labor, $600.

Immigration..... $48,100 71

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Explanations were promised as to this.

Mr. CARLING. That question was discussed very fully the other evening, when I stated that this vote was to close up the expenses for assisted passages in connection with ocean steamers. These accounts have been carried to a certain amount year after year, and when we closed up the accounts they were all sent in by the different steamship companies up to the 27th of April. They were received last July or August, and the total amount due to the steamboat companies was this amount, for which no vote had been taken.

Mr. FOSTER. It must be recollected, too, that the vote for immigration was very greatly cut down last year, and it was impossible to do the regular work with it, and to make these payments as well.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2:10 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 24th April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

P. E. I.—WEST POINT WHARF.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is it the intention of the Department of Public Works to repair the wharf at West Point, P.E.I., during the present season ? If so, is the work to be let by tender ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have not had the answer to this question, but I may say to the hon. gentleman that if this is one of the wharves which have been taken over by the Dominion Government, the wharf will be looked after. I cannot say whether tenders will be asked or not.

Mr. PERRY. It is one of these.

SHORT LINE—HARVEY TO MONCTON.

Mr. SUTHERLAND asked, 1. Has there been a survey of the route of the proposed railway from Harvey to Salisbury or Moncton ? 2. Are there any plans or specifications of the proposed railway ? If so, will they be laid on the Table of the House ? 3. Are there any reports, by Government or other engineers, with regard to the route to be adopted ? 4. What is the estimated cost of the proposed railway ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To the first question the answer is, yes. To the second: there are plans and profiles which were laid on the Table in 1886, but there is no specification. To the third: yes; they were laid on the Table in 1886. To the fourth: $16,000 a mile.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—JUDGES' SALARIES.

Mr. CURRAN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to draw attention to a statement made in the Montreal *Herald*. That newspaper publishes a fictitious report of the Government caucus, in which my name is mentioned. It says:

"Mr. Curran, M.P., contended that the salaries were already too high, and that in his constituency there were several lawyers who were ready to take the places of gentlemen should they resign. Mr. Curran made an able and incisive speech in defence of his position, and was supported by a large majority of the French Canadian members present."

I merely wish to say that this report is entirely erroneous and untrue. The gentleman who wrote it may have considered he was doing a very witty thing, but, in my opinion, I think he has simply made an ass of himself.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to make an observation. On seeing the paragraph referred to, I saw it must have been a mistake, because any one who knows the aspirations of the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran), knows that he never would have taken that attitude, with the future probability of his going on to the bench at no very remote date himself. Knowing it must be wrong, I telegraphed down that it was Mr. Cimon's name which was misunderstood for that of Mr. Curran. As Mr. Curran has denied the correctness of that particular statement concerning himself, I do not suppose he denies the accuracy of the report ?

Mr. CURRAN. Certainly, the whole report.

Mr. MITCHELL. And as to the man having made an ass of himself, the readers of the *Herald* do not think so.

Mr. CURRAN. The proprietor of the *Herald* may not.

N. W. T ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order for second reading of Bill (No 136) to consolidate and amend the Act respecting the North-West Territories,

Mr. DEWDNEY. When I introduced this Bill for the special purpose of consolidating the three Acts now in existence, my principal reason was that last Session the Legislative Assembly consolidated the North-West Ordinances, and I thought it would be very convenient to have the North-West Territories Act also consolidated. However, some hon. gentlemen opposite thought it was too late in the Session to put through this Bill; but I thought, subsequently, that if they would agree to raise no question on the clauses not amended, we might possibly be able to put through the amendment. Since that, several hon. gentlemen have informed me, that probably there would be considerable discussion on some of the old clauses of the Bill which I do not propose to amend, and, as the amendments I did propose are not of a serious character, and several hon. gentlemen on both sides have expressed a wish that, if possible, I might allow the measure to remain over for another Session, I beg to move that the order be discharged.

Motion agreed to, order discharged, and Bill withdrawn.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider resolutions (p. 1396) to authorise the granting of subsidies to certain railway companies, and to the construction of the railways therein mentioned.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will take these up separately. As the Committee must have seen, these are no new votes, but they are revotes. Principally they are votes which have lapsed either from the work not being commenced or not being finished within the statutory time for which the subsidies were voted, and we are obliged to come to Parliament again for a revote. Some of the companies whose subsides have lapsed have not shown any reason why those subsidies should be revived. But those referred to in this resolution are considered by the Government, under the circumstances, to deserve an extension of time. The whole of the vote is simply for an extension of time.

Mr. LAURIER. There might be some discussion to be raised as to the propriety of several of these votes, but, as the House has already assented to them, I will not raise any discussion upon them at all, but I think the House is entitled to some explanation in regard to the voting of these balances of lapsed subsidies.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

To the Ontario and Pacific Railway Company, for a line of railway from Cornwall to Ottawa, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $172,400.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a railway with a very magnificent title, but I think its pretensions are more modest. The railway, as chartered, was to run from Cornwall to Perth and to Ottawa. The vote was given for the road from Cornwall to Perth. The company, in which my hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) was largely interested on behalf of his constituents, found that the prospect of business between Cornwall and Perth was not such as to enable them to interest capitalists in the road, but he has been informed, and I think, from all I can learn, has been informed truly, that if, instead of making the grant for the road from Cornwall to Perth, it is made for the road from Cornwall to Ottawa, it will be possible that the road should be built, and that will be another important link between the St. Lawrence and Ottawa, and it will diminish the vote by fully $90,000. I ask the Committee to allow the word "Perth" in the resolution to be struck out and "Ottawa" to be inserted, and to diminish the sum by $90,000.

Amendment agreed to.

To the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company, for a line of railway from Hull Station towards Le Desert, a distance of 62 miles, a subsidy not exceeding in the whole $320,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps I had better read the memorandum which has been given me on this subject: The Ottawa and Gatineau Valley Railway was granted a subsidy by the 46th Vic., chapter 25, for the first 50 miles of their railway from Hull station, not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $160,000. By 47 Vic., chapter 8, they were granted a further subsidy for a line of railway from Kazuabazua to Le Desert, not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $160,000, or altogether, $320,000. By 48-49 Vic., chapter 59, this subsidy was doubled up on 62 miles, as follows, viz.: for a line of railway from Hull station towards Le Desert, a distance of 62 miles, in lieu of the subsidies granted by 46 Vic., chapter 25, and 47 Vic., chapter 8, a subsidy of $320,000. The Act 48-49 Victoria required the work to be commenced within two years from the 1st August, 1886. No contract having been entered into, and no work done on the 1st August, 1888, the subsidy lapsed. A careful location of the line has been made, and it is understood financial arrangements are being negotiated for its early construction. A revival of the subsidy is therefore asked. The line runs through a fine timbered country and the land is well suited for agriculture. It is considered that the extension of time is deserved, and that that country will be rapidly settled.

Mr. LAURIER. Have the surveys made by the company been laid before the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fancy so. I have not got them here, but I have no doubt that the surveys have been laid before the Government, and all the particulars were laid before the House at the time of the original vote.

Mr. LAURIER. As I have said, I do not propose to raise any objection to these votes. Great anticipations are entertained as to the future of the country through which this road is to run, but we are to a certain extent in the dark, and I can only hope that those expectations will be realised.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I hope so. It is a pity that this country which lies so near to the capital should not be developed.

To the Cap Rouge and St. Lawrence Railway Company, for twelve miles of their railway, from Lorette *vid* Cap Rouge to Quebec, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $38,400.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) knows something of that country?

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, I think so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Cap Rouge and St. Lawrence Railway was granted a subsidy by 49 Vic., chapter 10, for 12 miles of their railway from Lorette *vid* Cap Rouge to Quebec, not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $38,400. The work on this road not having been commenced within two years from the 1st August, 1886, it lapsed on the 1st August, 1888. This projected line runs along the north shore of the St. Lawrence River, east of the city of Quebec, a district which is thickly populated, and much interested in the construction of this road. A revival of the subsidy is therefore asked.

To the Parry Sound Colonisation Railway Company, for 40 miles of their railway, from the village of Parry Sound to the village of Sundridge, on the line of the Northern Pacific Junction Railway, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $128,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Parry Sound Colonisation Railway was subsidised by 49 Vic., chapter 10, for 40 miles of their railway, from the village of Parry Sound to the village of Sundridge, on the line of the Northern Pacific Junction Railway. This road was required, by the Act above referred to, to be commenced within two years from the 1st August, 1889. On the 1st August, 1888, it not having been commenced, the subsidy lapsed. The road passes through a district much in need of railway facilities, and as the prospects of raising the necessary funds for the early commencement of the work are represented to be favorable, a revival of the subsidy is asked. This road starts from Parry Sound, which is one of the most important harbors on the lake, and runs into the country to connect with the Northern Pacific Junction Railway. It is a splendid country, *in futuro*. There are few settlements, except along the margin of the lake. The company found that they could not finance, to use a common expression, for the building of that railway on the coast, and they, therefore, did not go through the form which is too often practiced by these railways, of making a sham commencement by breaking the sod, and grading a few miles. But they felt that unless they could get the assistance of the Federal Government, the road would not be built. The Ontario Government and Legislature have only this last Session granted this road $3,000 a mile, and the

company is satisfied that with the $6,200 a mile that will be granted, the road will certainly be built. It is a very valuable road, opening up a very valuable country. My hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has got a suggestion, which I think is a good one.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I move to insert after "Sundridge," the words "or some other point" on the line of the Northern Pacific Junction Railway.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the limit is at Sundridge, it does not quite meet the vote of the Ontario Legislature. This would make the terminus at Sundridge, it could be at no other place; but the Ontario vote for the same road is not so limited.

Mr. LAURIER. Does this meet the views of the promoters of the railway?

Mr. O'BRIEN. It is at their request.

For a railway from St. Andrew's to the Canadian Pacific Railway, at, or at any point east of the town of Lachute, in the County of Argenteuil, in the Province of Quebec, 7 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $22,400.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This line was subsidised by 47 Vic., chapter 8, from St. Andrew's to Lachute, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $22,400. This was amended by 49 Vic., chapter 10, as follows, viz.:—For a railway from St. Andrew's to the Canadian Pacific Railway, at, or at any point east of the town of Lachute, 7 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 47 Vic., chapter 8, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $22,400. The work was to be commenced in two years from the 1st August, 1886, but not having been commenced on the 1st August, 1888, the subsidy lapsed. The Great Northern Railway, it is understood, are prepared to take up the construction of this road and operate it; it is therefore asked that the subsidy be revived.

Mr. LAURIER. The Great Northern Railway—that is somewhere in the moon.

For a line of the Central Railway, from the head of Grand Lake to the Intercolonial Railway, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $128,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Central Railway was subsidised by 47 Vic., chapter 8, for a line of railway from the head of Grand Lake to the Intercolonial Railway, between Sussex and St John, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $128,000. By the terms of the Act above referred to, the road was to be finished by the 19th April, 1888; this not having been accomplished, the subsidy lapsed on that day. The company entered into a contract, under the Subsidy Act above referred to, on the 7th July, 1886, for the construction of this road, and the work has been carried on up to this date, the track being laid over the whole 40 miles subsidised, but the road is not fully completed according to contract; but inasmuch as it is far advanced towards completion, a revival of the subsidy is asked.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In the old Act the terminal point is fixed at some point between Sussex and St. John.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not looked at the Act myself. The memorandum I have is this: To subsidise a line of railway from the head of Grand Lake to the Intercolonial Railway, between Sussex and St. John.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It does not say where, on the Intercolonial Railway.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was not necessary to set out the whole thing here, but the company entered into a contract under the Subsidy Act above referred to. It must be under the present charter. The work has been going on up to this date, a track has been laid for the whole 40 miles subsidised, but has not been fully completed.

Mr. McMULLEN. How far has this road proceeded? What portion has been completed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Forty miles. The whole road has been built, but was not completed within the statutory time, and therefore it has lapsed; so they must get a formal vote of Parliament. The road was completed and fit for being run, but no money could be paid out without the vote of Parliament.

To the Albert Southern Railway Company, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 47 Victoria, chapter 8, not exceeding in the whole $31,771.43.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This railway was subsidised by 47 Vic., chapter 8, as follows, viz:—

"For a line of railway from Hopewell to Alma, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $51,200."

This company entered into a contract under the Subsidy Act on 23rd May, 1885, since which the work of construction has been proceeded with under difficulties. The line is 16 miles in length, over 10 miles on which track is laid, and the balance of 6 miles is partially graded. The company have received on account of the above subsidy, the sum of $29,428.57; but inasmuch as the road was not finished as required by the Act 47 Vic., by the 19th April, 1888, the balance of the subsidy $31,771.43 lapsed. It is asked that this balance be revived.

Mr. LAURIER. The amount should be $19,428, instead of $29,428.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; an error appears to have been made in the figures.

To the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy mentioned in the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 17, not exceeding in the whole $244,500.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Baie des Chaleurs Railway was granted a subsidy by 46 Vic., chapter 25, as follows, viz.:—For 100 miles of their railway, from Metapediac, on the Intercolonial Railway, to Paspebiac, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole the sum of $320,000. By 47 Vic., chapter 8, a subsidy was granted for the construction of the first 20 miles from the Intercolonial Railway, as follows, viz.:—For a branch of the Intercolonial Railway from Metapediac, extending towards Paspebiac, 20 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $300,000. The company entered into a contract under the above Acts, on the 7th November, 1885, and have since been prosecuting the work, about 50 miles being far advanced towards completion, and having earned and been paid subsidy to the amount of $375,500, and as they are prosecuting the work vigorously, it is asked that the balance of subsidy, $244,500, be revived.

Mr. LAURIER. According to the statute the company were to complete the road. On the completion of the first 20 miles the company were to receive $300,000, and for the next 20 miles $6,400 per mile. Now, it becomes an important question as to how far the work has been prosecuted, and how far completed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will furnish the information.

To the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway Company, for a line of railway from the Victoria Branch of the Midland Railway to the Village of Bancroft, in the County of Hastings, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 47 Victoria, chapter 8, not exceeding in the whole $145,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A subsidy was granted this company by 47 Vic., chapter 8, for a line of railway from the Victoria branch of the Midland Railway, to the village of Bancroft, in the Township of Dungannon, County of Hastings, not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $160,000. This company entered into a contract, under the Subsidy Act, on the 19th August, 1886, and proceeded with the work, and were paid on account of subsidy the sum of $15,000, but as the Subsidy Act above referred to required the road to be completed by the 19th April, 1888, which was

not accomplished, the balance of the subsidy, $145,000, lapsed. The road is an important one, serving a number of iron mines, stone quarries, &c. It is now asked that this balance of subsidy be revived.

To the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company, for a railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidies granted by the Acts 45 Victoria, chapter 14, and 46 Victoria, chapter 25, not exceeding in the whole $35,000.

Sir JOHN A. MADDONALD. This company was granted a subsidy by 45 Vic., chapter 14, fro a railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, a subsidy not exceeding $6,000 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $660,000,and by 46 Vic., chapter 25, for a railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, 110 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $6,000 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $660,000. Total, $1,320,000. On the 12th of April, 1884, the company entered into a contract under the above Acts for the construction of this road, and carried it forward near towards completion, having earned and been paid $1,280,000, leaving work to the value of $35,000 to be done, a similar amount being retained from the subsidy. As this work had not been done on the date on which the subsidy lapsed, 25th May, 1887, no further payment can be made, even if the work be finished as required. It is, therefore, asked that this balance of subsidy be revived. The road has been in successful operation for some time, and is doing good service to the country.

For a railway from Truro to Newport, in the Province of Nova Scotia, forty-nine miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $156,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This road was subsidised by 49 Vic., chapter 10, for a railway from Truro to Newport, N. S., 49 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $156,800, and was to be commenced in two years from 1st August, 1886, but as no work has been done thereon, the subsidy lapsed on 1st August, 1888. This road runs from the flourishing town of Truro to Newport station on the Windsor Branch, it passes through a very well settled and fertile district, the inhabitants attaching great importance to its construction as a means of developing trade. It is, therefore, asked that the subsidy be revived.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is there any prospect of the work being carried out?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The money has been secured and the work is about to go on, in fact some work has been done already. The right of way has been secured, and my information is that the money necessary to complete the road has been obtained. The company received a subsidy of like amount from the Provincial Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. Our experience in building roads down there has been, that when we first grant a bonus of $3,200 a mile, the next year we are asked to double that amount, and eventually we are obliged to undertake to build the road ourselves. That has been our general experience in that section of the country. I hope that that system is going to be dropped, and that we shall not be asked to increase those bonuses year after year. I do not know what promises have been made with regard to the building of this road, but I hope that we shall not be asked for any further bonuses.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know what roads in that section of the country the hon. gentleman refers to. He possibly has reference to what is called the Short Line in Nova Scotia, and with that single exception, no railway in the Lower Provinces has received a double bonus, or eventually been built by the Government. Therefore, the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in saying that this is the general rule.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend was led into error by the fact that the Short Line has given a bad name to that section of the country. When was this railway subsidised by the Local Government?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Last year.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There can be no doubt that this road passes through one of the finest agricultural districts of Nova Scotia, and connecting as it does the Eastern Railway with the Western Railway, I have no doubt it will be a very great convenience and a very valuable piece of road. It will also be of great value to the Intercolonial Railway as affording additional traffic for that road. I understood there was some difficulty in the way with reference to the amount which would be required for the construction of a bridge, and it was expected that the Government would render some assistance in that way. I think the Government should assist this undertaking, rather than that the enterprise should not be carried out there. I know that the Local Government are doing all they can in this matter, and that they will assist the Dominion Government in securing its construction at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. McMULLEN. My reason for making the statement I did was that it was well known to this House that we first granted a bonus of $3,200 a mile to the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, and Sir Charles Tupper assured the House that the road would be built for that money. Afterwards we doubled that bonus, and, after it remained on the Statute-book for a time, we eventually had to complete the road at the entire cost of the Dominion. Not only did we do that, but we did it under a wrong statement. We received a statement as to the probable cost of that line, but we found that in place of costing what was anticipated, it has cost nearly double the money.

Resolutions reported.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Clerk of the Crown in Chancery $100

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know, with regard to this increase of $100 for the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, if this is the notable individual whose increased salary we have persistently objected to? I would like to know who the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is. Is he the same man?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; he is another man. He is the late sheriff of the North-West, Mr. St. Onge Chapleau. This increase merely gives him $2,400, which is the salary of a chief clerk.

Mr. McMULLEN. I suppose he is not related to the Secretary of State.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think he has the great advantage of being related to the Secretary of State.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And he has the advantage of further experience. He has been in other departments in the service in which he was not equally appreciated.

Mr. McMULLEN. It might be well to find out how many more brothers the Secretary of State has, or this is the only one we have installed in office. Are the rest of them of age; for, perhaps, when they come to the age of maturity we will have to find places for them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think all of them now, like my hon. friend, have arrived at years of discretion, and know how to hold their tongues more than my hon. friend.

Mr. McMULLEN. We are all too apt to hold our tongues in this House. If we were more ready to tell the hon. gentleman in plain language what we felt, we might do him good, as well as serve the country's interests.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, if I am on a jury when my hon. friend is tried for holding his tongue, I will say, not guilty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This gentleman is the same, I think, who was in the Department of Public Works, and was dismissed by Sir Charles Tupper for irregularities.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He was in one of the departments.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it true that he was dismissed for publishing outside of the department private information which he had received there as an official?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no doubt that this gentleman had, but I do not think with any evil intention, or for personal emolument, been indiscreet in stating what he ought not to have stated, and it was thought well that that conduct should be marked.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In this way, by an increase of salary?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. He was afterwards appointed sheriff in the North-West, and, I believe, he performed his duties to the satisfaction of every one. Then he was deprived of his office by the new system of dividing up the North-West into districts, and having a sheriff for each district. On his office becoming vacant, he was appointed Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and has, I believe, performed his duties satisfactorily.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose he was so appointed, because he keeps secret the counsels and commissions of the Government with regard to the discharge of his duties. This man, I believe, was in the Department of Public Works, and there were some accusations made against him with reference to making known tenders for contracts in the public service. There was an accusation that he had accepted pay from some of the tenderers, and that was the ground on which he was dismissed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I really cannot say; I do not remember.

Mr. McMULLEN. It might be no harm to know whether there is any understanding with him that he is to carry out the gazetting of members at the next election in accordance with the example set by his predecessor.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He has been strictly charged to carry out the law relating to his department.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is a great pity that his predecessor had not been so strictly charged, and had not complied with the instructions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, you know, we are getting older and wiser.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think you are getting any better, though.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is uncharitable and unchristian.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Those public servants who are spending their lives in the faithful discharge of their duties must feel considerably encouraged at seeing that those who have not done so receive increases of salary.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is not the rule always; there are some very notable exceptions. We know that a gentleman who had discharged his duties in the Civil Service for many years, in the Marine Department, and who did an act which the Government thought he should not have done, in allowing a man to ship his fish, was dismissed promptly—Collector Ross. He was not allowed any retiring allowance, and he has not been re-engaged, I believe, nor is he likely to be.

Department of Interior—To pay C. C. Pelletier..... $150

Mr. MITCHELL. Is this the celebrated Mr. Pelletier who made the speeches at the last Hull election, and got into a very notable row there, which involved some newspapers in lawsuits for telling the truth? I believe he was in the Department of the Secretary of State.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is not the same. He was transferred, I think, from the Militia Department, before I took office. There are no politicians in my department.

Mr. MITCHELL. They work the North-West pretty well.

Department of Marine—To provide for the salary of a third class clerk, $742 50

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Can the Minister tell us the name of the person appointed?

Mr. FOSTER. The name of the person is Miss Grant, who has been a faithful officer in the temporary service of that department for the last eight or nine years. She has now been made permanent.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is this the usual allowance made to a third class clerk, or does the Government make a difference in the case of ladies?

Mr. FOSTER. No. She came in under the law in 1882, and she can be appointed under the law at the salary she has.

Department of Indian Affairs—To provide for the salary of a second class clerk, $1,100.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely there are enough officials in the department already.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think if the hon. gentleman would read the memorandum I have, which has been prepared by the deputy of the branch—I will not read it, as it is very long—he would come to the conclusion that the appointment was absolutely necessary, as the work has increased very much.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In what way has the work increased? The number of Indians has not increased. Has the work done in connection with them increased?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, the manner in which the accounts are kept entails increased labor.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The charges of the department keep increasing. We added nearly $2,000 to them in the Estimates of 1889-90, and now there is a further addition of $3,100, including the item for contingencies.

Mr. DEWDNEY. A great deal of labor has been thrown on this department, as on others, by the requirements of the Auditor General, labor involving careful preparation of voluminous statements every month. The appropriations for Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, the North-West Territories and British Columbia, amounting in the aggregate to nearly $1,200,000, entail a great quantity of work and the opening up of new sets of accounts, also the checking of contracts for supplies, and the examination of vouchers presented for payment. There is also the arrangement made with some Indian reserves by which some fencing has been made on one of the reserves and paid out of the Indian moneys, for which a separate account with individual Indians has to be kept, entailing a great deal of work. I went through this carefully before recommending that the appropriation be made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has got three extra clerks over and above those required before in the main Estimates. Those surely ought to have been sufficient to do the extra work.

Mr. MITCHELL. At least, when the main Estimates were brought in, the hon. gentleman ought to have known that he required this additional amount. The necessity could not have arisen in the last month.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is the Department of Indian

Affairs now under the control of the Minister of the Interior?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The expenditure of the Department of Indian Affairs in 1878 was $36,000 or $38,000. Now, one department expends $82,000 and the other $42,000, and with this additional sum, nearly $14,000, so that the expenditure of these two departments, apart from the extra expenditure for extra sessional clerks, is now $125,000, as against $37,000 or $38,000 in 1878. There is no justification whatever for this increase.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman had better strike that out.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot do without it. The expenditure of the Indian Department in 1878 was $38,000, and of the Indians $11,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Indians were not separate. The two together were $38,000.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have the figures here, and I take this opportunity of correcting the statement the hon. gentleman made some few nights ago. The expenditure of 1887-88, in the Department of the Interior, was $38,356.13, and of the Indians $11,254.11, making a total of $49,610.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What is it now?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have not the Indian expenditure here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We know what the hon. gentleman has estimated. He estimated for the year, without counting any additions, $32,762. And that does not include the Geological Survey, and he estimated for Indian Affairs, $42,415, making a total of $125,000, plus this addition of $3,531, or, as nearly as possible, $130,000.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The department to-day is in a different position from that in which it was ten years ago.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What more has it to do? The hon. gentleman has not made a single treaty since.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We are handling our Indians now. We have now 22,000 Indians on the reserves; at that time we had only a few hundred. We have to keep all these accounts, which represent a million of money.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The accounts were kept then as well as now, and there is no necessity for a thousand dollars more expenditure now than there was then.

Department of Printing and Stationery—Further amount required for Contingencies, $3,000

Mr. FOSTER. In the main Estimates, the amount which the department required was cut down, and they say it is impossible to get along with the lesser amount.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In other words, the good resolution to practice economy, which the hon. gentleman made some time ago, is abandoned.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all; but the necessary service must be carried on, and if the vote is too small, it is poor economy to let the smaller vote pass, and next year ask for the additional amount.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is presumed that the cutting down was not done in a hap-hazard way, but after some consideration. The Minister of Finance appears to have abandoned his promise to retrench.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is the type now set for the voters' list still stored in the frame shed on Sussex street? I do not think that is a safe place for such valuable plant.

Mr. FOSTER. It is well taken care of, and the other building will soon be ready to receive it.

Remuneration to special messenger for delivery of night mails to Ministers and Deputy Heads, $300

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this payment for one person, or is it distributed generally?

Mr. FOSTER. It is one person who delivers these mails at night.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Such a man would apparently be only doing two or three hours' work.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a good deal of tramping about in that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me that it is almost an absurdity to detail a special man for a couple of hours' work.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not like to do all that walking for less than a dollar a trip.

Further amount required for contingencies of High Commissioner for Canada in England $1,200

Mr. FOSTER. This has been put in the Estimates year after year, but it was omitted from the first Estimates this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that item 22 in the main Estimates includes "contingencies, including taxes and insurance on official residence, income taxes, rent, fuel, light, stationery, &c., $6,500." Apparently that covers the contingencies of the High Commissioner's house.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not cover the High Commissioner's contingencies which have been voted each year. My attention was called to it, and I found that the amount which had previously been voted was omitted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This vote amounts to $14,253, and it contains the vote of $1,200 which was voted in 1888 89, with $13,053 transferred from immigration. The Minister will see that it includes this $1,200.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the explanation is correct, but we will let the item stand.

Post Office and Finance Department contingencies—To make payment to those officers of the Savings Bank Branch, Post Office and Finance Departments, engaged in the balancing of and computing interest on depositors' accounts, to 30th June, 1889, $3,100.

Mr. FOSTER. This is an item which we have voted in the main Estimates in former years. A good deal of fault was found with that, because we were asking the clerks to do this work in extra hours and were paying them for it, and it was my determination, in conjunction with the Postmaster General, if possible, to have that item struck out and to make another arrangement. We went into the matter very thoroughly, and we find it impossible to do the work as economically in any other way. If we were not to employ these clerks and give them an extra amount, we would either have to employ other clerks and make them permanent, or to obtain special help for the time; and the employment of special help not used to the work would be both clumsy and quite as expensive, while the employment of stated clerks to do it would entail a larger expense on the departments. Therefore, it has been deemed best to do as we have been doing in the past, and as they do in Britain, to pay these clerks an extra amount for the extra and very hard work which they have to do in a very short time each year.

Mr. McMULLEN. The clerks work, as I understand, from 9.30 to 4. Do they perform this work within that time?

Mr. FOSTER. No, they cannot, because the books have to be in the hands of the clerks for the regular work during those hours, and this work has to be done subsequently.

Mr. McMULLEN. What salaries do these clerks receive?

Mr. FOSTER. The amount they receive under this vote is very small. The best accountants are detailed for this

work, and of course their regular salaries vary. Some of them are third class clerks and some are second class clerks.

Mr. ELLIS. On what principle is this amount charged partly to the Post Office Department and partly to the Finance Department?

Mr. FOSTER. Because the Finance Department have control of the Dominion Savings Bank branch, while the Post Office Savings Bank is under the Post Office Department.

Mr. ELLIS. This goes to increase the deficit under the Post Office Department, when it should properly be charged to the Finance Department.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the best policy is to transfer the whole of the savings banks to the Post Office Department, where the business can be much more economically managed than in the Finance Department, and that is the policy which the Government has been pursuing. As vacancies occur by death or resignation, we transfer the offices to the Post Office Department, and this year we have transferred twelve or fourteen of them.

Mr. McMULLEN. I contend that this system is objectionable altogether, and it would be much better to add a small sum to the salaries of those who do this work, if their salaries are not sufficient, in order to secure the extra half hour of their time for this purpose, and to have it understood that they shall do this work. The continuation of this system and its endorsation by the House will lead other civil servants, from time to time, to make demands for an increased allowance for any extra work they may be called upon to do. It would be very much better that the hon. gentleman should have it distinctly understood with these clerks, when they are engaged, that this work will fall to their lot, even supposing we should be asked to vote $50 or $100 additional salary, owing to the fact of their working additional time. There are now 423 clerks who draw pay for extra services, and the number is increasing. The result will be that every civil servant will be looking for a loophole through which he can draw some little allowance for extra work.

Additional salary to C. Schreiber, Chief Engineer of Government Railways..... $2,000

Mr. FOSTER. This additional sum was granted for the extra work which he had to do in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell the House that Mr. Schreiber has to discharge, in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, those duties for which this sum was originally voted?

Mr. FOSTER. I mean to say that Mr. Schreiber has yet a great deal of onerous duty to perform in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in connection specially with the arbitration which is being carried on. Besides, by the system of bonusing railways which has grown by accretion from year to year, his services are made greater in that respect.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). If Mr. Schreiber has too much to do, it is about time some change is made in the management of the Intercolonial Railway. His time is so much taken up with the Canadian Pacific Railway and these railway subsidies, that I think he should be relieved of his duties on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thought there was a general feeling pervading the public mind that we are not going to get many more bonuses for railways; certainly I do not expect any. If that is so, I do not see that this charge should be continued. It is true that Mr. Schreiber may have some of his time taken up with the arbitration on the Onderdonk contract; but I saw an announcement in the papers the other day that the arbitrators had adjourned for a final sitting to Dalhousie, Mr. Schreiber's summer residence. As this vote will not operate till the next fiscal year, I do not see why this sum should be required at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is the salary of Mr. Schreiber. He has had it for some years, and I think he has well earned it. I believe he is a very good and faithful officer. Sometimes, of course, in the strict execution of his duty, he has to thwart people, but he is a very good officer indeed, and an economical officer as well.

Mr. MITCHELL. All your officers are.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe they are. His duties are very great, and they are not likely to diminish. What with the Intercolonial Railway, the Prince Edward Island Railway, and the supervision of the subsidies which are granted to railways, and which, I fancy, will, to a moderate extent, be continued for some years, his duties are very great. I have occasion to know that Mr. Schreiber's services could be employed elsewhere profitably for himself and his family. In fact, I know that he was offered a much larger salary than the Government could afford to give any officer, however valuable; but he thought it his duty to the department, and at the request of the late Mr. Pope, who had implicit confidence in him, to remain, sacrificing, I think, a large income.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the country could do without him, and could supply his place very readily, to the satisfaction of the country, and the people who have to do with railways.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I doubt it. I dare say there would be a good many more cows to be paid for than there are now. Of course, that is mere chaff. The hon. member for Northumberland has been very successful in getting justice done to his constituents. I think if Mr. Schreiber was replaced there would be many more claims, and they would not be so steadily resisted, nor so successfully resisted. But the hon. gentleman, in his insinuating way, gets these things done, and the claims are, as a rule, admitted.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think that the interests of the country are served by persistently refusing reasonable consideration for claims presented, when payment has to be forced, even at the point of the bayonet, as I have had to do it in many cases.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister of Finance justified this mainly on the grounds of the subsidies given to railways throughout the country. As I understand, it is Mr. Schreiber's duty to attend to the different public works and railways under control of the Government. He has already a fair salary of $4,000. If, as the right hon. gentleman says, he believes he could get much more in a position elsewhere, all I can say is that, from what I understand of the way the Intercolonial Railway is managed, the sooner Mr. Schreiber accepts that position elsewhere and leaves the country, the better it will be for the railway interests. I believe that the Intercolonial Railway has been badly managed under Mr. Schreiber. I am sure there must be other engineers in this country who could manage that railway more successfully than he has managed it. I do not see why the House should be called upon to pay Mr. Schreiber a sum nearly equal to the income of a Cabinet Minister. I object most strongly to this item, because the Canadian Pacific Railway is now in that position, when the amount paid to Mr. Schreiber can be reduced. If any evidence were wanting of Mr. Schreiber's uselessness instead of usefulness, it is furnished by the correspondence brought down the Session before last relating to the Onderdonk transactions.

Mr. Schreiber there figured as the friend and advocate of Onderdonk & Co., and not as the Chief Engineer of Canada, charged to guard her interests. Had Mr. Schreiber accepted, as he was bound to accept, the arbitration of $72,000 in the first instance, which was made according to the reference, this country would have been saved $130,000. But Mr. Schreiber seemed, in that case, to guard more jealously the interests of Onderdonk & Co. than he did those of the country of which he was the servant. I, therefore, think that the country would be no loser if Mr. Schreiber were to transfer his services elsewhere, and, according to the statement of the right hon. gentleman, Mr. Schreiber would be a gainer, and so both parties would be satisfied. This item is regarded very unfavorably by the House generally, and, perhaps, the best way of testing this will be to move on concurrence that the item be struck out, and thus ascertain what the opinion of the House really is.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see by the Auditor General's Report, page 51, D: "C. Schreiber, 64 days, between September 4, 1886, and January 10, 1888, at $20, $1,280; 55 days' living allowance at $5, $275; parlor cars and porters, $1.75: $1,556.75. Is that amount in addition to his salary of $6,000 a year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). We were given to understand that as the Canadian Pacific Railway would be soon completed, this item would not long appear in the Estimates. That being the case, it is unfair, now that the Canadian Pacific Railway is virtually completed, that this item should be placed in the Supplementary Estimates. If the First Minister thinks that Mr. Schreiber is worth more than the salary paid him as superintendent of Government railways, he should come down to the House and ask the House to increase his salary. But to ask this House, Session after Session, to pass an item of this kind, under the pretence that he is actually performing services connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway construction, is absurd, when it is clear that the Premier desires that he shall receive a larger salary than he desires to place in the Estimates. If the gentleman's services are worth more, why should the Government not propose to increase his salary? If Mr. Schreiber has the management of the Government railways, he certainly cannot have time to perform other services. I feel it is unfair to the House to be called upon to vote items of this description Session after Session, and the suggestion of the hon. member for Halifax is the correct one, that the feeling of the House should be tested as to whether this item should be allowed to pass.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it the understanding that when Mr. Schreiber is called upon to do work as an engineer, he is to be paid $20 a day in addition to his salary?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In this case in question, he was acting as a member of the Railway Commission. I do not think any Government asks one of its servants to serve on a special commission without paying him. Mr. Schreiber was paid infinitely less that the other commissioners who sat with him. Whenever a Government official is placed upon a Royal Commission, he receives an allowance, always less than that paid to other commissioners. That has been the universal practice, and it is of the utmost importance that the best men should be obtained, and that if necessary we should have the services of Government officials.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). As Mr. Schreiber is manager of the Intercolonial Railway and engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, how could he find time to sit on the Railway Commission? During the arbitration with the Canadian Pacific Railway, is Mr. Schreiber to be paid for his services?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; he receives his travelling expenses.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did Mr. Schreiber, as Chief Engineer of the Intercolonial Railway, and at the same time filling a position as railway commissioner, receive both salaries at the same time?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A Royal Commission is a temporary matter, and this was a Royal Commission respecting the Railway system of Canada. Mr. Burpee, Sir Alexander Galt, Mr. Schreiber and Mr. Moberly were the commissioners. We cannot expect that work to be done *con amore* unless we give the commissioners a sufficient allowance.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Schreiber appears to be in receipt of $4,000 for salary, and $2,000 is voted annually in addition, and then $1,500 is paid to him for sixty-four days' work, and yet when objection is taken to this extra pay, it is termed cheese paring. The right hon. gentleman has stated that Mr. Schreiber was not paid as much as the other railway commissioners. Such was not the case. Mr. Schreiber received $20 a day, and $5 a day living expenses, the same amount that was paid the other commissioners, and at the same time he was receiving pay from the Government at the rate of $6,000 a year.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). While, no doubt, Mr. Schreiber should have a certain income, the Premier should not take this means of releasing himself from the responsibility of asking an increase in Mr. Schreiber's salary, if he thinks he earns it. On that ground the present vote is more unjustifiable.

Mr. MULOCK. I agree with the remarks which have fallen from the member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson). If it is intended to make this officer's salary $6,000 a year, let us have it so declared by Act of Parliament, and let that particular sum be attached to the office in question. But, I believe that this system of securing bonuses to public officers by the grace of the Government of the day, is a vicious system. An officer in the employ of the Government ought be entitled to his salary without the mere contingency as to whether or not some item is to be put in the Supplementary Estimates for him. That system destroys his independence, and makes him a more creature of the Government. The civil servants are entitled to a certain amount of independence; they have not altogether a pleasant time of it, I have no doubt, for they are probably obliged, on many occasions, to act a part which they would prefer not having to act. They are obliged to appear always as the defenders of the Government, and I have no doubt, that their mouths are closed frequently when, if they were more independent of the Government of the day, they would be able to speak with greater freedom, and the public interest would be the gainer by it. Therefore, I think this system of bonuses keeps an official entirely dependent on the Government, makes him subservient to them in many ways, and, as we know from past experience, works to the disadvantage of the country. I can remember well when Mr. Schreiber had to be referred to in connection with the Onderdonk arbitration, and in that case had he been free of the Government, had he enjoyed as a matter of right the salary we were voting to him yearly, do you think that he would have remained silent when, what had all the appearances of, and what I verily believe was a gross fraud, was being committed on the Treasury of the country. Had the Chief Engineer of the Government at that time been a free man, do you think he would not have felt bound and justified and free to expose that transaction which has never yet been explained to the satisfaction of the country. In that case arbitrators were appointed to value certain rolling stock, and they made an award of $72,000. What happened

then? That award was superseded, not on the motion of Onderdonk, but on the motion of the Railway Department, and the Government interceded and begged the arbitrators to increase their award. When the Public Accounts Committee were investigating that transaction, a motion was made to lay before that Committee all the papers connected with this Onderdonk award. The Government laid before that Committee, not what was ordered, but they cut out of the correspondence and proceedings everything that showed there had been a preliminary award, so that to all appearances, as they first presented the case to the Public Accounts Committee, there was but one award of $202,000. Everybody knew that that was wrong; everybody knew that there had not been an honest production of papers and documents, and when the Government had to lay the complete return before the Committee, it was shown that the arbitrators had first awarded $72,000 and no more, and that the Government intervened and coerced the arbitrators to revoke that award and to make a new award for $202,000. That transaction took place in the face of the advice of the Minister of Justice who is here to-day. It may have been the previous Minister of Justice, but, at all events, the Minister of Justice of the day decided against it and the old award was abandoned, in the face of the opinion of the Minister of Justice that the claimants in that particular case had no right to the compensation that they were contending for. It was pretended that the first award was too small, and why? It happened that when the contract was entered into for the construction of that particular portion of the road, there was no railway by which this rolling stock and plant used in the construction of the Pacific section could be brought into the country. There was a provision in the contract, that when the work was completed the Government might take over this plant if they desired it, and the Government, in the interest of the contractors, thought it was necessary to pay for this rolling stock on the basis of the price paid for it and the cost of bringing it into the country. On that occasion we were simply buying the rolling stock at its commercial value, and there was no reason, in the interest of the country, for making this extra award. The moment this award was made and that the country had taken possession of this rolling stock, it was the duty of the Department of Railways to make the most of it, but they did nothing whatever to guard the interests of the country. They left the rolling stock in the possession of the Canadian Pacific Railway, some of it in use, some of it lying rusting on the switches of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and so it remained until this House took the matter up, and then the Department of Railways manifested an activity, not to protect the interests of the country, but to escape from censure, by having this stock hauled from the Pacific down to the Intercolonial Railway. I am told that the Government was so negligent in the way they brought that stock down (and I suppose the active head of the department is responsible for that) that they had the engines hauled on the Canadian Pacific Railway as "dead engines" and the cars hauled light, as freight; whereas one would think the engines might be permitted under some arrangement to work their way down, at a very much less cost to the country. I am told that when this rolling stock for which we paid $202,000 arrived at Montreal, and when it was handed over to the Grand Trunk Railway by the Canadian Pacific Railway for transportation down to the Intercolonial Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway was unwilling to assume the responsibility of taking it, as they considered it was not worth the freight of hauling. Not a member of the Government has ever yet explained that transaction, and it was done at the instance of the Department of Railways, and largely at their instigation. Now, do you believe that it is right that a high official such as the Engineer of Railways should be kept in that dependent position that he is not free to come forward and expose a transaction of this kind, and protect the interests of the country and his own personal honor. I am not saying that he was to blame, but I say that his position should be made as independent of influences of this kind as it can be, and in that view I entirely agree with the expressions that have fallen from the member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), that he should have his salary, whatever it is to be, as a strict matter of right, and not as a gift from the Government. The First Minister says this is cheese paring. I suppose an engineer of the skill of Mr. Schreiber is entitled to his salary. The public service demands certain efficiency in this office, and the salary assigned to the office should be by Act of Parliament, and not in this irregular way. I do not consider a matter of $6,000 cheese-paring.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that. It was the objection to his being paid on the Royal Commission.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not referring to that. The salary should be attached to the office, and not the individual.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with you.

Mr. MULOCK. It is a very embarrassing thing for members to be obliged to vote yea or nay in regard to individuals. The personal character of the official should be kept entirely out of the discussion. I ask the First Minister if he does not think he had better take this amount out of the Estimates now; and if it is right to increase the salary, let him bring in a Bill next Session providing what the salary for the office of Chief Engineer shall be.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the salary should be fixed for the office, and I say it was a mistake that this $2,000 was not put in the main Estimates, and that the whole salary of $6,000 was not voted there. Without considering the question the hon. gentleman has opened, I think $6,000 is not a large salary for a first-class engineer, which I consider this gentleman to be, notwithstanding the opinion of the hon. member for Halifax. If he were removed, I do not think we could get an engineer of the rank and position he occupies at a less sum. I think it would be unwise to try to economise in the salary when you want great engineering talent in the running of our railways, and in the multifarious duties which are and will be thrown from time to time on this very important officer. I have no doubt, so far as Mr. Schreiber is concerned, that he stands above all suspicion of being swayed by the question of salary. The fact that he declined to take another office of great emolument, but felt it his duty to remain where he was, shows that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think the hon. gentleman was here the other night when a question was put as to what had become of this identical rolling stock which had been taken over from Mr. Onderdonk. We were informed that it had gone down to the Intercolonial Railway, but we could not obtain any definite information in regard to it, except that one railway was very loath to haul it, thinking it was not worth anything.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will get the information.

Mr. SPROULE. Although this vote refers to a portion of Mr. Schreiber's salary for the present year, I think it is perhaps not out of place to refer to the additional pay he got as a member of the Royal Commission. It does seem to have been very high, because, if we take the number of working days in a year, not counting holidays, his salary amounts to over $19 a day; and he got $20 a day in addition, for the additional work he did. At the same time, it must be supposed that his work in his office is being done by someone else, for which he is receiving $19 a day. It does seem that the salary, as well as the appointment, is a

royal one, and a little less salary I think would have been more in place.

Mr. MULOCK. The First Minister has stated that, in his opinion, it is a very vicious system of remunerating public officials.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say it was a vicious system, but I said that your proposition was a better one.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman entirely approves of the position I took, that the salary should be attached to the office instead of the individual. How long is this system to continue? Will the First Minister give us a promise that he will not pursue this practice in another year, but will deal with the matter in a proper way?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I will undertake that.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then it is definitely understood that the salary shall be fixed in another year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I will definitely undertake that.

Mr. McMULLEN. If there is any evidence required of the correctness of the position taken by the hon. member for North York, it is the exhibition made by that official in the Public Accounts Committee the other day.

Mr. MULOCK. I would not wish it to be understood that I said that Mr. Schreiber had given any evidence to the Public Accounts Committee that he did not do what was right. What I desired to say was that if he had been free from such influences as his position might have put him in, I thought he would, perhaps, have been able to save this country from considerable loss. I do not know what part he took in the matter at all, but, under ordinary circumstances, I think a chief engineer would not have been silent on such an occasion.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the First Minister would not be carrying out the views of the House if he brought down a proposition next year to pay the Chief Engineer $6,000. The $2,000 is given while the Canadian Pacific Railway engages his attention, and when that is off the hands of the Government, I have no doubt this House will consider that $4,000 is ample for the chief engineer of the Intercolonial Railway.

Dorchester Penitentiary—Additional amount required to pay accountant and schoolmaster., $200

Mr. McMULLEN. What is that for?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the main Estimates there is a vote of $600 for a schoolmaster's salary. The office is vacant, the schoolmaster having resigned, and it is proposed to allow the accountant to perform the duties, and to give him $200 out of the $600.

Manitoba Penitentiary..... $1,230

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask what is the necessity of employing mason instructors?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The intention is to make the quarries available for the purpose of carrying on the work there, mainly for building a boundary wall. It is desirable to do that as much as possible by convict labor. But as we have no trade instructors in stonework and masonry, I have asked for the two salaries for quarryman and masonry instructors.

Mr. WATSON. I think that is a very commendable object, but I would like to call attention to the fact that the warden of that penitentiary is allowed to absent himself from his duties more than he should, and has greater liberties than any warden of any other penitentiary in Canada. It has been stated in this House, and proved to the satisfaction of the Minister of Justice, who said he felt it was an extravagant penitentiary, and that it was necessary to make some enquiry into the extravagance of Mr. Warden Bedson, that the management of this penitentiary is very extravagant. Mr. Bedson has been appointed to the command of a battalion, and it appears to me that he should not be allowed by the Government to occupy a position that will take him away from his duties any length of time. He has also been appointed extra A. D. C. to His Excellency, a position which is also incompatible with the one he holds and for which he receives $2,800. Another officer who occupied the position of major of a battalion, Mr. White, had to resign the command of the 43rd Battalion because the Post Office Department could not spare his services. If it is necessary that Mr. White should resign the command of the 43rd on account of his duties in the Post Office Department, certainly Major Bedson should not be allowed to take command of a battalion and neglect his duties.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the attention of the House ought to be called to this Manitoba penitentiary. Of all our penitentiaries it is by far the most extravagantly managed, and I have no hesitation in saying that the explanations given with respect to it were very far from satisfactory, when the item was under discussion. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Auditor General's report he will find that in 1887-88 there were 70 prisoners in the Manitoba penitentiary and 74 in the British Columbia penitentiary. Yet the cost per head in the former was $707, and in the latter $475. While it may be true that the cost of maintenance in British Columbia is greater than in old Canada, I do not think that, except with regard to fuel, the cost in Manitoba for maintenance is greater than in British Columbia. Yet we find this additional vote—which in itself may be reasonable enough—of $1,230 asked for over and above the vote of nearly $50,000 for the Manitoba penitentiary. I entirely concur in the statement of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), that it is most inconsistent with the position of warden of a penitentiary, that Mr. Bedson should be colonel of a militia corps, and extra A. D. C. to His Excellency. I am bound to say that Mr. Bedson, in an emergency during the rebellion, rendered valuable services, and such particular recognition as might be accorded to him for that I would be willing to concur in. But, apart from that, there is a crying inconsistency in the warden of a penitentiary being colonel of a militia regiment, and I doubt if it is proper that he should be extra A. D. C. to his Excellency. One thing is certain, and that is, his administration of the penitentiary cannot be satisfactory to the Minister of Justice, nor to this House. The items, although they were discussed at a very late hour, showed very gross extravagance in the management, the result being an expenditure of the enormous sum of $707 per head to keep the convicts in Manitoba, while $474 is found sufficient in British Columbia, $305 in St. Vincent de Paul, and $274 in Dorchester. This shows there is something wrong, and if the hon. gentleman will look over the Auditor General's Report in detail, he will see that everything in connection with the Manitoba penitentiary is managed in a very extravagant way. Now, this particular item ought to be reduced, and the warden compelled to administer the penitentiary satisfactorily.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has only given one side of the question. I explained the other day that the Auditor General had not taken into consideration the large amount of stores, including upwards of $1,200 worth of fuel, that was on hand at the close of the fiscal year, and which, if allowed for, would have reduced probaby by one-third the *per capita* cost.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think that would reduce it by more than $40 a head out of the $707.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Perhaps I am in error as to the proportion, but the information I gave the hon. gentleman as to the clothing, stores and fuel on hand accounted to a great extent for the additional cost per head. As regards his position in the militia, Colonel Bedson has been for years, long before I came to the department, in the force, and on active service. Within the last six months, I believe, he has received promotion, and I am not aware that his promotion calls for the discharge of any duties more onerous than those he discharged before. As to his appointment as hon. A. D. C., that will not entail on him any additional work which will interfere with his duties as warden. While making the admission the other night that the management of the Manitoba penitentiary was, in some respects, more expensive than was satisfactory to me, I was obliged to state, and I repeat it now, that there is not a more diligent official in the public service than Colonel Bedson, and that no penitentiary is kept in a better condition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All the reductions the hon. gentleman speaks of will barely amount to $40 or $50 per head, and that does not affect the material question, because, even including all these, the expenditure asked for is higher than that asked for in 1887-88. The expenditure then was $49,500. The hon. gentleman wanted $50,500 in his main estimate, and he now asks for $1,300 more, making nearly $52,000. Nor can I say I was at all satisfied with the very general and easy statement that this penitentiary is well managed. Looking over the details I think it may be admirably managed in the matter of cleanliness, and so forth; but that it is very extravagantly managed is, from the items given us, very evident. Nor do I think that the hon. gentleman's explanation is at all satisfactory that this gentleman can discharge the duties of colonel of a militia regiment efficiently, and those of warden of a penitentiary at the same time. I know something, though not as much as the Minister of Justice, of the duties of the warden of a penitentiary, and I know that if the duties are properly discharged, they will keep the warden occupied all his time, and it is very inconvenient that he should be absent for any number of days, except it be in some emergency such as the North-West rebellion. But, in ordinary cases, the warden requires to be constantly on the spot, and I do not see how he can efficiently discharge the two duties. It seems to me that the thing is absurd on the face of it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to call the attention of the House to the difference in the charges made per head in the different penitentiaries. Rations cost in Kingston, $36.79 per head per annum, and in Manitoba, $63.21. Chapels cost 25 cents a head in Kingston, and $7.99 in Manitoba. Heating costs $19.16 in Kingston, $7.27 in Dorchester, and $165.49 in Manitoba. Postage, freight and express, cost 23 cents in Kingston, $12 in Manitoba, $1.79 in British Columbia, and 31 cents in St. Vincent de Paul. Printing costs $1.78 in Kingston, $2.20 in St. Vincent de Paul, $1.98 in Dorchester, and $5.07 in Manitoba.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the matter which has been brought forward by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) is one deserving the attention of the Committee. If the warden's duties require him to be in the penitentiary, he should be there all the time, and therefore I hope the Minister will insist upon this man's resigning one position or the other. If he be, as it is represented, such an efficient officer, we require his services in the penitentiary all the time. The Minister of Militia should be very careful in this matter, as the warden appears to be very extravagant, and may possibly get hold of some of the militia money, and I am sure the Minister of Militia is desirous to have the opportunity of spending as much of that money himself as possible. I think it is improper that such an important public officer as that, should be permitted, at his own will and pleasure, to go off playing soldier, when his duties may require his presence in the place for attending to which we pay him a very liberal salary.

Mr. MULOCK. It is clear that not only will the penitentiary service suffer from this joint system, but the militia service also. I suppose the office of warden has the first claim on this gentleman's time, but he has certain duties to discharge as head of a battalion. If he discharges his duties as warden, how can he discharge his business as colonel of a battalion? I think this is a very objectionable principle to sanction. He is trying to serve two masters, the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Militia. I do not know that he will have much difficulty in satisfying the Minister of Militia that he is discharging his duties efficiently, but the Minister of Justice should pay some attention to this. As to the third office which he holds, that of A. D. C. to His Excellency, I presume that will not require much of his attention except when His Excellency visits that part of the country, which I presume it will be his pleasure and his duty to do once a year, and on those occasions the warden will have to put on his uniform and his insignia, and will be an A. D. C. to His Excellency. The Minister of Justice stated that he was not aware that the office of lieutenant colonel of a regiment interfered with the duties of a warden. That is hardly sufficient reason for allowing the two offices to be combined. Is the Minister able to say that the duties of lieutenant colonel do not interfere with the duties of warden? His merely saying that he does not know is not sufficient; and can the Minister of Militia say that a man can properly discharge the duties of colonel of a regiment and also those of the warden of a penitentiary?

Mr. WATSON. The Minister of Militia has referred to the promotion of Major Bedson to the command of a new battalion. There is just as much use for that new battalion being formed in Manitoba as there is for a third wheel to a cart. These men are not drilled. The 95th Battalion, which is a good battalion and has Major McMillan at its head, and he is a worthy man, have not been able to get their men drilled. In the face of that fact, a new battalion has been formed. Major Bedson has only four companies in his battalion, and the probability is that the duties required of him as major of that battalion will not cause him to be much away from his duties as warden. In that case there is not much use for that battalion. If a new battalion is formed, the man in command of it should be free to attend to his duties at all times. As to any services rendered by Major Bedson during the rebellion, I think he has sufficient trophies around him to reward him for those services, and I think the honor of A. D. C. to the Governor General should have been conferred upon other military men there who are more deserving of it than Major Bedson.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister of Militia informed the House, when the question of Major-General Cameron was being discussed, that he never allowed political feelings to interfere with his appointments. That statement was received with a great deal of incredulity even from his own side of the House, but there must surely be something more than appears to induce him to place the warden of a penitentiary in command of one of his battalions. From my own experience—and I had experience in the militia for many years—I should say it would be considered a very irregular and a very undesirable proceeding. If this gentleman had been a military man of considerable experience, and the occasion arose where his services were immediately required, and no other man was available, I might admit that it might be considered advisable to make the appoint-

ment; but I do not suppose there are not other men in Manitoba who are equally competent to command a battalion. I presume that, with all the young and active spirits that flock to a new country, the Minister of Militia would have no difficulty in finding a man suitable to take such an important command. The Minister knows very well that he must either do one of two things, he must either make the militia altogether secondary to his permanent appointment, or he must neglect the duties of his permanent position. He must make the times for meeting and drilling to suit his other duties. I think that military men in this House—and there are a good many of them—who have in the past and who now occupy such a position, will agree with me that the two positions are not compatible with the duties which we have a right to expect from a person who properly fills either one or the other. I think it is a matter of regret that the Minister of Militia has placed the warden of the penitentiary in that very important situation.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON: I do not see, as Minister of Militia, that there is any reason why I should regret that Lieut.-Col. Bedson has been placed in command of the battalion. During the trouble in the North-West, he, at that time Major Bedson, rendered services which everybody is prepared to acknowledge. He was placed in a position of trust, in a position of danger, and during the time that he was accompanying the columns to the front, he showed that he could be trusted in every way, and he showed, moreover that he was in every sense of the word a good military man. Now, Mr. Chairman, it must be remembered that Col. Bedson is placed in command of a rural battalion. I do not see that his having taken command of a rural battalion can prevent him from giving all the time necessary to the position which he now occupies. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat knows that rural battalions drill in camp at headquarters, and during the 12 days they are at drill, there is much less to be done by them than by city corps who carry on their drill almost every night during the winter, and much more frequently than rural corps. So far as the position of aide de-camp to His Excellency is concerned, I think I explained on a former occasion that His Excellency selected his aide-de-camps without any recommendation from the Minister of Militia.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister says that Colonel Bedson commands a rural battalion, and as they are not called upon to drill very often, his services are not taken from his other duties. That would exactly meet the contention of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) who expressed the opinion that there was no necessity of creating that battalion until they had filled the other one. If this rural battalion has not been able to drill, it has been created merely for the purpose of giving Colonel Bedson command of it, and it shows there was no necessity creating that battalion.

Mr. WATSON. So far as this new battalion is concerned, if the Minister of Militia has funds sufficient to enable the different battalions to go into camp from year to year, I have no objection to Col. Bedson's battalion being formed. But the 95th Battalion has not been in camp since 1885, and it is, to my mind, absurd to have a new battalion when the Minister has not enough funds at his disposal to drill the volunteers now enrolled.

Kingston Penitentiary..... .... $15,860

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no objection in the world to the introduction of electric light in the Kingston Penitentiary, in fact I think it will be a considerable improvement. But the sum total of $15,000 for plant and $800 for salary of electrician, strikes me as very high. I would be glad to have from the hon. gentleman details of this item.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is familiar, though perhaps other members of the Committee are not, with the difficulties that we have had in lighting the Kingston Penitentiary. Some years ago, the manufacture of gas for the prison was estabilised and the necessary plant put in. About two years ago, it was found that it was inadequate in extent, and that to supply the plant necessary for the manufacture to the full extent of gas that was required in the prison required new plant to the extent of $10,000. In fact, I think tenders were called for, and in that way the cost was ascertained. There was likewise the fact that the manufacture of gas had resulted in considerable inconvenience to the neighbors. That was made a continual subject of complaint, and indeed legal proceedings were threatened with a view to putting a stop to the manufacture of gas Before I asked the Minister of Public Works to put in the additional plant for the manufacture of gas, which, as I have said, was estimated to cost about $10,000, I thought it was only right to ascertain the result of the application of electricity in lighting prisons in the United States. With a view to economy, and with a view likewise to making permanent any change that we desired to make—because if we made a large expenditure for the manufacture of gas and a few years afterwards decided that electricty was the better light, we would have thrown away our first expenditure—I asked the warden, while he was attending the prisons congress in the United States, to take that opportunity of visiting the chief prisons where electricity was used in lighting. He did so, and on a subsequent occasion to get further details, he visited, I think, almost every large prison in the United States where electricity is used and made himsef familiar with the latest improvements and appliances in work of that kind. And then, in order to ascertain what the probable cost would be, with a view of asking the approval of the House of the change, I had tenders called for. But the lowest tender was a sum not much below what I have estimated here; the other tenders range very much above, and the only apprehension we have had is whether the tender is not too low. Indeed it was contended by some of the other companies tendering, that it was impossible for the plant to be satisfactorily put in for the amount of the lowest tender. In order to make sure upon that point, I asked the warden to go again to some of the prisons in the United States and ascertain whether the tender that we had received included all the appliances which they found necessary there. His report was satisfactory in that respect. I think he has made himself thoroughly familiar with the appliances necessary to be put in, and the best mode of operating an electric light. I think it would be conducive to economy, and it would be far more convenient in connection with protective provisions for the prison to have an electric light, and to have much more abundant light, and a light that we can manufacture without inconvenience to the neighbors. Besides that, we have the advantage of making a permanent improvement instead of spending nearly as much for the new plant for the gas.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman inform me what he estimates the annual cost of supplying this, apart from the salary of the electrician? There will be an engineer required, or two engineers, will there not?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; we have an engineer now for the manufacture of gas. The salary of the electrician is the only additional salary that we shall have to provide.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman any estimate of the cost?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no objection to the introduction of electricity, for I think it would be a

great improvement both on the ground of health and as a protection to the prison; but I say this to the First Minister and the Minister of Justice—and I do not speak without knowledge, because I have had in various ways to do with electric companies—that it would be quite possible probably to make a contract with the electric company of Kingston. I have no interest whatever in that company, I may state to avoid misconception, and I believe it is run exclusively by friends of the First Minister. I think it would be more economical to make an arrangement to obtain the electricity from the establishment in Kingston instead of having a separate establishment in the prison itself. As a rule, prison establishments are costly, and I hardly think that more would be necessary in order to obtain electric light than to make connection with the lines outside the prison.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will make enquiry and will ascertain whether that can be done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it would be in the public interest and more economical. Electric lights at the present moment, are within 100 yards of the prison. It would be much more economical to adopt this plan than to have two electric plants, one for the supply of the city, and another for the supply of the prison, and unless there is strong reason to the contrary, the hon. gentleman will find it to be in the public interest to connect the prison with the electric company of Kingston.

Mr. McMULLEN. I find at page C—68, Auditor General's Report, that Dr. Lavell was appointed to examine Riel about the time of his execution, or when he was under sentence. The Dominion paid $885 for his expenses, &c., and also $126.70 for the expenses of Mrs. Lavell. Why was this country called upon to pay $126 for the travelling expenses of Mrs. Lavell from Kingston to Winnipeg?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That was for a service not in any way connected with the prison. The Government thought proper to employ Dr. Lavell to go on a very important mission, and they thought proper to accede to the request that his wife should accompany him.

Mr. MULOCK. What did it previously cost to light Kingston Penitentiary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot state exactly. I made enquiries a year ago in connection with an offer made by the city gas company, and I found from the reports of my officers that we manufactured gas for 20 per cent. less than it could be supplied by the city, besides the additional cost that would be entailed in laying pipes to the prison, which would be very considerable.

Mr. MULOCK. Has any communication been had with the electric light company?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; I promised to do so before incurring any expense. I am under the impression that difficulty would arise with regard to the certainty of the supply of power where you have to depend on a local company. In a prison, a great deal of injury might ensue from the establishment being left in darkness suddenly, or from an insufficient supply of light, or from having the light cut off at an hour which would suit ordinary citizens. All of these matters will have to be considered. There is no haste. I do not intend to go into the matter immediately, and I will enquire with respect to the certainty of supply from the city and the probable cost as compared with the cost if we furnish our own supply.

Mr. MULOCK. Are any of the penitentaries lighted by a municipal gas company?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; they are all lighted by oil except Kingston Penitentiary.

Mr. MULOCK. In adopting this new system, it must be remembered that you will have to extend it to other penitentaries.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; not the small ones, because the cost would not justify it.

Mr. MULOCK. That is the present opinion, but opinions are apt to be changed.

Mr. McMULLEN. What does the Minister anticipate as the annual cost of lighting?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. For the present, say a year or two, we would require to pay in addition to the engineer we have now, an electrician, for whom we ask $800. The companies which were consulted stated that we should procure an electrician for that amount, and that after a year or two one of our own employés might be sufficiently trained to perform the duties at a lower salary. I make no promise in regard to that matter, as I have no experience in regard to it, and only the information given by the companies. But as regards the cost of lighting by electricity, I am satisfied that it will be considerably less than the present cost of producing gas.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to know whether this system will result in a saving or not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It certainly will be productive of saving.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman propose to use the arc system or the incandescent, or both?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The report goes into that very minutely, but I cannot state the result arrived at.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know what the cost is expected to be. I may take this opportunity of reminding the hon. gentleman that, although a most excellent system in all other respects, the incandescent system is a pretty expensive one, as great power is required to produce the light; whereas the arc system produces a large quantity of light at a comparatively low cost, and, therefore, I think he will find he will effect economy by adopting the suggestion I have made. He must, of course, use the incandescent system if he is going to light the cells.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary $1,700

Mr. WILSON. I notice that part of this item is for 150 cords of tamarac. What did this wood cost per cord?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That expense was necessary owing to the changes being made in the carrying on of the work. Heretofore, the quarrying has been done by contract, and the intention now is to have it done by prison labor, and to incur as little expense as possible for outside labor. I have given notice that the contract will terminate. We ask this vote to pay the salary of an experienced quarryman, who will have charge of the convicts and instruct them.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). How much of this is for the tamarac, and how much for the tools?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A very insignificant portion is for the tools, and nearly the whole amount will be required for the wood.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The Minister will see that he would be paying about $6.66 a cord for tamarac wood, and that is very expensive.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I can assure the hon. gentleman that tenders will be asked for, and we will get the wood at the lowest possible price. It is proposed to bring the warden's salary up to the maximum, which would be $2,800. He was appointed just at the close of the period

when perquisites were allowed to the wardens, and I was unwilling to make any liberal allowance, in lieu of the perquisites which he would have been entitled to, under ordinary circumstances. Considering, however, the excellent manner in which he has discharged his duties, I thought since that I should be a little liberal with Mr. Ouimet, and increase his salary. I think he has well deserved this.

Committee rose, and, it being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Elections—Payments to Returning Officers. $300

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Would the Minister explain how it comes that this money has been due to the revising officers in Montreal and has been left unpaid since 1877 ? There must be some good reason for delay, as the Government are usually very prompt in meeting expenses of this kind.

Mr. FOSTER. These items are on the recommendation of the Auditor General, who says in his report: "The amount claimed under this head appears to be reasonable compensation for the services rendered."

To meet expenses in connection with Electoral Franchise Act..... $250,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the Minister expect that this amount is going to cover the entire cost ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is expected that this will cover the costs of the revision for this year. I presume that the payment to be made to revising officers themselves will not be more than it was at the former revision, but, by reason of the provision in the Bill recently passed, we expect that there will be a reduction in the expenses of some of their officers. The cost of printing has been taken out of the Estimates.

Mr. McMULLEN. This will give each revising officer for each riding about $1,200. Is that the amount it cost at the last election ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think about $1,000 covered all the expenses of revising officers, clerks, bailiffs, and service of that kind for each riding.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do not we understand that by the recent amendment the Act has been very much simplified ? Does the hon. gentleman think it will be necessary to increase the sum by $200 a constituency ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not intended to increase the salaries of revising officers. I spoke only from memory when I said that it cost $1,000 for each riding, perhaps I am under the mark. There are salaries to clerks, bailiffs, office rents and incidental expenses of that kind to be paid.

Mr. McMULLEN. Upon what basis does the hon. gentleman propose to pay the revising officers ? Some constituencies are very much larger than others and have more voters. Is it the intention to give them a uniform sum in every constituency, or a sum in proportion to the number of votes ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no intention of giving an equal amount in all the constituencies. The amount will depend on the number of voters on the list. In the last revision, the amounts were graded in the way that was explained to the House. There was an equal allowance in the first instance of $300 to the revising officer, a further allowance up to a certain number of votes, and a smaller allowance above that number.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would be satisfactory if the Minister could give us a statement showing how the expense for each riding is made up. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, allows certain sums for the revising officers, certain sums for the clerks, and certain sums for the cost of holding the court of revision, to make up this amount. Of course it ought to be clearly understood that the revising officer is paid in a particular way, so that he will be wholly independent of the Government, because these men, whose duties require them to act impartially between the two parties, should, like the judges in ordinary courts, be wholly independent of the Administration ; and they will certainly be so to a greater extent if they are paid by some fixed rule.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It did not require this vote to convince hon. members on this side of the House of the impropriety and absurdity of the Franchise Act ; but I think it will go far to satisfy hon. members on the Government side that the position we took in opposing the Franchise Bill was a sound one. Here we have the Government asking for a quarter of a million dollars to put this Franchise Act into operation. It is money completely thrown away. There never was any necessity for it, and there is no necessity for it now ; and if the Government had accepted the proposals made from this side of the House, which are also largely concurred in by members on their own side, we should have been saved not only this amount, but an amount averaging $500 in every riding to those who have to look after the voters' lists. When you add those sums together, they will make a very large expenditure, to say nothing of all the inconvenience and trouble caused to those who have to look after that very disagreeable business. We have brought down to us now, in black and white, a statement of the amount which the Government are going to impose on this country, simply that they might take control of this matter, violating every principle of the Franchise Act, giving manhood suffrage in two of the Provinces where it suited them to do so, and taking control in other Provinces. I think this vote is one of the most indefensible, improper, unnecessary, and wasteful votes that this Government have asked this House to adopt this Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I presume that this $250,000 in no way defrays the expense of the Government printing office. That is an extra, I presume ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes ; it is separate from this vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman state how much that will amount to ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot. It belongs to the administration of the Secretary of State's Department.

Mr. FOSTER. I will get it on Concurrence.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice how much is to be allowed for printing and how much for advertising ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We are not able to apportion the amounts in that way. I estimate that, for salaries of revising officers and the clerical assistance they need to get, the expense will be about $220,000 ; and in addition to that, this sum is intended to cover possible expenses of advertising, bailiffs, rental of buildings, and disbursements which the revising officers will have to make for getting copies of the lists, records and things of that kind.

Mr. MULOCK. So that it is expected that this vote will fully cover all the expenses ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. If it does, it will do what has not been the result heretofore of similar votes. We have been voting hundreds of thousands of dollars to put this Act in force, and we have supplementary votes which are the result of miscalculation. It is well enough to say that it is expected to be sufficient in a hap-hazard way, but I am afraid that

the record of the Government in connection with this particular vote will hardly justify the Committee in assuming that in this case they are any more accurate than they have been heretofore. I look upon this money as so much absolutely wasted. It is nothing more than money wickedly and wantonly wasted for no good purpose, and the sooner the Government has sufficient courage to retrace its steps in regard to this measure the better it will be for the country. I was struck with one thing in connection with the debate on the passage of the Bill to amend the Franchise Act. Speaking from memory, and so far as my observation went, not one member from Ontario raised his voice to endorse the principle of the Bill. True, they voted as they were told, but not one of them would commit themselves farther than by his vote.

Mr. RYKERT. I did.

Mr. MULOCK. During the passage of the Bill?

Mr. RYKERT. I always approved of it.

Mr. MULOCK. There are other questions the hon. member for Lincoln may approve of, but which will not meet the approval of the country. At all events I have no recollection of his speaking.

Mr. RYKERT. Your memory is poor at times.

Mr. MULOCK. I may be in error on that point. I am inclined to doubt it, all the same.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. You refer to the Act of this Session.

Mr. MULOCK. I do. I did not hear the hon. member for Lincoln speak in support of the Act this Session, or take part in the debate on the Act of this Session. That is the matter to which I refer. We could not do a wiser thing than to suspend voting the money. We are not obliged to vote it by any immediate necessity; we are not obliged to settle the lists this year. The Government passed the Act in 1885, they put it in force for one year, and it was so unpopular in the country that they have never since had the courage to have the lists revised. There is no greater condemnation of the measure required than that. Now the Government indicate an intention to have the lists settled, and if what they say is correct, that the lists now to be prepared are really to be the voters' lists settled by the Local Legislatures, I would like to know where is the public advantage to be gained by spending $250,000 simply to put a set of names on a different set of paper, for that is all that is involved in putting the Act in force now. We have the admission of the Minister of Justice that this is not to cover all the expenses of putting the Act in force; it is not to cover the expense of printing the lists. We have expended an enormous amount of money in erecting a building and so forth, and we have to consider therefore not only $250,000 to be scattered throughout the ridings, but the expense involved in printing the lists at the Government printing office. I think we ought to know what is likely to be the cost of printing the lists at the Government printing office. I would ask the Minister of Justice if he is prepared to give that information to the House to-night?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) asked that same question about ten minutes ago of the Minister of Justice, and then of myself. The Minister of Justice said he did not know, and I said I did not know, but that I would get the information, and the hon. member for South Oxford expressed himself as altogether satisfied with that.

Mr. MULOCK. He said he wanted that information for the purposes of Concurrence, and I hold that this information should be made known at this stage, because the $250,000 is but part of the larger sum. It is illusory to put down $250,000 as the amount of expenses of putting the lists in force when we know there is a very considerable sum to be added. Before we vote this portion of the cost, we should know what the other portion is, and then we shall know the total cost of putting this Act into force. The item should stand until that information is supplied. If it is going to cost $500,000 to put this Act in force, we might wisely pause before doing so. There are already plenty of demands upon the Exchequer. The Minister of Finance has promised an era of economy. The supplementaries of 1889 and those we are now considering scarcely bear out those promises. Before we proceed to vote this $250,000, we ought to know what the whole cost will be of putting this Act into force this year.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How much does it cost to print the lists now set up?

Mr. FOSTER. That question was asked and answered some time ago. I do not recollect what the answer was, but I will get that as well.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If we knew that, we could arrive at a conclusion as to the probable cost of correcting the lists. I do not think it will be much less than the original cost, because a large proportion of the names will be struck out altogether, and new ones put on.

Colonial and Indian Exhibition—to pay balance of freight charges and other unsettled accounts..... $3,500

Mr. CARLING. Some of the goods shipped to the exhibition went astray, and we are now trying to hunt them up. If they cannot be found, we will have to pay for them. There are a number of items, amounting in all to about $3,000 or $4,000.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Some time ago I made application for a party who had sent a stuffed animal to the exhibition, which came back in a damaged condition. The exhibitor is a poor man, and I made the application for him. I think some recompense should be given him, since this animal came back entirely destroyed. I have never heard anything from the department since, but I think this man Birmingham has a good claim if the Government are going to pay for goods which have gone astray or have been damaged.

Mr. CARLING. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has called my attention to the matter, and I will make enquiry in regard to it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think it is creditable to the large number of officials we sent there, and paid very highly, that $3,500 worth should have been lost, and that we should be asked to pay for that. There must have been not only bad handling, but, I am afraid, there must have been some misappropriation. It is hardly conceivable that, with the large number of officials whom the Government had in charge of these articles, such a large amount of property should have been lost. Besides, this is only a small amount. We have paid sums for this before, and this is only the balance.

Mr. CARLING. Some of these articles have gone astray. Perhaps some have been shipped to the wrong parties. We found that one article had been shipped to the manufacturer instead of to the owner, because the name of the manufacturer was on it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Have you a list of the articles sent there?

Mr. CARLING. I have some of them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not complain of the country paying for articles which they received and failed to deliver to the owner. That is right enough. But, as the hon. gentleman says, there must be gross negligence on the part of those in charge either in misappropriating the articles or in send-

ing them to the wrong parties. There should have been no difficulty, because the owners were known, and in most instances their names were attached to the articles. I think this is absolutely discreditable to the Government officers.

Mr. CARLING. I do not agree with that. There were a large number of articles shipped by different lines of railway and steamboat, and some were likely to go astray. We are endeavoring to trace them, and we think there are very few that we will not be able to get.

Mr. MULOCK. What officer was responsible for the missing goods?

Mr. CARLING. The goods were shipped to an officer in London who was selected by the High Commissioner during the Exhibition, and he had the duty of shipping those goods from London.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Minister of Agriculture will remember that I brought to his attention the matter of a plough which was shipped from the town of Chatham to this Exhibition. It was a very valuable plough, silver mounted, and it was not returned to the owner. I want to know if the Minister has received any information yet in regard to that plough.

Mr. CARLING. We are now endeavoring to trace that plough, and I think we will succeed.

Mr. MULOCK. Are there shipping bills in the possession of the department for these missing articles?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Then you will be able to trace them up?

Mr. CARLING. I think so.

Mr. MULOCK. Then they have left the Colonial Office and have gone into the hands of the carriers?

Mr. CARLING. We found that some shipments were made to different parties than the owners, because the name of the manufacturers was on the article instead of the name of the owners.

To aid in the further extension and development of the dairying interests of Canada..... $3,000

Mr. FISHER. In what way is it proposed to expend this amount, which I am very glad to see here? I hope this is the result of the recent dairymen's convention.

Mr. CARLING. The convention of dairymen assembled here about 10 days ago from different Provinces—I think all the Provinces were represented—and they made application to the Government to give them some assistance towards helping a convention of dairymen next winter. This item is to assist towards the expenses.

Mr. FISHER. I understand then that it is to be handed over to the Dairymen's Association?

Mr. CARLING. No, I do not say that; but this money has been placed to the credit of the department, and such steps will be taken as they think necessary to carry out the wishes of the convention.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I happened to meet the deputation that waited on us for the purpose of asking for assistance. They mentioned this sum, and the Government have agreed to give this sum. They were informed, however, that if it was merely to pay the travelling expenses of the convention coming to meet here in Ottawa or elsewhere, I do not think the Government would look upon it with favor; but, if the money was to be expended in really aiding the dairy interest, we would be prepared to ask Parliament for this vote. This amount will be expended in a manner to be agreed upon by the Minister of Agriculture and the convention.

Mr. FISHER. I think this is as good a form as this could be put in. I believe the Government will find the Dairymen's Association thoroughly worthy of the confidence placed in them, and that the Government will see that their work is so much in the interests of the country that they will have no difficulty in granting their requests in this respect. There is one question to which I would like to allude in this connection. I hoped to see in this connection some slight recognition of the work and the labors for some years past of the gentleman who was instrumental in bringing about that dairy convention—I allude to Mr. W. H. Lynch. All those who have been connected with the dairying interest of this country for some years, are well aware of the untiring industry and the indefatigable interest which Mr. Lynch has displayed in furthering the dairying interest, in devoting his efforts, without any compensation from the public, towards contributing to the information and the assistance of those who are trying to improve this industry in Canada. I understood not very long ago that a petition was being circulated and largely signed in the House, asking the Government to recognise in some way those efforts, and I had trusted that when the Supplementary Estimates came down we might find some slight recognition. I happen to know personally that for a number of years past Mr. Lynch has devoted his whole time and attention, and a considerable amount of his own private means, towards obtaining information and giving that information to the public at large on this branch of industry. I think I am well within the mark in saying that Mr. Lynch has made no money whatever out of his work. There has been an impression abroad that he was a paid official of the Government, but those who sit on the Treasury benches are well aware that that is not the case. He has done this work out of the enthusiasm he feels for the advancement of this industry. I trust that it is still not too late for the Minister of Agriculture to see his way clear to do something in recognition of Mr. Lynch's services to the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice in the Auditor General's Account that last year 75,000 copies of Mr. Lynch's pamphlet were purchased by the Government. Is it the intention to purchase any more this year?

Mr. CARLING. Those pamphlets on the dairy interests of Canada were purchased from Mr. Lynch and distributed amongst the members of this House. Mr. Lynch has applied to the Government to purchase 17,500 more pamphlets, and a number of letters that he has written, to be printed in pamphlet form and distributed. No action has been taken on the matter, but no doubt it will receive the consideration of the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What amount was paid for these pamphlets?

Mr. CARLING. $4,500. The Government bought the pamphlets for six cents apiece.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Lynch was paid six cents each for these pamphlets, and he had to supply them in the shape in which they were distributed. He certainly did not make anything out of them.

To aid in the extension and the development of the fruit growing interest of Canada..... $2,000

Mr. CARLING. This money is to be expended in the same way as the money for the dairy interest. The fruit growers intend to have a convention next autumn or winter, of representatives from all the associations in the country, and they intend to have an exhibit of the hardy fruits of the Dominion, and generally to discuss the interests of the fruit business.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). A very good object.

Lachine Canal..... $36,600

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have nothing to say to the item contained here, but this constant demand on us in respect to these canals is becoming a very serious matter. Eight or ten yars ago the Canals, at the worst, used to meet expenses, in the time of my hon. friend, Mr. Mackenzie, we derived a little money out of them. But I observe that you put together the annual expenditure which we find under the head of collection of revenue, and the sums chargeable to canals for income, and the sums in the main estimate by which you get a total expenditure on Canals chargeable to income in one shape or other, of about $800,000 a year. If I understand correctly the estimate of receipts for 1888, it is scarcely likely that the average income will exceed $300,000, so that we are expending about $500,000 more than we receive from the canals at present. Now, that may be quite unavoidable, but it is a very serious state of things, particularly in view of the fact that we are now asked for many millions in order to complete the system, and I hardly understand how the very great discrepancy has come to arrive. I may remind the Minister of Finance that in 1878, these paid their own way, and there was a very small profit.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The revenue certainly is not increasing, and one cause may be that the tolls are decreasing. There has been great pressure brought to bear upon Parliament and the Government for the reduction of the tolls on the St. Lawrence Canals, in order to compete with the Buffalo and Erie Canals. The tolls on wheat and flour have been kept at the very lowest, they were reduced two or three years ago, and are far beneath what the service is worth. The argument is justly used that if we increase the tolls beyond what they have been for the last two or three seasons, the river will be abandoned, and that the produce of the west will go *via* the Buffalo and the Erie Canals, or by American railways. These two routes are fighting against each other. The tolls have been removed altogether from the Erie Canal, and it is very hard to keep any tolls on our canals.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know all that, but really there is a point at which we shall have to draw the line. At the present moment apparently we shall have a deficit of $500,000 a year on the cost of keeping our canals in order, and the Minister of Finance told us the other evening that it would be necessary to expend $13,500,000 of additional capital, costing in round numbers about $500,000 more forever, in order to complete our 14 feet system. All this seems to point very much in the direction of the soundness of the arguments of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly), that this 14 feet navigation for really commercial purposes is of very doubtful expediency indeed. I could understand a reasonable increase in the cost and a reasonable increase in the loss, but such a difference as exists between the expenditure in 1878 and the expenditure to-day is exceedingly serious, and causes me to doubt very considerably the wisdom of the policy we are adopting.

Welland Canal..... $35,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I desire to ask the Government whether it is their intention to stop Sunday traffic on the Welland Canal. During the early part of the Session a return was brought down, showing the correspondence that had taken place between the Government and various parties in connection with the opening of the canals for Sunday traffic, and I learn from that return that public feeling in the neighborhood of the canal and throughout the Niagara peninsula is very much excited with regard to this question. Resolutions were passed by a public meeting by the Trades and Labor Council of Toronto, by the citizens of Kingston, by the Knights of Labor of St. Catharines by the Welland Canal Seamen's Assembly, by a public meeting at Thorold, by the Knights of Labor at Thorold, by the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, by a public meeting at Port Dalhousie, by the Trade and Labor Council at St. Catharines, by the Knights of Labor at Port Dalhousie and at Thorold, all condemning the opening of the canal for Sunday traffic. There was also a petition adopted by 96 residents of Port Colborne, also one from the Hamilton branch of the Evangelical Alliance and one from the Presbytery of Hamilton to the same effect. I know that much excitement has been caused in the Niagara district in regard to the opening of the canal on Sundays. I observe that the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), took quite an active interest in the matter, on both sides of the question, and for the information of the House I will give some of the correspondence that passed between that hon. gentleman and the Government on this question. On 25th May, 1888, the member for Lincoln telegraphed as follows:—

"25th May, 1888.

"A. P. BRADLEY,
"Railways and Canals.
"Can you give permission to steamer *Ocean* as requested?"

It appears that the parties were anxious for an answer, for the operator at St. Catharines sent the following message:—

"25th May, 1888.

"Please answer J. C. Rykert's inquiry of this a.m.
"OPERATOR AT ST. CATHARINES."

On 4th June the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) wrote as follows:—

"ST. CATHARINES, 4th June, 1888.

"MY DEAR BRADLEY,—Why can you not give the permit asked for in the case of the *Ocean* going through the canal Sunday. They only ask to be allowed to go through one lock for the convenience of the passengers.

"Very truly,
"J. C. RYKERT."

It appears that in a very short time the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), changed his views. He wrote or telegraphed to the First Minister as follows:—

"ST. CATHARINES, 9th June, 1888.

"To Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.
"Orders again issued compelling men to work Sundays on the canal. Great feeling about it. Please see Pope and get order cancelled. Answer.
"J. C. RYKERT."

On 21st June, the hon. gentleman appeared to get a little more excited about the matter, and telegraphed as follows:—

"ST. CATHARINES, 21st June, 1888.

"MY DEAR POPE,—I hope you will cancel the order allowing vessels to go through the canal on Sunday. It is causing a very bitter feeling here. I wish you would telegraph me that you have stopped it.
"J. C. RYKERT."

Then, again, on 10th July, the hon. gentleman writes or telegraphs:

"ST. CATHARINES, 10th July, 1888.

"MY DEAR POPE,—I herewith enclose you a copy of resolution passed at a public meeting here. I assure you that public sentiment is being greatly roused against the Government, and I am quite certain it will have a very serious effect upon any candidate who may present himself here. I cannot see why you should pander to a few Yankees.

"Very truly,
"J. C. RYKERT."

I do not think it is necessary that the canal should be opened on the Sabbath, because we have a return showing the number of vessels that have passed through on the various Sabbaths during the past season, and from that return I find that the number of vessels passing through lock 7, Port Dalhousie, eastward, was as follows:—16th September, 6 vessels; 23rd September, 8; 7th October, 3; 14th October, 6; 4th November, 4; 18th November, 1; 25th November, 1. Passing lock 7 and Port Dalhousie, westward, from 17th June, as follows: 1st July, 1 vessel; 8th July, 1; 5th August, 7; 19th August, 1; 26th August, 3; 9th Septem-

ber, 2; 16th September, 1; 28th October, 1; 4th November, 1; 18th November, 11; 2nd December, 2. I think the Government should attentively consider the fact that the people in that section of the country are very desirous that Sunday traffic should be stopped, and the Government should give the House to understand what their policy will be with respect to the opening of the canal on Sunday during the coming season.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Something, I think, has been omitted from the telegrams which my hon. friend read. The passage to which I refer was that unless the fourth commandment were better observed by the Government, it would go hard with a Tory candidate for Lincoln.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. member for North Brant Mr. (Somerville) has taken considerable pains to show thi House that I have been on both sides of this question. I do not doubt that he took his cue from the *Globe*, which a very few days ago very unfairly published a portion of one of my letters. The hon. gentleman says I was in favor of the canal being opened on Sunday on one occasion, and that I was afterwards entirely opposed to it. If the hon. gentleman will look at the correspondence, he will find that I asked permission for the *Ocean* steamer to go through one lock, the Cornwall Canal, in the event of the boat reaching the entrance of the canal at 12 o'clock Saturday night, this being for the convenience of the passengers. Only half of my letters was published by the *Globe*. That paper published the following :—

4th June, 1888.

"My Dear Bradley,—Why cannot you give the permit asked for in the case of the *Ocean* going through the canal on Sunday."

And there it stopped.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I read the whole of it.

Mr. RYKERT. But you said I was on both sides of the question. If you had laid proper emphasis on the latter portion it would not have so appeared. I simply asked permission for the *Ocean* to go through one lock, for the convenience of the passengers, in order that they might have the opportunity to go to church on the Sunday. I wrote as the hon. gentleman has read, but the *Globe*, which desires to injure me before the public, left out the latter part, which, however, the hon. gentleman has read, namely :

"They only ask to be allowed to go through one lock, for the convenience of the passengers."

I have been on one side of this question only. I am entirely opposed to opening the canal on Sunday. I was not urged to do it by any person, and I did it of my own motion. I have urged that strongly, not only upon the First Minister, but upon the late Mr. Pope, but so far I am sorry to say that I have failed. I entirely agree with what the member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) has said with regard to opening the canals on Sunday. There is nothing to be gained by it at all, and I do not withdraw one iota from my telegram that it was done to pander to a few Yankees. I am satisfied the whole thing was done to gratify the owners of a certain line of steamers running to Ogdensburg, and for no other purpose, and I still think the Government acted wrong in so doing. Public opinion in our section of the country is strong against it. The lock tenders do not desire it, and very few vessels pass through on Sunday. Sometimes there are only three or four, and to accommodate those few vessels about 150 men are employed on Sunday at an expense to the country of 20 cents an hour for each employé. I think you will find that not over twenty-five vessels all told took advantage of the opening of the Welland Canal on Sunday. I hope the First Minister will see the propriety of having this order cancelled so as not to give offence to a large portion of the people of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a question of a good deal of difficulty because there are opposing interests. While those who regard the strict observance of the Sabbath are pressing that the canals should be closed positively at 12 on Saturday night until after 12 o'clock on Sunday night; on the other hand we have the commercial interests who think otherwise. The shipping interests are petitioning against the closing of the canals on Sunday; the Board of Trade of Montreal has sent in a strong representation against it and the late Minister of Railway and Canals, in order as much as possible to prevent the desecration of the Sabbath and at the same time without interfering materially with the trade, adopted the system which existed last season and unless altered will exist in the coming season. That system is that the canal should be closed from 8 o'clock on Sunday morning until 9 on Sunday at night. Under this system the employés on the canal would not be prevented from attending to their duties or from going to church, as the churches hold service after 8 in the morning and they close at 9 at night. Therefore in reality during the whole of Sunday as against the night of Sunday the canal is closed. The employés have the whole day to themselves and it is a very serious thing to close the canal as has been represented by those who know most about it. If the canals are closed there is very considerable delay and there is a charge for demurrage on vessels in consequence. On the other hand it has to be considered that the Erie Canal is opened on Sunday and with the keen competition between the two routes it is a serious matter to close our canals. The employés of course are in favor of the closing because they are paid by the year and they would rather be able to get to bed by 12 on Saturday night and not be obliged to get up too early on Sunday morning. Those who are strong sabbatarians are also in favor of the closing, but it is a matter of commercial expediency altogether. The hours for worship on Sunday being reserved and preserved not only to the employés of the canals but to the crews and passengers on the different vessels the argument is used very strongly, that unless to those who conscientiously believe that it is a sin to do anything from 12 o'clock on Saturday night until Monday morning, the employés get full rest and full opportunity to attend worship. Petitions on both sides have been received by the Government; the question is engaging their attention, and a solution must be come to after weighing the arguments *pro* and *con*. The petitions of the shipping interests are very strong and very urgent that the rules which were adopted last season should be adhered to.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The First Minister will observe that the Erie Canal does not enter into competition with the Welland Canal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, does it not?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The same class of vessels do not carry freight through the Welland Canal as through the Erie Canal.

Mr. BOYLE. This question has caused a good deal of excitement among the people along the line of the Welland Canal, and the different members for that district have been interviewed time and again on this matter. They are all supporters of the Administration, and in some respect have the onus cast upon them of supporting the Government in regard to the opening of the canals on Sunday. I have listened attentively to the explanation of the Premier, but I regret exceedingly that I cannot agree with him as to the necessity of opening the canal on Sunday. He told us that the men could leave work at 8 in the morning and come on again at 9 at night, so as to give them time to attend divine service, but I would ask, what condition men would be in who have worked all night and left off work at 8 in the morning, to attend their religious duties? I say it is a case in which commercial interests should not weigh, and that nothing but danger to life and property would entitle

the Government to open the canals on Sunday. I hope this question will be taken under the serious consideration of the Government.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I occasionally get on the same side of the question as my friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) and my friend from Welland (Mr. Boyle), and I think that the grounds they have taken on this occasion are well worthy the consideration of the Government. I can well understand the pressure that is brought to bear on the Minister to have the canals opened on Sunday. The competition in business is always keen and active and we know very well that there is a business class both in Canada and the United States, who do not pay much regard to Sunday observance, provided that thereby they can add a little to their financial gains. I think that it is to be regretted that the Government should make any more concessions to that class when we take into account the length of time that our canals have been exempt from Sunday service, and that the employés, as my hon. friend from Welland says, who have to be at work at night cannot properly attend to their religious duties on Sunday. I think there is another reason why it is desirable that the Government should not concede what these parties ask for. While it may be pleaded by certain parties that the Erie Canal is open for Sunday traffic, I would remind the House that on the American side there has recently been a very strong and decided movement for reducing Sunday labor as far as possible. While there is a large minority of the community who are quite willing to encroach on the hours of the Sabbath rest if they can make a little more money by doing so, there is a very active movement for reducing Sunday labor on railways, the canals and in other ways; and I think it would weaken the hands of the people who are moving in that direction if it were possible to point to the fact that while they were exerting themselves to reduce Sunday labor, Canada was opening the doors for increasing it. Only yesterday I saw in the public journals that the managers of the Vanderbilt system of railways were making preparations to still further reduce their Sunday traffic; and I notice that the traffic managers of both the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific have recently stated to parties who interested themselves in the Sabbath question, that they were endeavoring to stop Sunday traffic on their respective lines of railway. I think under these circumstances it would be regretted if the Minister of Railways should yield to the pressure being brought to bear upon him for the purpose of securing more Sunday traffic through our canals. After the experience we have had of suspending Sunday traffic on the canals, and in view of the fact that the gentlemen who represent constituencies through which the Welland Canal passes so strongly express themselves in favor of the continued prevention of Sunday traffic, we ought to respect the sentiment of the community in that section and as far as possible avoid wounding their sense of justice and right in this matter, to say nothing about the advantage and comfort of the employés on the canal who are necessarily more or less deprived of their Sunday rest.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps the best plan would be for me to bring down the papers on both sides, and I will lay them on the Table.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the First Minister whether any representations have been made to the Government in regard to the rebate system in force in connection with the tolls on the Welland Canal? I understand that vessels passing eastward through the canal and going *vid* Montreal are entitled to a rebate, whilst vessels that do not continue their journey for a certain distance do not get that rebate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; that has been in force for some years, and there have been no representations and no communications with the Government on the subject that I am aware of.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is true, I believe; but the matter has been used to a considerable extent against us on the other side of the line. Complaints have been made both in Congress and in the United States press that this rebate practically operates as an unreasonable discrimination against their vessels. Of course, there is no doubt that legally and theoretically we have a right to do as we please with our own property; but still the hon. gentleman is aware that there is some sort of show for the allegation made that we do in practice charge a toll which discriminates to a large extent against American ports.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. While the Fishery Treaty was up in Congress, that was one of the various complaints made against Canada. I think when the time comes it can be easily shown that there is no discrimination, but that American and Canadian shipping are treated exactly alike. American vessels go to Montreal as well as Canadian vessels. I speak merely from memory, as I did not think the question was coming up to-night, when I say that within a certain period, rebates amounting to something like $8,000 were paid to American vessels in the same way as to Canadian vessels.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that in a technical sense there is no discrimination; but if I am not misinformed, if two vessels come through the Welland Canal, one bound for Oswego and the other for Montreal, the practical effect is that the one which goes to Montreal pays no toll for passing through the Welland Canal, while the vessel that goes to Oswego pays the full toll.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is so, but the vessel passing through the Welland Canal and going to Kingston pays the same toll as the vessel going to Oswego.

Mr. MULOCK. But there is not much of that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes, there is a considerable shipping trade at Kingston. They stand on precisely the same footing. I do not think it is profitable to discuss this question now; it is one that can better be settled hereafter, if there should be any negotiations between the United States and Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). While it may not be profitable to discuss the question from the hon. gentleman's point of view, I think it is pretty clear to the common sense of everybody that if a toll is charged with the view of compensation for the use of the canal, a vessel going to Montreal ought to pay just as much as a vessel going to Kingston. There should be no difference in that respect; and if the Americans wish to use the canal for the purpose of going to Oswego and we wish to use it for the purpose of going to Montreal, and we allow our vessels to go through at a smaller toll, it is perfectly clear that we are discriminating against them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Suppose no vessels stopped at Kingston, but suppose all Canadian vessels went to Montreal and all American vessels went to Oswego, could the hon. gentleman apply the rule that he now lays down?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will not discuss a hypothetical case. I would simply say that the tolls were taken off the Erie Canal for the avowed purpose of taking the whole trade from our canals. Are we to sit still and not try to retain some of the commerce on our own inland waters?

River St. Lawrence, Improvement of Ship Channel between Quebec and Montreal..... $100,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is in accordance with the statement made last Session, when the Government

assumed the work of deepening the channel between the harbor of Montreal and the harbor of Quebec. It was then stated that most likely $200,000 would be required to complete that work. The works to be completed are these: At Grondines village, beginning by the lower part of the channel opposite that place, we have to straighten the channel there and remove shaly rock and the estimate of the cost is $22,500; removing boulders $7,500; opposite the village of Batiscan, the boulders will cost $5,900; widening and hard pan and boulders, $17,100; Cape St. Michel, widening, clay and gravel, $19,500; widening, clay boulders, $21,000; Longueuil, widening and hard pan and boulders, $12,000. We have to add for deepening in certain places, to get the 27½ feet depth, $39,000; for cleaning places already dredged to give 27½ feet depth, with 10 feet 9 inches on flats. $9,000. We are asking this year $100,000 to go on with these works, and I suppose another $100,000 will next year complete the works from the lower portion of the channel above the harbor of Quebec to the east end of the harbor of Montreal on the River St. Lawrence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When that is done, what will our position be? We have assumed the debt, and I presume we will be responsible for keeping that channel in order. We do not receive any revenue from it whatever. In addition to the loss of interest, what sum will be required to keep the channel at its present depth, or does the hon. gentleman contemplate deepening it still further?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government do not contemplate going down lower than 27½ feet. That is what was asked by the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal, when they undertook this work with the consent of the Government and Parliament. After this is done, the straightening of the channel, the deepening at certain places where a sort of mound may have been left at the bottom of the channel, and the angles cut in such a way so that a ship may not have to slacken speed in going through the channel, as she has to do now at times, in order to get round an angle, the navigation will be as good as it was intended to be. It will take these two seasons and perhaps a third one, to complete this work. Then the only thing that would be left to keep the channel in good order would be probably to have a dredge, and a tug to bring her down every spring, and probably during the season of navigation, and to see whether there are not boulders that have been carried down by the ice in the spring and deposited in the channel. Perhaps there might be some silt in one or two places. As far as I can recollect, I think that, opposite the St. Maurice and perhaps a little below, there may be some silt deposited, and that may probably have to be dredged in the spring. There cannot be much, but still, if we want to keep the channel open to a depth of 27½ feet, that would have to be done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Roughly, how much do you put the total cost at?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot tell that now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Could the Minister state from recollection how many miles of this channel we require to deepen? I think a large part is natural navigation and is perfectly good.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It will be only a few miles which they will have to dredge, perhaps only three or four miles together, but we have, nevertheless, to take care that the channel shall not be interrupted by unforeseen circumstances, by boulders, for instance, as I have mentioned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it 300 feet wide, or 300 yards?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. 300 feet.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) I desire to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works to the petition of the electors of the parish of St. Jean des Chaillons, asking for the dredging of the river margins at this point. Since the dredging was done at Cap à la Roche, it is remarked that the water falls on the beach and that at certain times of the year boats cannot come alongside it. I would wish to know whether the Government intend to do anything to make good the injury done at this place?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I must say, in answer to my hon. friend, that I have given my attention to the petition which was presented by the hon. member, I think, or at any rate sent in to the department, respecting the shore at St. Jean des Chaillons. I have referred the matter to my engineer; and I think that without sending dredges expressly to do this work, means will be found, when the dredges employed in dredging the St. Lawrence in the neighborhood are not otherwise employed to utilise them in doing the work which the hon. member has just indicated. I cannot make a positive statement at the present moment, because I do not know now the power of these dredges, but I shall not lose sight of the matter.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) I wish to say to the hon. Minister that if he intends to do anything this year in the way of dredging the river margins at the place I have mentioned, it is absolutely necessary that it should be done in the high waters of the spring time, because, the moment that the water begins to lower, be it ever so little, there is no means of bringing the dredges alongside the shore, and, in consequence, the work will be kept back. I will also remark to the hon. Minister, that if the dredging is not done there are a number of brickyards which will be compelled to stop working completely, because the boats will be unable to come alongshore to take in their cargoes. If there was any means of doing the dredging at once it would be of great advantage.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I take a note of what the hon. member has just stated, with respect to the time at which it is necessary to do this work. I am not astonished when he speaks of the lowering of the water at this point, because the lowering of the water's level is felt everywhere on the St. Lawrence,—in the small harbors and on the shores; but it is imperative that this place should suffer, as others do, the inconvenience of having less water, in the interest of navigation at large.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). That corroborates what I stated to some gentlemen when the 25 feet channel was tested in 1884. I was on the *Peruvian* with some gentlemen from Montreal, and they said it was intended to deepen the channel to 27½ feet at Cap à la Roche. I said at that time, if you do you will make the channel shallower than it has previously been up to Montreal, and I see that the result which I foresaw has taken place. The water was very high last summer. In fact it was raining nearly the whole summer, but, notwithstanding that, the people on the shores are suffering from the lowness of the water, not only at St. Jean des Chaillons of which my hon. friend from Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) was speaking, but in several other places. Surely the water could not be so low unless the channel had been affected to some extent, and I am afraid that there must be a large expenditure of money if that work at Cap à la Roche is to go on. I stated on the occasion to which I referred, that if the natural dam at Cap à la Roche was removed the water would flow down, and the rest of the river would be lower than it was before. I am afraid that, if the excavations are proceeded with, and the channel is made 27½ feet deep at Cap à la Roche at low tide, the whole channel from there to Montreal will have to be deepened again. Of course, when the water is high, there

is no trouble at any place, but at low water there will be a necessity to deepen the channel in many places. Where it is intended to have 27½ feet, it will come down to 25 feet probably, and I think the work that is being proceeded with at Cap à la Roche will have a very different result from what we have in view.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I think that the hon. member is in error in considering the place to be a dam which holds up the water and prevents it from descending rapidly, for it cannot be considered as being such a dam. This obstacle need not be considered at the present moment, for even now vessels can pass in another channel. But in order to make the channel straighter and to facilitate navigation, the Harbor Commissioners have taken care to keep dredging at this place for many years past, and if the hon. member has remarked the material of which this obstacle is composed he must have seen that it is not rock but what is called shale; it is a kind of tufa, very hard and which appears to be rock, but which yields to the efforts of the dredge.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation). That is going to lessen the depth of water in the channel.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) No; I think, on the contrary, that the result will be such as the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) stated just now: that the water along the banks will be lower than before the dredging of the channel, but as to the channel itself I do not think that there will be any danger of seeing the depth lessened by the dredging which we are going to carry out at Cap à la Roche and at Cape Charles. I think that when the channel will be thus dredged, it will be possible to have 27½ feet of water, as was calculated upon and desired by the Harbor Commissioners when they undertook this work.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) has called the attention of the Government in this and previous Sessions to the fact that the harbor of Lunenburg absolutely requires works of the same character as those which are now under discussion; and, so far as I am aware, my hon. friend has not been able to get a satisfactory answer from the Government. I think no reasons can be assigned why a different treatment should be granted to the harbor of Montreal than to the harbor of Lunenburg. These works in the channel of the St. Lawrence are primarily for the benefit of the harbor of Montreal, they are for the purpose of enabling ocean steamers of the largest capacity to reach Montreal. If the principle is admitted, can there be any reason why the reasonable demand which my. hon. friend has made over and over again, and substantiated, I believe, by the local authorities, should not also meet with some degree of favor from the Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the friendship of the leader of the Opposition for the member for Lunenburg leads him to forget that the two works are not the same at all. The deepening of the channel of the St. Lawrence was effected, not alone for the harbor of Montreal, but for the benefit of the trade of the whole country. Parliament has treated that channel like the Lachine Canal, or the Welland Canal, or the canals of the St. Lawrence. That channel was deepened in order to accommodate the trade of the Dominion west of Montreal, in order that the imports and exports from the west should reach ocean navigation as soon as possible. I have no doubt that if that work had been proposed simply for the benefit of Montreal, the country would not have undertaken it; but it was primarily for the great Province of Ontario, and the large population west of Montreal. Therefore, the hon. leader of the Opposition is not justified in placing the harbor of Lunenburg on a par with the harbor of Montreal in point of importance. The harbor of Lunenburg may be an important local harbor, and I have no doubt that the hon. member for Lunenburg, if he will exercise a little patience, will find that that harbor will be treated as other places are. We cannot make all the improvements at the same time. I have been besieged all day by a number of my own personal friends who complained that I gave them nothing; and then gentlemen from the other side of the House have come and told me the same thing. I must say that they made me sorry all day, but I hope that they will give me a chance of rejoicing with them another year.

Mr. LAURIER. All I can say is, that if the hon. gentleman has been besieged by his friends for more favors, it is because he has justified the French maxim that *l'appetit vient en mangeant*. He has given them so much that they want more. If he would give just a little to my hon. friend from Lunenburg of what he gives so lavishly to his friends behind him, I am sure my hon. friend will be satisfied. I take issue with the hon. Minister in his remarks concerning the harbor of Montreal. It is a very good harbor in itself, provided the hand of man comes to the rescue, but the trade of the country would be served far better by the harbor of Quebec. The ocean trade has its natural terminus at Quebec, but we have endeavored to bring it up to Montreal. I do not complain of that, but, after all, I submit it simply justifies what I have said, that the same principle might apply to one harbor as to the other. The harbor of Lunenburg is not as important as that of Montreal, but in its way it is very important, because it is the point where the deep sea fisheries are the largest, and that reason alone ought to procure it some consideration. The Minister of Public Works says that the hon. member for Lunenburg ought to have patience. My hon. friend has exhibited patience for years, and if he had the assurance to-night from the Minister that next year his request would be complied with, then he would have nothing more to say.

Halifax Immigrant building..... $5,000

Mr. EISENHAUER. This is the only item for Nova Scotia. Now, a few weeks ago when we were discussing the general Estimates, I asked the Minister on what principle the Government erected public buildings in different parts of the country, whether it was according to population or revenue, or for political reasons. The hon. gentleman said: Oh, no, they always got the best information they could as to where the buildings were most needed. Their action shows that they do not follow that principle. The Government came to the conclusion, in 1886, that it was necessary to erect a public building at Lunenburg, at all events they went so far as to secure a site. I would like to know what information the Government has obtained since, and why they have not gone on with the work? I think it is evident that it must be for political reasons that they have changed their opinion. Now, in the town of Lunenburg there is a post office about twelve feet square, and the public, both men and women, have to remain outside until the mails are assorted. I have seen large numbers of people crowding about it in stormy nights. I think the Government must know the importance of that place. I suppose it is no use to bring the matter up now, as I have brought it up so many times before and could get no satisfaction, as to when the Government intend to erect a public building at Lunenburg.

Mr. ELLIS. Will the hon. Minister tell us what this item is for?

Mr. CARLING. This is for the erection of an immigrant building in the city of Halifax, where we have no building to accommodate them when they arrive in the winter season. Last year 18,000 immigrants arrived at Halifax during the winter, and this amount is to erect a building sufficiently convenient to accommodate immigrants on their arrival, and make them comfortable until they are ready to take the train west.

Mr. KIRK. Does the Minister say that all the immigrants arriving at Halifax came in the winter? I understood that only 18,000 came to that port altogether.

Mr. CARLING. The larger portion came during the winter months, and the Allan steamers were coming to Halifax instead of Quebec.

Mr. KIRK. Might not the Government, instead of erecting a new building for immigration purposes, convert the elevator, which has been constructed there at a very large cost, into an immigration building instead of keeping it there unused. Surely something can be done with this building. Perhaps the object in taking this vote is that part of the elevator should be converted into an immigration shed. I understand that if something is not done shortly it will tumble into the water. It is erected on a wharf, and the worms are eating the wharf away, and in 5 or 6 years this building, which cost a quarter of a million of dollars, will be in the harbor. Would it not be better to expend this money in utilising part of that building for an immigration shed, instead of putting up a new building?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Would the Minister explain where he proposes to expend this money?

Mr. CARLING. I have not had the pleasure of visiting Halifax, but it is intended to erect a building near the freight sheds of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the expenditure is a proper one, so far as the wants of the immigrants are concerned, at all events to some extent, although I do not think they suffer much; but the additional accommodation will be of very great advantage. The building will require to be near the sheds because the trains run into the sheds on the wharf, and the immigrants land there and have their baggage examined and their tickets checked. It will be necessary to have the sheds as near the wharf as possible. It has been suggested that the elevator should be utilised. I suppose it would cost more to utilise that building than to put up a building for immigration purposes. The elevator is not valuable to the shipping, but it is very valuable to Mr. Alvin Grant, who has charge of it, and who receives $1,600 a year for looking after it, and I am sorry to say no business is done at the elevator. The expenditure seems rather to have been wasted, but still the elevator is there, and it would cost more to utilise it than to put up a new building for immigration purposes.

Mr. KIRK. Is this Mr. Alvin Grant, who receives $1,600 a year from the Government, the same Alvin Grant who is employed by the Government to carry around boodle during election times?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The same man.

Mr. KIRK. Is this $5,000 intended to complete the building?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Mr. Alvin Grant is a very valuable servant to the Tory party—politically. He is always on hand to distribute the money at very critical times, and there is a controversy going on in the public press there now with respect to the amount of money distributed by Mr. Grant during the last election. It was known that he landed at Digby and left enough money there to defeat my friend, Mr. Vail.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think this discussion is going very far from the item.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). He has charge of the elevator.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. The elevator is not under discussion.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there any Dominion building at Halifax which could be utilised instead of erecting a new building for this purpose?

Mr. CARLING. There is no building belonging to the Government suitable for this purpose convenient to the wharf or the station.

Mr. MULOCK. Will $5,000 purchase a site and erect the building?

Mr. CARLING. It is intended to erect the building on a site belonging to the Government near the station and also near the wharf.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is there room on the Government property?

Mr. CARLING. I sent an officer of the department there to examine the site, and he reported there was sufficient room.

Mr. KIRK. I suppose Mr. Alvin Grant will be in charge of the new building as well as the elevator, and will look after the two buildings.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we should hear from the junior member from Halifax on the subject. I am not aware that Halifax has fully expressed its opinion on this subject.

Public Works, Prince Edward Island $1,400

Mr. WELSH. No doubt this amount is all right. I am also glad to see in these Supplementary Estimates an amount for public works at Selkirk, China Point and China Point Wharf. I hope the work will be offered by public tender on plans drawn out by the Government engineer, and that the work will be done under his inspection, because a large sum is wasted if the work is carried out by day work. I wish the amount was a little larger.

Public Works, Ontario	$123,400
Belleville Drill Shed	10,000

Mr. MULOCK. With reference to those grants for building drill sheds I would ask on what principle are those drill sheds erected, and how it comes that drill sheds are erected in some places and not in others? For example, it is known that it is necessary to have improved drill shed accommodation in Toronto; on what principle are these drill sheds built, are they erected on account of the importunities of the locality?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I find, for example, that $10,000 has been granted by the town of Brantford towards the erection of the drill shed, provided the Federal Government will contribute the same amount. After the Department of Militia has decided that the building is required, the fact that this offer is made by the municipal authorities justifies the Government in asking a similar amount from Parliament.

Mr. MULOCK. Did Belleville contribute anything towards this drill shed?

Mr. BOWELL. The corporation of Belleville gave no money, the drill shed was built by the officers of the battalion and others who subscribed various sums for the purpose. The Government gives them this appropriation to assist in paying off the debt. I may add that these drill sheds are transferred to the Department of Militia when the Government contributes anything towards them; so that they cannot be diverted for any other purpose.

Mr. MULOCK. When was the drill shed at Belleville erected?

Mr. BOWELL. It was built last summer. I observed that one of the newspapers stated that the town had given a lot for that purpose, but I know that it is not the lot upon which the drill shed has been erected.

Mr. MULOCK. What was the total cost of the Belleville drill shed?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know myself, but from information I have received, it was $15,000 or $20,000. Judging from the size of the building and the locality in which it is situated, I do not think it cost any more.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the Minister of Customs think it cost more than $10,000 to erect this drill shed?

Mr. BOWELL. I should think it would when finished. I have already told the hon. gentleman that I thought it would cost about $15,000, but I do not think it will cost any more.

Mr. MULOCK. It may be that the gentlemen who subscribed for the building of the shed will get back every dollar that they expended, and that brings me back to the original question; on what principle are those buildings connected with the militia service erected in different parts of the Dominion? Brantford subscribed $10,000, whereas this vote may cover all the expenses of the drill shed in Belleville.

Mr. BOWELL. Suppose that were true, I can tell the hon. gentleman that Belleville has maintained a volunteer force since 1857, and for part of that time two battalions, and never had a dollar from this Government or any other Government to assist in paying for or providing drill shed or armories. That has always been paid by the officers themselves and other gentlemen, and this drill shed has been built by private subscriptions. This vote is to assist in paying off the indebtedness on the shed which exists at the present time, so that these gentlemen will not get any money back.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Has the city of Belleville contributed anything towards assisting the officers and other parties in constructing that shed?

Mr. BOWELL. Not that I am aware of, except from the statement made in one of the newspapers. I stated in this House when the matter was discussed before, that Belleville had done nothing, and a newspaper corrected me in that statement and said that the town of Belleville had given them a lot. I do not know where that lot is.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I understand that the usual custom is to transfer these properties to the Militia Department as soon as they are completed.

Mr. BOWELL. In many cases, when volunteers have been disbanded after a drill shed has been built, it is sold, and if the municipalities have contributed any portion towards its construction they get a sum in proportion to the amount they have paid in.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I understood the Minister to state that these gentlemen had kept up this drill shed for a number of years. But now it appears that it had been transferred to the department and kept up by it. I think we ought to know whether there is any principle underlying the building of these drill sheds in these cities. It appears that in Brantford one-half the amount has been contributed, and the Government ought also to expect Belleville to contribute one-half the amount for the drill shed there. Is there any reason for treating Belleville in one way and Brantford in another way? Is it because they get a little more support from one locality than from the other? I am inclined to think that it is.

Mr. BOWELL. What I said to the hon. member for North York, was, that the drill shed was only built last summer—and I am informed now by the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby), that it is not yet fully completed—that I thought the expenditure would not exceed $15,000, that it had been built by the subscriptions of officers and others in the city, and that this was an appropriation by the Government to assist in paying the indebtedness on that drill shed. If my hon. friend reflects for a moment, he will come to this conclusion: that men who have given their time and money for years towards the maintenance of the volunteer force, should receive as much consideration from the Government as a municipality which contributes a certain amount from the chest of the town to assist in building a drill shed.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I have no objection that a private individual should be compensated equally with a municipality, but what I say is that Belleville receives $10,000, and the whole shed is only worth $15,000, whereas Brantford is only to receive $10,000 on condition that it contributes another $10,000, and what I argued was that the private individuals in Belleville are benefited to double the proportion that the municipality of Brantford is.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the Minister of Militia can now answer the question I put. I do not wish the Minister of Customs to understand me as objecting to the grant of this money for the drill shed at Belleville, but I am asking whether there is any general principle on which public money is voted for the erection of these buildings throughout the Dominion. Is it a matter of principle or a matter of pressure?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There is an Order in Council which regulates the manner in which the drill sheds are built all over the Dominion. The invariable rule is that whenever the Government contribute a portion of the expenditure, the title of the property must be made over to the Crown. Whether the money has been contributed by individuals as in the case of Belleville, or as in the case of Brantford has been contributed by the municipality, the amount of money contributed by the Government depends altogether on the outlay for the building of the drill shed. The Brantford drill shed is more expensive than the one at Belleville. In no part of the Dominion have the militia force contributed more from their own pockets for the maintenance of the force than the Belleville volunteers have done, and I can say that there is no force whose efficiency has been kept up to a higher standard. The contribution which the Government has made for the Belleville drill shed is in the same proportion as the contributions we have made to other portions of the Dominion.

Mr. MULOCK. What is that?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I cannot say exactly. The contribution the Government made was for the purpose of reimbursing those who had incurred expenses for the building of the drill shed. The property was made over to the Government, as was the Brantford property, and every other drill shed property in the Dominion.

Mr. MULOCK. Then, perhaps, the Minister can tell us what the local gentlemen have contributed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. So far as I can recollect, merely speaking from memory, the drill shed in Belleville cost between $15,000 and $17,000. The property was a valuable property in the central portion of the town; it had been bought at a period when its value was not as great as it is at present, and it was considered to have increased in value, and the proportion contributed by the Government was nothing more than we contributed towards other drill sheds in the Dominion.

Mr. MULOCK. Is this expenditure in this particular case being made in harmony with the provisions of the Order in Council that the Minister of Militia has referred to?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There is a general Order in Council to regulate the expenditure in the building of drill sheds all over the Dominion in ordinary cases. In large centres, such as Montreal and Toronto, where the militia force is larger than in others, that general Order in Council is not followed, nor has it been followed in the cases of

Brantford or Belleville, where the contributions made by the municipality or the individual members of a corps are taken into consideration to form a basis on which the Government contribute.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. the Minister of Public Works read a minute last night stating that Brantford had passed a by-law agreeing to pay $10,000 towards the building of a drill shed, provided the Government provided another $10,000. Are the local authorities of Belleville in precisely the same position?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I consider that, in the case of Belleville, we have been paid our proportion, taking into consideration the value of the property handed over to us by the Belleville volunteers, and I consider we are treating them on a footing of equality with every other place where we have put up drill sheds.

Mr. MULOCK. The property then is worth $20,000.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I did not value it at all.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. the Minister of Customs stated to the Committee that a conveyance of the property had been made to the Government, that the building had been erected by private enterprise, and that this $10,000 was to go towards recouping those gentlemen to the extent of our grant. If Belleville is being treated in the same way as Brantford, and Brantford has been paid $10,000 in cash, then the value of the property in Belleville must be $20,000, since the decision of the Government is based on the equal contribution in each case.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears that this promise with regard to Belleville was made by some person, and an advantage is given to Belleville over some other places. Is it to implement the promise of the Minister of Customs?

Mr. BOWELL. I never promised the people of Belleville a single dollar, directly or indirectly, neither did they know that a dollar would be given until it appeared in the Estimates. It would be much better if we did not indulge in such insinuations, particularly where there is no necessity for it.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite apparent, from the immense vote for the erection of public buildings throughout the country, that there is some purpose not publicly known behind this expenditure. Some influences are being brought on the Government to secure the construction of buildings where they are not wanted. Post offices are erected in places like Joliette, where the whole receipts are something under $2,000 a year; while in other places, where the receipts are over $4,000 a year, no post offices at all are erected.

Mr. BARRON. I can see no objection to a subsidy being given when a contribution is made by a municipality, but I think it is most dangerous for the Government to let it be known that private individuals, officers of different regiments, should they subscribe money to build a drill shed, will be repaid by this Government a portion of the same. We may find people taking advantage of this, and it ought not to be assented to. The voting of money to recoup private individuals ought not to be encouraged.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. the Minister of Militia stated some time ago that he was going to buy a house in Kingston for some military purpose. I do not notice any vote taken for that. Where or for what was that money to be expended?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The property was purchased as a residence for the commandant of the Royal Military College of Kingston, and the amount paid was $12,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, I know, but what I want to know is what vote in the Estimates covers that expenditure? Has the money been paid?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The amount has not been paid yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. From what vote are you going to pay it?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I suppose it will have to be brought down in the Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then it is not in the Estimates.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It will have to be paid. I will bring down the information to-morrow from the records of the department to give the answer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the money been paid?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am under the impression that it has not been paid yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have not the slightest desire that it should be paid. I only want to know from what vote are you going to pay it?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will bring down the information to-morrow.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Why was it considered necessary to buy this residence? I understand that all the commandants of the Military College before the present one paid their own rental or bought their houses.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. As the hon. gentleman knows the commandant was allowed $800 a year for the purpose of finding quarters, and it was almost impossible to find lodgings for the commandant at that time. We thought that it would be in the interest of economy to buy this property at the price we paid for it, as we would save the money allowed to the commandant for the purpose of obtaining quarters.

Guelph Post Office—Improvements—to complete... $3,000

Mr. INNES. What is the nature of the improvements the hon. gentleman proposes to make there? About three months ago the heating apparatus was put in there. Is this vote for that purpose, or does the hon. gentleman contemplate any other improvements in the interior of the building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are a number of small works to be performed in that building.

Mr. INNES. What was the amount of the contract for the heating apparatus?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is not connected with this vote.

Mr. INNES. A vote was taken last year for that purpose, but I want to know if a portion of this is required to pay that, or if the vote of last year completed it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No portion of this vote will be required for that.

Mr. INNES. Are these miscellaneous improvements which you propose to make?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are amounts for attics, spoiled pipes, painting, re-painting outside wall, inside painting, cleaning, superintendence, and so on, and deducting a balance left over of $208, it leaves $2,000 to provide for.

London Military Buildings $10,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What are these buildings? Is this for the Military College?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This amount is to be applied to complete the Infantry School building, the drill shed, officers' quarters and so on.

Mr. MULOCK. Is the drill shed for general use or for the school alone?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is for the school alone.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the city of London contribute anything towards this?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No, the city of London has nothing to do with it. It is for the Infantry School.

Mr. MULOCK. Will it be used for general purposes?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Orillia Public Buildings (the town contributing the Wheeler lot free of cost)..... $4,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not object to Orillia getting a post office, but I desire to ask the Government on what principle they are proceeding in erecting post offices. I find that in Woodstock, where they derive a revenue of $13,000, there is no post office building. You have already passed votes for post offices in small places, and I want to know upon what principle that is done?

Mr. MITCHELL. How can you expect a post office in Woodstock, when the representative votes against the Government?

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to find out what the principle is upon which these buildings are erected.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is the principle.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have already voted for the erection of a post office at St. Henri, the revenue from which is $1,200. There is already a post office in Joliette, from which the revenue is $1,900, and there are from 35 to 40 places in Ontario where the receipts are over $4,000 a year but where they have no post offices. How is it that you erect a post office in Joliette where the rental was only from $60 to $80 a year, and the revenue was only $1,900, and a post office in St. Henri, where the receipts are $1,200 and the rent only $60 a year, while in Woodstock, from which the receipts are $13,000, there is no post office? I want to know on what principle the erection of these post offices is proceeded upon. It is full time that some rule should be laid down. If post offices are to be erected in county towns, I have no particular objection to that, if it is honestly carried out, but I object to peddling round patronage in insignificant places, where the receipts are practically nothing, and neglecting important places like Woodstock where the receipts are five or six times as much, and I want to know on what principle the Government profess to defend such a course.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the revenue from this place?

Mr. HAGGART. $7,652.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) can find fault with this item. In 1887 the post office there yielded a revenue of $6,860, now it is $7,600, and there is a population of about 5,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. What are the reasons that you do not build a post office in Woodstock?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Because the Government has not thought that they should ask a grant of money for that place this year. We cannot build everything in the same year. Orillia has been mentioned for three or four years, and the attention of the Government has been specially called to it. Finally we found that the place deserved a post office, and although it is not in a constituency represented by a supporter of the Government, we did not think that was a reason why the people should be deprived of the building. I suppose that if the hon. gentleman continues to press the claims of Woodstock upon the attention of the Government, we may finally become convinced that it requires a new building.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a pity that the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) is not here. I think he could throw some light upon the subject. If his version of the case be correct, the "Jamaica" car tarried there once, and there was a strong appeal made the inhabitants of Orillia to turn out my hon. friend, which I am happy to say, was not successful. But one of the arguments used, as the hon. gentleman stated in the House, was that in the fulness of time they should have a post office, and that time has now arrived. That appears to be the explanation, rather than any fixed rule or system in regard to population or revenue, at least that was the explanation given by the hon. member who represents that county.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have to apologise to the Minister of Public Works for making the remark I did to the hon. member who has taken objections to this motion. I presumed the Government only gave post offices and things of that kind to constituencies who returned members who support them, but I find to my surprise that Orillia is in the constituency represented by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) who does not very often vote in favor of the Administration. For the constituency that I represent there is not a single item, although I made a strong personal appeal the other night to the Government, and I thought that the Minister of Public Works, who is generally so fair in everything that he does—I cannot apply that remark to all the other members of the Administration ——

An hon. MEMRER. Name.

Mr. MITCHELL. Why, all the rest of them.

An hon. MEMBER. The Minister of Marine?

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, I don't care a pin about him. He is only a boy; he don't amount to anything anyway. What I mean to say is this: that inasmuch as they have given this post office to a constituency represented by an opponent, I do not think they should have excluded the County of Northumberland, when I asked for a trivial matter of the addition of a small vote to improve a wharf. In the case of Orillia the Government have violated the rule, or at least the practice, which they have followed, and I think we ought to have some explanation why we have departed from the practice of giving favors only to constituencies represented by supporters and thus practically purchasing them.

Peterborough Custom House..... $10,000

Mr. LANDERKIN. There ought to be some explanation given of this item. If I am rightly informed this vote has a history. I would like to know upon which lot this custom house is to be built.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The other lot.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They bought two lots for a custom house and a post office. They bought one lot originally for the custom house and post office; they do not put the post office on that lot, and they do not put up the custom house at all. Now they are going to put up a custom house, and where is it going to be built?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The post office has been built on a lot on Hunter street, a street that leads to the village of Ashburnham. We thought that the post office would be better there, because it would serve both the town and the village. The other lot, as the hon. gentleman calls it, is near the city hall, or the market place. That lot is destined for a custom house and an inland revenue office. We think it is a proper place, being in the business part of the town, upon which the custom house and inland revenue office, and any other minor offices we may have in Peterborough, may be located.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Which one was purchased first?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it is this lot.

Mr. BARRON. I wish the hon. gentleman would have the same difficulty in satisfying his friends about this transaction as he had in satisfying the gentlemen who came from the town of Peterborough insisting upon their particular lots being purchased. The hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) above all others, should condemn this transaction. The House should know that as soon as it was known that the Government were going to build a post office in the town of Peterborough syndicates were formed composed entirely of supporters of the Government. Each syndicate determined that the Government should buy their respective lots and not buy the lots of their opponents. The members of the syndicate or their friends insisted that their respective lots should be purchased. The Government found such difficulty in satisfying their friends that they bought both lots, and now they make the excuse that it was necessary to have both a post office and a custom house. The House well knows that there is not in Ontario a town the size of Peterborough where the post office and custom house are not combined in one building. In Lindsay, a town not quite as large but rapidly growing, and it will exceed Peterborough in a very short time, the post office and custom house are in one building. The same is the case at Port Hope. I now ask the member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson), whether this is not the case?

Mr. STEVENSON. I tell you it is not so.

Mr. BARRON. I challenge the hon. gentleman to deny the fact that there were syndicates formed. Does not the hon. gentleman know that?

Mr. STEVENSON. It is not true.

Mr. BARRON. Also that these syndicates owned two lots, and that each insisted on the Government buying their lot, and that the Government found themselves in such a difficulty that they had to buy both lots, and have now been obliged to go to the expense of putting up an enormous custom house, towards which a vote is asked of $10,000, as well as a post office. The member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) knows what I say is true.

Mr. STEVENSON. It is all humbug.

Mr. BARRON. Be candid, and you will say, speaking from the heart, that every word is true. The hon. gentleman knows the members of the syndicates as well as I do, and he knows that in order to get over the difficulty with respect to rival claims, the Government bought both lots and are putting up two large and extravagant buildings when one lot and one building would suffice; and all this is done for the purpose of satisfying their own supporters. The Government had not the courage to say to one of the syndicates that they would not buy their lot, but they purchased both lots and have now entered upon an enormous expenditure to put up two buildings. I ask the hon. member for West Peterborough to rise and say if what I state is not correct, that two syndicates were formed and two lots bought owing to the demands of the syndicate.

Mr. STEVENSON. The hon. gentleman expects this House to take everything he has said for granted, as he did the other night in regard to the timber question. There is not the shadow of truth in a great deal of what he has said. There never was a syndicate formed to my knowledge, and I know there never was. Four persons, two years before there ever was talk of a post office, bought the lot from the late Robert Nichols, and with that lot I have nothing to do, and I never was a party to the transaction and never had any interest in it.

Mr. BARRON. I never said you had.

Mr. STEVENSON. You said I was a party to it or had an interest in it. The other lot was sold by individuals; I never owned any part of it. I say more, that the Government bought the property at a very low price. Where they bought there was not room for a custom house, but it was convenient for a post office to supply two places, the town and a village with over 2,000 inhabitants. The sum of $60 per foot was paid for it, and to-day it is worth $120 or $140 a foot, or more than double. It is true we did not get a very good post office but only a cheap one, because we were to have a custom house as well. We are not getting as much spent on it in Peterborough as was spent in Lindsay, although that town is only half the size of Peterborough—it is not half the size, what is more it is not likely to become more. I distinctly contradict the statement that there have been syndicates formed to sell to the Government one inch of the land in Peterborough, nor have there been syndicates formed, and I am well aware of the facts with respect to the whole transaction. But more than four years ago the land was bought by four individuals, whose names I could mention, some of whom were supporters of the Government and some were not. They bought it to make money out of it. I think they sold the whole of it; they sold part to the Government and part to other parties. They sold part to the Government at $100 a foot, and they received from Mr. Cox $125 a foot immediately afterwards. The revenue paid by the post office of the port of Peterborough amounts to $15,000 a year and that at the custom house to $36,000 a year, and the hon. gentleman knows that Lindsay does not compare with it. The less the hon. gentleman says about this matter the better, for we could tell something about him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Tell it.

Mr. STEVENSON. I do not want to be personal, but I could tell some things. There was not a word of truth in his statement in so far as the syndicates are concerned. This much of it is utterly untrue, and I am sorry the hon. gentleman ever mentioned it. Private parties bought the post office ground and sold it, and they sold it for less than they could obtain for the adjoining property. The other lot was sold for $60 a foot and to-day it is worth at least $120 a foot and it could not be bought at that figure. I am quite satisfied that it was long ago understood that we should have both a custom house and a post office, and the Government chose to erect two buildings instead of one.

Mr. BARRON. Out of the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh, and I knew that my case would be proved very much by the hon. gentleman himself. He said that one lot was owned by four individuals, one of whom was Mr. Grasett.

Mr. STEVENSON. It was bought three years before.

Mr. BARRON. It was known that the Government contemplated building a post office. Then the hon. gentleman knows that there were four gentlemen who contemplated selling the lot to this Government.

Mr. STEVENSON. They never had the least notion of it.

Mr. BARRON. However, they bought it, and the hon. gentleman says for speculative purposes. I desire not to be understood as asserting that the hon. gentleman had any interest in selling these lots to the Government. I know very well that the hon. gentleman who could afford to give at Christmas, just before the election, 400 cords of wood to the people would have no necessity to go into such a speculation. But the hon. gentleman has said the other lot was owned also by a gentleman who wanted to sell it to the Government. I think he has made out my case. Each of those wanted to sell their lot to the Government, and between them they got wrangling over the matter, and the hon. gentleman himself now has admitted out of the fulness

of his heart pretty much what I have said. I ask him if upon that lot for the post office there is not plenty of room for a custom house?

Mr. STEVENSON. No.

Mr. BARRON. I am bound to take the hon. gentleman's word, but I have seen the post office and the business is not sufficient to occupy the whole building.

Mr. STEVENSON. Well, it is all occupied.

Mr. BARRON. The Minister of Public Works may be sincere in making this excuse, but he has been misinformed. The post office is not so near Ashburnham as to make it a reason why it is to be put on that lot. The Minister of Public Works said it was necessary to put the custom house near the market; why, Sir, where the custom house is, is not a stone's throw from the market.

Mr. BOWELL. Oh.

Mr. BARRON. The Minister of Customs says "Oh." Has he been there?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; last winter.

Mr. BARRON. Then the Minister could not know as the custom house was not built. It is perfectly outrageous to think that the Government is wasting the money of the country in this way to please two rival claimants, the one a syndicate composed of one gentleman as the member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) said, and the other composed of four. The hon. gentleman cannot get up in his seat and say (without drawing a long bow at all events, if I may use that expression) that there was not great excitement in the town of Peterborough as to which of the two parties was to sell their lot to the Government, and the pressure was so strong upon the Government that they had to buy both lots to satisfy their supporters. I know whereof I speak, and the hon. gentleman has proved my case, to a certain extent, when he said that one of the syndicates was composed of four men, one of whom was Mr. Poussette.

Mr. STEVENSON. Your own brother-in-law.

Mr. BARRON. Yes, my own brother-in-law; and I mention him to show whereof I speak. I say it is an outrage that the money of the country should be expended in this way. I am sorry to see the member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) who is so well off, and so indifferent about the wasting of money—who can give cords of wood to the poor of Peterborough—I am sorry to see him get up in the House and justify this extravagant transaction.

Mr. MULOCK. Was it possible to have combined those two buildings having regard to the public convenience of the town of Peterborough.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. STEVENSON. There is not room for them.

Mr. MULOCK. Why has the rule been departed from in this case, was it to suit the convenience of the town of Peterborough or was it for the reasons advanced by the member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron)?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We have not only to consider the first cost of the two buildings, but we have to remember that for all time to come they will require different staffs of caretakers and different systems of heating and lighting, which will make a great additional expense. I think the Government have made a great mistake in this, and I think they should have shown a little more manliness and refused to be duped by those Peterborough people. They should have been satisfied with buying only one lot and erecting both buildings upon it, and if they had done this it would have been a great saving to the public, not only in the erection of the buildings but in their cost and maintenance afterwards.

The Government has never experimented in this way in any other town, and it is evident from what the member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) says that this was done in consequence of a disagreement among the syndicates with regard to the purchase of the lot, and that the Government found its way out of the difficulty by acceding to their request and purchasing both lots. The lot first purchased was that on which the custom house is to be erected now, and the lot I believe was large enough for both the custom house and the post office. The hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) says that the lot was not large enough, but if that is so they should not have purchased it at all, because in the first place they intended to erect both custom house and post office on that lot. I cannot see how it is possible that, in a town of the size of Peterborough, it was found necessary to have separate buildings for the custom house and post office. The population is not so numerous and the extent of the corporation is not so great that there should be two public buildings there. There is no doubt in my mind, and there can be no doubt in the mind of anybody, that in this transaction the Government have perpetrated a job which cannot be justified.

Mr. STEVENSON. There is no job about it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think that this extravagance should not meet with the approbation of the people of Peterborough no more than that of the people of the country, because the people of Peterborough are as much interested as the people of the rest of the country in maintaining a system of economy in the public expenditure. This extravagance does not suit the people generally, although it may suit a few individuals who are the friends of the member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson).

Mr. STEVENSON. There are no friends about it It is not the truth you are talking.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The sensible men of the town of Peterborough who desire to see this Government carried on in an economical manner will be opposed to this extravagant and unnecessary expenditure, which ought be condemned not only by the sensible men of Peterborough but by the sensible men of the whole country. The member for Victoria charged here that the member for West Peterborough had been gracious enough and philanthropic enough to present to the poor people of his town no less than 400 cords of wood, just prior to an election. I think it would be interesting to the members of this House to know whether the men who got those 400 cords of wood were voters, and whether the member for West Peterborough was exercising undue influence over those men by this gift?

Mr. STEVENSON. That statement is just as true as the statement made by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron). All I can say is that it is not true. The hon. member for North Victoria is laughing at you, and if he can make you believe it it is all right.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know anything about these philanthropic contributions which have been made by the member for West Peterborough. I did not hear the Minister state what has been the total cost of this post office with the land, or what is expected to be the total cost for the Peterborough custom house?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contract for the post office was $18,000, and the land cost $6,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How much does it contain?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Sixty feet by 100, that is, for the post office. For the custom house the lot has cost $3,900, and the building is expected to cost about the same amount as the other.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The result is that $24,000 are required for the post office, and the hon. gentle-

man expects that he will require $22,000 for the custom house, in all, $46,000. What my hon. friends have stated, as the hon. gentleman knows, is perfectly correct, that in every case without exception, where the town is no larger than Peterborough, these buildings have been put together, and there is no doubt they could be put together there, and maintained at a cost of probably $25,000 or $30,000. It does look to me as if a very scandalous job had been perpetrated here for no reason under Heaven except to conciliate the two wings of the hon. gentleman's Peterborough supporters. Of course, we know that his position is such that he requires a good deal of nursing at the hands of the Government. I think his majority was the same as that of the hon. member for Kingston, so that there may be a fellow-feeling between them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I really forget what my majority was.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The majority of the hon. member for West Peterborough was 13, I am told.

Mr. STEVENSON. Twenty-three.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Ten more than that of the hon. member for Kingston. There is not much doubt that half the sum would have been sufficient but for these political exigencies.

Mr. STEVENSON. The hon. member has had small majorities as well as myself. In Centre Wellington he had not much more than I had. We need not complain very much, neither of us, in that respect; we both did our best.

Mr. LISTER. I have this to say, with regard to the building of post offices, that the system pursued by the Government is a gigantic system of bribery. I am not surprised that they should have treated the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) in the way they have done, in view of the fact that his election expenses cost $12,000. He said he "didn't care a d——, because Cox's cost him $13,000."

Mr. STEVENSON. I am sure the hon. gentleman never heard me say so. That is another story got up by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron).

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman does not deny it.

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes, I do deny it.

Mr. LISTER. The town of Peterborough has two public buildings, a post office and a custom house. There were two wings of the hon. gentleman's party who owned lots which they wanted to sell to the Government, and they sold them to the Government for about four times what they were worth. It was considered that those buildings should have been put on one lot; but one wing of the hon. gentleman's party kicked, and so the Government bought the other lot, and now they are putting up two buildings in that town. Two or three Sessions ago I obtained a return of the post offices and other public buildings erected by this Government, and I found that in small towns of 700, 800 or 900 inhabitants, yielding scarcely enough revenue to pay expenses, this Government had erected public buildings at a very great cost to the country, when the requirements of the particular communities did not demand them at all. The Minister of Finance has a little town of 500 or 600 in his constituency, where a post office was erected at a cost of $18,000 or $20,000. If the hon. Minister of Public Works had to pay the cost of these buildings out of his own pocket, he would not be so ready to construct them; but he draws his $8,000 or $9,000 a year, lives like a lord, and snaps his fingers at the hard-working people of the country who have to pay for them. In Walkerton, a small town of 2,500 or 3,000 inhabitants, a post office is to be erected. In the town of Strathroy, with only about 2,500 inhabitants, for the purpose of carrying the county, the Government promised to erect a post office, and the people there are now having a fight as to which corner of the town that post office ought to be in. But in large towns such as Woodstock, yielding a revenue of from $10,000 to $13,000 no public building is erected, because the place is represented by a Liberal. In the town of Sarnia, a place of 6,000 or 7,000 inhabitants, yielding a revenue to this country of $8,000 or $10,000 a year, there is no talk of building a post office—why? Because the intelligent electors of the county in which that town is situated have thought proper to send a Liberal here to oppose the Government. On no principle is this Government guided in the construction of post offices. Not by the revenues of the place, not by the size of the town, but simply to please their political supporters, and to make the constituencies sound, as far as they can do so by the expenditure of public money. The Minister of Agriculture was formerly Postmaster General, and in my town his brother-in-law is the owner of the building in which the post office has lately been removed, and the Government pay a rent of $300 to that very worthy gentleman, and so long as he lives and the Minister of Agriculture remains in the Government, I suppose that amount or more will continue to be paid to him. And thus it goes on, and the people's money is squandered. In the town of Cayuga, with only $700 or $800 of revenue, the Government erect a post office, at a cost of something like $20,000, for the purpose of making that constituency secure for the late member, Mr. Montague. We find the small villages throughout the country are demanding public buildings. There is no end to this system when once started. The towns first, then the villages, demand this expenditure, and political exigencies force the Government to yield to their demand. The sooner the Government lay down a hard and fast rule from which they will not depart, the better it will be for the country at large. This system is a cormorant growing every day; it is a cancer in the body politic, something like the systen of railway subsidies which, when started, cannot be stopped, and Heavens only knows where they are going to lead to. This system is destructive of the independence of the country, it encourages the people to put their hands into the public Treasury, and the sooner it is put a stop to the better it will be for the whole community. The day must come, sooner or later, when the Government will be condemned for this extravagant expenditure. If towns yielding large revenues are not to be entitled to public post offices and buildings, on what principle can you justify the expenditure in the small towns and villages on public buildings? We will find every village demanding a public post office, and then the mere hamlets, and the Government will have to yield to their demands.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to say another word before this item passes. If the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is in the House, I would like to draw his attention to what I am going to say. He goes in for the purification of the House and the prevention of placemen having seats in the House. If he is not here, perhaps the hon. the Minister of Public Works will send for him. I see the Government have rented, from Cox & Stevenson—I believe that is the firm to which the hon. member for West Peterborough belongs—a building for the Trent Navigation Company, and pay a rent of $80. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to this, for I am sure he would like to know it. I am sure he would like to see if it is true that a gentleman occupying a seat in this House can have a contract with this Government. Another little point in history in connection with this matter I would like to give, and thus spare the Minister of Public Works, who will be pleased to have this piece of history known, as it will probably close the discussion. It appears there was a lot bought in Peterborough, this very lot con-

cerning which we are now legislating, for the purpose of building a custom house and a post office. That lot was bought and paid for, and the deed specified the purposes for which it was bought. There were four gentlemen who owned the other lot, known as the Sawers' lot, and they thought they would sell their lot to the Government also. They bought it, I believe, for speculative purposes, and they succeeded in selling it to the Government. The difficulty that arose was this: The four gentlemen were those who rode under the banner of the Minister of Customs, that is when he used to ride under that banner—when he used to uphold the flag. I wish the hon member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) were here, I would like to call his attention to this matter as it may aid him in his present crusade. These four gentlemen in this syndicate were of one party, the gentleman who owned the other lot was of another party. He was an Irishman, and his lot had been bought, but the building had not been put upon it, for it appears the policy at that time was based on the motto: "No Irish need apply." The followers of King William apparently were in the ascendant at that time, and they triumphed over the follower of King James, and so the post office was taken away from the lot bought for it, and placed on the other lot, no doubt mainly through the influence of the hon. the Minister of Customs. That was during the time when the Minister of Customs used to parade on the Protestant horse. He does not do that now. Since he got into the Cabinet he has put the horse in the stable, and some people think the horse starved to death. At all events he never takes it out now for a canter or a promenade on any occasion. It is necessary now to conciliate the other party, to blend the orange and green, and this beautiful net-work has been devised through the skill and ingenuity of the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson). The former member was not equal to the occasion, and he had to retire between those two factions. I do not know but that the hon. member for West Peterborough was behind the Minister on those occasions, and the consequence was the late member had to retire. The hon. gentleman set his wits to work to blend in harmony the orange and green in Peterborough, and what was the means he took? It was the expenditure of public money. The Government gave him $40,000 or $50,000 to build two buildings, where one would have done, and this was done for political purposes. The hon. Minister of Public Works knows that every word I have said is true, and will be obliged to me for giving him this explanation, because it spares him the disagreeable necessity of making the facts known to himself.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. the Minister of Public Works must have made some mistake in the figures he gave. The Auditor General's Report shows that the first contract was $16,500. Last year we expended $18,139; less $840, which makes a total of $34,898, expended on the post office already, and there is a further grant in the estimates now under consideration for $1,900. This does not include the purchase of the lot at all; $6,000 was the price of the lot the post office was erected on. If the custom house is to cost an equal amount, we will find the expenses for public buildings in Peterborough will foot up to something over $80,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have not the figures here, but, when one of the hon. gentlemen opposite put a question to me, I thought I remembered that the amount for the building contract was $18,000. That was stated simply from memory. As to the purchase of the lot, I said I thought it was $6,000, and I think I was not far from the figure in that case. Then for the other lot, I stated the amount was $3,900. I did not expect that the question of the post office lot would be brought up, because this vote is for the custom house only.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. gentleman will see that the amount for public buildings in Peterborough will be over $80,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; if the first building cost as much as the hon. gentleman says, the second will not be so expensive.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask if it would not be convenient to have the post office adjoining the custom house. I thought probably the Minister of Public Works hesitated in replying to that question, when I put it before, because he had not the local knowledge, and, therefore, I think the member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) should furnish the Committee with that local information. You have now the post office a completed structure, and have not started building the custom house. Would it not be better to have them together? What is your opinion in regard to that?

Mr. STEVENSON. It was intended from the beginning that we should have two buildings. I was not in the House at the time, but I know two plans were submitted, one for the custom house and one for the post office, and the estimated cost for one building was $16,000 and for the other $20,000. Our neighboring town of Port Hope has a building, including the post office and custom house, which has cost over $46,000, although it has a much smaller population than we have. In Belleville, which is a town of about the same size as ours, the building cost a much larger sum. The place where the custom house is to be is much more suitable than it would be if it were placed near the post office, as it is in the neighborhood of the two railway stations. I admit that there was a great deal of fighting about the post office, but I had nothing to do with it; I took no part in it; I never signed a petition or asked the Minister to put that building in one place or the other.

Mr. LISTER. You saw the Minister about it.

Mr. STEVENSON. The building lot was purchased in the place where the post office is now, because the people said the original place selected would not do, that it was too far from the business part of the town. That is where it is now proposed to build the custom house. If the Government had built the post office, they would have had to put another office in Ashburnham, but now we will have only one post office for both places.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the hon. gentleman remember in what year the lot which is now to be used for the custom house was purchased, when it was intended to be used for the post office?

Mr. STEVENSON. I think it was in 1885.

Mr. MULOCK. It was bought then with the intention of being used for the post office, and the plan was afterwards changed?

Mr. STEVENSON. The people would not have it there.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman tell us in what way the question was submitted to the people? Was it decided by a vote of the people?

Mr. STEVENSON. The people petitioned to have the post office in another place.

Mr. MULOCK. Does not the hon. gentleman think it would be in the interests of the people of Peterborough, irrespective of any complications which might arise from the fact of the Government having bought lots in different places, to have these two buildings adjoin one another?

Mr. STEVENSON. No.

Mr. MULOCK. If it had to be done over again, you would select these sites?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes; I think I would.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) whether the Government is under any special obligation at this time to erect this custom house in Peterborough; whether they have made any pledge or promise to that effect?

Mr. STEVENSON. When Mr. Hilliard was member, I understood that they agreed to build a custom house and post office, and that they bought the land for both buildings.

Mr. MULOCK. Then a promise was given to the people of Peterborough to erect a custom house there. I suppose that promise was given after the lot was bought. Now, we are getting at the true inwardness of this matter. We discover now how the Government are obliged to ask for this vote. A promise was made to the people of Peterborough, on the eve of the last general election, that they would erect a custom house. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Hilliard was promised a custom house, and now we are called upon to enter into this expenditure in order to fulfil a promise which was made as a means of promoting a Dominion election. We have the admission made by the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) that Mr. Hilliard promised this custom house, having regard, of course, to the election which was shortly to take place, and the Minister of Public Works lent himself to this and made this pledge. I would like to know whether he really endorses this pledge of which the hon. gentleman speaks?

Mr. STEVENSON. I did not know anything of the Minister in the matter. It is Mr. Hilliard I am speaking of.

Mr. MULOCK. However, the Minister of Public Works is now asking for this vote of $10,000. Are there plans and specifications in his possession, and such other information as will enable him to tell us what will be the outside cost of this public work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose this building, when completed, will have cost $24,000.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the hon. gentleman say whether this is mere guesswork, or have there been plans prepared showing the character of the work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The plans are never prepared before the vote is given by Parliament.

Mr. MULOCK. Here we vote $10,000, and the building may cost $40,000. That does not seem to me to be a businesslike way of proceeding. We should know before we commence to build what the cost is likely to be. We should also have some explanation of this statement made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). It appears that you are able to rent buildings in Peterborough for certain Government officers. That great public work that is going on now, the construction of the Trent Valley Canal, has an office there. While you are preparing these plans you might get a small corner in this great office for that purpose.

Mr. LISTER. Nobody can charge the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) with a desire to conceal any information he may possess, but there is one thing he did not tell us. He did tell us that he was brought in to decide between the positions. I understand from the discussion to-night that there was internal dissension as to where these public buildings should be, and in order to conciliate one part or the other, it was decided to put up two buildings instead of one. The hon. gentleman has told us that this was done under a promise made just before the election. He tells us that public opinion was consulted, and expressed itself by several petitions numerously signed by the residents of the town from which he comes. He also tells us that he did not sign either of those petitions. He wants the House to understand that the sites were selected purely on account of their suitableness for public buildings. I want to ask the hon. gentleman if he did not come to Ottawa and see the Government?

Mr. RYKERT. Don't answer him.

Mr. LISTER. Did he not use his influence for the purpose of having two buildings put up instead of one? Did he not see the members of the Government for the purpose of arranging this little trouble within the camp?

Mr. STEVENSON. I did not.

Mr. MULOCK. You had no correspondence with them?

Mr. STEVENSON. No, sir.

Public Buildings, Ottawa—addition to Supreme Court building $5,000

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is not sufficient accommodation at present for the judges and the members of the Bar and the library. It is proposed to make an extension of the building to the rear for the purpose of making rooms for the judges, and to turn the judges' rooms into a library. This sum will not be applicable for that purpose, which will cost about $10,000.

Toronto Examining Warehouse..... $35,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the probable cost of this building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This property is composed of 5 different lots. The Dominion owns 3 lots. There are 2 other lots, for one of which we are paying a large rent on a lease which has now to be renewed, but the city of Toronto will not renew it unless we give a large additional rent. We require that lot. The next lot, which is vacant, the Government think they should secure for further extension. The only way to obtain the property is for the Government to have it expropriated, and, therefore, we have placed this sum in the Estimates. Excluding the present amount of $35,000, the total cost has been $357,935.

Mr. MULOCK. Do we receive any rentals? It was represented that if $50,000 were expended on the recommendation of the then Collector of Customs, Mr. Patton, merchants would store their goods there, and we would receive rentals, which would pay well for the investment.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no doubt it is so, but I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information, as the Minister of Customs is not present.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). With respect to the amount of $4,000 for the custom house and post office at Walkerton, perhaps the hon. gentleman will state the population, postal and customs revenue and estimated cost of the building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Walkerton is the county town of Bruce, and its population is placed at about 3,000. The judicial offices and registry offices are in the town, and there are also two banks. The post office revenue is $5,043. The cost of the lot will be $3,000 or $4,000, of the building about $12,000, and about $4,000 more for fittings.

Public Buildings, North-West Territories..... $87,100

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is proposed to be done with this large sum, and where are these buildings to be erected?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Buildings are to be erected at Regina, Maple Creek, Medicine Hat, Calgary, Fort McLeod, Lethbridge, Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, Battleford, Prince Albert, Batoche, Wood Mountain and certain outposts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On what principle does the Government contribute towards a hospital at Medicine Hat?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Territories have no revenue of their own and they have no hospital,

Public Buildings, British Columbia..... $37,250

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the Minister of Militia explain the character of the buildings proposed to be erected?

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What did you appropriate for these buildings last year and how much of that has been expended? I think there was a balance unexpended.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I answered the hon. gentleman previously, and the *Hansard* will show what my answer was. I think the whole appropriation, as far as I can recollect, was expended. This is to complete. I think seven or eight, or nine thousand dollars have been expended, and the total cost will be about $30,000.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). You used to have an officer out there to look after things generally; have you got more than one now?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We did not build the barracks just for one man.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How many men are there in "C" Battery?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 100 men and 6 officers.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What is the Government going to do with the old penitentiary building at St. John, N.B.?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There has been an application made by the municipality for the building and the Government are considering it, but they have not yet come to any conclusion.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I do not think this vote of $400 is any more than sufficient to keep them in repairs, but I think the Government should accede to the application made to them, because the buildings are useless at present and an expense to the country.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We are considering the offer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have some little reason to complain of the Minister. He has not yet completed the new fence around the Dominion buildings in Charlottetown.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will have to see it myself.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I spoke to the architect about it and he said he would have the old fence removed. The building has been finished there for some time and the old fence is an eyesore and destroys the whole square there. It ought to be removed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will attend to it.

Harbors and Rivers, Nova Scotia..... $38,600

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What is the vote of $1,500 for Cow Bay for?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is to repair damage done to the breakwater by a heavy gale on the 12th of February of this year.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I see there is a vote of $3,000 for a wharf and repairs at Somerville, which is in Queen's County. I see there are two items for that county. I suppose the Government thought it necessary, in the interest of the party, to spend this money now, after having refused it for a long time when that county was represented in the Liberal interest.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This Somerville is in Hants County.

Mr. LOVITT. I am pleased to see that the Minister has at last found out that the breakwater at Port Maitland requires repairing, and I am pleased to see a vote placed in the Estimates for that purpose.

Mr. KIRK. There does seem to be some hope for counties represented by Grits in this House at last, after eight or nine years. I recognise the fact that there is to be a small expenditure in the County of Yarmouth. I hope, as the Minister has at last recognised the wants of a county represented by a Liberal, that he will carry his good feelings a little further and see if there are not some needs farther east. I want to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that there are two harbors in Guysborough which have been reported upon by his own engineers, but that is all that has been done. They have reported on the subject of breakwaters for New Harbor and for Indian Harbor; yet the Minister can find no money for these works. We have a large number of vessels and a large number of people engaged in trading and fishing, and they require protection; but although the Government can find millions of money to throw away on railroads in counties represented by Ministers, they cannot spare a dollar to protect the poor fishermen of the country. I remember not many years ago, when instead of receiving $38,000 for breakwaters and river improvements in the Province of Nova Scotia, we received over $180,000 in order to facilitate the fishing industry in that Province. The County of Guysborough does not get one dollar for any purpose. Do not the people of that county pay taxes as well as the people of any other county? And have they not a right to a portion of this money? But they do not get it. I say it is dishonest and unfair for the Government to deny the just rights of that county and other counties represented by Liberals in this House. The Government had, previous to the last election, voted a sum of money and purchased a site in the town of Lunenburg for the purpose of erecting a public building. They discovered, however, very suddenly, I believe from the poll books, that there was no necessity for the building. It is unfair to treat counties represented by Liberals in this way. If the Government think they are going to coerce electors to vote for them to support such corruption as this they will find they are mistaken.

Mr. HICKEY. It is very difficult to satisfy some hon. gentlemen. They find fault with the Government for voting money in counties where they have supporters, and call that corruption, and now they say the Government are very corrupt when they will not stretch their conscience by trying to corrupt counties which return Opposition members.

Mr. KIRK. The Government placed a sum in the Estimates for the purpose of corrupting the counties and then withheld the expenditure for the same purpose. The Estimates are bristling from end to end with sums of money placed there for the purpose of corrupting the electors.

Grosses Coques Breakwater..... $8,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It appears to me the Government are taking great care of the county of Digby. I do not object to it, but I am led to understand that this pier at Grosses Coques is at a place where there is no commerce whatever. There was some shipbuilding, but that has ceased and no vessels frequent the place at all. There are five harbors in the counties of Digby provided for. I do not say that the improvements are not necessary, but the Government took a number of years to recognise that fact, and I would remind the hon. Minister that if he builds all those wharves, when the elections come on he will have no occasion for expenditure in those places.

Mr. JONES (Digby). I am glad the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) takes such an interest in the county of Digby, but as regards Grosses Coques he is entirely mistaken. It was owing to the neglect of the old member for the county of Digby that the wharf there was going to pieces, and that the people sent a memorandum to the Government asking for this expenditure.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I will not say that the hon. member is not correct in that, but it is natural that I should

take some interest in the County of Digby, as it is my native county, and, when the hon. gentleman makes the statement that the hon. member who represented Digby in this House for a number of years neglected these matters, he makes a statement which he cannot substantiate, and he should be careful before he makes such a statement. If he looks at the records of the department, he will find that recommendations were made every year by his predecessor for these public works, and they were invariably disregarded because that hon. member was not *en rapport* with the Government of the day.

Mr. JONES (Digby). I can substantiate every statement which I have made, and I say that the hon. member who represented the County of Digby for so many years entirely neglected that county, both when he was a member of the Opposition and when he was a Minister of the Crown.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am willing to believe that the hon. gentleman has been informed to that effect before he would make such a rash, such an unauthorised, and such an untruthful statement in this House; but, if he would apply to the Minister of Public Works, I have no doubt that he would be furnished with the applications and recommendations made by his predecessor for all these public works during all the time he represented that county in this House.

West Jordan Bay—Dredging..... $1,200

Mr. KIRK. What is the reason for voting special sums for dredging in different harbors when we have already voted a general sum for dredging?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount voted for dredging is too small to employ the dredges all the time, and in order to supplement that, if we want the dredges to do the work which is required, we must have these special votes. Therefore, we state which of these works require dredging. If we have to take out of the small vote of $15,000 or $20,000 for dredging, $1,000 or $1,200 for three places, we could not work these dredges for the season.

Mr. KIRK. Then I should like to ask how it is that the Minister overlooks the application which has been made to him for the use of the dredge at Sherbrooke? Will the Minister ever get over the narrow principle of confining the vote to counties which are represented by supporters of the Government? There are items in these Estimate for places in Shelburne, but there is none for the county of Guysborough.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think there is a good deal in what the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Kirk) says. There is a general item for dredging in the Province of Nova Scotia, and it appears singular that the hon. gentleman takes these places out of the general category. I am not objecting to this item, but I think the general vote should cover all.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We cannot do it out of that.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the hon. gentleman should rather enlarge the general amount.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I thought that, when I could state where the dredging could be made, it would be more agreeable to the House to state it. Of course, if the House prefers, we will put $10,000 more for general dredging.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman would give a statement of all the dredging work to be done during the season, it would be all right, but I object to his taking both methods. When the general vote was under discussion, he said that he could not state where the dredging was going to be done this summer, but he has arrived at a decision to do some dredging in a county represented by one of his brother Ministers. That may be all right but, if he can do that in regard to the county of Antigonish, he ought to be able to do so in regard to other counties.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is necessary to have a general amount for the working of the dredges. Take, for instance, the harbor of Kincardine or the harbor of Goderich, two of the large harbors on the lakes, where a large bar may be formed in the spring and where we have to send a large dredge, or perhaps two, to open the entrance, because otherwise the harbor would be closed altogether. It is necessary, therefore, to have the general vote, because, in those cases, we cannot tell what will be required. But, where the amount of expenditure is foreseen, we have considered it better to specify it.

Mr. KIRK. Perhaps the Minister can now decide whether he can send the dredge to St. Mary's River at Sherbrooke which is not far from Big Tracadie.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will see whether this work can be done.

Western Head..... $5,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The chief engineer says this is required for extending the breakwater, the outer end of which has been carried away during a storm. This work has been constructed for the purpose of facilitating the landing of the numerous fishing boats owned in the locality.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is this work being done by contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Sometimes we do not give contracts. Sometimes we have to remove portions of the work that are rotten or damaged, and the rest may be sound, or it may not. We cannot tell before beginning the work what it will be, or what is the amount of damage done. In such cases it costs less to do it by days' work, but generally we do it by contract.

Port George—heavy repairs to pier..... $5,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is in Annapolis, on the Bay of Fundy. The engineer reports this work to be necessary in order to place this pier in a thorough state of repair. Up to the first of January last the total amount expended was $8,076. We will require probably $3,000 more to complete.

Harbors and Rivers—Prince Edward Island..... $3,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This is a pitiable sum for Prince Edward Island. After the conversation that we had in the earlier part of the Session, and the petitions that were forwarded from Mount Stewart, and the discussion that took place in reference to the necessity of the construction of that wharf, I thought the Minister would put a sum in the Estimates for that purpose. A very small sum would have done. I do think that the Mount Stewart wharf would not cost over $1,500. It is a work of great public necessity, and there has been an immense amount of trouble about that wharf. Within a few miles of that place there are five or six hundred people who are concerned, and are praying that something may be done to get a wharf built. I offered myself to subscribe towards the construction of one. The Local Government will not build it, and we have petitioned to this Government to build it, and really I think they should have put in a small sum. It is too bad. My hon. friend from King's (Mr. Robertson) attended one of the largest public meetings that has been held in that section of the country for many years, and he says the whole country for 20 miles around is clamoring for this wharf to enable them to ship their produce. The hon gentleman had all the facts presented to his department six or eight weeks ago, and

we pressed it as hard as we could from this side of the House. The people suffer untold inconvenience.

Mr. HICKEY. Why do they not build a wharf?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I) Wharves are built by the Government for the people in all other parts of the Dominion. I thought once, as the hon. gentlemen opposite profess to think, that the Government ought not to construct wharves up the rivers, but I found I was wrong. I wrote a letter to that public meeting saying that I did not think that the Dominion ever voted money for the construction of wharves 20 miles from the sea. I found I was wrong, I found the harbor of Three Rivers in Quebec, and I found in New Brunswick and in Nova Scotia a number of places where the Government built wharves. In this case a great many farmers are deeply concerned. How are they going to ship their produce in the fall? They cannot ship it from Mount Stewart bridge, and unless the wharf is built I do not see how they are going to get their produce away. Vessels cannot get near the bridge, and I do not know what the farmers are going to do. It is a matter of $2,000 at the outside.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I happen to know something about this. Our vessels from Nova Scotia, in the autumn, when the fishing trips are over, all go to Prince Edward Island to carry away the produce. There is a general rush late in the season, and the ports being closed early, if the vessels do not get away at the proper time, the produce remains over. I have to do with these vessels, and I know we experience the greatest difficulty in getting them to go to this place on account of the want of wharf accommodation. This very place mentioned by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has frequently come to my notice. Vessels going there to load have in some cases been obliged to leave without doing so. The farmers along that river want to get rid of their potatoes in the autumn, and if they do not get vessels to take them away, they remain over and can be shipped only after navigation is opened in the spring. If they can get them away in the autumn to the States or to the other Provinces, they are of some value, but if they remain over till spring, they decay and become of much less value. The farmers cannot get them away unless they can get vessels to take them, and the vessels will not go there unless there are wharves where they can load.

Mr. ROBERTSON. When I attended this meeting this last winter I was informed that one of the vessels that came there was damaged from the manner in which she had to load, and some vessels had to leave the port for want of accommodation. The Dominion could obtain a good revenue from a wharf erected there, and in fact it would pay high interest on the investment. From the wharf at my village there is a revenue of $250 to $300, and the total amount expended did not exceed $2,000 or $3,000, and if a wharf were built at Mount Stewart it would also pay a large interest on the investment.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The village contains 1,000 people. and the surrounding country is fully settled by farmers, There is only a shipping season of from four to six weeks during which schooners come there from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. This work would cost about $1,500, and I hope the Minister will consider the advisability of having it executed.

Harbors and Rivers, New Brunswick..... $17,500

Mr. ELLIS. Has any new contract been given out in connection with the Campbellton wharf?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think a contract was given to a firm in Ottawa, which sent in the lowest tender.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will furnish the names of the tenderers and the amount?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have taken a note of it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Where is the wharf at Kingston to be built?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount asked is to be applied towards the construction of a wharf at Kingston, above the bridge and over the Richibucto River. It will answer both damming purposes and assist vessels in passing through the draw-opening of the bridge. The whole cost will be $7,000, towards which $4,000 is now asked.

Mr WELDON (St. John). I should like to know how many vessels ever passed that draw. I never heard of a vessel going up there at all. The town of Kingston is below the bridge, and I cannot understand the object of expending $7,000 above the bridge. Who were the parties making the application?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The municipal council applied for the construction of this wharf.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Vessels never go up there. I know that vessels built up there came down passing through the draw, but I never heard of any going up the river except small schooners carrying rigging for the vessels built there. At that time there was quite a good shipbuilding yard some distance above the bridge, and it was the only place in New Brunswick where ships were built under sheds. It has, however, entirely disappeared. So far as I know that country, I must say that it appears to me to be a perfect waste of money, because the business stops at Kingston. Vessels used to go up there in former times carrying rigging and material for the ships that were built there, but no ships are built there now and it is simply a farming country above Kingston.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Is this breakwater at Shippegan, for which $10,000 is asked, near the end of the Caraquette Railway?

Mr. FOSTER. It is north of that.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). When the men of the channel Islands came there to fish there was a good business done, but there is hardly sufficient business done there now to justify this expenditure. Will this be the whole cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think when it is completed that it will cost $20,000.

Mr. ELLIS. The total shipping in the port of Shippegan last year was five vessels of 560 tons with crews of 30 men. The total duty collected was $622, and the goods entered were valued at $4,262. This work may be necessary, but it seems to be a most extraordinary expenditure in connection with a port of that kind.

Mr. FOSTER. This expenditure is not so much for the port. My hon. friend, if he understands the geography of the country, knows that just north of this port are the islands, and the object of this breakwater is to improve the passage between the mainland and the first island which cannot be made now by vessels, and at the present time vessels going to Caraquette have to go 35 miles around. It will be of utility not only to commercial vessels, but to the large fleets of shipping vessels which can make this passage when the work is completed.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Does the hon. Minister think that considering the shifting sands on that coast the breakwater will have any effect at all?

Mr. FOSTER. Part of it has been built already, and so far as it has been built it has had a very good effect. The engineer believes that when the breakwater is completed it will have the effect of deepening the passage.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). With reference to this vote of $1,000 for Lincoln wharf, do I understand the Govern-

ment will apply the principle of repairing the wharves on the River St. John? If so I am very glad to hear it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is one of them at all events.

Harbors and Rivers, Quebec..... ..... $103,600

Mr. JONES (Halifax). A vote of $10,000 has already been asked for Lévis Graving Dock, and the $4,000 voted here makes $14 000 in all. Seeing that we received only $2,000 from that dock last year, I am afraid it is not likely to be a very profitable investment.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps not, if it remains at that point. But I think the hon. gentleman will not complain if the revenue was only $2,000 this year, because it shows that there were not many accidents to vessels, and very few repairs to be made. I think he must have seen by the return I brought down the other day that during the previous season the revenues of the dock were $21,000. It may be that, this year, the misfortunes of mariners may be the good fortune of the dock. Nevertheless, we must make these repairs and improvements if they are required.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency). (Translation.) I am happy to see that the Minister of Public Works has granted a sum of $6,000 to make urgent repairs to the wharf at St. Laurent, Island of Orleans, but I think that there will be more than that to do on it. It is necessary that the wharf should be lengthened. At certain time of the year, during the season of navigation, especially at l w water, it is almost impossible for the steamboat which keeps up the connection between Berthier and Quebec to come alongside this wharf. At the beginning of the Session I had occasion to make some representations to the Minister on this subject. With the prudence which characterises him, he told me that he would send his engineer to examine the locality, and I see with pleasure that this engineer has made a favorable report to him. There is also the wharf at St. François, on the Island of Orleans, which was begun some years past, and if this is not speedily completed it may happen that the water will carry it away. On the other side of the Island of Orleans there is another wharf at Ste. Famille; at this place also a line of steamboats touches every day and it is of consequence that this wharf should be completed. A terrible accident happened here some years back, and a great number of persons lost their lives at this place. I trust that the hon. Minister will do his best to finish these works. I know that it is too late this year, but I hope that next year he will place in the Estimates a sum sufficient for the purpose.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) What is there to be done at St. Timothy?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) That will enable the farmers to receive and send away their products.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Are they wharves?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Yes; little wharves. The item of $7,500 for Grand River is for a work for which I wished to ask money from Parliament last year. The present sum will not be enough to complete the whole of the work. A breakwater must be built to provide a refuge for the fishing vessels. Every year there is a loss of life at this place; I think that three persons were drowned there last year.

Harbors and Rivers, Ontario..... ..... $59,786 58

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The vote of $10,000 for Thessalon Harbor, in Manitoulin, is to provide for repairs required for the wharf, and for the extension of the same for a distance of 150 feet with a depth of 22 feet of water, in order to afford shelter to vessels from south-westerly storms, and landing facilities for the largest class of vessels.

Mr. PLATT. I wish to ask the hon. Minister, with regard to the general vote for dredging in Ontario, whether we are to expect that dredging shall be done only at such places as he mentioned in the early part of the evening, or whether any portion of that $45,000 may be apportioned to smaller harbors?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. During the recess, as soon as I have time, I will examine all the applications and all the reports of the engineers, and then I shall see what amount is required for each, and what we can do with the money that has been placed at our disposal for that purpose. Of course, I always go to the most pressing works, for example, the harbor of Goderich.

Mr. PLATT. The Estimates do not preclude us from hoping that something will be done, and that the engineer will visit that harbor at any early day?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I promise the engineer will visit it at an early day.

Rondeau Harbor works—to pay F. B. McNamee & Co, contractors, in full settlement of their claims $1,286 58

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. McNamee & Co. had the contract. They delayed their work, having their plants elsewhere, and my department was not satisfied with the delay, so we took the work in our own hands and finished it. This balance remained to the credit of McNamee & Co. on their contract.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is there any other work being done now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; some repairs at the entrance of the harbor.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I want to ask the hon. the Minister about the bar at the mouth of the River Thames. I understand a contract was let for the removal of the bar.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Orders were given to attend to that work.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There is another stream close by, Little Bear Creek, which has frequently been brought to the attention of the hon. gentleman, and which he promised to look after as soon as the dredge has done removing the bar from the mouth of the River Thames which is only a few miles from Little Bear Creek. The dredge might be allowed to go in and clean out that creek, as that work is important on account of the numerous settlements and the square timber and logs piled up along the banks. It never can be done at a more convenient time than this summer.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot make the promise. We have had the experience of another creek where we dredged, and the result was that damages were claimed afterwards by parties along the banks.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This is a different thing.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. "Chat échaudé craint l'eau froide." I am afraid I cannot promise. The hon. gentleman has said that there is a great deal of timber and things of that kind on the shore, and after dredging that little creek, the people on the shore will say that there were land slides and that their timber is gone or their warehouses injured, and they will claim damages. I do not say that I will not do it, but I cannot give any promise.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This Little Bear Creek was dredged about three years ago and made a navigable stream. It runs right through the county, and there are no warehouses or buildings along the line of the creek at all. The stream was made navigable, but on account of the earth not being thrown far enough on the bank, a great deal has slipped

back and formed shoals, so that at certain points vessels cannot pass.

Roads and Bridges—Bridge over the Belly River at Lethbridge, N.W.T., re-vote.....$3,000

Mr. WATSON. I had expected that in the Supplementary Estimates we would have a vote for building two bridges over the Upper Assiniboine River. I do not know whether another Supplementary Estimates are to be brought down. Will the hon. the Minister inform me if there will be any more?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, I think.

Mr. WATSON. I hope the hon. gentleman will see fit to consider the petitions for these bridges favorably. The hon. the Minister of the Interior, who represents an East Assiniboian constituency, is probably more interested in the bridges than I am, as they are intended to allow the settlers in the northern portions of his district to reach the place where they do their trading this side of the Assiniboine River. The river is almost on the boundary line between Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and consequently the bridge should be built by the Dominion Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is no doubt right about these bridges, but I must say that though I wished to submit these works to my colleagues for their approval, I could hardly do so as I had not the data I require for works of that kind. There is nothing more difficult than making an estimate for a work at that distance without knowing exactly what the bottom of the river is, whether it is clay or boulders or sand, and then it is necessary to examine what the difference of level is when the freshets take place. In order to have a bridge which will remain, we need that information, and I cannot receive that simply from a letter sent to me by some friends who where kind enough to send me that information; but I cannot go to my colleagues with that, and recommend that a work of this kind should be undertaken without having the information from my engineer.

Mr. WATSON. Surely the hon. gentleman is mistaken, or has not been properly informed by his engineer, because plans have been submitted made by persons on the ground, as to the depth of water, the approaches, the height of the water at high water and at low water, and the soil, and surely the Minister has sufficient information before him to come to a decision. I state for his information—and I suppose the Minister of the Interior has some knowledge in regard to this—that these two bridges can be constructed for $6,000. I speak especially in regard to the north bridge, because there are many settlers there who have now to go three times the distance they would have if the Government would vote $3,000 for the construction of a bridge.

Telegraph Land Line on North Shore of St. Lawrence—extension to Pointe aux Esquimaux, to complete.....$5,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will the Minister explain that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is a continuation of our telegraph system on the north coast. This will bring us as far as the Pointe aux Esquimaux. Then we will have probably a cable to go to Anticosti and connect with the land lines there. Thus we will reach the east point of Anticosti, and there most likely we will have to put a cable to Belle Isle, where the new cable from England to America will come. If that takes place, then our lines on the north coast will be a paying concern, but, until then, we will have only the local traffic.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the Minister is expecting a traffic over that line which he will not receive, because all the communications by these cables will go to their own destination and not over the lines which may be built by the Government of Canada. The Government proposes a scheme which will involve a great expenditure without any return.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is not done yet, and will not be done this year.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The cables from the other side will go to their own destination and will not be sent in such a way as to accommodate the Government of Canada. It appears to me that the Government should hesitate before undertaking a work of this magnitude. The extension to the Pointe aux Esquimaux on the Labrador coast may be justifiable, but I cannot see why. I do not know for what purpose it can be used.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The result of the extension of the line on the north coast, as far as the people living there are concerned, is that by that means we have been able to save lives, when wrecks have taken place, because the people have been able to telegraph and get vessels to go to the relief of the wrecks and to take provisions. In regard to fishing purposes, also, they are able to obtain information which they could not otherwise receive. There are people on the coast who have no other communication with the world except what they can obtain in this way, and they are often short of provisions. In addition to that, this Pointe aux Esquimaux is a station in accordance with the plan originally adopted. There will probably be three or four small cables required, but this will save a great deal of expense in achieving the desire which we have to cross to Anticosti. In any case, we must go to Anticosti, where our land lines are. We need not go further unless the cable comes from Great Britain to Belle Isle, and then we may connect with it from the Island.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think this is a work of very doubtful utility, and I think the explanation of the Minister would satisfy the country that, if the people to whom he refers require this in order to get food, they are a class of people who would not avail themselves of this telegraph line in a commercial way or contribute to its value.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are a number of fishing establishments there.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). For a very short time. That is a very poor district indeed, and is growing worse every year. If a shipwrecked crew could not be cared for by the people on the coast, that would show that they must be in such a condition that they could not be very useful to this telegraphic communication.

To provide for steam communication between St. John, Digby and Annapolis.....$2,500

Mr. KIRK. I notice that in the main estimates the vote for steam service between Port Mulgrave and Port Hood, on the north, and Port Mulgrave, Arichat, Cape Canso and Guysborough on the south, was reduced from $5,000 to $4,000. Is that service to be continued with that lesser grant?

Mr. FOSTER. The service is to be continued as usual.

For steam communication between New Westminster and Victoria.....$7,500

Mr. GORDON. I would like to ask the Minister if it is the intention of the Government to contract for a mail service direct from Vancouver to Nanaimo. The Board of Trade of Vancouver, the City Council of Vancouver, and the City Council of Nanaimo, have memorialised the Government for that service. At the present time our mail travels 155 miles *vid* Victoria, involving 24 hours delay in the

delivery of our mails, whereas the distance direct across is only 32 miles. Heretofore one of the difficulties has been that no direct steamers were plying between these two ports, but at the present time there is a direct steamer plying three times a week, and the people are willing to accept a tri-weekly service rather than have their mails go *vid* Victoria, until a daily service can be established. I cannot too strongly urge the importance of this service upon the Government. I would also ask the Government to increase the service to twice a week, that the people of Comox have petitioned for. Large collieries are being developed in that district, the population is increasing, and there is general prgoress, so that they are entitled to a semi-weekly service. Up to the present time there has been only one steamer plying; at the present, however, there is a steamer running regularly twice a week, and I think the Government ought to forward the mails twice a week to that important district.

Mr. FOSTER. It was proposed that the service between New Westminster and Victoria should follow the rule of the other services and be paid by the Postmaster General for the mails that were carried, as provided in the Bill we passed a short time ago. But in looking into it I found that there was a contract running for a little time yet, that contract has to be carried out. It is quite true, as my hon. friend says, that there is a more direct route from Vancouver to Nanaimo. I will call the attention of the Postmaster General to that matter, in order that he may make provision in his Bill to send the mails as proposed.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 25th April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FISHING LICENSES—RIVER NATASHQUAN.

Mr. FISET (translation), asked, whether the Government have issued or intend to issue licenses for fishing with the net in the River Natashquan? If so, to whom, how many, and to what distance from the mouth of the river?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I must ask the hon. member to have the kindness to postpone this question as well as the succeeding one, inasmuch as my colleague, the Minister of Marine, will not be here to-day, being indisposed.

DISPOSITION OF SCOTT ACT FINES.

Mr. BARRON asked, What disposition (if any) does the Government intend to make of the moneys collected by way of fines under the Canada Temperance Act, and lying unexpended in the treasury of those counties wherein the said Act has been repealed? Has the attention of the Government been called to the justice of returning to the municipalities in each county the fines so collected from within such municipalities, and now no longer needed for the enforcement of the Act, by reason of the repeal thereof in such counties?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. These fines, in so far as the Government has any disposal of them, have fully been disposed of by the Order in Council of the 15th November, 1886, and the Government is advised that it has no further control. They have been given to the municipalities for the purposes of the Act.

SCUGOG RIVER.

Mr. BARRON asked, Does the Government of Canada exercise jurisdiction over the waters of the Scugog River, within the town of Lindsay, as far up the stream as the Lindsay lock, or are such waters within the jurisdiction of the Government of the Province of Ontario?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As to any particular Acts indicating the jurisdiction, I am not in a position to give an answer unless the hon. gentleman will give some information as to when the Acts have taken place. As to the legal question, there is a difference of opinion. It has been referred to my department, but an opportunity has not yet been found to examine the question.

OLD SETTLERS' CLAIMS IN MANITOBA.

Mr. LARIVIERE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint a Commission to investigate the old settlers' claims in Manitoba, as requested by the old settlers' committee?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A deputation waited on me a few days ago in reference to this matter, and I promised to take the matter into consideration. It is still under consideration.

POSTAL SERVICE—RED RIVER.

Mr. LARIVIERE (translation) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to increase the postal service through the parishes and settlements along the Red River, by forwarding the mail daily by rail in lieu of the present mode of conveyance?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my colleague, the Postmaster General, I may state to the hon. gentleman that there is already a postal service carried out by one of the railways, and that the Postmaster General is, however, considering the matter. He will be glad to confer with the hon. gentleman if he is willing to call at his department at any time.

IMPORTATION OF ILLUMINATING OILS IN MANITOBA.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government, as requested by a petition of the merchants of Winnipeg, dealing in illuminating oils, addressed to the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, to allow them to import such oils in iron tanks to be retailed from the same; and also to allow such oils to be measured at time of delivery to importers of the same?

Mr. BOWELL. That subject is now under the consideration of the Department of Inland Revenue.

LEONCE STEIN OF QUEBEC.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth) (for Mr. BARRON) asked, Is Leonce Stein, of the city of Quebec, in the employ of the Government? If so, in what capacity; since when; and what is his salary?

Mr. AMYOT. Is the hon. gentleman authorised to ask that question?

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Yes.

Mr. AMYOT. Did Mr. Barron ask you to put the question?

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I was asked by Mr. Barron to ask the question.

Mr. CARLING. Leonce Stein is the chief clerk in the Immigration Agency in Quebec. He was appointed by Order in Council on the 8th June, 1877. His present salary is $1,000 per annum.

LIGHTS AND BUOYS IN LAKE ST. LOUIS.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before going into the Orders of the Day, I have been requested by a leading forwarder of Montreal to read the following telegram:

"Kindly ask why lights and buoys are not placed in Lake St. Louis. Department will not answer me."

Perhaps the department will give some explanation of this.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Unfortunately, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is laid up with an attack of neuralgia, but if the hon. gentleman will send me the telegram, I will send it to the department.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE—COMMANDANT'S RESIDENCE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Militia, in reply to a question of mine, yesterday, promised to inform me under what particular vote a payment was to be made for the purchase of a house for the Commandant of the College in Kingston. I believe he has the information now. Will he be kind enough to state it?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The amount required for the payment for a house purchased for the residence of the Commandant of the Royal Military College is charged to the vote for the Royal Military College for the year 1888-89.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want, of course, to precipitate a discussion, but I would remind the First Minister that a sum of that kind can with no propriety be charged to the vote which was taken, without any statement whatever to the House that such a purpose was intended. This is the purchase of a house in Kingston for the commandant. It was purchased, I understand, from a question addressed to the Minister, within a very few months, and instead of an item being brought down in the Estimates for it, my hon. friend informs me that it was to be paid for out of an unexpended balance. It appears to me that that is entirely contrary to all sound practice, and that a distinct vote in the Estimates ought to be brought down for such a purpose above all other purposes. There is no sort of justification, I think, for applying an unexpended balance to a purpose of that sort.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As I understand it, my colleague, the Minister of Militia, discussed that point with the Auditor General, and the Auditor General said that was the proper way of doing it. I quite agree with the statement of the hon. member opposite that, in a matter of that kind, the House should be fully informed. My hon. friend might have stated, in some discussion relating to militia expenditure, that this sum was going to be appropriated out of that vote for the purpose of furnishing the commandant's house.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a matter of public importance, and I think, under all the circumstances, it would be better to have a distinct vote brought down for it. The First Minister will see that it will be a most dangerous and a most mischievous precedent, the Auditor General to the contrary notwithstanding. I have great respect for Mr. McDougall's opinion on matters of detail, but on a point like that I must say that I differ entirely from him. I think a distinct vote ought to be brought down.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that I took the House into my confidence, and upon an answer to a question put to me across the House, I stated that the house had been purchased, and I gave the details of the purchase, and the amount of money paid. It may be that the amount should have been placed in the Estimates. My justification is, as I explained to the hon. gentleman, that we considered that it should be charged to an unexpended balance for 1888.

Mr. LAURIER. The question is not viewed, I think, in its proper light. The First Minister stated, in answer to my hon. friend, that the Auditor General found this to come within the statute. It is quite possible that the statute is wide enought to cover the appropriation, but there is the question of propriety apart. Though the sum may be legally appropriated, still the question is this—and this is the point raised—that it is not proper that this appropriation should take place, when no mention of it was made to the House. The voting of the money may be legal, but is it proper? That is the point that is made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is to say, that the great point is to inform the House of the appropriation. My hon. friend did inform the House, in answer to the question, of the purchase. I quite agree with the statement of the hon. gentleman opposite, that it would be well that such an expenditure were put specifically in the Estimates.

Mr. LAURIER. It is a wide stretch of discretion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman propose to do? I think that an item like that ought to be specifically brought down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman opposite will not be very punctilious about the notice, my hon. friend will bring it down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We will make no difficulty about the notice.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That when this House adjourns on Friday, it stand adjourned until Saturday at three o'clock, and that Government orders have precedence.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE—STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.

Mr. AMYOT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to say a few words on a matter of privilege. In the course of the few remarks I offered to this honorable House, on the 22nd inst., I asserted that one of the grounds of objections of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) to the subsidy of a new line of steamships between Canada and England, was that, by the Government resolution, the steamers would be bound to call to a French port. I had so understood the speech of the hon. gentleman as far as I could hear it from my seat. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in answer, has intimated to me, on the floor of this House, that he had not so construed the speech of the hon. member for Halifax. I have since verified his remarks by reference to the advanced sheet of the *Hansard*, and I find out that, in fact, I had misconstrued the words of my hon. friend. As reported in the *Hansard*, what he said was:

"But if the Government seek only to have a mail line, and the steamers have to go to a French port, its usefulness will be so impaired that there will not be sufficient travel from either side to support it."

So he was complaining that the line subsidised was only intended as a mail line, which, according to him, was in-

sufficient. He would have preferred, as he says in another part of his speech, a service "with a larger carrying capacity," so as to enable the ships to carry more freight. I believe it my duty to make this correction to my remarks of the 22nd instant, and to acknowledge that the hon. gentleman has in no way objected to Canadian steamers having connection with French ports. The hon. member for Halifax is the last man in this House whom I would treat harshly or unfairly; his constant and kind courtesy, his high personal character, and his devotedness to all parts of the Dominion entitle him to the very contrary. I am sorry such incidents occur. They are due to the vicious acoustic properties of this House. From the seat which we occupy, we can hardly hear what is said at six paces from us. The construction of the room is bad. An oval chamber should be made, and should do away with those columns behind which the voice goes not to return. I hope the hon. Minister of Public Works, during the recess, will remedy that most annoying state of things. It becomes very tedious when we have to sit for long hours, hearing a noise, but not being able to hear distinctly one-fourth of what is said.

I.C.R.—SUMMER RATES.

Mr. LAURIER. I called the attention of the First Minister the other day to the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk had adopted summer rates to the Maritime Provinces. I suggested the propriety of similar rates being adopted by the Intercolonial Railway. The right hon. gentleman was kind enough to say that he would have the matter investigated. Can he give me an answer as to the position of the matter now?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Summer rates have been adopted by the Intercolonial Railway. I received, as perhaps the hon gentleman knows, a communication from the Board of Trade of Quebec on the subject. I answered the board at once, and they thanked me for the prompt manner in which the arrangement had been made.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved second reading of resolutions respecting subsidies to certain railways therein mentioned.

Mr. LAURIER. I have just one observation to offer with respect to these resolutions, and it is in regard to the resolution respecting the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. That railway was granted a subsidy of $620,000, to be distributed as follows: $300,000 to be paid upon the completion of the first 20 miles of the road, or an amount equal to $15,000 a mile. Then $6,400 per mile was to be paid for the next 20 miles, and the balance, 60 miles, at the rate of $3,200 per mile. The hon. gentleman stated yesterday, in answer to a question from me, that the company had worked 50 miles of the road. If the company had conformed to the agreement they would have completed the first 20 miles, for which they would have been entitled to $300,000, and having received $375,000, there are $75,000 remaining to be applied on the next 20 miles, and that sum would cover a little less than 12 miles. That is to say, that the company should have completed now a little less than 32 miles and a little more than 31 miles. But the hon. gentleman has not been able to say that they have completed that length of road; he has merely stated that they had worked on the road over a distance of 50 miles. If the terms of the contract have not been complied with, if they have not completed 31 miles of the road, I submit to the right hon. gentleman that the company are not entitled to the balance of the subsidy they claim, because in order to be entitled to the balance of this subsidy, they must bring themselves within the terms of the statute, because if they are not compelled to fulfil the terms of their contract—for they have entered into a contract with the Government by the statute—they can leave the balance of the road unfinished, and they can receive for the portion of the road they have completed a subsidy far exceeding the subsidy intended to be granted them for that work. It will be necessary, under such circumstances, to have an accurate report as to the state of the road that has been completed in order to ascertain whether or not they have fulfilled the terms of the statute.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The statement I submitted to the House was prepared by the department, but if the resolutions are concurred in, I will not move any further stage until the information desired is brought down.

Mr. BERGERON. I may be allowed to say one word upon the question of railway subsidies. I congratulate the Government upon their granting subsidies to railways in the different parts of the country. The policy was inaugurated in 1879, and it has been a very progressive policy. I am sorry, however, that the Government have not seen their way to subsidise a railway, which is a very short one in length but a very important one, for which I asked a subsidy at the commencement of the Session, a railway in my county to run from Valleyfield to the Adirondack Mountains in the State of Vermont. I understand these subsidies are granted, not merely for the sake of constructing railways, but in order to promote the general interests of the country. Of all the railways that I see subsidised in the resolution, I do not believe there is one that would be of so much interest to the country as the one I have mentioned. This road from the St. Lawrence to the Adirondacks would bring into this country the wealth of that district of the State of Vermont which is called the ore district. There are mines there which are of the greatest importance, and the companies are obliged to take the ores to Cleveland in order to have them worked.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would mention to the hon. gentleman that this motion has simply reference to the renewal of lapsed subsidies. The question of new railway subsidies has not yet come before the House, and I only gave notice of those subsidies last night. When those subsidies come to be considered, we can properly have the speech of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BERGERON. I have seen the late subsidies, as well as those now under consideration, and I thought this was a proper time to bring this matter forward; but I yield to the suggestion of the Premier, and I will make my observations later.

Resolutions concurred in.

FRENCH TENDERS.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) I wish to call the attention of the Government and especially of the hon. Secretary of State, whom I now see in his seat, upon a state of things which, I believe, is unbearable. Whenever tenders are asked for in counties below Quebec, or at least in any county, they do not take the trouble of asking for French tenders, nor sending French forms of tenders. I have just received these forms of tenders, which are——

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation.) I do not think that is a matter upon which the hon. gentleman can now offer remarks to this House.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) If the House will allow me, I have only a few words to add.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) The hon. member will have an opportunity to offer his remarks when the House shall be moved into Committee of Supply.

CULLERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 142) to amend the Cullers Act, chapter 103 of the Revised Statutes.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Is it proposed to do away with the supervisor of cullers in Quebec?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that was the view of the Minister of Inland Revenue, but nothing was decided on as to it.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Some information of that must have reached Quebec, as I have received a telegram from Mr. Henry W. Walsh, a former president of the Quebec Board of Trade, which says:

"As a former president of the Board of Trade and a merchant of 50 years' standing in Quebec, I trust you will oppose the intention to do away with supervisor's office, as an act of gross injustice to the present supervisor and to the trade in general."

The other day it was represented that the trade were asking for these changes, but this telegram shows that such is not the case and that the trade of Quebec, which is deeply interested in this matter, is opposed to the changes to be made by the present Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no doubt that the officers whose salaries will be affected by the Bill are very much opposed to the measure, and all kinds of representations they could make have been made to the trade of Quebec, and that they have endeavored to speak with the voice of the trade of Quebec.

Mr. LAURIER. The object, as I understand, of the hon. gentleman was to abolish the office of collector of slide dues and not the supervisor of cullers.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The latter office is not abolished by this Bill or this scheme, nor does the Bill or the scheme make necessary the abolition of that office. I only stated what might possibly take place.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). If the Bill does not make it a necessity it will be impossible to abolish the office of supervisor of cullers. I would like to know is it intended to use the Bill for that object, and if not I do not see why the Government should take the power. All the merchants whom I have seen in Quebec recently have told me that the square timber business would be much larger this year than it has been for 18 years past. I am surprised to see that this year when there will be more need for the services of square timber cullers than there was for the last 18 years, that it is now proposed to reduce the number of cullers from thirteen to eight. I was told the other day that all the square timber cullers we have in Quebec will be needed this year for the largely increased trade that is expected.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I did not quite understand the Minister of Justice whether this first section provides for the repeal of that part of the Cullers Act which requires a supervisor of cullers to be appointed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The effect of this section is merely to repeal that part of the section of the Act which refers to the collector of slide dues. After the Bill passed the other day, the collection of the dues is no longer vested in the Inland Revenue Department.

On section 2,

Mr. LAURIER. There is no necessity for that now.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think there is. I remember an expression that the Minister gave me, that the cashier was a most competent person, who should be retained and might be put in charge.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). The present supervisor is the most competent man who could be appointed. I have no personal interest in him, because he belongs to the party of the Government, but I believe his appointment is recommended by all the trade of Quebec. He is a very civil officer, and he has been in the lumber business, owning a large mill and doing an immense business, for many years. No more competent man could be found in the whole Dominion for the position.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I wish to add my testimony in favor of the present supervisor (Mr. Patton). He is a most courteous and competent official, and I hope, under the provisions of this Act, whatever may be done in the way of reducing the expenditure, that Mr. Patton may be continued in the office he at present occupies. As the hon. member for Quebec has stated, he has the confidence of the merchants in Quebec, and I believe he has also the confidence of manufacturers who have to deal with the office.

On section 3,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The effect of this section is to strike out of section 32 the provisions regulating the number of cullers.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no opinion to express as to the merits of this disposition; it may be required or it may not be; that is more than I can say at present; but it seems to me that the time is most inopportune at the beginning of the season to make this reduction in the number of cullers, from thirteen to eight, because these men of course depend upon the business season for their livelihood. If this measure had been postponed for another year, I think no injustice would have been done to anybody.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I may add that there is a great difference between the culling of square timber and the culling of lumber. I know as a matter of fact that almost all the lumber merchants say they do not want the official culling. I know some firms whose lumber sells better because it has been culled by their own private cullers than if it had been done by the official cullers. But such is not the case with square timber. For that cullers will be necessary as much as they have ever been, and there will be as much done this year as in any year during the past ten years.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I can safely promise, on behalf of the Minister, that the staff will be kept up to the requirements of the trade in square timber.

On section 4,

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I drew the attention of the Minister of Inland Revenue the other day to this phase of the trade, that timber going to Quebec in rafts is usually what is technically called measured off, and then under the specification prepared in the supervisor's office, it is sold to the shipper, who has it culled by his own culler and classified for shipment to the old country. I want the Minister to state whether, in his opinion, timber which may have passed through the culler's office and been measured off under the authority of this Act, can be subsequently culled by the parties who purchase it without being required to have it culled by the Government cullers?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no doubt that this is the intention of the Act, and unless the hon. gentleman were able to call my attention to something that would make it obscure, I think that would be the result of it.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed, on a division.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 145) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. DEWDNEY. I wish to amend that, by inserting in the third line, after the word "Act," "or any prior Acts relating to Dominion Lands."

On section 4,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the object of that?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In taking the declarations of settlers, the department has authorised the homestead inspector in some cases, to take the declaration, whereas the Act states that it must be taken by the local agent. One of the objects of this clause, is to make valid those declarations which were taken inadvertently by the homestead inspectors. Another reason is, that the old Act only provided for a lien on the construction of the buildings, but not on the material.

Mr. WATSON. I do not particularly object to this clause, but the Minister ought to instruct the inspectors to be more careful in regard to the evidence they receive. In a case with which I have dealt this Session, the inspector apparently took only one side of the evidence, and the result was that the original homesteader, whose land had been cancelled, as I think wrongfully, had no right to put his evidence in at all, and the patent, on the report of the local inspector, was nearly being issued to the other applicant. I had reason to believe, and the department had reason to believe, that that was a one-sided report, because they stayed the entry until the original homesteader put in his evidence.

On section 7,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Suppose, for instance, you have certified to the Hudson Bay Company that certain sections shall vest in the company, of course that is under a contract, and does not require a patent from the Crown in order to vest the title in the company; but if you state that these sections are set out for settlement, although the survey may have been irregular, what would be the effect of this provision upon the title of that company to these particular sections. If the sections are, according to the irregular survey, more in their interest than they would be under the new survey, I doubt very much if this will allow you to prevent their keeping those sections.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The section and township lines are run much more carefully than sub-division lines, and this refers almost entirely to sub-divisions.

On section 8,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My impression is, without carefully considering the provision of the Act, that the hon. gentleman ought to make some further provision in order to prevent a valid title being set up against the surveys. I think it is a matter upon which the Minister of Justice ought to be consulted. I would say to the Minister of Justice that the Hudson Bay Company, under their contract with the Government, are entitled to certain sections in each township, that when the land is set out for settlement the title to these particular sections is vested in the Hudson Bay Company, and is not dependent upon the issue of the patent. The issue of the patent is merely a matter of convenience not necessary to a title. The Minister of the Interior makes provision in certain cases for a new survey after the land has been set out for settlement, after a title under that land survey would vest. This may be a very necessary provision to correct gross irregularities in the survey, but you would require to make some alteration in the Act to prevent the Hudson Bay Company acquiring a deed or title under the first survey, which can be affected or altered by the survey as it will be made under this Act. The Act requires some further provision in order to prevent the mischief to which I refer.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will give my attention to that section before the Bill finally passes.

Mr. WATSON. Does not the Minister think that 8 per cent. is too high for these people to pay who borrow money for building? Seven per cent. is the ordinary rate in Manitoba, and you authorise parties to collect as high as eight. I think these people give good security for the moneys advanced.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think it is too late to make that change now. I fancy that the commissioners made all these arrangements in England with the crofters on these terms.

On section 9,

Mr. DAVIN. Before you proceed further, I would call the attention of the Minister to one or two suggestions which I hope he will adopt. I know that the House is anxious to get away as quickly as possible, and for that reason I did not discuss this Bill on the second reading, for if I had discussed it then, I should again have to make the same proposals that I have to make now, and, with a view of economising the time of the House, I allowed the second reading to take place *sub silentio*. Now, the Minister of Interior is in possession of petitions on the subject of second homesteading; he has read the memorials, not only of this year, but that have heretofore been sent down by the North-West Council when he himself was Lieutenant Governor. He will be aware of certain petitions that were presented to this House by myself and by the then hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Perley), who was his predecessor. Now, these petitions relate mainly to second homesteading. In 1887, the following petitions were presented by Mr. Perley and myself:—

John O'Connor *et al*,	of	Belgonia	and	vicinity,	presented by Mr. Davin.
J. G. Gordon	"	Moose Jaw	"	"	"
John Secord	"	Regina	"	"	"
R. Fallis	"	McLean	"	"	"
Robert Reed	"	Parkin	"	"	Mr. Perley.
Geo. Anderson	"	Grenfell	"	"	"
B. Limoges	"	Whitewood	"	"	"
Adam Johnson	"	Moffat	"	"	"
John Trotter	"	Wolseley	"	"	"
David Miller	"	Benhecula	"	"	"
W. McInnis	"	Swift Current	"	"	Mr. Davin.
Wm. McKillop	"	Pengarth	"	"	"
Chas. Stewart	"	Rose Plain	"	"	"
C. H. Hinck	"	Strassburg	"	"	"
John Dermody	"	Montgomery	"	"	Mr. Perley.
Angus McBeath	"	Touchw'd Hills	"	"	"
A. G. Thorburn	"	Broadview	"	"	"
W. L. Atherton	"	Fort Qu'Appelle	"	"	"
Thos. Mutrie	"	Wishart	"	"	"
Chas. Watson	"	Hayward	"	"	"
Edward Carss	"	Carssvale	"	"	Mr. Davin.
Jos. Deskay	"	Esterhazy	"	"	Mr. Perley.
Geo. W. Grant	"	Saskatoon	"	"	Mr. Davin.
John Markin	"	Parklands	"	"	Mr. Perley.
W. A. Smith	"	Workman	"	"	"
R. J. Steele	"	Trigarva	"	"	Mr. Davin.
Jas. Russell	"	Longlakton	"	"	"
A. Maxwell	"	Marcetow	"	"	"

In 1889 the following petitions were presented by myself:—

D. L. McPherson *et al*, of North-West Territories.
John Drinnan *et al*, of Medicine Hat, North-West Territories,

Chas. Holden *et al*, of Regina, North-West Territories.
George Seibold *et al*, (Germans) of Regina District, North-West Territories.

A considerable number more were presented by Mr. Perley and by myself. The Minister of Interior, before the meeting of Parliament, had a memorial sent down to him from the agricultural societies of the North-West, one from Moose Jaw, and others from several other agricultural societies, insisting on one or two things, but mainly insisting on the right of those who were entitled under the Act of 1883 to a second homestead and were deprived of it by subsequent legislation—praying that they should be re-established in their rights. It is not a very large affair, and I will show the Minister why, in common justice, it should be done. I have here in my hand——

Mr. PRIOR. What is it?

Mr. DAVIN. A guide book, published in 1885 by the Department of Agriculture. Mind, the date here is of some considerable importance.

"In the case of a homesteader being entitled to receive his homestead patent for land occupied by him for the full period of three years, he will, on production of a certificate to that effect from the Commissioner of Dominion Lands, be permitted to made a second entry."

Here is a book circulated by the Department of Agriculture in 1885-86 throughout Europe, throughout England, Scotland and Ireland; and nevertheless you pass an Act in 1886 by which every man that had a moral and legal right to a second homestead, would have been deprived of it; that Act was assented to on the 2nd June, 1886. I told the House already this Session how I got Mr. White to put that on to 1887, and I hope I will get the present Minister to do justice by putting the date on to 1889. If he puts the date in the clause on from 1887 to 25th May, 1889, he will not leave a man in the Territories that can grumble on this point. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that all that is necessary is the insertion of a suitable clause; and I have a clause here I should like to submit, but as a private member I cannot move it, and I should be out of order if I attempted to do so. The clause reads:

"Clause 43 of said Act as amended by clause 59, chapter 31 of the Act passed in the Session held in the fiftieth and fifty-first years of Her Majesty's reign, is hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefor:

"43. No person who has obtained a homestead patent or a certificate countersigned by the Commissioner of Dominion Lands, or a member of the Dominion Lands Board, as in the next preceding clause mentioned, shall be entitled to obtain another homestead entry: Provided, however, that any person who on the second day of June, in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine, had obtained a homestead patent, or a certificate of recommendation for a patent, countersigned by the Commissioner of Dominion Lands, or who had complied with the homestead provisions of the Acts then in force relating to Dominion Lands, entitling him to such certificate, or any person who has been permitted under the terms of section thirty-eight of the Dominion Lands Act, 1883, to create a charge upon his homestead, and had completed his homestead duties on the said second of June, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine, shall be permitted to make a second homestead entry."

That clause would then be precisely what the clause is in the amended Act, with the difference that instead of 1887 you would have 1889. Of course, the answer that will be made by the hon. gentleman is this: The policy is a bad one. As I said in 1887, if the policy is a bad one, whose fault is it? Is it the fault of those who read your pamphlets and Act of Parliament, who took your pledged faith in pamphlets and in Act of Parliament and came into the North-West, as some of these petitioners say they came, on the faith of your pledged word, nay, on the faith of your solemn Act of Parliament, and afterwards you turn round and cut them down as with a scythe, not leaving one man entitled under your legislation to obtain a second homestead but for the change I got Mr. White to make in 1887. I will give the House an idea of some of the hard cases in regard to this matter. Take the case of my friends the Porters at Medicine Hat. Those men went there in 1883. When they began to plough Mr. Pierce went to them and warned them not to plough. He did not give any reason; he gave them the idea that the land was to be part of a reserve. The railway had not got there then, and this was done because of what might be termed the sinister town site policy we had adopted. When these men were about to plough and cultivate, Mr. Pierce came to them, and told them not to do it. They stopped then, and did nothing. The next year the railway had got there, and as they were four and a half miles north-east of the railway, they had some idea they might go on, and they erected a tent in the spring of 1884, and began ploughing and cultivating. At this hour they are among the best farmers in Canada, and among our foremost farmers in the North-West. They have 160 head of cattle, a large tract of land, well cultivated, and yet these men who came in during 1883, forsooth, because they did not get their recommendation for a patent before legislation that was entirely unjust, entirely unworthy of Canada, and unworthy of the Government, these men, if they wish, cannot get a second homestead There is also, north of Moose Jaw, a friend of mine, W. C. Sanders. You will see his name in the report of Mr. Saunders, of the Experimental Farm; and you will find out from that report that he is one of our most intelligent farmers. He went there in 1883, and was assured by the Commissioner of Dominion Lands in Winnipeg that he would be quite safe if he went east to purchase stock. He went east for that purpose, and remained seven months purchasing stock; and because he was only five months of that year on his homestead, although morally, of course, he was really a resident on his homestead, he could not get his patent in time for a second homestead. These are hardships, and I entreat the attention of members on both sides of the House to the case, and above all, I urge the Minister of the Interior to consider it. I can assure him that he could do nothing, in my opinion, that would be more conducive to the efficiency of his department, and, above all, to the satisfying of the people of the North-West, than the adoption of this clause, which I cannot move. There is another topic. The other day the Minister was asked a question about the half-breeds, and in regard to Gabriel Dumont being among them. I ask the Minister's attention to this matter, because I have had a letter from there, and I am told the half-breeds are discontented, and I should also like very much to have the attention, if I might venture to ask it, of the Minister of Justice. Here are men that you go to deal with who were not in Manitoba when you dealt originally with the half-breeds for the extinguishment of the Indian title. They had nothing to do with the half-breeds in Manitoba, when Parliament set aside 1,400,000 acres for the extinguishment of the Indian title there. Yet you go to them, and expect them to deal with you on the precise footing you dealt with those men with whom they had nothing to do, and with the privity of whose contract they had nothing whatever to do. You ask them to be satisfied with those conditions. If you want the extinguishment of the Indian title, as it is acknowledged to rest in them, you must go and bargain with them, and with their children. Up to the present date this matter is a trifle; but if you fail to do this you give an argument to Gabriel Dumont, and men of that kind, to stir up trouble and strife, and I do hope we shall not have an exhibition of what we had before, that, the moment these men get restless and really troublesome, you send impetuously a Commission up there to deal with the matter. I have a clause here dealing with the subject, but again I cannot move it. I would be out of order as a private member if I were to do so, but it is very much at the service of the hon. Minister if he will accept it. The clause reads as follows:—

"That whereas it is expedient to end all half-breed claims, and whereas under the Half-breed Commission of the 28th of March, 1885, the Indian title *quoad* half-breeds only extended to those born prior to the

15th of July, 1870, and as in the interval between the 15th of July, 1870, and the 28th of March, 1885, a number of children were born to parents coming under the said Commission, be it enacted that such children shall be dealt with on the same footing as the half-breeds born prior to the 15th July, 1870, and those half-breeds who residing in the North-West Territories on the 20th of April, 1885, who were otherwise entitled to scrip but who failed to comply with the conditions of the Order in Council of the 20th of April, 1885, be granted scrip, notwithstanding such Order in Council. And any judge of the Supreme Court of the North-West Territories is hereby empowered to hear, investigate and adjust half-breed claims arising under this Act or previous Acts of the Parliament of Canada."

I will venture to say, that if the Minister of the Interior will place this question before the Minister of Justice, that hon. gentleman cannot come to any conclusion other than that the suggestion I make is one prompted alike by considerations of morality and also by everything that law and justice would suggest. There is another matter I would like to have seen dealt with in the Act, and I will suggest a clause for the consideration of the hon. gentleman. I think we ought to do something to encourage tree culture in the North-West, and I would suggest this clause:

"Any person who has obtained a homestead or pre-emption entry, may elect to pay for his pre-emption in whole, or in part, by planting trees, tree planting being allowed to count at the rate of 5 cents a tree, planted either on homestead or pre-emption, but no credit shall be given for trees which had not been planted at least three years before the payment is made, and which are not healthy at the time of making the payment."

I think if a clause like that were adopted by the Minister it would lead to a very desirable energy being displayed in the cultivation of trees. There is another provision that is probably needed in the Act, or, the object might be dealt with by regulation, and it is this. It is a mistake, in my opinion, that cancelled pre-emptions are not placed in the same position as cancelled homesteads. I cannot see why, if a man can enter on a cancelled homestead, he should not be able to enter on a cancelled pre-emption. I know very well the idea that will suggest itself to some minds, especially to a bureaucratic mind: Oh, that would interfere with our income; but, Sir, it would interfere very little with our income, and if you got a second homesteader on to a cancelled pre-emption, he and his family will soon be paying into the pockets of the country a great deal more than you can get from a person who should go and purchase that cancelled pre emption. Of course if we can get a new comer to go on to a cancelled pre emption it is as useful as a man having a second homestead. I did not bring this point before the House when we were on the second reading of this Bill, for the reason that I wanted to economise the time of the House. We are now in Committee and I will send over these clauses to the Minister of Interior, with great respect and with my compliments, and if he thinks it worth while to adopt any of them I shall only be too glad. I know that that second homestead question cannot rest as it is, for the reason that that policy of the Government is entirely against justice and against the sentiments of the people of the North-West. From every part of Assiniboia petitions have come to us in reference to this matter, and I hope sincerely that the Minister of Interior will see his way to meet the demands of the people.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In reference to the matter of second homesteads, I think the hon. gentleman knows my opinion with regard to them. I think it was unfortunate that a second homestead was ever given, and I am quite sure that, although he has named a number of petitioners who are personally interested in getting these, I can get a larger number of people to protest against second homesteading as a principle. From what the hon. gentleman has said, I do not think he expects me to introduce these clauses into our present amended Bill, but I can assure him that every settler who is entitled to a second homestead will get it, however I may feel very much disinclined to perpetuate a system which I think has been a very great injury to the country. The hon. gentleman mentions a great number of people in my own district who have sent petitions here. That may be the case, but, although that is the case, it would not affect me one way or the other in making any change in the law which I think would be detrimental to the country. In regard to the question concerning the half-breed claims, which the hon. gentleman has submitted, that is a matter which requires some consideration, and I promised the hon. gentleman, and some others, a short time ago, that I would look into it. I do not think this is a proper time to consider that question, nor is it a proper amendment to insert in this Bill. I feel very much inclined to assist, in every possible way, the tree culture of the country, but I do not think we can do it successfully by the proposition which the hon. gentleman has made. I think he had better leave these matters rest for the present. I propose not to tinker with the Dominion Lands Act this year, and I only brought in such amendments as are absolutely necessary. During the recess I shall go very carefully into the matter of the land regulations, and I hope before the next Session opens to be able to suggest some amendments to the Land Act which, I think, will be acceptable to the people of the North-West.

Mr. DAVIN. The Minister says that the persons who have petitioned are interested. Of course they are interested; but what harm is that? Is it against a man who goes into court with a just claim that he is interested? What would you think of a judge who said to him: "Sir, you are interested in this case, and you should be nonsuited." Of course, the people of the North-West are interested in this matter, and why should they not be? I have here the speech of the late Hon. Mr. White, delivered at Qu'Appelle, on this question, and he describes the people whom the hon. Minister might get to petition against this, and says that they are men who have homesteaded in Manitoba, and gone out there and taken up a second homestead. Mr. White said:

"But there is no doubt whatever about this, that where there are grievances or complaints it is a matter of the greatest possible consequence that they should be promptly dealt with either one way or the other. (Hear, hear.) If a complaint is made, whether it be by a company or an individual settler in the North-West Territories, if a complaint is made, my own conviction is—and I entirely concur in the statement of the address on that point—that it is a matter of the greatest possible consequence that it should be dealt with at once. It does not follow, mark you, that you can remove the grievance, it does not follow that you can do exactly to a man or corporation or community all that you ought to do; but it is important that they should have your answer, whatever that answer may be—Yes or No. For instance, if a man feels that a man should like his homestead without performing his duties on it, it is better that he should be told that he shall not have it than to be kept dilly-dallying, writing—or getting his friends to write—and not knowing what his fate is in regard to it. It is better that the thing should be settled promptly, and if the Yes is given, then he gives twice who gives quickly; and the fact should be recognised by the Government in dealing with the public."

He continued to say:

"Now, gentlemen, these are the subjects referred to in your address; but there are other subjects referred to in other addresses and in relation to which I may say a word or two. One of these which was referred to in the very first address presented to me when I came into the country is that of second homesteading; and last night, at the meeting to which I referred and which was a meeting of very intelligent farmers who knew what they were talking about, and many of whom were second homesteaders, as they stated to the meeting, they dealt with it in a manner which was entirely in sympathy with the prevailing sentiment I had heard, and that is that second homesteading has proved in its practical operation to be a mistake, and that, therefore, it ought not to be continued."

Now, Sir, of course, as I say, some of these persons have denounced the second homesteading as a bad policy, and on the question whether the second homesteading is a bad policy or not, the hon. Minister and I are one; but that is not the question I raise here; it is not a question whether it is a bad or a good policy, but the question is whether it is a bad or good policy to do injustice to people to whom you gave certain rights. That is a wholly different question. The Hon. Mr. White then went on to say:

"Now, the object the Government had in view in adopting the principle of second homesteading was a very laudable one. At that time we

were all in a condition of boom, we supposed all the land of the North-West would be worth a great deal of money, and that every man who came here would be enabled to become very rich. At that time the idea was that a pioneer farmer from one of the old Provinces who knew what settlement in a new country was, and who could deal with the conditions by which he was surrounded in a good and proper way; that such a farmer coming into the country could, as soon as he got his patent, possibly sell to a tenant farmer coming from the old world who knew nothing about this pioneer work and would be anxious to get a farm partially improved, with buildings erected, and so on."

It will, therefore, be seen that the late Minister of the Interior, who was present in this House when this policy of a second homestead was adopted, tells you that the object the Government had in view in passing this second homestead clause was actually to make speculators; to cause men to come in there and take a farm and then to sell it and go to fresh fields and pastures new. I know as a fact that most of the second homesteaders want to cultivate not only their present homestead but their second homestead as they want more land; but even if you take the very worst view of the second homesteading, that the man is a speculator, we have the authoritative interpretation of the late Minister of the Interior that that view was the very one which was present to the mind of the Government. Under these circumstances, I do not think that the hon. Minister of the Interior saying that he disapproves of it, and that it does not meet his views or the views of the Government, will settle this question, because if you have the whole Government of Canada against it, or if you have the Government of 500 Canadas against it, the persons who are demanding the right to a second homestead have, by reason of your Act of 1883, and your pamphlets issued by the department in 1885, promising them a second homestead, justice on their side, and with justice on their side they will beat the Government in this matter. I should be very sorry to see the Government persevere in that policy, because I remember the flourish of trumpets with which it was first announced, and if it is persevered in, we shall have the spectacle of the Government of Canada strutting into a difficulty and afterwards sneaking out of it.

Mr. WATSON. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia has told the Government what the results will be unless they yield to the demands of those people who think they are entitled to a second homestead. As one who had a seat in the House at the time the Bill of 1883 was passed, and as an advocate of second homestead entry, I wish to state that the object of providing for a second homestead entry was not to encourage people to come to this country in the hope of obtaining two homesteads, but the object was to retain in our own country people who had sold their lands, and who, if they did not obtain a second homestead, would have gone and settled south of the boundary line. The third clause of this Act is, no doubt, intended to provide that patents shall not be declared to have been obtained fraudulently on account of homesteaders who disposed of their rights before the recommend for patent had issued. Some did dispose of their rights during the boom days, and they were ready to go to the United States if they could not get a second homestead in this country; and the object of placing that provision in the Act of 1883, was to retain those people in Manitoba and the North-West. I have no doubt that the interpretation of the clause given by the hon. member for West Assiniboia is correct, but it was not the intention of the House or of the Government at that time to offer such inducement to immigrants coming to the country. I am glad to hear the Minister of Interior state that the matter of tree planting is likely to receive his favorable consideration. If the Government do not feel disposed to grant a tree claim, I think the suggestion of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia, that they should allow, say 5 cents a tree, for all trees found growing on a homestead, in lieu of payment for the land, is a very fair one. Like the hon. member for West Assiniboia, I believe early settlers should have the right to make a second homestead entry of their pre-emption. A great many people go into that country who are not able, out of their earnings from their homestead, to pay for their pre-emption, and in a great many instances the pre emptions have fallen into the hands of speculators; and if these people were allowed to go on and earn their pre-emptions by large improvements, it would be in the interest of the settlers and the Government. Another matter, which has not been referred to by the hon. member for West Assiniboia, but which should receive the attention of the Government, is, that persons who made entries for 80-acre homesteads and 80-acre pre-emptions, should be placed on the same footing as people who have come to the country later and obtained homesteads of 160 acres. This is one of the results of a changing and vacillating land policy. The land regulations, as I have repeatedly stated, change not only from year to year, but from month to month. A considerable number of homesteaders took up lands when the regulations only allowed them to take up an 80-acre homestead and an 80 acre pre-emption at $2.50 per acre. After, the regulations were changed so that settlers could acquire 160 acres of homestead and 160 acres of pre-emption, and those people petitioned the Government that they should be placed on the same footing as settlers who came in at a later date. The Government has modified the regulations, so as to allow them to take up 160 acres, provided that they will purchase 80 acres or 160 acres of some other Government land at $2.50 an acre. That is not a right policy; it encourages a system of speculation, because speculators will hunt these people up and try to induce them to purchase the land and transfer it to them; and I had hoped that the Minister of the Interior would have seen fit to have made the Act retroactive, in order to give these people the same advantages and the same encouragement as people who came into the country years later. There are some other matters which I would like to mention in connection with the land regulations, but I have referred to them before, and at this stage of the Session I do not wish to take up any more of the time of the House.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY—BRITISH COLUMBIA MINING LAWS.

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

Mr. MARA. I wish simply to call the attention of the Government for a few minutes to the complicated state of the mining laws in the railway belt in British Columbia. During the past four years, the mines there have been practically locked up on account of the suit between the Provincial Government and the Dominion Government, and it is impossible to estimate the injury the Province has sustained during that time by reason of the Government not being able to give titles to mining lands. It is true the miner has been able to prospect and work his mines, but an individual miner or a company of miners can do very little in quartz mining without the aid of capital, and capitalists will not invest when there is any doubt or uncertainty as regards title. I may mention one case which will show how mining development has been retarded during the past four years through the legislation of both Governments. The Selkirk Company, of Ille-cille-waet, spent two years in opening up what are believed to be rich and valuable mines, and had laid out about $100,000 when they found they would require a further outlay of about $200,000 or $300,000 to enable them to erect works, build a tramway and develop the mine in such away as to enable them to ship ore. Not having the means themselves, they endeavored to secure outside capital. They succeeded in interesting a firm of English capitalists, who, after an examination of the mine, agreed to float a company in England, to give them one-third paid-up shares, and to recoup them the $100,000 they had expended, provided they could obtain a title. Yet,

although the old company recorded their claims with both Governments, and did everything the law required, they were not able to satisfy the English capitalists, who said that where there was so much uncertainty about the title, and when there was a direct conflict between the mining laws of the Province and the mining regulations of the Dominion Government, they could not invest, and that valuable mine is to-day at a standstill. It is generally supposed that the decision of the Privy Council, given a short time ago, settled these difficulties. I am sorry to say that is not the case. Although settled satisfactorily, so far as the Provincial Government is concerned, it has, in another direction, only tended still further to complicate matters. The Provincial Government are, of course, satisfied with having gained their suit, and having established the claim for which they contended, the miner also is satisfied because he is more favorable to the mining laws of the Province, believing them to be more liberal, and that he will have less difficulty in obtaining a Crown grant from the Provincial Government than from the Dominion Government. But the capitalist is not satisfied, because he has now two Governments to deal with instead of one, two staffs of officials to deal with instead of one, and two sets of mining laws, which, in one essential point, are diametrically opposed to each other. The position is this: The Provincial has control over the precious metals, which only include silver and gold; the Dominion has the control over the baser metals and surface rights. A miner may obtain a license from the Provincial Government, and record his claim with the Provincial Government, but the Dominion Government may say to him: Before you cut a single stick of timber on that ground, you must get our permission; before you put a pick into the ground, or erect a building for your works, you must get our permission. They may go further, and say: It is true, you have acquired the right to mine for precious metals, but we have control over the baser metals; we believe that the ore on which you are now going to work contains base metals, and we will give a license to anyone wishing to mine for base metals in that ground. Hence, you have to apply to the two Governments—to the one to mine for precious metals, and to the other to work for base metals. In a case of that kind, who is to decide? The law courts will have to decide. Of course, it may be said that the Dominion Government will not interpret the law harshly. But if you follow up their own regulations, and if the land is vacant, any miner may ask that a claim be recorded in his favor. Once recorded in his favor it is alienated to him. He then has all the rights of the Dominion Government and can say to the miner who obtained his license from the Provincial Government: If you do not abandon your right in favor of mine, I will apply to the courts for an injunction, or you must buy me off. It is well known that along the line of railway there are large bodies of low grade ore, and it is impossible to determine whether they contain precious or base metals. If the galena carries more silver than lead, it is a precious metal; if it carries more lead than silver, it is a base metal. And the Dominion Government may have jurisdiction one day and the Provincial the next. The character of the ore frequently changes. One day the ore will carry more silver than lead; another day more lead than silver. In support of this view that we have these low grade ores with the precious metals side by side, found in the same claim, I will read a few short extracts from the report of Mr. James Brady, mining engineer:

"Field on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and on the western slope of the Rocky Mountains, is reported to have been shipping argentiferous galena at the rate of about 100 tons a week to Vancouver in anticipation of the smelting works at that place starting up. The 'Monarch' and other claims in this district are in a fair base metal and silver bearing belt which crosses the railway, and extends from above Funnel Mountain to Otter Tail Creek."

Again:

"Jubilee Mountain and Spellumacheen on the west side of the Columbia River above Golden, make a good showing, and have a considerable quantity on the various dumps, and will, undoubtedly, be in a condition to ship considerable quantities of smelting ores as soon as navigation opens."

These sections are partly in the Dominion belt and partly out of it. There is only an imaginary line dividing them. The miner will be unable to tell whether he should record his claim with the Provincial Government or with the Dominion Government, and, if afterwards the mine proves to be valuable, and the survey is made, it is only then that it can be determined which Government will have jurisdiction over the mines. Then again:

"McMurdo's camp is a promising district for base metal and silver ore, and can ship by steamer to Golden."

Here we have the authority of a mining engineer of high standing, that base and precious metals are found side by side, and, as my hon. friend to my left (Mr. Colby), an old miner, reminds me, even in the same shaft. That reminds me of another point which I had almost forgotten to mention. The mining laws of the Province of British Columbia are based upon the laws of California and all the mining States in the Union except one, but the Mining Regulations of the Dominion are different. The laws of British Columbia permit the miner to follow dips, spurs and angles of his lode or vein. The Dominion regulations insist upon the miner adhering to vertical lines. Under the provincial law the miner may go outside of the vertical lines, if the lode is found to be a spur or angle of his lode. A man may have a lode or vein which may be base metal when he takes up his claim under the Dominion Government, but he may suddenly find precious metal, and that he is working the spur or angle of a man who has been previously licensed under the Provincial Government, and though he has spent money upon it, the other man can take his claim away from him. We have two Governments in these lands, and two sets of officers administering two sets of laws. What I think should be done is this. The law should be assimilated, but perhaps that is not going far enough. You may assimilate the laws and yet have two sets of officers administering the same laws, but not thinking alike, and therefore there will constantly be trouble, as one is dealing for the Dominion and the other for the Provincial Government. What we require is that the mining laws shall be administered by the same Government, and that the laws enacted, while liberal to the miner, will afford such protection to the capitalist as will enable him to feel that he has an assured title, free from any doubt, cloud or uncertainty. Now, as to the remedy. Our Province has in the Peace River district a large area of what is believed to be rich agricultural land. I would suggest—and the idea does not originate with me, but has been before the public for some time—that an exchange should be made with the Provincial Government of those lands in the Peace River district for the lands in the railway belt. Those lands are contiguous to your North-West, and are more easy of access from the North-West. If it can be shown that the Dominion Government can administer the lands better in the interest of the Province than the Provincial Government, I would say, let the Dominion Government administer them, but I think it can be proved that the lands can be better administered by the Provincial Government. Their Government is on the spot. The members of that Government are brought more closely in contract with the people. They have made mining laws a study, and will be better able to make such changes and modifications as may from time to time be required. Another important point is that the mining laws can be administered more economically by the Local Government, because they have officials all along the line at every important point, while the Dominion has officials only at two points Westminster and Calgary. I, therefore, think the law can be more economically administered by the Provincial Government. Of

course, the exchange of lands requires negotiation, and we hold that no time should be lost. Mining development has been retarded for four years, and I would press upon the Government that, in a matter of such vital importance to the Province, they should ask the Provincial Government to administer the base metal mines. There is no class of the community which pays so much to the Government in the way of duties as the mining community. I have shown that the mining laws within the belt are in the most complicated state. All we ask is that the Government should take some step, and at as early a date as possible. to remove those difficulties and place the laws in such a state that the miners will be encouraged to prospect, and the capitalist to invest his money and assist in mining development.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have listened with a great deal of attention, and I think with some profit, to the remarks made by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara). I understand quite well the anxiety which he has on this subject, and I also know the anxiety which is felt by a very large number of people in British Columbia in regard to this matter. I am an old British Columbian myself, and I am an old miner, and, consequently, I have a fellow feeling for British Columbians and for the position in which they are placed in regard to this matter. The complication has been going on for the last four years, as the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara) has stated, but it was thought that the decision of the Privy Council in the case lately before them would have, to some extent, brought us out of the difficulty. However, when I saw a copy of the judgment in the *Times* a few days ago, I found that the decision was given only with regard to the precious metals. Probably that was the only claim made by the Province of British Columbia. The unfortunate claim of the Local Government has certainly placed the matter in a more unsatisfactory state than it was previously. The hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara) has shown that it is very difficult to dissociate the precious metals from the baser metals. I have always found that the difficulty with regard to the administration of the minerals in the railway belt has been increased to some extent by the difference between the laws of British Columbia and the mining regulations of the Dominion. This is a matter which could be very easily rectified if thought necessary. The larger question which the hon. gentleman referred to, namely, the transfer of the railway belt for lands in the Peace River, is a very serious matter. With regard to the smaller matter, an arrangement has been suggested by which the two Governments might come to terms. I agree that no time should be lost by which some such arrangement should be come to for the working of those mines. We all know that capital is ready to be put into the mines, already a considerable sum has been invested. I can assure the hon. gentleman that, so far as I am concerned, I shall invite my colleagues to communicate at an early day with the Government of British Columbia with a view of coming to some arrangements. I find that before I took office a proposition had been made to the Government of British Columbia to exchange our railway belt lands for lands in the Peace River country. This has been considered by my predecessor, and I am informed that he did not look upon it very favorably. Last summer Mr. Robson, one of the members of the Local Government, visited Ottawa, and also placed this proposition before the Government, but on account of this claim being at that time before the Privy Council, it was not thought advisable to deal with the matter. However, I am quite sure that the Government will be ready to consider any proposition that the British Columbia Government might make, and I can assure the hon. member for Yale that I shall do everything that I can in order to bring about a satisfactory settlement, so that these mines may be worked.

Mr. MARA.

MILITIA AND DEFENCE—CLOTHING.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the House proceeds again into Committee of Supply, I desire to invite the attention of the House to an important branch of the public service—I refer to the Department of Militia and Defence. I am sure that the interest which hon. gentlemen, without regard to party, take in that important service, will be allowed a sufficient excuse for my taking up the time of the House at this late period of the Session. It is within the recollection of all of us that it is but a short time since the regular army of England was found represented in various parts of the Dominion of Canada; but, about the time of Confederation, a change of policy in that regard was adopted by the Imperial authorities, and since that time we have been left to our own resources, and allowed to develop in our own way whatever system of militia might commend itself to the people of Canada. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Canada are not, as a whole, I think, in favor of a standing army. We desire, if possible, to develop and maintain a volunteer system, believing that it will sufficiently attain the objects of the force, and, at the same time, aid in building up and developing a proper sentiment in the country. For 21 years, or thereabouts, we have been engaged in developing this system. During that time the people have submitted to considerable burdens in order to give the system a fair chance. Year by year, this Parliament has been called upon to expend large sums of money to aid in developing the force. That taxation on the part of the people up to the present time, acquiesced in, unprotested against, is good evidence, I think, that the people desire the system to be maintained according as the resources of the country warrant. My remarks being particularly directed to the present Administration, I will not refer to the system prior to coming into office, under the present Government, of the Minister of Militia, to whose administration I intend especially to direct my remarks, not holding him responsible for the state of affairs prior to the year 1880. I may state, for the information of the House, that in that year the people placed at his disposal, in order to maintain this system, the sum $690,018.93. That was the amount necessary at that time to maintain the volunteer system of Canada. Since that time that expenditure has increased by leaps and bounds, and during the year closing 30th June, 1888, the ordinary expenditure of the department of Militia and Defence amounted to $1,273,178 59; in other words, the expenditure of $690,000, with which the Minister began his administration in 1880, has, within eight years, increased by 85 per cent., or by the sum of $583,160. That increase, spread over the full period of eight years, amounts to the sum of $76,895, as representing the annual growth of the expenditure under his administration. This year we have been called upon to vote, and are about to vote and place at the disposal of the hon. gentleman who presides over that department, the sum of $1,290,200, being the largest sum ever yet placed in the hands of any Minister of Militia in Canada; in other words, we are now asked to place at his disposal in the department a sum almost double that which was found sufficient to carry on the system in 1880 under his own administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, is there any reason why the expenditure has increased to this extent, and at this rapidity? I ask the hon. gentleman whether the service has doubled in efficiency within the last eight years. Is there any record, either within or without Parliament, that would justify any hon. gentleman in saying, on the floor of this House or outside of it, that the increased advantages afforded to the force have been in proportion to the increased expenditure? Has this expenditure produced satisfaction in regard to the administration of the department? I hardly think any person at all familiar with the public opinion of the country will venture to assert that it has,

Unfortunately, in this case, it appears to me that the more money that is placed in the hands of the Minister of Militia and Defence, the more unwisely the expenditure is made, and the greater the sum placed at the disposition of the department, the more the public interests are neglected. I speak advisedly when I say that, with respect to a large portion of the volunteers, and I speak for the volunteers in the district from which I come, Toronto and that district, and representing, as I think they do, to a very large extent, the opinion of the volunteers of a large radius around that district,—I say, speaking as I think, their opinion, that there is but one opinion with regard to the administration of the Department of Militia and Defence, namely, that it is not administered in the interest of the force, and, as a result, the volunteers of that district, at least, have entirely lost confidence in the Minister of Militia. I may be in error on this point; I speak from my own experience. There are other hon. gentlemen who are familiar with the feeling that obtains, and they are supporters of the Administration. I do not know what their sentiments are in regard to this matter, but they are here to contradict me if I am wrong, and in their presence and with the full knowledge of what I say, I assert that the volunteers, the militia force of that part of Canada to which I have referred, are, I believe, unanimously in favor of a change in the head of the Department of Militia and Defence. One might naturally ask, what is there to show for this vast increase of expenditure at the hands of the department? It will be said that we got full value for all the money that we expended. It is known to this House that it is almost impossible for a member in Opposition to ascertain all the details connected with the expenditure of that sum of money, but, notwithstanding those disadvantages, it has been within the power of a Committee of this House, to some extent, to ascertain whether there was any real foundation for the charges that have, from time to time, been made against the department. It has been charged against the head of the department that he has made improvident contracts, that he has wasted public money, that in his administration of the department he has departed from sound business principles, that he has degraded the service, that he has introduced political considerations into the administration and patronage of his office. These acts have been charged against the hon. gentleman, and if one-tenth of them be true, this House should not allow them to be continued for one moment. So far as the opportunity afforded by the Public Accounts Committee was concerned, I say these charges have been sustained and more than sustained. That Committee has only been able to take up one slight branch of the expenditure this Session, but so far as that enquiry has gone, it has established the grossest misapplication of the public funds by the Minister of Militia and Defence.

Mr. HESSON. That is not true.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps, when I have read the evidence, the House will find whether it is true or not, and if the House fails to do so the country will find it, and so, at all events, I shall have discharged my duty by giving the House and the country the evidence in support of the statement which I have made.

Mr. HESSON. You utterly failed to sustain the case.

Mr. MULOCK. We shall see from the evidence what I have accomplished. I charge the Minister of Militia and Defence with having issued contracts for supplies of clothing for his department without regard to sound business principles. I charge him with having made contracts at unnecessarily high figures and without having invited tenders. I charge him with having issued contracts to political supporters of the Administration to supply the Militia force of Canada with clothing at prices 50 per cent. and more higher than the price for which he could have obtained better material in other quarters.

Mr. HESSON. It is not correct.

Mr. MULOCK. I shall show whether it is correct or not. I am making the charge, and I am going to give the evidence. I may say that we have only been able to investigate the details of one contract, so difficult is it to conduct an enquiry of this kind before a cumbersome body like the Public Accounts Committee. I charge that the Minister of Militia and Defence sanctioned the issuing of a contract to one W. E. Sanford, now a member of the Senate of Canada, to supply the Militia force of Canada with a large quantity of clothing, and that at the time he issued that contract he had in his possession a tender from the firm of Webb & Co. of England to supply clothing at a very much less price. The facts were these: That shortly after the tender of Webb & Co. was received the Minister signed the contract with Mr. Sanford, giving him a greatly increased price over the price for which those goods could have been procured from Webb & Co. Let me say that in 1886 the Department of Militia issued an advertisement for certain supplies. From that time down to the present they have never called upon the public by advertisement to compete for contracts connected with the Militia Department. There was but one advertisement ever issued, and that was in 1886. After that year, what do we find? In 1887 there was a general election, and Mr. Sanford, now a member of the Senate—and as a member of the Senate I would desire to speak of him with all respect, but as a public contractor I must, in the discharge of my duty, refer to him in the capacity of a contractor—rendered valuable services to the Conservative party during that election. I received information which justified me in stating to the Committee that Mr. Sanford had contributed a very large sum of money to secure the success of the Conservative party during that election, and I proposed, if I were permitted to do so, to enquire as to whether those improvident contracts subsequently let to him were not intended to serve the purpose of recoupment. The Committee declined to allow that enquiry. There is the fact, however, that the Minister did, as I say, give to Mr. Sanford in 1887 a contract to supply the department with a large quantity of militia clothing, and issued that contract to him without having published any advertisement in any paper in Canada calling for tenders. The only thing they did on that occasion was to issue a circular to four merchant tailors in Canada calling upon them to tender; these four being favorites of the Government who had already held contracts. That circular letter was issued in August, 1887, and, at the same time, the Department of Militia sent a letter to Webb & Co., of London, England. This firm, I understand, had for many years supplied the Government with militia clothing, and they also supplied large quantities of these articles to the British army. The following is the letter which was sent to Messrs. Webb & Co.:—

"HEADQUARTERS, OTTAWA,
"29th August, 1837.

"GENTLEMEN,—I have the honor to request you will be so good as to send in a list of the lowest prices at which you will undertake to supply for the Militia of Canada, the undermentioned articles, in the event of its being decided to import such articles from England, viz:—

"(1) Cavalry tunics 6th Dragoon Guards.
" " " 13th Hussars.
"(2) Artillery cloth tunics.
" " serge jackets.
"(3) Rifle cloth tunics.
" " jackets.
"(4) Infantry scarlet cloth tunics, No. 2 cloth.
" " " No. 3 cloth.
" " serge jackets.

"The quality of the tunics to be the same as used by the above arms of the Imperial regular army. Also kindly quote prices for artillery and

infantry serge trousers same as those last supplied by you to the Department.

"I have the honor to be, Gentlemen,
"Your obedient servant,
"(Signed) WM. POWELL,
"*Col. Adjt. Militia.*

"MESSRS. WEBB & Co, London, E.C."

On the 12th September, 1887, the Department of Militia and Defence received a cable message from Messrs Webb & Co. in reply to this letter, and that cable was followed by the following letter to the Militia Department here:—

"LONDON, 16th September, 1887.

"To the Adjutant General of Militia,
"Canada.

"SIR,—In reply to your letter 20,261 dated the 29th August last, we beg to inform you that we have this day wired as per copy enclosed, which we now confirm:—

	s.	d.
"Cavalry tunics 6th Dragoon Guards	14	11
" 13th Hussars	19	6
"Artillery cloth tunics	15	3
" serge jackets	6	1
"Rifle cloth tunics	14	1
" serge jackets	5	9
"Infantry scarlet cloth tunics, No 2 pattern	12	6
" " No 3 new pattern.... 10 2 heavier than old	10	8
"Infantry serge jackets	6	5
"Serge trousers, artillery	6	10
" infantry	6	7

"The quality of the cloths and serges to be the same as used here for the regular army. We trust these prices will ensure your esteemed order.

"We are Sir,
"Your obedient servants,
"(Signed) G. S. WEBB & Co."

That letter was sent on the 16th September, by Webb & Co., who supply the regular army in England, and for many years supplied the Canadian forces to the entire satisfaction of the department here, and to the satisfaction of the people. But what did the Minister of Militia then proceed to do? He proceeded to let out a contract to William E. Sanford, of Hamilton, dated 16th November, 1887, to supply a certain quantity of those articles, the total cost running up to thousands and thousands of dollars. I may state that, in the comparison of prices which I will make, I have turned the sterling money into currency at the rate of $4.90, which, I think every hon. gentleman will admit, is very liberal. I may state that, at the Public Accounts Committee, Colonel Powell, of the Adjutant General's Department, stated that 5 per cent. added to the English price would pay every charge of freight, &c., and lay down the clothing from the manufacturers in London at the stores of the department at Ottawa. Now, we will compare the prices. Webb & Co. offered to supply the cavalry tunics of the 13th Hussar pattern at 19s. 6d., add 5 per cent. for freight to this, and $5 currency is the price at which the Minister could have supplied the English-made cavalry tunic of the kind to which I referred. Instead of doing this he gave the contract to Wm. E. Sanford to supply the same kind of cavalry tunics at $7.64; in other words, he gave him a bonus of 53 per cent. on that class of goods. I make that charge and I prove it. Webb & Co. offered to supply the Government with cavalry tunics of the 6th Dragoon Guards pattern at 14s. 11d.; add 5 per cent, which it would cost to lay the goods down at Ottawa, and the price in currency would be $3.83. What did the Minister do? He issued a contract for a large quantity of these to Wm. E. Sanford at a price of $5.89, or he gave him a bonus of 54 per cent. above what the English goods would cost laid down in Ottawa. Webb & Co. offered to supply the Government of Canada with artillery cloth tunics at 15s. 3d., or $3.92, laid down in Canada, but the Minister of Militia issued a contract to Wm. E. Sanford to supply these tunics at $6.04; or a bonus of 55 per cent. given to W. E. Sanford. Webb & Co. offered to supply the Government with infantry scarlet cloth tunics, No. 2 pattern, at 12s. 6d., or $3.21, laid down in Canada, but the Minister of Militia issued a contract to W. E. Sanford for those tunics at $5, or, in other words, he was given a bonus of 55 per cent. Webb & Co. offered to supply rifle tunics, green cloth, at 14s. 1d., to which, adding 5 per cent. for all expenses of freight, &c., the cost of laying down at Ottawa would be $3.60½. Then the Minister of Militia issued to W. E. Sanford a contract to supply these garments to the Government at $5.58½, or 55 per cent. more than they could be supplied for in the way I mentioned. I might further state that Webb & Co., in their tender, offered to supply a large number of other articles, I presume at the same rates. They were not supplied by Mr. Sanford, but by other tenderers, I presume, but the Committee did not attempt to investigate the dealings of any other firm with the Militia Department than that of W. E. Sanford. Well, I charge the Minister of Militia with more than that. I charge him with having issued a contract to the firm of James O'Brien & Co., of Montreal, in the fall of 1887, for three years, for thousands of greatcoats, costing in all perhaps $30,000 or $40,000, without even having gone through the form of a circular letter or of advertising for tenders. There never was an invitation to the public to tender for these supplies; and he issued that contract, not at a price which was current in 1887, but at the price at which those garments were supplied to the department in 1884. In that year James O'Brien had contracted to supply greatcoats to this Department at a certain price; and as every hon. gentleman knows, there was between 1884 and 1887 a very considerable shrinkage in the cost of such goods. These charges I will verify by a perusal of the evidence later on.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MULOCK. Before you left the Chair, I mentioned to the House that Mr. Sanford, while a contract was in force between him and the Government to supply the department with clothing, had been called to the Senate. Allow me to give the dates of some matters about that time. The first contract that was entered into with him was in 1886. That contract was current in the spring of 1887, and on the 12th of April of that year Mr. Sanford was called to the Senate. As his contract at that time was only partly executed, within a couple of months after being called to the Senate he made an assignment of this contract to a Mr. Stephen. Yet after that Mr. Sanford continued to carry out the terms of the contract, to conduct a correspondence with the Government, on behalf of Mr. Stephen, to present accounts under the contract, and in every way to act as the substantial contractor, the only possible change being the formal or nominal transfer of the contract to Mr. Stephen. Let me state, too, that in the month of June, 1887, Mr. Sanford converted his business, which had been theretofore conducted in his name exclusively, into a joint stock company, in which he continued to be the principal proprietor, to work out this contract, and to accept a new contract. His company is known in the correspondence as the W. E. Sanford Manufacturing Company. Then, on the 15th of October, 1888, the Minister of Militia, without having advertised for tenders, without having adopted any system to obtain competition, awarded a new contract to Mr. Sanford to supply the department with 9,200 garments of various kinds for the use of the force, including those for which Webb & Co. had tendered in the previous year. That contract was issued on the same basis as the contract of 1887, and it involved a cost to the country of $47,395, the price of the goods being 55 per cent. higher than the same goods could have been supplied for in the way I have referred to. Notwithstanding the colorable assignment to Frank Stephen, and the converting of Mr. Sanford's business into a corporation, throughout the whole of this transaction W. E. Sanford was the principal beneficiary, for a long time the only one, and

during this time he was, and he still is, a member of the Senate of Canada. So that we have this transaction as a mere bye-product of this enquiry, showing not only the misconduct of the Administration in their use of the public money, but dealing directly with one of the members of the Senate, a supporter of the Administration. I do not at this stage dwell upon the propriety or otherwise of using the Department of Militia for the purpose of securing friends in another part of the Legislature; but I think that branch of the case is still open to proper comment. It is, in my opinion, highly unbecoming any branch of this Legislature that its members should either, directly or indirectly, profit by contracts made with the Parliament of which they form a part. Nevertheless, that state of affairs has continued up to the present, and what I have stated as to Mr. Sanford's connection with the affair is not a mere matter of hearsay or dispute, but we have Mr. Sanford's own admission that he merely made the transfer of the contract to avoid pains and penalties, while he remained substantially in the same position as when a personal contractor and had the same interest. In his defence he said he considered he had been acting in perfect propriety in adopting that mode of evading the Independence of Parliament Act. I charge the hon. Minister of Militia with this matter, with having so negligently looked after the contractors that they were enabled to foist upon the country large quantities of manufactured goods for the use of the militia, inferior in material, workmanship and appearance and inferior in every other respect to what could have been obtained at 55 per cent. less if the Government had chosen to accept another tender. I understand the hon. Minister of Militia says that in all this matter he was developing the great principle of the National Policy; that he had the alternative of ordering these goods from England at a reduced price, or placing the contracts with Canadian manufacturers, and thus encouraging the home industry, and he chose the latter course. But will the hon. gentleman pretend to say that the National Policy involves the abandonment of every wholesome business principle, and that in order to live up to the National Policy it is necessary, in buying supplies for the country, to abandon the principle of advertising for tenders before entering into contracts? Does the National Policy involve corrupting branches of the Legislature and creating disaffection amongst the militia of Canada? Surely the National Policy is not intended to operate in that way. Would it not have been wholly consistent with the National Policy, after you had decided not to accept any competition from abroad, to adopt a healthy, honest system at home, and issue your contracts on business principles? Whilst I admit that it would be preferable in all cases, other things being equal or nearly equal, to expend our money among ourselves, still no excuse can be advanced for disregarding those ordinary and well recognised principles that ought always to attend the letting of public contracts. If those charges which I have made are true——

Mr. HESSON. They are not true.

Mr. MULOCK. There are witnesses who have proved them. If these charges, which I have made, have borne no fruit——

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. MULOCK. There is not an hon. gentleman before me who can say that these things have not borne fruit. Let me tell you what has happened in the case of the Queen's Own Rifles. We were informed by credible witnesses, men in the force, that that battalion, which has been in the service since 1860, were dissatisfied with the material served out to them.

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. MULOCK. That the men refused to accept from the Government the uniforms tendered to them, preferring to buy out of their own pockets suitable uniforms from England. I say that is proved.

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. MULOCK. It is proved by the evidence. The hon. member for Leeds may say "no," and may obstruct, but it is not possible to enlighten that hon. gentleman. His position is to serve his Government through thick and thin and *per nefas* rather than *per fas*.

Mr. FOSTER. Explain.

Mr. MULOCK. I will come to the evidence. What I say is that the Queen's Own Rifles refused to accept the uniforms served out to them by the Government for the reason disclosed by the evidence, and taxed themselves to supply themselves with proper uniforms. They who are engaged in this patriotic work of serving in the militia were truer to their country than the hon. the Minister of Militia, for, instead of abandoning the service, they chose to bear the additional burden of paying out of their own pockets that which ought to have been paid by the public. The hon. member for Leeds says none of this is true. Let him look at the evidence.

Mr. TAYLOR. What I said was that none of the clothing served under these contracts were found fault with by the troops in Toronto.

Mr. MULOCK. I will give some extracts from the evidence taken before the Committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. Give the whole of it.

Mr. MULOCK. The evidence is before the House for any hon. member to read who desires to do so.

Mr. TAYLOR. We could not get it printed, because you kept it all the time.

Mr. MULOCK. May I ask, Mr. Speaker, for your protection? It is quite clear the hon. member for Leeds feels he has been driven into a corner.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have not.

Mr. MULOCK. If he were not, he would allow this debate to proceed in the usual way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You do not need protection if he is driven into a corner.

Mr. MULOCK. I will give some extracts of the evidence before the Committee of Public Accounts, and show how far it bears out the serious charges I have made. The first witness was Lieutenant Colonel Powell, Adjutant General of the Forces, and who has for many years been in the service of the department. Colonel Powell gave the following evidence:

"Q. How does English-made clothing compare in durability, fit and appearance with the Canadian made, such as has been supplied within the last year or two?—A. It is better in fit and appearance.

"Q. How about durability?—A. We have not been able to test that yet. It would take some time.

"Q. What is the average life of a well-made English uniform as compared with what the department has obtained in Canada?—A. It is intended to be the same.

"Q. I know it is intended to be the same, but what is the experience by you?—A. Experience has shown us that the articles are not so good nor so long lived.

"Q. Are you aware that there is quite a feeling of dissatisfaction among the militia of Canada in regard to the quality of clothing now being served out?—A. There have been a good many complaints."

Then, in answer to the Minister of Marine, the examination goes on:

"Q. Practically, you have to give a monopoly to these men to get a better class of goods?—A. Yes, practically that.

"*To Mr. Lister:*

"Q. Is it not a fact that during the last five years you have had constant complaints from the different battalions throughout the

country of the quality of the trousers furnished to them?—A. Yes, that is, in many cases.

"Q. Have not these complaints been made that the trousers have worn out and become useless during fourteen days these battalions are out on annual drill?—A. In some cases they have.

"Q. On the 5th August, 1887, without asking for tenders from any manufacturers in Canada or England, you informed James O'Brien & Co., that they were to have the contract for three years more at the same rate that had been paid to them before?—A. They submitted a tender as to price.

"Q. At the same price paid to them previously?—A. Yes.

"Q. Did you take any steps to ascertain if greatcoats could be furnished by other firms?—A. No."

There the department itself, on the information of the Adjutant General, admits that a contract was made with James O'Brien to supply overcoats for the period of three years, and that no efforts were made to obtain tenders from any other source. Do you want any better evidence than the evidence of the department itself? Probably the hon. gentleman will contradict Lieut. Col. Powell. I charged before the Public Accounts Committee that the Queen's Own Rifles were dissatisfied, as I have already stated, and some witnesses from that battalion were produced, among others, Capt. Bennett. Capt. Bennett has been, as he states, in the service since the year 1877, about 12 years ago. He has been a private in the force, and has gradually risen to the position he now enjoys of captain. His examination is as follows:—

"*By Mr. Mulock:*

"Q. I stated to this Committee, last week, that there was dissatisfaction in the Queen's Own in regard to the character of the uniforms issued by the department. I have been so informed. Surely that is not the case? A. There has been great dissatisfaction among the officers and me for the last five or six years.

"Sir A. P. CARON. Before this question is gone into, I should like to submit to the Chairman of the Committee"——

And he goes on to object to any enquiry as to the cause of dissatisfaction.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Hear, hear.

Mr. MULOCK. And the Chairman and the Committee being adverse to my proceeding with that branch of the enquiry——

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Oh.

Mr. MULOCK. Does any one contradict that?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Surely the Chairman was not adverse to anybody.

Mr. MULOCK. I was only going on to give a narrative of what occurred. Then Capt. Bennett was examined as follows. He produced some uniforms:

"Q. Will you select some of these samples of uniforms? A. These are two tunics taken out of the regimental stores that have never been used.

"Q. What do you object to in regard to these? A. These are two different colors.

"Q. What should be the color? A. Rifle green.

"Q. What do you call this color? A. A sort of blue, as far as I can see.

"Q. Does that fairly represent the lack of uniformity in the color of the issue? A. When in the new issue, that is when issued first, but when the tunics are worn a year or two, they become all kinds of shades. We have a dozen different shades. When that tunic is worn a year, it turns one shade first and then another.

"Q. There is a lack of uniformity in the color? Have you got any that have been worn so that we may see how they stand the wear? A. That is a uniform which a man in my company returned last Friday night. It has had two years' wear. That is the state of it

"Q. How long ought it to be good for? A. They were issued for five years.

"Q. Will the issue last five years? A. It will not last that long.

"Q. What is this tunic (taking up another)? A. That is one of the issue of 1877, an English tunic.

"Q. And this other one was issued in 1887? A. Yes.

"Q. What is the condition of the two? How do they compare? A. I think the comparison is against the Canadian tunic.

"Q. Then the tunic of 1877, issued about ten years before this one, is in a better condition than the one you are complaining of? A. Yes, we have uniforms in the regiment that were issued in 1867 that are better than this one. We have a few issued at that date.

"Q. This uniform of the issue of 1877, has it been in use as constantly as this one of 1887? A. More so. They both come out of the company.

"Q. They are both in constant use? A. Yes.

"Q. This one was used as much? A. Yes, and the man refused to turn out for spring drill unless I gave him another tunic.

"Q. I ask you whether the tunic of 1877, which you produce, has been worn as much as the one issued within the last two years? A. Yes.

"Q. And, as a result of the comparison, the one issued two years ago has suffered more from wear in two years than the other in twelve years? A. Yes.

"Q. You say that on your honor as an officer of the Queen's Own? A. Yes.

"Q. Well, does that evidence apply generally to the issue in question? A. It does.

"Q. It applies generally to the issue to the men? A. There is the greatest dissatisfaction among the men of the regiment in regard to the Canadian issue.

"Q. How do you know that? A. I know that from my personal experience in my own company.

"Q. I am told that the whole of the Queen's Own Regiment are ordering new uniforms at their own expense from England. Is that not correct? A. That is perfectly correct. They are not all ordered yet, but they will eventually order, I believe. The majority of the companies have ordered now.

"Q. What companies have ordered now? A. A, B, C, D, G and H. I think these are all that have ordered

"Q. Ordered what? A. New clothing, both tunics and trousers from England.

"Q. Why? A. Because the men are ashamed to turn out in the uniform that they have now.

"Q. Those worn out or new ones? A. What is in the regiment now. We have all kinds and all sorts and conditions of uniforms.

"Q. Would they be satisfied with new uniforms from the department? A. They would not, from the experience they have of those in use now, and beside that we can get them much cheaper than what the department charge.

"Q. For $5.68 you have an English uniform, and for $9 you have a Canadian. Now just give us your opinion as to the relative merits of what the volunteer gets between the English and Canadian militia uniforms? A. Of course this is an English uniform, and we have never had any experience with that particular uniform, but I believe it has been tested here and found to be nearly all wool beaver that is the expression used. It will last from five to six and seven years, while the Canadian uniforms will only last, as your experience proves, about two years.

"Q. So much for durability. What about appearance? A. There are no two questions about the appearance, any person who examines these tunics will see.

"Q. What are your politics? A. Conservative. I have always been so, and my family have always been.

"Q. What is the condition of the uniforms of the Queen's Own band? A. Well, I know that they are just about getting a complete new outfit.

"Q. Why? A. Because the others are worn out.

"Q. When were they issued to them? A. In October, 1886.

"Q. How long should that issue have lasted? A. Five years."

This gentleman was cross-examined in various ways, and these are some of his questions and answers. I stated in regard to the contract made with James O'Brien in 1888, that it was made on the basis of the terms granted in 1884, that is, that the prices given to him in 1884 were exactly the same prices that were given to him to supply great coats to the force in 1888; and I stated that there had been a shrinkage in value, and, under those circumstances, it is fair to assume that had the Government adopted the proper course of advertising for tenders in 1888 for great coats, they would have obtained them at prices far less than those which they awarded in 1888. Oliver Wilby was subpœnaed and he gave evidence in regard to the shrinkage. His cross-examination at some little length shows that the woollen coats—these great coats are woollen—were a great deal cheaper in 1888 than they were in 1884; he was unable to state the percentage, but he stated that fact, which shows how it would have been in the public interest had the department seen fit to invite public tenders. The Hon. Mr. Sanford was examined, and I merely read his evidence now to corroborate what I have stated:

"Q. I believe you had a contract with the Militia Department in 1886? A. Yes

"Q. You had a contract with the Militia Department for the supply of clothing? A. Yes.

"Q. That contract, I believe, is here among the papers? When were you appointed to the Senate? A. On the 12th April, 1887.

"Q. The contract of 1886 was in force at that time?

"Hon Mr. BOWELL. This is not the Committee of Privileges and Elections

"Mr. SANFORD. The contract was assigned to Frank Stephen, and you will see the assignment among the papers.

"Q. Well, then, who carried out the terms of that contract? A. The firm of Frank Stephen. We manufactured the goods simply to complete the contract.

"Q. Who are Frank Stephen & Co.? A. They are simply agents for the cloth.

"Q. You had a remaining interest in it notwithstanding this assignment? A. We had the interest of completing the contract.

"Q. Did you share any of the profits in carrying it out? A. We retained exactly the same position in regard to the contract as before, so far as its results were concerned. The simple object, I may say squarely, in making that assignment, was to avoid, and very necessarily on my part, a question which might arise in regard to public criticism. As I stated before, I was authorised by the highest authority to complete a contract which was necessary in the interest of the country, and would make me liable for damages if I neglected to complete the contract entered into prior to my being called to the Senate.

"Q. So you ceased to be the real contractor, but your interest remained exactly the same? A. Exactly the same."

He ceased to be the real contractor, and he continued to be the real contractor.

"Q. When you speak of W. E Sanford & Co. as the first contractors, was there anyone in the company, but yourself? A. Not during the last year.

"Q. When the contract of 1886 was entered into? A. It was W. E. Sanford & Co., but W. E. Sandford was alone. I was the only contractor"

That is, Mr. Sanford was the only contractor at the time these contracts were in existence and being carried out, and he had been called to the Senate.

"Q. When did it become the manufacturing company? A. It became the manufacturing company in June.

"Q. I ask whether Mr. Sanford is the principal member of that corporation during the continuance of this contract, during the time the W. E Sanford Manufacturing Company had their contract with the Government. Were you or were you not? Are you yourself one of the principal shareholders? A. Yes.

"Q. Now, I come to a branch of the case that I raised before. I want to ascertain Mr. Sanford's contribution to the Conservative party?

"The CHAIRMAN. I ruled that out before. It is of no interest to the Committee and we have no right to interfere."

Then the examination goes on and shows that on the 15th October, 1888, a new contract was entered into with the Sanford Co. for 9,200 garments at the prices of 1887. So we have it from Mr. Sanford himself that the Sanford Manufacturing Company, which in no sense had ever been a contractor with the Government in 1888, became a contractor to supply the militia force of Canada with uniforms at prices which had been given in 1887 to W. E. Sanford, which prices I have shown to be 55 per cent. higher than was necessary. The next witness examined whose evidence I have noted, is Mr. Irving, who was called by Dr. Bergin. In the course of his examination he makes this statement, which may be considered as bearing upon the question of quality:

"Last year I examined some stores in Ottawa. Watson showed us a pair of trousers which were originally supposed to be blue. The front part was a red color, a claret color, and the back part was blue, and that was a reddish color."

After some difficulty we succeeded in obtaining some further evidence from the Queen's Own. I now read the evidence of Lieutenant J. S. Crean. This man had been in the service from 1877 to the present time, and had risen, like many other good men, from a humble position to occupy the proud position of lieutenant in the Queen's Own. He and his father before him were merchant-tailors in the city of Toronto, and military outfitters:

"Q. Have you had an opportunity of seeing the character of the clothing of the Queen's Own? A. Yes, I have seen a great deal of it.

"Q. What is you opinion of it? A. My opinion of the clothing that is now issued is that it is exceedingly bad—very bad.

"Q. In what respect? A The material is bad, the cut is bad. It is impossible to get a tunic to fit a man. The tunics are not cut and made up according to the measurement. The material is bad, and it is not always of the same color."

Then further, in speaking of the bad cut of the tunics he says in answer to another question:

"They are cut out of proportion and would only fit men of mature years. In every single instance the tunics were altered more or less. There was not an exception.

"Q. How about the tunics issued to the privates? A. They are exactly the same.

"Q. Are the tunics often of uniform color? A. No, they are not.

"Q. How does the cloth in the present issue of tunics compare with the cloth of the English clothing? A. It does not compare at all. It is of very much poorer quality.

"Q. How does the color of the present issue compare with the color of the English clothing? A. Well, the color of the English tunics I have seen some blue and some green.

"Q. Are you a supporter of this Government? A. Yes, I have always voted Conservative, but I do not think the militia should suffer for the sake of the party."

Color Sergeant McKell, who has been in Queen's Own Rifles 13 years, says:

"*Examined by Mr. Mulock*:

"Q. Have you any prejudice against this Government? A. I am a red hot Conservative myself, and always have been. I have worked against yourself before now.

"Q Do you know if any of the Queen's Own have purchased, out of their own pockets, uniforms lately? A. Yes; I have purchased them myself.

"Q. When? A. Last year

"Q. Why did the men buy their own uniforms from England instead of what was issued by the department? A. Owing to the poor quality of the clothing supplied to the regiment by the department.

I call the attention to the fact that Color Sergeant McKell said that they took this particular action on account of the poor quality of the clothing issued to the service by the Department. It is immaterial under what contract this clothing was obtained, as far as this question is concerned. The clothing issued to the Queen's Own was of such an inferior quality that the regiment did what Sergeant Major McKell said they did—they threw it back on the Government and preferred to tax themselves and properly clothe themselves. The examination continued:

"Q. How long have you been in the service? A. Thirteen years.

"Q. You were in, in 1876? A. Yes

"Q How does the issue of recent years (of 1887 and 1888) compare as to the issues of ten years ago? A. The general opinion throughout the regiment is that they are getting worse.

"*By Sir Adolphe Caron*:

"Q. Getting worse? A. Yes, that is the uniform impression of the men generally. I am speaking now as a non-commissioned officer, and I hold the same opinions as the great majority of the regiment do at the present time.

"*By Mr. Hesson*:

"Q Is that as to workmanship or material? A. As regards the cloth and fit, we cannot get a fit without taking the clothes to Crean, or someone else. I paid $9 to get this tunic fixed here with stripes, and one thing or another on it.

"Q Why didn't you get a new one? A. I got that one, and the trousers for $9 in England."

They got for $9 in England a complete outfit, whilst here for that sum they could only have got part of the uniform under the wise administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. The Minister of Militia called a number of witnesses, to prove—what? That they had not got any of the bad uniforms. Who were they? A number of members of the House. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior), and several other gallant members, and one or two officers of the service who are not members, were called to prove they had never got any bad stock, and so the Minister proposed to dispose of the charge of the Queen's Own and the proof that they got bad material, by showing that down in New Brunswick in the one case and out in British Columbia in the other they did not happen to get stock of which they complained. That is the character of the defence. During the examination, I desired to have examined all the officers of the Queen's Own, intending as far as the opportunity presented itself to exhaust that subject and then proceed with another. I have had during this Session communications sent me by leading members of the force, colonels and field officers and men in different parts of the country, and had the opportunity presented I would have continued this examination and perhaps have been able to have had a larger quantity of evidence, and evidence covering more ground than I have now. But the time of the Committee being exhausted, it was agreed that, in so far as the opinion of

the Queen's Own was concerned, instead of obtaining the opinions of the superior officers we should take the opinions of the captains. When Captain Bennett appeared before the Committee, and was asked what the opinion of the regiment on the whole was, he said that in order to satisfy himself thoroughly upon that point he had directed a circular letter to every captain in the regiment and had received replies from a great many, which replies he offered to produce to the Committee. At that moment he did not happen to have with him the circular letter he had addressed to the captains, and accordingly the Committee, having such a fine appreciation of the rules of evidence, declined to allow him to put in those letters which he had received from the captains, claiming that they would be unintelligible in the absence of the letter of inquiry. Accordingly, he went home, and he subsequently forwarded to me the circular letter, and the result was that these documents were accepted by the Committee and finally made part of the evidence. The following letter was sent me by Captain Bennett:

"TORONTO, 29th March, 1889.

"MY DEAR SIR,—Enclosed you will find a copy of the circular letter which I referred to in my evidence yesterday before the Public Accounts Committee, as having sent to the officers commanding companies in the regiment with reference to the clothing supplied by the Militia Department. The replies I produced when before the Committee, and handed them to you as requested.

"Yours sincerely,
"C. E. BENNETT.

"WM. MULOCK, Esq., M.P.,
"Ottawa."

Then follows a list of captains to whom was sent the circular letter, viz, Captains Thompson, Pellatt, Greene, Mason, Mutton, McGee, Sankey, Murray, Brock. The following is the circular letter sent by Captain Bennett to the officers:

"TORONTO, 23rd March, 1889.

"MY DEAR MASON,—I have received a summons to appear before the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons, Ottawa, next Thursday, to give evidence with regard to the state of militia clothing. I would like to have an expression of opinion from you as to the feelings amongst your men regarding the wear and state of the present issue of uniforms; also if your company have ordered new uniforms from England, and if so, what was the cause that led them to do so. I shall be glad to have your views by next Tuesday if at all possible.

"Sincerely yours,
"C. E. BENNETT.

"Captain MASON, Q.O.R."

Here are the replies:

"*Memorandum.*

"From Pellatt & Pellatt, 40, King St. East,
"TORONTO, 25th March, 1889.

"To Capt. BENNETT,

"MY DEAR BENNETT,—Your memo. to hand *re* clothing Queen's Own Rifles. I have ordered 20 tunics from England for the reason that we get them at $5.75 delivered in Toronto, and made to fit the men according to the measurement which we send over, also the cloth is very much better indeed than what we receive here at $6.50 and have to spend some $2 to get them altered to fit the men.

"Yours, &c.,
"H. M. PELLATT,
"*Captain 'B.'*"

"SURVEY DEPARTMENT.
"V. SANKEY, P.L.S., City Surveyor.
"TORONTO, 26th March.

"DEAR BENNETT,—In reply to your letter on uniforms, I would say: 1st. My company has decided to order uniforms from England, the order has not yet been posted, but it is to go this week. The reason is that the Canadian made uniforms do not wear well, either as to color or material. The slightest thing will tear it. The foresight of the rifle or drag of straps at the shoulder. The cost also is more. We have paid $6.50 for the Canadian tunic, and then have to get it altered to fit, which costs from $2 to $4 more, and have also to pay for having the "Q. O. R." marked on the shoulder straps. The English uniform costs us $5.75 for tunic made to fit. "Q O. R." worked on, of first-class material and finish. The company think that when they have to pay for uniform, they had better get such as will look best and cost least. At present the company look decidedly motley, some in old and some in new tunics. Excuse haste.

Yours truly,
"VILLIERS SANKEY."

Mr. MULOCK.

"TORONTO, 25th March, 1889.

"MY DEAR BENNETT,—I have yours of 23rd March, and have to say that very generally the reason given by men resigning and not serving their full term is that they 'wont wear that rotten clothing,' and as to the difficulty experienced in recruiting, I will say nothing, as your own experience with that matter will prove sufficient. If fit and proper clothing is not provided at once for the Militia, and a more liberal policy adopted regarding this and other matters, the active militiaman or volunteer will soon be a thing of the past. My company have not ordered uniforms from England, and won't as long as I am in command. If the volunteer is to be worth anything to the country, he should be properly equipped, clothed and trained, and, under existing circumstances he is neither the one nor the other.

"I am, &c, sincerely,
"JAS. C. McGEE.

"Captain C. E. BENNETT, &c., &c."

"TORONTO, 27th March, 1889.

"MY DEAR BENNETT,—In reply to yours of the 23rd instant, I beg to say that the reason for ordering new uniforms by my company, is that those on hand are no longer in a condition that the men can take any pride in wearing them, and most of them are long since unfit for wear.

"Our reasons for ordering new uniforms from England, are that both in quality of material and price, we have been able to do much better than with the department, besides which a perfect fit is guaranteed, each uniform being made to order from measure.

"I may say, the uniform we have in the past received from the militia stores have given great dissatisfaction, the quality being poor, and color irregular, so that under certain conditions of light, hardly two uniforms could be found exactly of the same color. I am of opinion this is due largely to the dyes used, failing to stand exposure, though a difference has been found in color of uniforms received fresh from store.

"English uniforms on the other hand received eight or nine years ago are still in wear and color has not failed at all.

"Yours sincerely,
P. L. MASON."

Here is another letter:

"TORONTO, 27th March, 1889.

"MY DEAR BENNETT,—Replying to your letter, *re* uniforms, I have ordered tunics for my company from Messrs. Hobson & Son, London. My reasons for doing so are as follows: I find that the tunics issued by Government to my company became unfit for use after about one year's wear. The cloth becomes rough and loses its color, and the general appearance of the tunics is at no time soldierlike or military, even when the garment is correct size around the chest I find that it is not well proportioned in other respects. I have rarely found one to fit without alterations, which alteration in most cases costs from one to three dollars. The Canadian tunics in my company which have been in use not more than two years are past use, and I find it impossible to induce new men to enter the service unless they are given a respectable outfit.

"I have ordered English tunics, which are to be made to the measure of each individual man in my company.

"The cloth is all wool beaver, very much superior to the Canadian goods, and the cost laid down for the Canadian ones, and the cost laid down in Toronto, will be fully 15 per cent. less than I have to pay for the Canadian ones. Any further information I can give you I will be happy to supply.

"Yours truly,
BOYCE THOMPSON,
"*Captain 'A' Co. Q. O. R. of Canada.*"

Here is still another letter on the same subject:

"TORONTO, 27th March, 1889.

"MY DEAR BENNETT,—Your letter dated the 23rd to hand *re* clothing, which I have received from the Militia Department. I regret to say that they are not what they should be. In some cases I have known them to be moth-eaten and the colors anything but satisfactory. In lieu of rifle green we get navy blue which gives the men a shabby appearance when in a body.

"In speaking for the men I must say the comments they make on the clothing is not very flattering to the maker or to the Militia Department.

"Yours very truly,
"J. A. MURRAY.

"Capt. BENNETT,
"Queen's Own Rifles."

Here is another letter on the same subject:

"TORONTO, 25th March, 1889.

"DEAR BENNETT,—I reply to you letter of the 23rd instant respecting the clothing issued to my company by the Militia Department, all I can say is that were it not for the continual complaints regarding the clothing which an officer commanding a company has poured into his ears night after night of drill, there would be some pleasure in being connected with the militia force.

"Apart from the conglomeration of shades of blue and green by the color in the tunics fading, the chief cause of complaint is the lack of wear in the clothing. We now have tunics made in England and issued to the company years ago which are in better condition than the recent Canadian issues, the latter being in many cases unfit to be worn in day time;

"At the recent meeting of my company it was decided unanimously to order uniforms in England to be uniform with the remaining companies of the regiment and on account of the wretched condition of those in stores.

"In a word, the Canadian-made clothing will not wear nor will the color stand. I am inclined to think too that the contractors do not stick to one shade of coloring, for at least a dozen shades of blue and green can be picked out of any two companies any day on parade.

"Yours truly,
"H. VINCENT GREENE."

"C. C. BENNETT, Esq."

So much for the opinions of the officers and non-commissioned officers of the Queen's Own Rifles. I think I have established to the satisfaction of all reasonable men, what I stated before the Public Accounts Committee, that at least one regiment—the Queen's Own—was generally dissatisfied with the treatment it had received in this respect. Perhaps it might be instractive to some hon gentlemen if I were to give a class of evidence that is beyond controversy—evidence of persons directly in the pay, in the hiring of the Minister of Militia; his own men of the regular forces I hardly think they can be discredited, and let us see what they have got to say about the matter. The hon. the Minister of Militia comes from Quebec, and he has a battery there presided over and managed by his own political friends.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not true. There are no political friends of mine in the battery.

Mr. MULOCK. I don't know whether they are friends of the Minister now.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Then you should not say so.

Mr. MULOCK. I think they can hardly be considered his friends now in view of what he has been doing, but at all events they are sympathisers of the party to which he belongs.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Mr. MULOCK. I hardly think the Minister will be able to establish the contradiction. I will give the names in time and then he can make his reply. At all events the department here issued such wretched stuff to Battery "B" that on the 13th May, 1887, some of his own employés convened a meeting of a board of officers in the citadel at Quebec to report as to the quality and make of the tunics supplied by the Minister. The president of the board of officers was Lieutenant Peters and the other members of the board were Captain Rutherford and Captain Fayes. Let me read to the hon. gentleman the document which was sent to himself by these officers:

"PROCEEDINGS of a Board of Officers assembled at Citadel, Quebec, on the 13th day of May, 1887, by order of Major C. J. Short, Comg. R. S. A., for the purpose of examining and reporting upon quality and make of tunics supplied to "B." Battery Reg. C.

"President, J. Peters, Regt. A.; Members, Captains A. H. Rutherford and F. A. Fayes, Regt. C. A

"The Board having assembled pursuant to order, proceed to carefully examine the tunics one by one and after such examination find that 105 are unserviceable for the following reasons: The cut and the general construction is most faulty in almost every respect as there is no perceptible attempt to follow the ordinary rules pursued in tailoring in regards the proportions of the human figure.

"It becomes therefore impossible to fit men out in keeping with the ideal of a soldier's neatness, and though in cases were the tunics are taken to pieces and made over, owing to the neglect in the original manufacture it is impossible for the regimental tailor to turn out a proper garment.

"The Board also find that there is a multitude of shades and quality of cloths among the lot now in store This destroys uniformity and the stuff is so shoddy and limp that in a few weeks wear it fades, wrinkles up and becomes most unsightly on parades. The Board find that none of the tunics are what they should be, but they have selected the above mentioned number as the worst and totally unfit for issue.

"Signed at Citadel, Quebec, this 13th day of May, 1887.

"J. PETERS, *President*,
"R. N. RUTHERFORD, *Captain*,
"J. A. FAYES, *Captain*.
"*Members*.

"Approved,
"C. J. SHORT, *Major*.

"Forwarded for the information of the officers commanding Regiment Canadian Artillery.

"C. E. MONTIZAMBERT, *Lieut.-Col.*,
"*Commanding R. C. A.*

"14th May, 1887."

Some correspondence took place between the department and the authorities at the Citadel in regard to this charge, and Lieutenant Colonel Montizambert, one of the hon. gentleman's supporters, a strong Tory, not a Liberal-Conservative—a Tory of the Tories——

Mr. BLAKE. Dyed-in-the-wool, not like the tunics.

Mr. MULOCK. A controversy took place between Mr. Watson, the inspector of the stores, and the authorities at Montreal, and Colonel Montizambert writes to Ottawa the following communication:—

"I have the honor to forward herewith photographs showing a 5 ft. 7 in. tunic on the body of a 5 ft. 8 in. man. This tunic is marked as 37 in. in the waist. The actual measurement is 41 inches. The trousers reach nearly to the shoulder blades behind, and cap marked 21 in. is really 22. You will see from the fit in the photograph what an amount of alteration is required, causing endless trouble and expense to the men, unsatisfactory alike to the tailor, who has to make alterations at the lowest cost, and to the man who has to pay for them out of a very small income. I also forward herewith a letter of complaint addressed to the officer commanding "B" Battery by the civilian master tailor on the same subject."

This letter was referred to the highest military authority in Canada, Major General Sir Frederick Middleton, and he expressed his opinion in regard to the matter as follows:—

"I quite concur in the remarks of the Commandant as to the hardship of the soldier in furnishing him with uniform that requires such an outlay for alteration."

You will observe that Colonel Montizambert pointed out that the cut of the trousers was so wholly regardless of the human figure that at the back they reached up to the shoulder blade. This complaint was referred to the inspector of stores, and how do you think he proposes to get over it? He says:

"With reference to the trousers being high in the back, I may say our sizes and lengths are taken from and measure the same exactly as the 'English sealed pattern,' and if put on men whose waist and leg measure corresponds with that marked on trousers, they will fit every time."

If you can get men into the service who are all leg, then they will fit this uniform. In regard to the charge made by Colonel Montizambert and his battery as to the quality of the goods, what do you suppose was the answer of the inspector of stores at Ottawa, who contradicts every officer in the country? He says:

"I have the positive assurance of Mr. Rosamond, the manufacturer, that the goods are made from pure wool."

He is satisfied to ask the manufacturer of the cloth, who tells him that there is no truth in the statement of the officers at Quebec that the cloth is shoddy and has all these defects. Well, Sir, that communication was brought to the knowledge of the Minister of Militia, but it made no impression on his mind, and about the same time complaints were coming in from all quarters. For example, the department issued a lot of stuff to the battery stationed at Toronto; and after enduring till patience ceased to be a virtue, the battery there convened a board of officers on the 20th of September, 1887, to enquire into the issue of regimental trousers to the men of that battery. There were present, as president, Lieutenant Sears, temporarily with us, but of the regular army, Lieutenant Wadmore, and Lieutenant Cartwright. That board reported:

"It considers the serge trousers unfit for issue, being largely composed of shoddy, and having been burnt in the dying process, rendering them rotten and liable to tear with the slightest strain, as per sample enclosed. The cloth trousers appear to be of fair quality, but in the case of both cloth and serge trousers, sufficient care does not seem to have been taken in the make or cutting."

This communication was laid by the board of officers before Lieutenant Colonel Otter, the commandant, and he expressed his opinion of the matter in the following words:—

"Approved and forwarded on the 6th instant, and reported upon the serge trousers issued W. C. Company, and since then several other instances have occurred, all showing how bad is the material of which they are made. A sample is herewith enclosed."

Colonel Otter got no redress, and on the 20th of August, 1887, he sent this communication to the department at Ottawa: —

"I have the honor to report, for the information of the Major General commanding, upon the articles of clothing named in the margin, and issued for the use of C Company, I. S. C. 1st, tunics. Those made of Canadian cloth, by Sanford & Co, Hamilton, seem to be dyed only on the surface, and not in the wool; the result is that whenever wet either from rain or perspiration, they turn black, and thus become unfit to be seen. 2nd, serges. While the cloth in these articles is very good, the price charged ($4.50), when issued upon repayment is more than a soldier can afford to pay. Great fault is also to be found in marking the sizes of these articles. It is very incorrect."

This communication, at last, came before Sir Frederick Middleton, and he makes this note upon it:

"I would take the opportunity of urging the necessity of furnishing the uniform, &c., for the different schools of instruction from England, for the reasons given in the second and third paragraphs."

Namely, because Mr. Sanford's supplies were of the defective character referred to by Colonel Otter. I commend this charge to the hon. Minister of Customs and to the hon. member for North Leeds. Again Colonel Otter has to follow up this subject, and he says, in a letter of the 6th September, 1887, to the Adjutant General at Ottawa:

"The serge trousers, in many cases, turn green after a few weeks service. They tear very easily and are badly made, particularly in the fork and seat, the former not been firmly sewn to the latter. They are so cut as to cause such a strain when a man stoops as to rip. An expert tells me that the material is shoddy and also burnt in the dyeing."

Again, on the 20th September, 1888, Colonel Otter writes to the Adjutant General at Ottawa as follows:—

"TORONTO, 20th September, 1888.

"SIR,—I have the honor to report most adversely upon the quality of the serge trousers issued to 'C' Company, in proof of which I forwarded a pair by mail to-day, which have not been in wear a month and became torn without having any heavy strain put upon them. We have had half a dozen similar cases in the last six months, which has necessitated another issue to the soldiers.

"W. D. OTTER."

In the year 1887, Lieutenant Colonel Montizambert thought he would make a report to the Minister of Militia on this subject, and you will find in the official reports laid before Parliament Lieutenant Colonel Montizambert's report as to the general character of the clothing issued by the department to "B" Battery. It is dated 31st December, 1887, and appears on pages 179 and 180 of the Militia Report of 1888. Speaking of the great coats, he says:

"The material of the great coats issued to the men is so indifferent that it does not wear as it should."

In connection with this matter, let me emphasise what I complained of before. In face of this notice by Colonel Montizambert, I find that Mr. O'Brien, who had issued this unfit material, received a few months after, without competion and tender prices far in excess of the current prices for additional clothing.

"The cut of the tunics and trousers is so bad that expensive alterations are necessary in every case, and in many suits the size does not agree with the marks. Either properly cut clothing should be supplied or the allowance to the men increased from 50 cents to $2 or $3. The quality of the material, especially in the cloth tunics, is very inferior."

What does the hon. the Minister of Militia say to this communication referring to the whole issue of 1887, and condemning it both in regard to quality of material and workmanship. In the same report, the Militia Report of 1888, another high official in the service of the Government, Lieutenant Colonel Cotton, Commandant of the Royal School of Artillery, says:

"The clothing not yet perfectly satisfactory. The greatest fault lies in the cut of the tunics and serge patrol jackets, the latter, supplied by a Hamilton firm, being too large, large sizes have to be taken by men of medium height, and therefore are cut to waste in the fitting. The dye of some is inferior; the clothing which is blue in the shed shortly turns to a green and claret color."

Mr. MULOCK.

Then we come to British Columbia. On the 11th May 1888, the board of officers at Victoria took up this matter by order of Colonel Holmes, who directed that a board of officers should be convened to enquire into the complaint, and report. On the 11th May, the president of the board, Major Peters, the other members being Lieutenant Ogilvie and Lieutenant Gaudet, reported as follows:—

"The serge clothing in many cases is made up of remnants of different descriptions of cloth, portions of which fade, while others remain their color, and so a soldier presents an appearance as if his apparel was made up of two different kinds of clothing."

That report was forwarded by Colonel Holmes to the department in Ottawa, so that in May, 1888, the department had due notice of the grievance in British Columbia. I am sorry I can scarcely refer to a month of the year without coming across the official report of some corps condemning the clothing supplied. Here is a report of the Volunteer Battalion for Militia District No. 1, London, Ont. On the 6th of June, 1888, Lieutenant Colonel Fisher, of the 27th Battalion, sent the following communication to the Brigade Major of Militia District No. 1:—

"LONDON, 6th June, 1888.

"SIR,—I have the honor to call your attention to the matter of clothing, applied for by requisition last April for the use of the several companies of the 27th Battalion.

After speaking about the requisition he goes on to say:

"Companies Nos. 7 and 9 received an issue of clothing in 1886, but the trousers then issued were of such miserable material that a few days in camp used them up. In fact they were totally unserviceable and should never have been issued to the force.

He proceeds further to say:

"The officers commanding the corps find much difficulty in inducing young men to join the force, and the difficulties are greatly increased when the supply of clothing is poor and unserviceable."

When this communication was laid before the Brigade Major, he endorsed his experience on the margin as follows:

"The experience of companies of Military District No. 1, to which trousers were issued in 1886, and that the trousers were made of a very inferior cloth, or whatever it might be designated."

The Brigade Major would not so far compromise his reputation as a judge of cloth as to admit they were made of cloth. On the 11th June, 1888, another court was held in the city of Quebec. On that occasion, the president was Capt. Farley, the members being Captain Fayes and Lieutenant Pelletier. The report says:

"The board having assembled pursuant to order, proceeded to examine the trousers and to call witnesses. No. 2055, Gr. Holderness, 'B' Battery, R. C.A., states: I was issued with a pair of serge trousers in April last; I wore them about 20 minutes, when they split across the seat. I went to the Quartermaster's store and got another pair on repayment. I have worn them not three weeks yet, and they have also split at the same place. The trousers were not subjected to any extra strain. I consider the splitting of the pants due to the inferior quality of the cloth.

"No. 2036, Gr. L. Watters, 'B' Battery, R.C.A., being called, states: I was issued with a pair of serge trousers in May last. The fifth time I wore them they broke across the back part of the leg beyond the seat. They were not put to any extra strain. The inferior quality of the serge is the cause of the trouble."

On the evidence before that board, the board came to this opinion:

"The board, having examined the trousers and heard the above evidence, are of opinion that the trousers are made of an inferior quality of cloth, were unfit for issue, and recommend that they be replaced at the public expense."

This communication was laid before Lieutenant Colonel Powell of the Adjutant General's Office, Ottawa, and he made the following memorandum:—

"The material of which the trousers were made appears to have been defective. There is much complaint about many of the serge trousers issued to other corps."

In connection with the serge trousers, I see that the department offers the excuse that, in 1887, some inferior articles found their way into store, but that will hardly explain the complaint of Military District No. 1, London, which was

made in 1886, and which in the most thorough way condemned the whole issue. On the 16th June, 1888, another court of enquiry was held in the Citadel of Quebec, to deal with the same matter. On that occasion Captain Farley was president, and Captain Fayes and Lieutenant Pelletier were members, and they say:

"The board, having heard the above evidence, and having inspected the clothing, find that 54 tunics are of good quality of cloth and make, and fit for issue, and 46 are of an inferior quality of cloth, 36 of which the backs are cut at the waist. The board therefore recommend that the 46 above mentioned tunics be condemned. As to the cloth trousers, the board inspected 100 pairs, all of which are of good quality of cloth, but as pointed out by the master tailor, some of the larger sizes are no larger at the forks than those of smaller sizes."

Mr. Watson, the inspector of stores, tried to offer some excuse for having passed such defective material, and what do you suppose is his excuse? On the 30th July, 1888, he seriously presents to the Minister of Militia this explanation:

"Having so much difficulty in watching defects at other points, viz., widths and lengths of collars and shoulder straps, this matter escaped my attention, which I very much regret."

The matter he referred to was that a serious mistake had been made in cutting tunics at the back. It appears that the same thing occurred before and on the 16th June, 1888, it was pointed out that the manufacturer of these garments was cutting them in an erroneous way. Mr. Watson suggests that the whole of this difficulty can be got over in this fashion:

"However, as the waist belt covers the seam in all other tunics, so it will in the artillery, and consequently when worn will not be noticed, and is no defect."

On the 31st July, 1888, Lieutenant Colonel Cotton, of Kingston, sent the following letter to Lieutenant Colonel Macpherson of the Department of Militia:

"DEAR COLONEL MACPHERSON,— I have numerous complaints made to me of the quality of the trousers and forage caps issued to the men. Two or three pairs of the former, only a short time in use, were brought to me burst through stooping. Our tailor says that the material is shoddy In this matter I cannot express an opinion, but I can vouch for the fact that they certainly go long before they should. The forage caps turn green in a few days' exposure to the sun. The men buy English made caps to wear for walking out. All this, of course, causes discontent and grumbling, and any redress is out of my power."

Further he says:

"I am sorry to trouble you with these matters, and would not do so did I not know that you are anxious to effect improvements.

"Yours sincerely,
"W. H. COTTON."

He admits the anxiety of Colonel Macpherson to effect improvements, but he evidently feels that there is a superior power not so anxious. Another month does not go by before another court sits on this. On the 10th August, 1888, we find the following letter from Lieutenant Colonel Montizambert, directed to Lieutenant Colonel Irwin, of the department at Ottawa:—

"I have the honor to forward to you by parcel post this day a pair of serge trousers issued to No. 2156, Gr. G. C. Goldie, on the 20th July, as a sample of the material of clothing that is being issued to the Battery. This pair is only one of the lot; they are all alike. As you will notice, they have not been in wear three weeks, though issued for a year, and now the man has only his cloth trousers to wear for all duties parades, fatigues, &c."

That is signed by C. E. Montizambert, Lieutenant Colonel, Commandant. This came before Lieutenant Colonel Irwin, and, on the 13th August, 1888, he makes this memorandum:

"With reference to accompanying application, which is only one of several of the same nature, it is requested that authority may be sanctioned for the return to store by Commandants 'A' and 'B' Batteries, R.S.A., of all serge trousers of the same issue, in order that, if possible, an issue of a serviceable nature may be made from store. These serge trousers are intended to last for twelve months, but, from the nature of the material employed, it appears evident that from three weeks to a month's wear is sufficient to render them unserviceable, and in consequence the men have to purchase other pairs at their own expense."

"D. T. IRWIN,
"*Lieutenant Colonel, Commanding C. A. Regiment.*"

This application came before Major General Sir Frederick Middleton, and he makes this memorandum:

"The badness and unsuitability of the clothing issued to the permanent troops has been several times brought to my notice during my late inspection. The men of the permanent force are obliged to keep up their supply of clothing, &c., after issue, from their own pockets, and it is, therefore, hard for them if the article originally issued is not good."

This communication came before Lieutenant Colonel Powell, and he made the following minute upon it:—

"The material of which the trousers are made is not good enough for the purposes of permanent corps."

On the 27th August, 1888, another court was held in the city of Quebec. The president on that occasion being Captain Fayes and the members being Lieutenant McGregor and Lieutenant Mailloux. On this occasion the court examined a great many witnesses, among them being McCormick, Holderness, Richardson, Armstrong, Lennon, Harrison, Mulcahy, Murray, and so on. Without going into detail I may say that the court on that occasion unanimously reported as follows:—

"The board having heard the above evidence, and carefully examined the pants and tunics above referred to, are of opinion that the following articles of clothing are of bad material and condemn them."

And they go on to enumerate a lot of clothing and a lot of tunics of cloth and of serge, and trousers of cloth, which they sent back to the store condemned. Later on another board of survey was assembled at the Citadel of Quebec, the president being Captain Farley, the other members being Captain Rutherford and Captain Fages. They had on that occasion to deal with some of these old grievances never redressed, and in their report they say:

"They are of opinion that the serge tunics are not indigo dye, but are otherwise of good quality, and fit for issue. The board are further of opinion that the cloth tunics are from half an inch to an inch too long in the waist."

The report then goes on to speak of a lot of 30 tunics that they had examined:

"Of the other 10 the board are of opinion that 9 of them are of bad quality, the material being woolly in texture and bad make, being cut right across the back instead of the back being in one piece, and one is made of different material, the sleeve being of one piece of cloth, and the body of the tunic of another, and, therefore, we condemn the last named 10 tunics."

On the 26th September, 1888, Lieutenant Colonel Cotton of the battery at Kingston, was obliged to call a board of survey to investigate similar matters, the president being Major J. Wilson, and the members being Captain Rivers and Captain Hudon. They took evidence and reported:

"They are of opinion that the trousers are damaged in fair wear and tear, we find the trousers of inferior quality, and recommend a new issue."

They also recommended that all serge trousers of this issue be returned to the store as unsuitable to issue to permanent corps. The last expression of opinion is from Lieutenant Colonel D.T. Irwin who, since this last communication, stated that the total issue of serge trousers was unsuitable, in fact should never have been issued. Now, I have given you Mr. Speaker, the testimony of 11 boards of survey composed of officers entirely in the service of the Government. I presume that the members of these boards are entirely credible witnesses, I hardly suppose that any member of the Government would discredit these witnesses. Yet all these men in the pay of the Government, under the thumb of the Government, from a sense of duty, and from loyalty to the force, over their own hands condemn the quality, both as to workmanship and material, of the garments issued to the force. Have I not, therefore, made out to the satisfaction of any reasonable man that the character of the material, the character of the workmanship, in fact, the general product of these contracts, has been of an inferior character? Let me tell you who have given evidence in support of the contention that I have established. I have read to you the evidence of one color sergeant, nine lieutenants, fourteen captains, three majors, seven

lieutenant colonels, one brigade major and of Major General Sir Frederick Middleton—35 officers in all, every one corroborating what I have stated, that the militia service has been unfairly treated in the respect of which I complain. Let me call attention to one little instance. When we were examining certain witnesses before the Public Accounts Committee, I refer particularly to Mr. Crean and Color Sergeant McKell, there was an extraordinary revelation. The department laid upon the Table certain goods of an exceptional quality, beyond all question good, and when these were placed in the hands of these witnesses they said candidly, if garments of this character were served out to the men, they would be satisfied with them; but they said, these are not of the quality we have seen, we are not complaining of what you have got in store, we are complaining of what have been served out to us. A short time after that these gentlemen went down to the stores by invitation, I presume, and there they were shown garments which met with their entire satisfaction, and I impress this upon the consideration of the House. You will find in the public press letters from these two gentlemen which I will read. Here is a letter from John Crean to Mr. Sanford:

"DEAR SIR,—Since giving my evidence yesterday, I have been shown the clothing now in store, which has been manufactured by the Sanford Company within the last two years. I think it quite up to the English manufacture, both in material, workmanship and fit, as we tried some of them on. If the Queen's Own had been served with as good clothing as I saw yesterday, I feel certain that there would not have been the dissatisfaction which now exists; and so long as the clothing is kept up to the standard of that in the stores now, there cannot be any just cause for complaint.

"Yours,
"JOHN F. CREAN,
"*Sergeant Major of the Queen's Own.*"

Then Color Sergeant McKell wrote as follows:—

"SIR,—I was shown clothing in store yesterday. I examined the material and also tested the fit, and found it very good in both particulars, and think that if the material used in the rifle tunic was as good as what I saw in the scarlet, there would be no ground for complaint. The material in the rifle tunic that I saw in the stores, however, is of much better quality and fit than those which have been issued by the Queen's Own for the last few years.

"S. C. McKELL,
Color Sergeant, 'D' Co., Q.O.R. of Canada."

Now you will observe, Mr. Speaker, there are two qualities of clothing furnished by the contractors, one quality for use and one for show.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Mr. MULOCK. All I can say about that is that here are two witnesses—you will not question the credibility of Mr. Crean and McKell. Will the Minister question their veracity?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I question your statement.

Mr. MULOCK. I am speaking of their veracity.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I question your statement.

Mr. MULOCK. The question now is as to the evidence. I am not a witness; I am giving the evidence these men stated in the Public Accounts Committee, and they have stated over their own hands in the public prints at the request of the Minister's friend and contractor, Mr. Sanford——

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is again a statement you cannot prove and cannot substantiate.

Mr. MULOCK. That those letters were not written at the request of your friend?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. You cannot make that statement because you know it is not a fact what you state.

Mr. MULOCK. I say it is a fact. I say these communications are addressed to Mr. Sanford, and it is fair to assume——

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. You stated that it was at Mr. Sanford's desire that those letters had been written; and now you change it.

Mr. MULOCK. I say so still.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No, you change it.

Mr. MULOCK. I say they bear on their face evidence of having been written at the request of Mr. Sanford. It is immaterial; I am not discrediting those witnesses, but I accept their evidence in its entirety. When they went down and examined the stock on hand as well as the samples shown before the Public Accounts Committee, they said: Had you used for the force and for us the grade of clothing you have produced as exhibits in Parliament and shown to the public, there would have been no dissatisfaction in the country. I have a letter from Mr. Sanford himself showing that he has one kind of goods for one part of the country and another kind for another. I will read this letter of Mr. Sanford, and hon. members will find it on the files of the Militia Department produced before the Public Accounts Committee. It is as follows:—

"HAMILTON, 28th January, 1888.

"My dear Colonel MACPHERSON."—

Fancy a contractor directing a communication in that tenor to one in the service —

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is awful, it is worse than the tunics.

Mr. MULOCK. The letter continues:

"I understand a request has been made by the Batteries in Toronto for the cavalry tunics, and while the cloth indeed is very fair, yet the balance of the same will be if anything much better. I would suggest not delivering their lot (being in such a prominent place as Toronto) until we can give them the best goods.

"Please do not misunderstand me. The cloth of which these are being made has been inspected by Mr. Watson, but they are improving it all the time at the mill, and it is most desirable that these prominent points (such as Toronto) should be well taken care of.

"I remain, yours faithfully,
"W. E. SANFORD."

Any kind of clothing would do for the country battalions, but there is to be special care, according to the contractor, to guard those prominent points like Toronto. If they gave their best quality to Toronto, considering the complaints that have come from that city, what must have been the quality of the goods served outside of it? It strikes me as scandalous that any contractor should propose such a thing to the Department of Militia. It is clear that those proper relations that ought to prevail between a contractor and the department do not exist in this case. Who is the real Minister of Militia in so far as the clothing branch is concerned? He occupies a seat in the Senate. It is not this hon. gentleman who is now declaring that he has been faithful to the public service for all these years. Would any honest contractor, any man who had no relations with the Government except those of a contractor —would any honest contractor, I say, dare to sign his name to such a document as that, proposing that a fraud should be committed upon the service, that one kind of goods should be meted out to one part of the service and another kind to another, that tricks should be resorted to, but that special care should be exercised to guard prominent points and let the inferior goods go to the other points? Had a proper feeling existed, had the Minister of Militia been alive to his business, had he been at all true to the public service he would, if he had properly appreciated his duty, have caused a thorough investigation into the matter; he would have dispensed with his old inspector who had been doing this work for many years. I think I have made good the statements with which I began. I think I have established by evidence beyond all controversy that the Minister has neglected his trust and has violated his trust, and has sown the seeds of dissatisfaction among the force.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MULOCK. Hon. gentlemen may protest as they like. I am giving my impression, and they will have an opportunity to express theirs. But considering the sacrifices made by the country, considering the sacrifices made by the volunteers, they are entitled to better treatment than this from the department. The country has loyally and willingly poured out millions and placed them at the disposal of the Minister of Militia. The volunteers for years have made many sacrifices for the benefit of their country. They have paid out their money cheerfully, and they have given their time. The rank and file, and even the officers have surrendered days that might have been theirs for amusement in order to perfect the organisation. They have surrendered a good deal of their personal liberty, they have rendered themselves liable to be called upon to perform active service, as they have done in the past. They have willingly put their hands in their pockets in these various ways, and yet when I ask that they shall have justice from them in regard to their uniforms, and that the money shall not be taken out of their own pockets, the Minister protests against this attitude. What have the volunteers done that they should, by this mismanagement, be thus taxed in order to enjoy the privilege of serving the country as soldiers? What is to be the effect of treatment like this? Is not such treatment calculated to chill the ardor of the volunteer, to destroy that spirit upon which the whole system hangs? It is a voluntary system. Men join it from choice, from good will, from patriotic motives, and if the Minister sows the seeds of dissatisfaction, he will produce greater injury to the service than his Government or a dozen Governments can undo. There is in my judgment a remedy. Before it is too late, let us place at the head of the department, in the high position of Minister of Militia, a man who will sympathise with the force, who is of the force, who has been with the force, who is a volunteer, who knows the trials of the force.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Are you a volunteer.

Mr. MULOCK. I have been a volunteer; but I am not Minister of Militia, I am trying the Minister of Militia. I say let us remedy this evil by creating a sympathetic feeling between the force and the head of the department. Why, the hon. gentleman who is Minister of Militia is a man who is, so far as I know, innocent of any military experience.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Hear, hear.

Mr. MULOCK. He acknowledges it, and I doubt if he would be capable of manœuvring a battalion of barnyard fowls if he had the opportunity, and yet he is supposed to sympathise with the volunteers, to know their wants and relieve them. I attach great importance to the militia system of Canada. Apart from the service it has rendered as a protective institution, and apart from the service it may hereafter render as a protective institution, it is a great scheme for educating public opinion, and in that regard I think we cannot too highly feel the importance of developing in it a healthy spirit. We have a country here to which we invite the people of all races, and varied as is the racial origin of our people we can all rejoice, or we should all rejoice, that while true to the memories of the past we can meet on one common ground, that of true Canadian patriotic sentiment, and if the proper administration of the Militia Department will tend to develop that sentiment, I, for one, say: Let us bring about that improvement; let us impart that true national sentiment to the Canadian volunteer—a national Canadian common brotherhood in arms. Then if that is done the militia service will be doing good work, not only as an organisation of a military character, but in assisting to cement together all the various nationalities which constitute this Dominion. I say that our Canadian militia service has fallen short in this regard, or that it is calculated to fall short in this regard, owing to the dissatisfaction with the Minister of Militia's administration as shown in these matters. Before it is too late let us restore confidence, let us tell the militia forces of Canada, that the highest military position that the Government of the people of Canada can confer is within the reach of one of their own force. I see around me in this chamber many hon. members of the militia force; men who have gallantly served in the field and who have not failed at the hour of duty. Are all these gallant gentlemen to be denied position, and is the force to be told that the force exists in order to supply a place for a politician, who has no sympathy with them. If time would permit I would remind the Minister of Militia of another grave act of dereliction of duty on his part, but I will be brief in my reference to that. I say that his action in denying to the volunteers of the York-Simcoe Battalion that same treatment that was accorded under like conditions to other volunteers, was in itself an act which disqualifies him to act as Minister of Militia. He has treated the men of that battalion most unfairly, and they did not deserve unfair treatment from the department or from the country. They responded to the call of duty, and they left their homes when called upon to defend the country. They went forth not knowing they were to return; they served as they were ordered to serve, and the head of that battalion discharged one of the most noble deeds that took place during the troubles of 1885. They came home with honor meted to them deservedly by the country, and the only person in the whole of Canada who was found ready to deny them justice, was the Minister of Militia. Now, after four years; after importuning the Minister, after argument upon the floor of this House, after years of clamor both in this House and in the Militia Department, that justice should be rendered to this battalion, the Government was compelled to render this tardy measure of justice by promising that they would do what the Minister of Militia should have recommended them to do four years ago. Is that the way in which to develop a military spirit? Is that the way to treat men who are prepared to make these sacrifices for the benefit of the country? No, Sir, it is not. I cannot find language in which to express my strong disapprobation of the treatment accorded to the men of the York Simcoe Battalion by the Minister of Militia. He of all the militia forces of the country is profiting by his position. These men are making their sacrifices while he is here jaunting and enjoying himself and fattening upon the wealth of the land. Under these circumstances I say that it is time for Parliament to call upon the Government to reorganise this department and to place at the head of it a man who has sympathy with the forces; a man with whom the force have sympathy and in whom the country has confidence. Until the Government do that I submit that the militia force of Canada are not receiving fair play at the hands of the Government. I therefore beg to move, seconded by Mr. Laurier, in amendment:

That all the words after "That" be struck out and that the following be substituted: "The administration of the Department of Militia and Defence at Ottawa as at present constituted is unsatisfactory to the militia force of Canada and does not command public confidence."

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the Session we have had threatening indications of an attack against the Militia Department by the gentleman who has just resumed his seat. The fight has now been fought, the attack has been made, the smoke has lifted from the battlefield, I see very few wounded, and I must say that the attack if it has been a long one, has not been a brilliant one. The hon. gentleman in his address might possibly have interested a meeting of tailors, but he cannot expect to appeal to the judgment and to the common sense of hon. members of this House and to pro-

duce that effect which I have no doubt he possibly fancies he may have produced. As usual, the hon. member has not been courteous in the manner in which he has made his attack, although I have tried to be courteous since I have had—not so much the advantage—but since it has been my experience to meet that gentleman on the floor of Parliament. Under the constitutional principles of old England, Parliament was supposed to be a club of gentlemen, but I fail to see why, if that distinction which has been recognised in England, were to be applied here, the hon. gentleman should find a place among us. He is discourteous, he is rude, and at times insolent. It may be that he feels there are privileges in the House of Commons which protect him against his insolence and his discourtesy, for I know that hon. gentleman does not show that same amount of insolence outside of the House of Parliament which he shows here. Now, Mr. Speaker, in resenting the attack which has been made by the hon. gentleman, I wish merely to defend the department over which I preside. I wish not so much to defend myself as to defend the manner in which the department has been administered; not because I happen to be the political head of the department, but, because, as such, I have been following the advice and inspirations of men who for years have been serving their country, who should not be exposed, as we public men are, to the attacks which can be levelled at any moment against a politician in Parliament, but who as Deputy Ministers or as head of the different branches, have been receiving from their country pay for the valuable services they render to the public. Upon that ground, and that ground alone, I am prepared to take up the cudgels and defend the Department of Militia against the malicious attacks which have been levelled against it by that gentleman, who pretends to speak on behalf of the volunteer force of Canada, and who, in winding up his speech, appealed to that patriotic feeling which exists in the breast of every volunteer, to avoid disunion and to bring together the different elements composing this country. And, Sir, of whom is he the advocate? Not of the volunteer force, nor of the Dominion, nor of Ontario, but of one battalion—of the Queen's Own Battalion. Every word which he has uttered expressed the views of that one battalion, and not those of the volunteer force of Canada. If he wants union, if he wants the volunteer force of Canada to be what history has always shown it to be, when it comes to defend the flag and to protect Canada and Canada's institutions and constitution against attacks from inside or outside, he is not pursuing the course calculated to make it so. Sir, that hon. gentleman stands up as the spokesman of the volunteer force, and regardless of his statements, as he always is, he says that I, in the position I occupy tonight as Minister of Militia, have never been known to the militia force, and have never, at any moment in my life, taken any interest in the militia force of Canada. Sir, when I was almost a boy, at the time of the Trent affair, when many men expected that at any moment their services might be required for the defence of their country, when I was studying my profession in Laval University, I followed the current, as did all my compatriots in that old city of Champlain—the old fortification of Canada, in the old city of Quebec—and with others, friends of mine, got up companies, and I served under Lieutenant-Colonel DeSalaberry, the name of whose ancestors has been written in the golden pages of Canada's most brilliant history. Sir, it was during that time that I enlisted, as most of my compatriots in the city of Quebec did, to fight for that old flag which we Frenchmen in Canada recognise as our own flag—that old flag which has made and is making the people of all parts of Canada one people. The interests of Canada require that there should be no fanaticism on one side or on the other side, but that we should all join hands together to develop that brilliant future which Providence has laid out for Canada.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

Now, Sir, how can I answer the hon. gentleman? This attack has been made before, Sir, and the charges brought by the hon. member have been disproved. His attack against the Department of Militia before the Committee on Public Accounts has resulted in a shameful defeat; and, Sir, if I cannot prove that these charges are ridiculous and false from the evidence produced by the hon. gentleman himself, I am prepared to give up my case, and I am prepared to follow the advice which the hon. gentleman gives—that it is time another should be placed at the head of the Department of Militia. Mr. Speaker, it is not the first time that that suggestion has been made. I feel that the hon. gentleman is carrying out a system which was inaugurated before he made his attack to-night. One who signs himself "Canadian" has been writing in the *Broad Arrow*, of London, England. Fancy, Mr. Speaker, a Canadian not having the pluck to fight his battles in Canada, but has to select the columns of the *Broad Arrow* in London to attack the institutions of his country. That Canadian, possibly a Canadian of the stamp of the gentleman who has just been making this attack, I am informed is known in the literary circles by the poetical name of "Linchpin." It was "Linchpin" who led the attack in Toronto, and who levelled accusations against me as a French Canadian, which I do not resent. I leave to those who know me, to those who have read the history of my native Province, to those who know the French Canadians, whether we French Canadians can occupy a position of trust which throws enormous responsibilities at certain times upon the shoulders of the occupant of that position. That position, I am proud to say, has been occupied by countrymen of mine; and I call countrymen of mine men of every nationality living in Canada. I call countryman of mine a Canadian, whether his ancestors came from the flowery Provinces of France, or from the Green Isle, or from Scotland, or Germany, or any other portion of the known world. I call Canadians those who live in our country, who wish to develop its resources, and, above all, who wish to make this country one inhabited by a united people, loving its institutions, and trying to make of it one of the happiest and most prosperous countries in the world. But, Sir, "Linchpin," or a friend of "Linchpin," who signs himself "Canadian," writes and says, in the *Broad Arrow* of the 27th October, 1888:

"Some British Canadian should now hold office, one who is above race and prejudices, and who would only care for the true efficiency of the militia."

Now, that may mean the hon. gentleman—I do not know; no doubt he would only care for the true efficiency of of the militia. Of course he is free from any prejudices, and of course he would consent to hold office only in the interests of his country. Nothing else would induce him to do so. Looking over the records of the Department of Militia, I find that we have had as Ministers of Militia, taken according to date, Sir George Cartier, Mr. Hugh Macdonald, Mr. Ross, Mr. Vail, the Hon. Mr. Jones, who has taken a great deal of interest in the charges brought to-day against the department, Mr. Masson, and the Hon. Sir Alex. Campbell, whom I succeeded. I leave it to any hon. gentleman who will impartially look into the records to say whether the French Canadians who have occupied this portfolio have not filled the position as brilliantly, at least, as the British Canadian that the *Broad Arrow*, under the inspiration of that brilliant Canadian, would like to have at the head of the department? Now, Sir George Cartier left the Treasury benches for what cause? Because he wanted to organise the militia force of Canada, because he wanted to have in this portion of the British Empire a force that, at a given moment, under certain circumstances, would be prepared to join with the Imperial forces to fight the battles of the Empire and Canada. Well, Sir George Cartier organised the military force which has been the

foundation stone of our military organisation. The Hon. Mr. Macdonald, although not a French-Canadian, did not contribute very much to what Sir George Cartier had done in organising the militia. Mr. Ross, I am perfectly safe in saying, did not get up any foreign war, or organise a militia, or contribute to its success. Mr. Vail, be it said to his credit, organised the Royal Military College. The Hon. Mr. Jones, I am sorry to say, no doubt owing to the fact that he did not remain long enough in office, did not mark his passage at the Department by any brilliant feat. Mr. Masson established the cartridge factory, which to my mind not only is indispensable but is destined, under certain circumstances, to render great services to Canada. Sir Alex. Campbell was only a short time in office; and with regard to myself, I am bound to say, since I have been attacked, that in the number of years I have filled the office I have contributed my quota towards the organisation of the Militia. When I came to occupy the position I now occupy, I found two batteries of artillery, "A" and "B," giving us a contingent in the permanent corps of about 300 men. Since I have been at the head of the department, the Cavalry School at Quebec has been organised, the Mounted Infantry School at Winnipeg, the Infantry School at St. John's, the Infantry School at Fredericton, the Infantry School at London, the Battery of Garrison Artillery at Victoria, the Engineer's branch of the department, to which is entrusted the carrying out of the repairs and certain constructions as part of the public works of the Department of Militia are concerned. The hon. gentleman says that the expenditure has increased since 1880, and he asks, if it is possible that we can have value for this increase in the expenditure? Why, if the hon. gentleman, instead of measuring all these trousers and looking into every tunic and turning every coat inside out, had taken the trouble to consult the Blue-book, he would have seen how the increase in expenditure can be accounted for. It has been caused by the addition of the Cavalry and Infantry Schools; by the formation of "C" Battery in British Columbia, which did not exist in 1880; by the Government grants to the Dominion Artillery and the Rifle Associations; by the issuing of pay for the annual drills of the said corps. Now, the hon. gentleman, with the accuracy which distinguishes him, stated that I took no interest whatever in the Militia Force. I can tell the hon. gentleman that it was I who asked that the officers be paid according to rank. Until I took charge of the department, the officers, whether belonging to one rank or the other, received a dollar per day, whether out on special service or going through the annual drill. I thought they should be paid according to rank, just as the British officers are paid in the British army. There is also the assumption by the Department of Militia and Defence of the cost of constructing and repairing barracks and military buildings which formerly were in charge of the Department of Public Works. That is an additional service which goes to increase the militia expenditure as compared with 1880. In other respects, there has been no increase, but rather a reduction. As Minister of Militia I consider I am exposed to every possible attack that any hon. gentleman wishes to bring against me, and, indeed, my usefulness as Minister of Militia would have been gone long ago, if I could not withstand attacks such as the one that has been made against me to-night. The hon. gentleman, following out the policy of his party, has attacked the contracts which we gave out, solely for the purpose of abusing the Government of the day and the policy of the Government, and was ready to publish to the whole world that the manufactures of Canada were absolutely dead and useless, just for the purpose of making a point against the Government. The policy of this Administration is a different one from that of the hon. gentleman and his friends. We felt that we wanted to build up a strong nationality in our own country. Following in the wake of the great republic on the other side of the line, we carved out for Canada a policy that has created in Canada Canadian manufactures, which has developed the industries of the country, and keeps within Canada the amount of money which every year we were sending to foreign countries to purchase what we could produce ourselves. We consider it of the first importance to establish manufactures of the various articles necessary for the clothing and equipment of the militia forces. And I am proud to say, whatever may be the result of the attacks of the hon. gentleman against me, that what I have done, if it were to be done over again, I should do so to-morrow. I have contributed to keep within Canada, since I have been Minister of Militia, about $200,000 which were leaving every year the pockets of our Canadian people and were being expended in foreign, though friendly markets. This amount was sent to the tailoring establishments of England, but now it contributes largely to give an impetus to our manufactures here, to teach our Canadian people to be independent of the resources of others. To-day we are in such a position, through the impetus which has been created among our manufacturers by the policy followed by the Government, that in ten weeks we can equip and dress ten thousand men without any possible trouble. I admit, and I am not ashamed to admit it, that, like everything else, the beginnings of the system were rather difficult. We felt that we were a people strong and intelligent enough to go on and work out, as other people had done, our own destiny. I heard the hon. gentleman discuss our clothing from the standard of the clothing of old England. Old England has been for centuries manufacturing the clothing required not only for the English army, but, through the competency of her manufacturing establishments, also largely to the clothing and equipment of the continental armies of Europe. And what do we see to-day? The hon. gentleman saved me a great deal of trouble before the Public Accounts Committee by bringing forward witnesses whom I should have been obliged to bring forward to prove that, although England had had the experience of centuries in this matter, Canada was manufacturing to-day an article so far superior to anything which we could import from England. I leave it to any impartial member of the Committee of Public Accounts which at times was kept waiting for the convenience of the hon. gentleman who is formulating these charges against the Department of Militia, whether it was not proved beyond any possibility of discussion by the witnesses brought forward by the hon. gentleman himself, and after seeing the samples which were produced before the Committee of Public Accounts, that our manufacturers, who had started for the purpose of equipping and clothing our citizen patriotic soldiery, had, in a comparatively short period of time, succeeded not only in rivalling but in surpassing the clothing which we used to import from England, and to pay money, which we have now kept for Canadians. I am prepared to say that, if the same policy had to be formulated again, I being Minister of Militia and occupying that position and that responsibility, I would believe that I was helping the militia force of Canada by helping the country. The militia force loves that country more than anything else. The members of that force are prepared to sacrifice their blood to defend it, and I say that, if we can make that country prosperous, we are doing what the militia more especially desire. It is possible that a swell regiment, composed of gentlemen occupying prominent positions in banks, friends of the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Mulock), gentlemen occupying prominent positions in commercial institutions, may prefer to send their measure to a London tailor and import a tunic which fits like a glove on a well shaped hand. If they add to their patriotism a fondness for style, and desire to be dressed in the height of perfection, and desire to import a tunic from a London tailor for $9 instead of wearing the one which Canada can afford to give to Canada's soldiers, I

do not blame them for that. I appreciate their good taste, and I congratulate them on their ambition as a battalion to look better than any other battalion, but I beg these gentlemen not to expect me, extravagant as I may be, extravagant as the hon. gentleman says I am, to serve out to the whole force of Canada such tunics as the hon. gentleman and the witness he brought forward stated were models of what the Militia Department should have adopted for the use of the service. Can we imagine Queen Victoria, and England, with all England's wealth, applying to Poole, the great London tailor, to fit out the whole British Army? It would not only be extravagant, but the people of England, with their common sense—and I wish I could say that the hon. gentleman would share in the same gift with the English people—would frown down as ridiculous and absurd the idea of a battalion or battalions being fitted out by the swell tailors of London. Irrespective of the cut of the tunic or the fit of the trouser, whether the dye on one side is a little lighter than the dye on the other or not, I know that under any uniform the militiamen of Canada have fought the battles of their country, and that is enough for me. The parade to the people of the country is a pleasure, because in seeing their soldiers, under the uniform which they wear, the Queen's uniforms we know that they are training for the day when their services may be required for more important purposes, but I have never heard of a Canadian militia man who has hesitated to perform his duty because his tunic had not been imported from London, or because, forsooth, the fit of the trousers was not exactly what they would have liked it to be. I said that I had admitted that the beginnings of this Canadian manufacture of clothing was not as brilliant a success as we would have wished it to be. The mills in Canada, as in any other country had to acquire the experience which was indispensable in order to produce a fabric equal to what we had been importing from England and which had been issued to the force. But, Sir, our men went to work under the impulse given by the policy we had established, our millowners went to work and imported machinery and plant; they even sent to England to import skilled labor, and they have produced an article which is superior to anything we have ever imported from England. Sir, the hon. gentleman with that delicacy of touch which is characteristic of him, accuses me of having corruptly given contracts to political friends and allies on the eve of a general election. Sir, I fight my political battles as a politician, but when I am given a trust by the people of Canada, I feel the responsibility that rests upon me. I have been severely attacked in this House and in the press, but I stand my ground, relying upon those who will take the trouble to look into the administration of my department. I admit that more capable men than myself could be found to administer the Department of Militia, but I do not admit that one could be found who loves his country more sincerely, who is more devoted to the militia force of Canada than myself. My master is the Parliament of Canada, that Parliament votes a certain amount of money, and I am told that with an amount of money that is intended to keep up a force of 20,000 men, I ought to keep up a force of 40,000, and give them everything they ask. Sir, I am not afraid of attacks. During the last eighteen years I have fought the severest political battles in the Province to which I belong, and I am ready to resist the attacks to-day or tomorrow, to a public man, whenever called upon to do so. But it is discouraging to be treated with injustice for my conduct at a time when, under circumstances which we all regret, I was called upon to assume a responsibility which had never been assumed before by any other Minister of Militia in Canada, and I take this opportunity of returning my thanks to the press on both sides of politics for the justice which they meted out to me for the manner in which, according to my abilities, I did my duty on that occasion, and I did it in such a manner that Canada, I trust, had no reason to be ashamed of the way in which those troubles were put down in the North-West. I want fair play, the fair play of every Britisher, even a French Canadian Britisher expects fair play. Now, the hon. gentleman says that we gave contracts without any advertisement whatever. The hon. gentleman, in case I did not thoroughly understand his classical language, asked me to take down his statement, and I did as he told me. The hon. gentleman says that in 1887 we issued contracts to Mr. Sanford and to other people, and that we had a tender from Webb & Co., at lower prices. Now, if it is possible to appeal to the fair play of the hon. gentleman, if it is possible for hon. gentlemen sitting on the right of the Speaker to appeal to his sense of fair play, I ask him whether it was not proven by Colonel Powell, that no tenders were sent in by Webb & Co., from England. The dates speak for themselves, and the hon. gentleman, I was going to say, is disingenious in referring as he has to these dates; but I see hon. gentlemen sitting around me to-night, I see members of both sides of the House who are members of the Committee on Public Accounts, and they know perfectly well that it was established by Colonel Powell himself that he wrote on the 16th September, a letter to Messrs. Webb & Co., to ask their prices for the different articles which we were desirous of obtaining by contract from Canadian manufacturers. Now, I will give you a reason for that, and any hon. gentleman who knows anything about it would not require to have it explained to him; but for the benefit of the hon. gentleman I will tell him exactly why we wrote to Webb & Co. We are not tailors in the Department of Militia, and before entering into contracts for the clothing of the militia force, it was necessary for us to get information upon which we could apply to tenderers to ask them for the kind of material that we wanted, and the prices at which they could furnish it. This letter was sent on the 16th September, and I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that Col. Powell, the Adjutant General, was particular in stating that Webb & Co. made no tender, that it was not intended to enter into a contract with them, but he had been instructed by the head of the department to write and get their prices, specifying the different articles. The reason was that we wished to know upon what grounds we could apply to Canadian manufacturers to furnish the clothing for our force. That letter was sent on the 16th of September, 1887, and on the 16th of November, 1887, a contract was entered into with Mr. Sanford. Now, if these dates are taken in relation with the evidence of Colonel Powell, it will be seen that the intention of the department in writing to Webb & Co. was only to get information which would enable us to ask for tenders from Canadian manufacturers—if these dates do not show that that was our purpose, I do not know what other evidence could show it. The hon. gentleman, of course, had his fling at Mr. Sanford, a senator and a brilliant ornament of the Senate, a gentleman who has arrived at that prominent position through his own energy, a self made man, who has contributed his large share to the prosperity of Canada, and who was deserving of the recognition of his merit by the Government of the country to which he belongs. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman should be the friend of a gentleman who has contributed, by his own energy, to the prosperity of this country, and who has carved out for himself a career which enables him to lay claim to the highest position in the gift of the country. It is men like Mr. Sanford and Mr. James O'Brien we want in our midst, and not those who find everything wrong, who see everything through the darkest possible glasses and always imagine that unless they are in power the country cannot possibly prosper. The hon. gentleman said that we had given to Mr. O'Brien contracts for 3 years at the prices of 1884, and he declared that since that year there had been considerable shrinkage in woollen goods, and that consequently we had been paying a higher price to Mr. O'Brien than we should

have paid for the goods which he is manufacturing for the department. The hon. gentleman, and this is not the first time, is completely wrong. There has been no shrinkage in woollen goods, so far as I can ascertain, since 1884. The fact is that from that year up to the present time wool has been going up, and we fancied we were doing the best we could for the department when we insisted on the contract being continued for 3 years at the prices of 1884. The prices of wool were as follows :—

" Wool prices from Journal of Commerce :

October 9, 1884 :

Medium	17 cts.
Selections	19 "
Supers	21 "
Extra	25 "

October 27, 1887 :

Medium	21 to 23 cts.
Supers	24 to 25 "
Extra	28 to 29 "

These figures show that the average of the prices since I entered into the contract with Mr. O'Brien has been altogether in favor of the department. That is not all. I was Minister of Militia, and this fanatical French Canadian at the head of the department was entering into corrupt bargains with manufacturers. And when upon this point I may state that in addition to the fanatical charge which is being made against me to-night by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), I am condemned in a newspaper, the *Mail*, as conducting the Militia Department upon lines laid down by the Jesuits. Strange as it may appear to reasonable men it is a fact. This charge is made in a letter from a " Lieutenant Colonel," who selects the columns of the *Mail* as the organ of the militia force, although the militia force generally like their organ to stick to their flag. The militia force of Canada has never given up its flag, and I do not see how the *Mail* can pretend to speak for the militia force. I should not like it to advocate my case at all events. This patriotic " Lieutenant Colonel " says :

" The wants and needs of the men, the wishes or feelings of the officers, the questions of organisation, equipment, arms, ammunition, recruiting, clothing, drill, discipline, &c , &c , are all Persian to one who is only a politician and holds his present position by virtue of his power (aided by Sir Hector) to keep *en rapport* with the Jesuits, and through them to keep Quebec in line for the Government."

Hon. gentlemen can imagine the difficulty of running the Department of Militia and having to consult the Jesuits to know exactly what to do about tunics, trousers, and everything else, in regard to which the hon. gentleman has attacked me to-night. But the hon. gentleman accuses me of having entered into a three years' contract for political objects. I will give hon. members the reason why I entered into a contract for three years. The permanent head of the department, Colonel Panet, who was selected by hon. gentlemen opposite for promotion to the high position of a senator, and afterwards appointed by them Deputy of the Minister of Militia, during their short life on the Treasury benches, who was not a political friend of mine, although a personal friend, and I can say without reference to politics that he has been true and faithful to every Minister of Militia who has occupied the position I now occupy, wrote as follows :—

" DEPARTMENT OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.
" OTTAWA, 5th August 1887.

" The undersigned has the honor to report that the military Grey Coats supplied in Canada for the past 4 years by the contractors, Messrs. James O'Brien & Co , of Montreal, have been found most satisfactory to the department, both as regards quality of cloth and workmanship, the cost comparing most favorably with prices paid for similar articles formerly purchased in England. In view of the above facts, and as the present contractors have taken pains to meet the department's requirements in every respect and have become fully acquainted with all the details connected with the manufacture of the Great Coats, it is submitted that it would be advantageous to the service if in future a contract could be extended for 3 years instead of calling for tenders annually, it being understood, of course, that payments to the contractor in each year should be subject to the votes of Parliament for the respective year.

" Respectfully submitted,
" EUGENE PANET,
" *Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence.*"

I was not satisfied with that. I felt almost in the air that I might be attacked, that I might be told by some hon. gentleman that a French Minister got a report from a Frenchman, who was under his control, and it might be brought up that I had used undue influence. So I went to a good Scotchman, John Macpherson, Lieutenant-Colonel Macpherson. I received as Minister the following communication :—

(*Memo.*) " OTTAWA, 5th August, 1887.

" The undersigned has the honor to report that the military Grey Great Coats supplied in Canada for the past four years by the contractors, James O'Brien & Co., of Montreal, have been found most satisfactory to the department, both as regards quality of cloth and workmanship, the cost comparing most favorably with the prices paid for similar articles formerly purchased in England. In view of the above facts and as the present contractors have taken pains to meet the department's requirements in every respect and have become fully acquainted with all the details connected with the manufacture of greatcoats, it is submitted that it would be advantageous to the service if in future a contract could be extended for three years instead of calling for tenders annually, it being understood of course that payments to the contractor in each year should be subject to the vote of Parliament for the respective year.

" Respectfully submitted,
" JOHN MACPHERSON,
" *Director of Militia Stores.*"

I read this to show that in the administration of the affairs of the department I consulted with my officers, who have been for years at the head of the different branches, and who have had very much more experience than I have in regard to such matters, and they stated it would be in the interest of the force and the department and of Canada to enter into these contracts. That is not all. In 1884 we advertised, as we always had done, through the press, for tenders for the different articles of clothing required. I call the attention of the House to this fact, that the system of advertising for tenders, when only a few firms tender for the goods, in every newspaper in every village, town and city is a piece of wanton extravagance that should be put down. What was the result ? It may have cost $1,000 to the department to pay for the cost of advertising for these tenders all over the Dominion. Even papers not authorised, with that spirit of enterprise which characterises the press of our country published the advertisement, and under gentle pressure I found it almost impossible not to have the accounts which they sent in paid for these advertisements. As a result of all the advertisements which we paid so much money for only five firms in Canada tendered. In 1887 the department sent a circular to the five tenderers—in fact the only tenderers we had—asking them for their prices. We followed the same system that is followed in England, for the army clothing supplies, there are only a few firms who have the capital, the machinery and the experience required to enter into a contract with the British Government for the equipment and clothing of the army. The result of our circulars was that four of the best firms of Canada tendered and the lowest tenderer received the contract. Those men entering into contracts for three years have gone to the expense of importing machinery which in some instances cost as much as $2,000 or $3,000. This machinery will cut by hydraulic power hundreds of pairs of trousers or riding breeches in a short time. The result of the system which has been organised under the protective policy which we have adopted towards the manufacturers is, that under any emergency we have got to-day within the limits of Canada a system by which we can equip any number of men in a very short period of time. When we first commenced this policy, I admit that we did not succeed well. We commenced with the dark dyes for the cloth; we took the blue and took the dark green, and it was declared to be utterly impossible for Canada to ever attempt to manufacture the scarlet cloth. It was explained by those who understood the business that the difficulty about scarlet cloth was that the whole of the factory had to be decked out in white while the dyeing process was going on, that canvas

had to be put all around the factory, and it was explained that if a particle of any foreign color dropped upon the material that was going through the process of dyeing it would destroy the whole piece at an enormous loss to the manufacturer. We triumphed over those difficulties and to-day we have Canadian scarlet cloth which is declared by experts to be superior to anything manufactured in England. Why should we not be proud to do as other people do, clothe our own soldiers and find within our midst all that we require for our own wants. Why should we expend the money of Canadians in foreign markets, when we can get what we require as well at home? Now, Sir, the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has spoken about the evidence which he produced at the Public Accounts Committee. I regret to have taken up so much of the time of the House and I have only a few words to say upon that point. He is a lawyer and I belong to the same profession, and I saw, as most hon. gentlemen must have seen, that he did not feel exactly comfortable when he was examining his witnesses. I have no doubt that before a court of justice he would wish to have better witnesses than those he produced before the Public Accounts Committee. He brought down Captain Bennett from Toronto, a grocer, to judge of the cloth, and the cut, and the fit of the tunics. A very charming gentleman this Mr. Bennett was, but he declared that really everything Canadian in so far as the uniforms were concerned, was nasty, and it did not fit; and he said that the Queen's Own, having at heart the interest of their country, had decided that it would be unbecoming for them to wear the tunics that were served out by the Department of Militia; but they had forwarded measures to England—to London tailors—and that they were going to get out the tunics. Captain Bennett produced one of these tunics. No doubt it was a remarkably well turned out tunic, it looked very nice, and I have no manner of doubt that he would look very nice in the tunic too. But, Sir, it was a very expensive tunic and we could not afford to pay that money for it. This prominent witness was brought down from Toronto and he brought down a number of tunics with him and of course he said that what were supposed to be Canadian tunics were perfectly useless and the men were ashamed to wear them. I leave it to any member of the Committee if it be not a fact that when a tunic was shown to Captain Bennett it was impossible for him to say whether it was an English tunic or a Canadian tunic—and the worst tunic that he inspected, one that he said was perfectly useless, that was of bad cloth and bad make and bad everything else, turned out to be an imported tunic from England. That is the kind of evidence upon which the hon. gentleman wishes to destroy the reputation of the administration of the Department of Militia. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs reminds me that when two tunics were placed in his hands Captain Bennett selected the better of the two, and he made no mistake about that, for the difference he saw was so great that even with his experience, he not being a clothier, nor a military tailor, but being a grocer, made no trouble about it and he immediately selected the best of the two which turned out to be a Canadian tunic. I say the hon. gentleman was a little disappointed in this for he did not expect it. Again the hon. gentleman brought down from Toronto Sergeant Major Crean, the regimental tailor of the same battalion, and he also pronounced in his opinion the inferiority of the issue of 1885. Now, Sir, I have stated candidly, and I wish to repeat it, that the beginnings of our Canadian manufacture of clothing were not a success. We had given our contracts to the lowest tenderers, and they, having no capital, produced articles which were not up to the standard. We, therefore, gave them up and adopted the principle of sending circulars to those whom we knew to be competent, from their financial position, their experience, their machinery, and the other means at their disposal, to carry out the contract. What was the result? We are producing to-day an article which I assert is superior to anything we have ever imported from England. The hon. gentleman spoke of the visit paid by some hon. members to the stores. I was glad indeed to find that some gentlemen took sufficient interest in the matter, before criticising, before giving a verdict against us, to go down the short distance necessary to visit the stores on the banks of the canal, and to inspect the clothing manufactured in Canada for Canadians. What was the result? The hon. gentleman disingenuously stated that we had goods for show and goods to serve out to our men. In the militia stores, which were filled with tunics, trousers, and every part of the equipment of a soldier, in every flat of that huge building, any gentleman was at liberty to go from one shelf to another, to take down the various parts of a soldier's equipment and inspect them, and then to say whether the hon. gentleman's statement was true, that we have clothing for show and clothing for use. Sergeant Major Crean, the regimental tailor, said the articles shown to him were not up to the mark, and he expressed the opinion that the tunics of the Queen's Own, who sent to England for them, were far superior to anything we had. The hon. gentleman might have done as Mr. Crean did. He should have gone down to the stores before making his speech to-night, if impartial enough, and should have examined those different articles of clothing for himself. Sergeant Major Crean is a good tailor, and he gets the benefit of refitting of the tunics served out to the militia force in Toronto. The hon. gentleman tried to establish before the Committee on Public Accounts that the Canadian tunics had to be refitted by a tailor. Sir, every tunic which we imported from England had to be refitted by a tailor. Sizes are given, and in some instances the men may be exactly fitted. In our Government corps we get all the tunics made according to the requisitions sent in by the commandants of the schools, and every man has to be refitted by the regimental tailor before he looks as smart as he wants to look in his tunic, and we allow 40 cents each for refitting the tunics. Sergeant Major Crean charges $2 and some cents, and of course, I can understand that. We have an ordinary tailor whose only ambition is to refit the tunic and make it fit when it does not fit; but he has not a great name to keep before the public, as Mr. Crean has, and consequently he does not charge for the name, but only for refitting the tunic. Now, here is the letter which Sergeant Major Crean sent to Senator Sanford, and it should have been beneath the hon. gentleman to charge Senator Sanford with having obtained those letters, or that they were sent to him through any pressure of mine. Hon. gentlemen who are members of the Committee on Public Accounts know that while I was not unfriendly towards Sergeant Major Crean, I made no attempt to gain his good will; but it was my duty to ask him the questions I did. Before he left for Toronto, he came to my room of his own accord in company with Color Sergeant McKell, and he said: "Sir Adolphe, before I leave for Toronto, I wish to tell you that after going through my examination before the Committee of Public Accounts, Mr. Watson asked me to go and visit the stores." Of course, the hon. gentleman who attacks Mr. Watson does not know that he is a strong political opponent of mine, and that ought to cover a good many sins. He is a good Grit, who votes steadily against us, and I have kept him because he is a good Grit; there are a few of them, and I think we ought to preserve those we have. Sergeant Major Crean went on to state that he had sent a letter to Senator Sanford, and he added, "If you will kindly send for that letter, if you require it, you can make any use of it you like." The hon. gentleman read that letter. It was good policy on his part to do so. It is a great blow to the whole of his plans, and, as a good general, he thought he should take the lead in reading it, That letter is as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 12th April, 1889.

"HON. MR. SANFORD.

"DEAR SIR,—Since giving my evidence yesterday, I have been shown the clothing now in store, which has been manufactured by the Sanford Company within the last two years. I think it is quite up to the English manufacture, both in material, workmanship, and fit, as we tried some of them on. If the Queen's Own had been served with as good clothing as I saw yesterday, I feel certain that there would not have been the dissatisfaction which now exists; and so long as the clothing is kept up to the standard of that in the stores now, there cannot be any just cause for complaint.

"Signed, JOHN F. CREAN."

The hon. gentleman may try to explain away this letter but I contend that it decides the whole matter in controversy between us. Here is the witness called by the hon. gentleman, who goes down to the stores and picks out the identical articles of clothing complained of, and he comes back and says that Canada cannot do better than it is doing for the militia force, and that if clothing such as that had been supplied to the Queen's Own, there would have been no reason for complaint. Of course the Queen's Own is a swell regiment, and its men prefer Mr. Crean to an ordinary tailor. If they prefer a swell tailor like Mr. Poole, the London tailor, they are quite free to have him if they pay the price; but they cannot expect us to pay the price, when we have already an article which is not only equal, but superior to anything that we have ever imported from England. Color-Sergeant McKell is an Englishman, and I was glad to see that we have, in Canada, Englishmen as intelligent as he to come and settle among us. He had very strong prejudices and he declared the Canadian clothing was far inferior to what it should be. He went to England and purchased his tunic, which was really very well turned out, and superior to anything we could produce, but it was lined with a most expensive lining, and the trimming and everything was perfect. Of course he could afford to pay for it, and I congratulate him on the pride he takes in the appearance of his regiment, but he cannot ask me to pay these high prices. S. C. McKell, Color-Sergeant of the Queen's Own, wrote as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 12th April, 1889.

"HON. MR SANFORD,

"SIR,—I was shown the clothing in stores. I examined the material, and also tested the fit and find it very good in both particulars, and I think that if the material used in the rifle tunics was as good as that I saw in the scarlet, there would be no ground for complaint. The material in the Rifle tunic that I saw in stores, however, is of much better quality and fit than the tunics issued to the Queen's Own for the last few years.

"Signed, S. C. McKELL."

Rome was not built in a day. The first tunics turned out were not as good as those we have now, and if the Queen's Own are a little patient they will soon get the best tunics we are, through the success of our policy, now able to turn out in Canada. The hon. gentleman one day insisted in bringing before the Committee two important witnesses, who were going to decide the whole case in his favor. The hon. gentleman did not read their evidence, but I will read it to you. Mr. Willby, manufacturer of woollen goods at Wilton, Ontario, and having 37 years' experience as a cloth manufacturer, on being sent for by the hon. member for North York gave evidence, as follows:—

"The cloth of which the English overcoats are made was of the worst possible character."

The hon. gentleman before coming into court had lawyer-like seen his witness, and the evidence of this witness was to be the culminating point of the attack, and the proof of all the charges.

"Clearly the cloth of which the English overcoats are made is of the worst possible character. I was not aware that anything so poor was manufactured in that country. It was absolute rubbish."

These are the imported goods that the hon. gentleman wanted me to continue to import, and to send a couple of hundred thousand dollars of Canadian money every year to England to import these goods.

"The Canadian coats, however, he pronounced good in style and of the best quality, and worth four times as much as the other."

Now, at this particular point, I wish to say that the system followed in England is very different from the system followed here. The life of a tunic in England is a year, and on active service it is immaterial how long it lasts. The important point in England is the cost, and it is all manufactured of the worst possible shoddy, kept together by glue and wax. But in Canada we use a tunic that is to last five years, and if we issued such rubbish to our men as Mr. Wilby says the English tunics are made of, they would not last any longer than the year. He pronounced the Canadian goods all wool and worth four times more than the other. Another witness was called by the hon. gentleman, and the hon. gentleman's witnesses save me a great deal of trouble as they prove the reverse of what he wanted them to prove:

"Mr. J. C. MacIntosh, cloth manufacturer, of Woodbridge, pronounced the English cloth worth 20 cents per yard, as against the Canadian cloth worth 80 cents, and stated that the English goods were the worst possible shoddy, held together with flour and glue, whereas all the Canadian goods were made of pure wool, and were much more durable."

These were not my witnesses. The hon. gentleman had proved enough in my favor to enable me to dispense with calling any. Senator Sanford was examined. His testimony was to the effect that he, in response to the departmental advertisement in the press from 1884 to 1886 calling for tenders, their company tendered with others, securing a portion of contract through the last two years. In 1887 their company, together with all the manufacturers who had previously tendered or manifested any desire to compete for this work, received a circular calling for tenders. His company was the lowest for a portion only of the goods required. Upon this point Senator Sanford, although a very good friend of mine and of Canada, and a man who has done his share towards developing the interests of Canada, complained of the Minister of Militia. He says:

"The Minister of Militia having called for tenders reduced my contract 12 per cent."

His contract was the lowest for the portion he had tendered to supply:

"The contract was not awarded, the department informing them that as the sum voted for the clothing of the Militia was not sufficient to permit the department giving the contract at that price, that if this company would reduce their price they should have the contract for three years, but as this would reduce their goods to cost they withdrew their tender."

Now, Senator Sanford, who has been so corrupt, finds our prices too low, and says: Keep your favors to yourself, I am going to give up this contract:

"They withdrew their tender some time later, the manufacturers of the cloth, in view of their having gone to a large expense taking skilled workmen to England to perfect them in the art of dyeing the scarlet and green, having put in expensive vats they were unwilling to loose this work, and they would reduce the price of cloth between 6 per cent. and 7 per cent. The makers also of tunics reduced their price for making rather than to loose this work during the dull season."

Here is this extravagant Minister of Militia giving the contract to the lowest tenderer, and sending for the successful competitor, and telling him that unless he reduces his prices 12 per cent. or 13 per cent. he will not get the contract. Upon the advice of my officers, upon the Order in Council—for I did not proceed upon my own responsibility, but took every precaution and laid the report of my officers before my colleagues—I was prepared to give the contract for three years in consideration of his reducing his rates and in consideration of his having imported expensive machinery and skilled labor, I said: If you will reduce your price 12 per cent. I will give you a contract for three years. Canada has benefited by this, and I would, under similar circumstances, do again exactly as I did then. Now, the hon. gentleman who expresses his deep sympathy for that militia force, hesitated somewhat when he said that some of the gentlemen belonging to that force who also commanded sufficiently the confidence of their own people

to sit here to represent their interests in Canada, gave their evidence, because he says they are all behind the Treasury benches. The hon. gentleman said he was a volunteer. I never heard of his belonging to any volunteer company, but, if he belongs to the force, he must know that these witnesses came here as officers and gave their evidence on their honor as such. I did not send for grocers from Toronto to say what cloth was worth, but I took the gentlemen who had been wearing these tunics, and I said: Your men have been wearing these tunics in camp and out of camp, and they expressed their opinion in the most independent manner possible. Some said the tunics were very good indeed. Others said they might be better. My friends Colonel O'Brien, Colonel Tyrwhitt, Colonel Prior and others laid before the Committee the experience of the clothing which had been used by their own men. Could we get better evidence than that to appeal to the sense of justice of the Committee before which this investigation was going on? The hon. gentleman indignantly appealed to the House, and said that the contract had been awarded to Senator Sanford, and that he had made large contributions towards the Conservative party. Now, that is unwarranted. The hon. gentleman cannot make that statement, because he knows very well that he cannot prove it, and no man should make a statement of that kind affecting the character a gentleman sitting in the other branch of this Legislature unless he would be prepared to prove it; but, of course, the hon. gentleman knows better than I can tell him that "suspicion haunts the guilty mind," and possibly he thinks we have done what he would have done under the same circumstances. I never heard of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) being a paragon of virtue as far as electoral matters were concerned. I have heard a great many things of him in North York, but I never heard that the hon. gentleman could boast of his extraordinary virtue in connection with electoral matters. I will not go beyond this: that if the hon. gentleman is prepared to prove what he stated well and good; but if he is not it is beneath the hon. gentleman, as a member of Parliament, or, at all events, it is beneath members of Parliament to make a statement which they are not prepared to prove, attacking the character of a gentleman such as Senator Sanford. I regret to have taken up so much time. I very seldom take up the time of the House, but I felt it to be my duty, as representing the Department of Militia—though, as far as I am concerned, I am prepared to be attacked and to resist such attacks, and I do not believe this one will hurt me, and the hon. gentleman may repeat such attacks every day if he likes—but it was my duty as head of the department to stand up and say that the officers under my charge, who are at the head of the various branches, acted in the interests of Canada. They are the paid servants of the public, to look after the interests of the public, and I have no doubt that they did their duty. But for this assault which was made upon them, I would not have got up here to speak as I have spoken. The hon. gentleman has been very liberal in giving us the different portions of the evidence, and I must thank him for his courtesy in writing to me to tell me that he intended to lay upon the Table a motion attacking my department. But I must say that he left me somewhat helpless. He had asked the Committee on Public Accounts to have the evidence printed, but, pending that time, he took possession of the evidence, and, when I went up to consult the evidence and to see how I could get out of this frightful attack which has been made against me, I found that the hon. gentleman had taken all the powder away with him. However, speaking from recollection, and from the few notes I took before the Committee on Public Accounts, I trust that, although not as perfectly as I should have liked to have done, I have shown that the charges are absolutely idle, that there is nothing in them, and that the great attack of the hon. gentleman has culminated in a huge fizzle. I have proved that by the very witnesses produced by the hon. gentleman himself. I beg to express my regret at having taken up so much time, but, if I had gone over all the notes I have here, I should have taken much longer. I consider that the little I have been able to show to the House, so far as evidence is concerned, and so far as the case has been conducted before the Committee on Public Accounts, proves that we have done in the Department of Militia what it was our duty to do in the interests of Canada and of the public.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have followed with the closest attention the long and labored argument of the hon. the Minister of Militia in reply to the statements made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), fortified by official documents emanating from the Minister's own department. I think, if the hon. gentleman had considered the reports which have been submitted to this House, he could hardly have arrived at the conclusion with which he seems to have satisfied himself on resuming his seat. The hon. gentleman at the commencement assumed one position, which I think was very unworthy of him and of the high position he occupies. He attempted to impute to the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) the suggestion that he was endeavoring to bring this forward because the hon. Minister happened to be a French Canadian. I thought that the Minister of Militia would have hardly condescended to the lowest level of ward political clap-trap on such an important occasion as this, in conducting a discussion in this Parliament of Canada. There was not a word from the hon. member for North York referring to the hon. gentleman as being a French Canadian. He made no such reference either directly or indirectly, but he said he believed that gentleman was not qualified by previous military training or experience to place himself in sympathy with the militia force of this country. Again, the Minister of Militia placed himself in a position which I thought, judging from my own experience—and I think it would come home to the experience of every honorable and high-minded member in this House—was a very improper position for him to assume. He endeavored to shelter himself against the accusations brought against him by my hon. friend, under the plea that he was not only following, as he said, the inspiration of the department, but he submitted a document to prove his contention that he was following the suggestions made by the officers of the department. Would that satisfy this House or this country? Does he endeavor to shelter himself behind the officers of his own department? I think every member must have felt that he was placing the officers of his department in a false position. Any honorable and high-minded man would have said: I take the responsibility of the act; I judged it in the interest of the country to follow this policy, instead of sheltering himself, as he attempted to do, behind the officers of his own department. The older members of this House will recollect that when the leader of the last Liberal Administration (Mr. Mackenzie), made a purchase of steel rails, and when he submitted to this House in justification of his action, a recommendation made by that eminent engineer, Sandford Fleming, that idea was scouted by the Conservative party in this House and throughout the country. Sandford Fleming, your authority for making a purchase of that kind, the Tory orators would say: You are the head of that department, and you must assume the responsibility, and you are placing Mr. Fleming in a false position in endeavoring to show that it was his act and not your own. Mr. Mackenzie did not do that to shield himself from responsibility, but to show that a man like Mr. Fleming, who was familiar with that class of railway articles, had committed an error of judgment, but Mr. Mackenzie took the whole responsibility of that act. So the Minister of Militia should have taken the responsibility of this act from the very commencement. The Minister made

one statement to this House which I call upon the members to note. He says they had no tender from Webb & Co., of London, to furnish the militia clothing. He dwelt upon that fact as going to prove that the prices obtained from Webb & Co., in answer to a communication from the department, were only a statement of prices without any reference to their supplying the goods to the Government. Now, let us read the letter, which has already been read, which was addressed to Webb & Co., by the department, dated 29th August:

"GENTLEMEN,—I have the honor to request that you will be so good as to send in a list of the lowest prices at which you will undertake to supply for the Militia of Canada the undermentioned articles, in the event of its being decided to import such from England."

Here was an expressed desire on the part of the Government to obtain from this firm in England an offer of the prices at which they would supply the articles to the Government. Webb & Co. cabled a list to the Minister, and, subsequently, on the 16th September, wrote a letter, a part of which I will read again as going to disprove entirely the position taken by the Minister of Militia:

"In reply to your letter dated 29th August last, we beg to inform you that we have this day wired you as per copy enclosed, which we now confirm."

They then give the lowest prices which they had given by cable, and at the conclusion of the letter they say:

"The quality of the clothing and serges to be the same as used here for the regular army. We trust these prices will ensure your esteemed order."

Now, Sir, how the Minister of Militia could stand on the floor of this House and state as he did so positively, and base his argument on that one fact that they never had a tender from Webb & Co., in face of these documents which have been laid before the House from his own department, I think will surprise any hon. member who has an idea of fair dealing and proper representation that should prevail between public men in the Parliament of the country. That one statement will go to prove how much reliance can be placed on every other statement made by the Minister to-night; and if, at the commencement of these observations, I prove that the Minister has been guilty of a gross misrepresentation of the facts, I think hon. gentlemen will then arrive at a conclusion of how much importance they can attach to any other representation which fell from the hon. gentleman. The charge made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), while embracing a great variety of improper transactions, was mainly confined to this central proposition: You were offered, by Webb & Co, of London, English clothing at a certain price, and instead of accepting that tender you, two months afterwards, entered into a contract with Sanford & Co. for a contract for these goods on an average of 55 per cent. over the rates at which Webb & Co. offered to supply them. Has the Minister dealt with that transaction at all? No, Sir, he has not pretended to deny, he has not pretended to disprove the figures given by my hon. friend who laid the case before the House. Why, Sir, my hon. friend proved that in regard to cavalry tunics that we could import for $5, what we were paying Sanford & Co. $7.64. Again my hon. friend showed that the cavalry blue clothing of the dragoons which we could import for $3.83, we were paying Sanford & Co. $5.89. He showed again that artillery tunics which we could import for $3.92, we were paying this Hamilton manufacturer $6.04. He showed again that the infantry scarlet tunics which we could import under this offer from Webb & Co. at $3.21, we were actually paying $5 to Sanford & Co. For the rifle tunics, which we could import from England under the same tender for $3.60, we were paying $5.58½ to Mr. Sanford. Did the hon. gentleman say one word to disprove that fact, did he state it was erroneous, did he attempt to meet that plain, positive, direct issue? No. What did he do? He went off on to the National Policy, he went on all imaginary side issues he could raise, and I was surprised, I must confess, when the hon. gentleman justified his action and the policy of his Government on the ground that he was not going to spend this money in a foreign country. Is England a foreign country? Do hon. gentlemen opposite, who, whenever they feel a little jubilant, sing "God save the Queen," call England a foreign country? I had an idea that we belonged to that country. The hon. gentleman, however, repeated over and over again that the policy of his party was to spend the money in Canada and not in a foreign country. One would have thought they were referring to Russia, Turkey or Germany, but certainly no one could for one moment have supposed that they were referring to the mother country. Another point which the Minister failed to grapple and deal with was the statement made by the hon. member with respect to the military boards which had condemned his clothing. What has the hon. gentleman to say in regard to that matter? Did he make any reference to it whatever, did he attempt to explain why those eleven military boards in various parts of the country, some of them as late as 26th September, 1888, at Kingston, and in the same month in Quebec, and in August in Quebec, and July in Kingston, and June in London, and March in Victoria, and September, 1887, in Toronto, condemned his clothing. Did he endeavor to explain that those military boards were composed of men who wilfully, designedly, maliciously and politically reflected on the administration of the hon. gentleman? And did he attempt to explain that those men were unqualified to express an opinion? It is true the hon. gentleman censured or attempted to censure some of the officers of the Queen's Own who gave information as witnesses before the Public Accounts Committee. But I think the Minister will hardly go quite so far as to insult the high military gentlemen who composed those various eleven boards, sitting in the various cities of the Dominion, on the occasions to which I refer. Surely these men were not doing it simply to annoy the Minister of Militia, or the Government of which he is a member. Surely they had a higher motive than mere political animosity against the hon. gentleman! We know what was the reason. We know that the clothing which had been distributed to the various headquarters and various battalions had been of the most unsatisfactory character, that when it came to be examined by those boards, by officers competent to express an opinion, who had seen it in wear, they all pronounced a strong, a most emphatic opinion in condemnation of it. What had the Minister to say? Not one word; he never referred to the subject. Was it because he was afraid and dare not deal with it, and dare not tell those military men they did not know what they were talking about? It was rather, perhaps, because he knew that he could not deal with, in any other way. If any hon. gentleman will take the trouble to reflect for one moment and consider this great central fact, that these various boards at prominent points in the Dominion have frequently and deliberately held a survey on the clothing which has been furnished by the Government, and have condemned it with a unanimity which would astonish anyone, because it might be supposed that some one might have held a contrary opinion and have endeavored to show that under some circumstances it might have been more satisfactory. But on every occasion which has been referred to by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), these boards have most emphatically condemned the clothing supplied by the Government. Was it because they have any feeling against the Government? I think not, because those gentlemen who were examined before the Public Accounts Committee all admitted most frankly that they were supporters of the Administration. We cannot even give credit to the manufacturers for having sent this clothing by accident. We cannot even give them the benefit of that doubt, because if there was anything poorer than that which the evidence shows was supplied

to those places, the rest must have been very poor indeed. The suggestion of the manufacturer that poor clothing could be supplied to the outlying districts, the rural battalions, was an intimation which has been properly characterised by the hon. gentleman who moved this motion. In the relations which should exist between a contractor and the Government it is highly important that no such familiar terms should be used as those that were addressed by the contractor in the letter to "My dear Macpherson," and to state that it would be better perhaps, in order to avoid all scandal, that some of the clothing which was not quite so good as we would like should be sent to the country districts where we will not hear of it, where there is no public opinion, but send the best clothing to prominent places like Toronto, Montreal, and Quebec. The Minister did not tell the House what action he took upon that letter, but from the readiness with which he fell into the suggestion of the manufacturer, no doubt he fell into that suggestion as well.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read the letter.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It has gone to the reporters· Hon. gentlemen will find it in *Hansard* to-morrow morning· Did the Minister endeavor to show that those prices were not excessive at the time the contract was made? He took no opportunity to ascertain whether they were in excess of what was the legitimate price of the day. He had no right to assume that the prices in 1887 would be the same as they were in 1884. The Minister gives a list of certain wools or woollens as being the same price in 1884 and 1882. I do not pretend to be an authority on that point; but an hon. gentleman assured me to-night that wool, which in 1884 was 30 and 32 cents, was 10 cents lower in 1887. Whether that be so or not, I do not venture to say, as I am no authority; but I have the authority of an hon. gentleman, who is not now present, that such was the condition of affairs. I have no doubt about one fact, that there must have been a material falling off in the value of wool from 1884 to 1887. If the Minister had used that precaution and prudence which any business man would have exercised in his transactions, he would have been able to have secured for this country a very large saving, if he had still been determined to buy here and not import from the old country. What came out in the Committee on Public Accounts? When those various tenders were given, one was given to Mr. Sanford, another to Mr. Shorey, another to Doull & Miller of Halifax and poor Mr. O'Brien was shut out in the cold. They did not say that Mr. O'Brien's tender was not as low as any of the others. They gave Mr. O'Brien no answer with respect to his tender which had been submitted, but they said to him—and that came out in the evidence: "As we did not give you any share of the tunics we will give you the contract for overcoats at your own price, without asking anyone else to tender." That was the way that transaction was concluded. They asked no one else; they even did not ask Mr. Sanford & Co., or Doull & Miller, or Shorey & Co., but to conciliate Mr. O'Brien, after taking from him what he had formerly enjoyed and divided with the other three friends, they turned around and gave him the contract for the overcoats. Those coats were submitted to the Committee and there again the Minister of Militia, with that disingenuousness which characterised his whole argument, endeavored to throw upon the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) the accusation that he had endeavored to prove that these coats were not as good as those of English manufacture. No such statement was ever made. No exception was ever raised by that hon. gentleman or by any of us who were present. The only exception we took to that transaction was that it was given to Mr. O'Brien without competition. That was the whole ground upon which we based our objections. The hon. Minister said also that if the Toronto battalion desired to import their tunics and to look more trim and soldier-like they could do so, and he endeavored to create a laugh at their expense (which I have no doubt they will appreciate) when he pointed to the fact that they were unwilling to be clothed by the ordinary good tailor in this or any other country, but that they must go to the great English tailor, Poole & Co., to have their tunics and uniforms made. That was not the only sneer which the Minister of Militia threw out against the Queen's Own Battalion. I know nothing more about the Queen's Own than that during the time I had the honor to administer the Militia Department I always heard of them—and I have always heard of them since—as one of the smartest corps in this Dominion. If the officers and gentlemen composing the Queen's Own Regiment desire to present themselves on parade at their ordinary gatherings in neat and fitting uniforms I think the hon. gentleman should have given them credit for that desire instead of sneering at them and saying that they had to have their uniforms made by Poole, the great London tailor. I repeat that the Queen's Own will no doubt appreciate at its full value the reflection which the Minister has cast upon them. His whole argument went to ridicule the contentions of the men composing that fine battalion; his whole argument went to prove that the men composing that battalion were not satisfied as men of other battalions were and as they should be with the uniforms they received. We showed before the Committee on Public Accounts that in addition to the difference of cost between the imported and the home made article that there was a very large proportion of home made uniforms which had to be refitted, and that this cost from $2 to $3 each.

Mr. HESSON. Not true.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. member for Perth says "it is not true," and I suppose he knows a great deal upon most subjects, but I have never heard him quoted yet as a high authority on Military subjects. The only ground upon which the minister could justify this was that some of the uniforms from England have to be changed as well or the Canadian-made uniforms. That is quite true. I do not wish to present an unfair argument to the House. Some of those articles either manufactured here or brought from England have to be fitted to the men, but it was proved before the Committee that a very much smaller percentage only of the English uniforms had to be refitted, as they were cut more artistically, and more to the shape, and better made. I know nothing about the matter further than from the evidence of these military men who were examined on this subject. Now, Sir, there is another point involved in this besides the militia uniforms. We spend about $70,000 a year for the uniforms of the Mounted Police and that comes under these contracts as well. The statement made by an hon. member of this House of the cost of the clothing for the police may lead as to imagine how large the sum would run up to in view of the high prices which are paid. $70,000 a year is paid for the clothing of the Mounted Police and that is divided among the few favored clothiers of the Government. Therefore, we are not now dealing only with the militia of the country, but we are dealing as well with an equally important and costly branch of the public service the Mounted Police, and it becomes us to consider the whole question as to how the interests of this country are sacrificed to conciliate a few favored manufacturers in Canada. We have proved, that we can import a better article from the old country and at 55 per cent. less cost. I remember well when I was in the Department of Militia, and I think the same thing applies to almost the same extent to-day, though possibly not to so great an extent; that we always considered that there was a difference in value arising from the fact that English uniforms would wear for three years as against the Canadian

uniforms wearing two years. There may have been improvement in Canadian manufactures since that time. I am willing to believe there has been. I do not wish to undervalue any improvements that have been made by the Canadian manufacturers, or to undervalue Canadian manufactures at all, but the only ground on which the Minister can justify the purchase of Canadian manufactures for our military service in preference to the English manufactures, is, if we can buy them on as favorable terms. The only ground on which they could justify to the people of this country or to this Parliament the giving to Canadian manufacturers any preference over the English manufacturers, would be that they serve us as well and as cheaply; but so far from that being the case, it has been established beyond doubt by the statements submitted by the department, that while we are paying 55 per cent. more, we are not obtaining a better or even as good an article as we could obtain from the English manufacturers. What will the taxpayers of this country, the great majority of the farmers, the fishermen, the agricultural laborers and the mechanics, say of this? Are you going to pay 55 per cent. more to three or four manufacturers of this country, and put hundreds of thousands of dollars into their pockets, when we have to pay the expense? I say it is a policy that should be denounced in this House, and which will be denounced by the country at large when it comes to be understood. But there are other grounds on which to justify this resolution. The administration of this department has been as unpopular with a large number of members on that side of the House as it has been with members on this side and with the country generally. I know hon. members on that side who entertain the feelings we express to-night, and who if they act on their own independent judgment, will be found supporting the resolution in your hands. On the occasion of this investigation before the Public Accounts Committee, one hon. member on that side, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) made these observations:

"We ought to proceed in the investigation, but I do not think we ought to proceed with an investigation as to whether the militia of this country are satisfied with the Minister of Militia, because I think if that was the question, there would be a unanimous opposition against the Minister of Militia."

That I believe to be the opinion honestly entertained by a very large number of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, Sir, I will give you other reasons than this bungling in regard to the militia clothing, and they are higher considerations, because they are matters of principle. You may get over a question of dollars and cents; but if you offend a people's sensibilities, and their idea of what is right or wrong, that is a matter which cannot be righted by a vote of this House. The fact that the Minister of Militia has spent more money than he ought to have done may be commented on and deprecated by both sides of this House; but when he undertakes to deal with the great and important matters connected with his department, in a narrow, prejudiced and unprofessional manner, he offends the *amour propre* of every military man in this country. What did we find here a short time ago in connection with pensioning the relatives of Sergeant Valiquette? That man, who unfortunately lost his life in the North-West, left a father, a mother, two brothers and three sisters, who were granted a pension of $397 per annum, whereas, if the man had lived and had been able to work as he had been doing, he would have earned $273, or $35 less than was paid to his family after his death. I denounced that on the floor of this House, and the leader of the Government was so surprised at the statement that he promised to investigate the matter, and see that the law was properly carried out; but up to the present moment no change has been made in that matter. Then, again, we had occasion lately to mention a political appointment made to the command of the Military College. We saw that the political influence of the High Commissioner had secured the appointment as commandant of his son-in-law, who had retired from the service a year and a half or two years before, and who would have been completely disqualified from holding any such position in the old country. I say that was a political appointment for a political purpose, which is most destructive of the confidence the people of this country should enjoy in all our institutions. During the time I administered the affairs of that department, strong as my political views and sentiments are on all public questions, I never allowed my political feelings to enter into any part of the administration of that department. I had the proud satisfaction of hearing, during the short time that I administered its affairs, that I enjoyed the confidence, not only of the department, but of a large portion of the military throughout the country; and I can point with some satisfaction to a remark made across the House last Session by the right hon. leader of the Government, that he had always understood that I had fairly administered the business of the Militia Department. I remember on one occasion I found that by a system of service of so many years as a captain made a man a major, and a major a colonel, until every battalion throughout the country was getting full of majors and colonels; and with my own knowledge of what was right and wrong and good for the service, I put an end to that, and compelled every man to serve so many years before he could reach the higher grades; and the hardest stroke on that occasion fell upon some of my own friends. I remember the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who was then Finance Minister, coming to me with a letter, and saying: "A friend of mine has written to me complaining of the order you have issued, under which he is prevented from obtaining his majority, which he would have obtained in three days had your order not been issued." He did not ask me any particular favor, but he wanted to know what I should do. I said: "The answer you will have to convey to your friends is this, that the Minister of Militia regrets very much that he did not enter three days before he did." I refused in so small a matter as that to be influenced by political feeling, and no man from one end of this country to the other can point to any act of political favoritism on my part during the time I had charge of that department. There is a position connected with the department which hon. members of this House who belong to the service, and other military men in the Dominion have always naturally and very properly aspired to, viz, the command of the Wimbledon team. And men have heretofore been taken who have been identified with the militia service of the country. The officers selected hitherto have invariably been men who have served in various regiments, or who were in command of battalions to which they were attached, and men who have rendered yeomen's service in the militia force. What do we see now? The Minister of Militia takes a clerk out of his department who never commanded a regiment or a battalion, and places him over the head of old and faithful militiamen to command the Wimbledon team. I say it is an outrage, which the military instinct of the country will rebel at. I have nothing to say against Colonel Bacon individually, because I know nothing in any respect for or against him. No doubt he fills his position very well, but it was an insult to the military instincts of the country to take a clerk out of the department and place him in command of the Wimbledon team when he had men who had identified themselves with the militia affairs of the country and had served in the field in many ways, and who deserved recompense at the hands of the Minister of Militia. The hon. gentleman said that I was giving particular attention to the Militia Department. I always have and shall always do so, as long as I have a seat in this House. I served in the Militia Department a short time, but during that time found every man connected with the department ready to render

me every possible service and information. No public man ever was associated with a better set of officers and men than I was during the time I occupied the position of Minister of Militia. They were strangers to me when I entered the office, but rendered me the most cordial assistance and co-operation, and when I left the department it was with the good will and kindly feeling of every one connected with it. Therefore, I shall always continue to take an interest in the department, and for that reason I do not wish to see its influence destroyed. I do not wish to see an hon. member like the Minister of Militia, by his capriciousness and his political designs and aspirations, introduce into every branch of the department an idea which is going to work a serious wrong to the militia generally. That one department should stand above all political considerations and be administered from public necessity alone. For this reason it is I have endeavored to criticise and to bring before the House anything wrong in the department which required a remedy. I do so, not from any feeling of animosity towards the Minister of Militia, but because I have been enabled to gauge public opinion in this House and the country, and can see that he has not been administering his department according to the well understood wishes of the people and the interests of the militia force. I believe many hon. members opposite share my views and I hope that on an occasion like this, when party feeling should be thrown aside, they will join with us in the endeavor to remedy the evils in the administration of the Militia Department, and endeavor to have that department administered in the interests of the country and not of political hangers-on.

Mr. KENNY. There are few questions in which the public and this Parliament are more concerned, Mr. Speaker, than on the question of militia and national defence. There is hardly one that appeals more strongly to that sense of patriotism which should animate every man. As regards the militia management I do not stand here as its defender. I suppose like many other matters of public concern it may not be perfect, but when it is to be criticised, it should be criticised fairly, impartially and honestly, and when an hon. gentleman stands up here and poses before us as an assailant of the militia force and the administration of the Militia Department we ought to consider who he is. When the senior member for Halifax stands up, as he frequently does, and reminds us that once upon a time he was Minister of Militia of Canada, we have the right to ask how he administered that department. During the short time he served there, what was the principal feature of his administration? I cannot tell now from memory whether that hon. gentleman occupied that position six or eighteen months, but it was long enough for the people of Canada and the people of Nova Scotia, for on the very first occasion on which that gentleman appealed to the constituency of Halifax to endorse his administration of the Militia Department the electors of that constituency told him that his administration was—shall I use the hon. gentleman's own words?—" unworthy of his high position." I have the right to apply to the hon. gentleman the language he applied to the Minister of Militia. It is a language I am not personally in the habit of using, and I took it down as it fell from the hon. gentleman's own lips:

" Unworthy of his position, unworthy of a high-minded gentleman, narrow, prejudiced, unprofessional, and offending the *amour propre* of every militiaman of Canada."

That hon. gentleman's administration of the militia was such that on the very first occasion when he appealed to his constituents at Halifax he was defeated by an overwhelming majority. Let us look at that hon. gentleman's conduct, from 1878, when he was driven out of office for his maladministration, down to the present year. From 1878 down to 1888, he has never said one kind word of the militia of Canada. Any reference he made was in the shape of a sneer or an insult. When hon. gentlemen stand up here and claim consideration because they have served the Militia Department of Canada faithfully, it is well this House should be reminded of how they conducted themselves when the Militia of Canada were taxed in a way in which they had never been taxed before. When the unfortunate rebellion broke out in the North-West Territories and a regiment was ordered from the city of Halifax, the whole community was excited. Wives were separated from their husbands, mothers and fathers from their sons, but the people of Halifax, farther away from you than any other portion of this great Dominion, responded as cheerfully to the call of duty as did the citizens of Toronto, Montreal and Quebec. There was one man in that community from whom we had a right to expect a good example. We had the ex-Minister of Militia in that community, and during all that time he had nothing but sneers and unkindness for the militia of his own country. He has accused the Minister of Militia of sneering at the Queen's Own, because the Minister explained that that corps, being composed of gentlemen of wealth, desired very laudably that their clothing and equipments should be of better quality than the country can afford for the militia generally. The Minister of Militia explained candidly that he found no fault with the Queen's Own; but, when the Halifax regiment was ordered to the North-West, the ex-Minister of Militia, who poses as such a pattern that every other Minister of Militia must follow his example, had nothing but sneers for the regiment from his own city. I defy any man to search the press of Halifax when that regiment was leaving for the North-West, when appeals were made and subscriptions were made for them, to find on record from the ex-Minister of Militia a kind word or a kind act for that regiment. Are we to hear criticisms of this kind and to sit silently by? When questions of national defence are before the House, are these men to tell our Ministers what they are to do? No man who knows the career of that hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) can listen to such remarks with ordinary patience. I have not the honor of being a member of the Committee on Public Accounts, but by accident I strayed into the Committee room when an hon. gentleman who occupies a prominent place in the other end of this building was under examination, and I heard enough of the evidence to satisfy me that the hon. gentleman who had assumed the *role* of cross-examiner was exceedingly dissatisfied with his witness. Any man who is engaged in the business in which I am engaged knows that no firm in Canada stands higher than the firms of Sanford & Co., James O'Brien & Co., Shorey & Co., and Doull & Miller. I was gratified to learn that in Canada to-day we are much more advanced in manufacturing productions than my knowledge of the business led me to believe, and I was exceedingly gratified to hear that these uniforms can be produced in Canada of excellent quality, and that we can manufacture them within our own country, which I think is eminently desirable. There was a most amusing incident connected with the investigation before the Public Accounts Committee. It followed the examination of the hon. Senator. A witness was called by the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), whose absence now is very much to be regretted, and it turned out that this witness was an employé of the Mowat Government. It appeared that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) had been in correspondence with that gentleman, and the witness had to admit, during his cross-examination, that he had been a constant assailer of the Department of Militia and of the hon. gentleman who administers that department, and that his *nom de plume* was "Linchpin." I must say that the gentlemen who were criticising the Minister of Militia made very little out of the examination of that gentleman. I regret exceedingly that these papers were not printed. I think it is very unfortunate that, on a matter of this character, in which we all take great interest, all the information

should have been restricted to the hon. gentlemen who are members of the Committee on Public Accounts. Before the discussion was introduced, before commercial men were assailed, men who occupy as good a position before the country as those who assail them, it would have been better for the House to have had the opportunity of looking over the evidence. But, taking the statement of the Minister of Militia and comparing it with that of hon. gentlemen opposite, I do not think there is much fault to be found with the clothing. I have served in the militia in years gone by, and I profess to take a deep interest in all that concerns it, and I think that, before anyone poses as an authority on this matter, he should satisfy us that he is at heart and in earnest a friend of the militia of Canada.

Mr LISTER. It would be a somewhat amusing thing for this House to watch the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) when the senior member (Mr. Jones) is speaking, because if the junior member did not rise immediately after the senior member had spoken who knows what the result would be? I think there must be an underground string in some way arranged between the two sides of the House, because I have observed that, as soon as the senior member takes his seat, the junior member springs up with surprising elasticity, and it is evident that, no matter on what subject the senior member speaks, the junior member will not fail to do his duty, but will get up and face the difficulty whether he knows anything about the subject or not. It is evident that he feels it to be his peculiar duty to oppose everything which the senior member supports. Has the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), I would like to ask him, been always as zealous in defending the Minister of Militia as he has been to-night? Has he not this Session spoken very strongly against the Minister of Militia and the administration of his department? How is it that, to-night, we find the hon. gentleman speaking so fervently in defence of that Minister? Is it possible that he has got the claim of Mr. Tobin settled, in regard to which he has been dodging about the department for the last two months? Is it possible that the acerbity which characterised him in the past has been mollified by the action of the Minister of Militia, so that my hon. friend now defends him as kindly and as zealously as a sucking dove? He talks of the senior member for Halifax sneering against the militia. Does he know what he is talking about? Does he know that that hon. gentleman controlled the Department of Militia before he had a seat in this House? His record is before the country, and nothing the hon. member can say can affect his reputation in Halifax and throughout this country. Does the hon. gentleman forget that the senior member for Halifax was elected by a much larger majority than he received? As to the ordering out of the volunteers, did not the senior member (Mr. Jones) desire just what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kenny) wanted, that the volunteers of Halifax should be asked to volunteer for the service instead of being ordered out without regard to the necessities of the people or their families?

Mr. KENNY. The people of Halifax know all about it.

Mr. LISTER. Does he not know that the martial spirit of the young men of Halifax animating them as it does, would have induced vastly more men to volunteer for that service than the country demanded? Then why does he attempt to refute the senior member for Halifax? Sir, many hon. gentlemen sitting opposite me know that the administration of the Militia Department of this country, has been scandalous in the extreme.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. LISTER. Hon. gentlemen who know nothing about it may say "oh, no," but people who do understand it know that it is so. The expenditure for the Militia Department has been doubled, and the efficiency of the department has been little or any increased. The Minister of Militia has violated the cardinal principles which should prevail in the Government of this country, inasmuch as he has awarded contracts for the military supplies to political friends without tender and at prices greatly in excess of what they ought to have been purchased, the articles being inferior to what they ought to have been. Does not that hon. gentleman know that from one end of this country to the other, for the past three or four years' complaints have been coming in to the department that the clothing furnished to the militia has been inferior in every respect? Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman, in the Committee, said that the men ought to grow to the clothing, instead of the clothing being made to fit the men. To my knowledge a company going out of my town and serving for 14 days, came back ragged and tattered and torn, because the men had been furnished with nothing but shoddy cloth to cover their backs. The Minister, for the purpose of assisting political apostates who are paid for following the Government, has disregarded the principle which ought to prevail in the administration of the department. We find him, without inviting tenders from people who are prepared to furnish these articles, giving contracts for three years to political friends of the Government, to political apostates, at prices 60 per cent. more than these same articles could have been supplied from other sources. What do we find? He sends a circular around to four manufacturers of military clothing, and he awards a contract to three of these men, after he has information from England that the price he was giving them was 60 per cent. higher than the articles were worth, and much inferior than could be furnished from England. James O'Brien, of Montreal, was one of the men who had received a circular from the Government. James O'Brien was never told that his tender was not accepted. But in order to make political capital, for reasons for which the hon. gentleman knows — and which I can tell him if he does not know—James O'Brien was never told that he was not to receive a portion of the contract for clothing; and, without notifying him at all, the Minister asked him to tender for overcoats, and he was awarded the contract for overcoats at prices fixed by the department. James O'Brien furnished the overcoats, and no tenders were ever asked for them from anybody, but at the *ipse dixit* of the Minister of Militia the contract was awarded. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that we have no Czars in this country. His conduct will be criticised by the people, and if his actions in the administration of the department are such as will not bear the light of criticism, he must expect the consequences. I say I am voicing the feelings of the volunteers from one end of the country to the other when I say that the administration of the department has been scandalous in the extreme, that favoritism has been shown in that department to political friends. Need we go less than 300 miles from this place to find that, as compensation given for the grossest political apostacy, he has put into the hands of one man tens of thousands of dollars yearly, without tender and without contract, at prices 60 per cent. more than the articles could be furnished, and for articles so inferior that they could not be worn for the short time of 14 days. The time has come when the Minister of Militia should vacate his place and a better man should occupy it. There is nothing but discontent pervading the militia force of this country, there is the feeling that the Minister of Militia has lost his usefulness, and that his place should be filled by some other man more abreast with the times, who knows the wants of the volunteers of this country. If we are to spend a million and a quarter a year upon the volunteers of our country, surely we have a right to expect that the money shall be honestly and properly expended, and not be expended for the purpose of rewarding the friends of the Minister. It is time for every

man who takes an interest in militia matters to express his opinion on the administration of the affairs of that department. I say to the members of this House who are members of the militia force of this country, if you feel to-night as you have felt in the past, it is your duty to vote against the administration of that office. I repeat again that from what I have seen, from what I know as a member of the force, and as a member of the Public Accounts Committee before whom this matter has been brought, the administration of that office has been little less than dishonest—to put in the mildest terms. The hon. gentleman has neglected the duties pertaining to that office in awarding the contracts as he has done. If hon. members are content with the conduct of this department, then, of course, we will have to submit until the people of the country have an opportunity of passing a verdict upon this case. But I believe that, from all the evidence that has been brought forward, the House will find the Minister of Militia guilty of the charges brought against him.

Mr. HESSON. If anything could show that the hon. gentleman who brought this matter up has got a bad case, it is the tone of the address of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. If he were actuated by the motive which hon. gentlemen, I presume, on that side of the House would rather have it understood as being proper motives to actuate hon. gentlemen in the discussion on this subject, he would not have lost his temper in the way he did, or have used language that appeared to me to be not only ungentlemanly but exceedingly improper on the floor of this House. The hon. gentleman had a very weak case when he abused an hon. member who thought it his duty to rise in his place and point out that the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), who has to-night posed as a friend of the volunteers, had in other places acted altogether in a different direction. That hon. gentleman's management of the Militia Department has not yet been forgotten in Canada. We all remember perfectly well that he was at no time considered a very brilliant man or a warm friend of the volunteers, nor had he a reputation as a man who would stand up either for the volunteers of Canada or for the motherland and the old British flag. If there is anything to show the failure of the attack upon the Minister of Militia and the administration of that department, it is to be found in the evidence produced before the Committee on Public Accounts—and hon. gentlemen opposite will give me credit for watching proceedings pretty carefully—and the evidence produced by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) to a large extent showed that he was actuated by personal motives, instead of honestly attempting to act in the interests of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FISHER. I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that statement?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I did not understand the hon. gentleman to say that the motives, although personal, were improper.

Mr. HESSON. I say that if the hon. gentleman was not actuated by personal motives in his attack, if he had an honest desire to promote the interests of the country, he would not have made the attack he did. I watched the proceedings before the Public Accounts Committee very carefully. The hon. gentleman had the fullest opportunity to produce all the evidence he could produce. He had been in correspondence for a long time with different parties, and the House has had evidence of this from the numerous letters the hon. gentleman has read; in fact, he was fishing everywhere to find some gentleman to lay a charge against the administration of the Department of Militia. If there was anything likely to prove that those charges were bad, it is found in the character of the attack made on the Minister and on the evidence submitted to the Committee, and in my opinion it was the most utter failure I have witnessed since I have been in Parliament. I have never witnessed any case that has so utterly broken down in spite of all the privileges which have been afforded the hon. gentleman to produce his evidence, and that evidence consisted of testimony of men who were no doubt dissatisfied with the supplies furnished them, and I dare say they are not alone in this respect. Before I take my seat, I shall show that there is good reason why they are not all satisfied with the supplies furnished by the department. One after another the witnesses before the Committee testified that they did not know whether the goods were of Canadian make or not; all they knew was that they had been issued to them by the department. The evidence of the hon. gentleman's own witnesses was of this character, that they knew they had received a distribution of tunics and other supplies after the return of the troops from the North-West, and those supplies had not proved satisfactory. They believed those were Canadian goods, but when they were confronted with the fact that there was no contract with Canadian contractors, and that the stock on hand was composed of English supplies, when those gentlemen found the evidence as to the bad value, and that the high charge of from $2 to $3 was made for altering a tunic, when it was shown that these goods were almost all, if not entirely, taken from the supplies in stock which had been brought to this country in 1885 and 1886 from England, and before contracts were made with those gentlemen with whom so much fault is now being found, when this was shown by experts and by officers in charge of the goods and it was shown distinctly that they were English goods, the whole case utterly failed. When the hon. gentleman's own witnesses were taken down to see the stock supplied by Canadian contractors, and when the hon. gentleman by way of taking the wind out of the sails of the Minister read a letter stating that those gentlemen, after seeing the stock supplied by our Canadian manufacturers honestly admitted they were superior to English goods, the hon. gentleman might have allowed the case to drop. But he had made such utterances and such promises with respect to exposing the contractors and the department that he could not permit himself to allow the matter to be dropped without allowing it to be brought before the House. The hon. gentleman's own witnesses turned upon him; and when the hon. gentleman's own supporters saw the case was utterly broken down, even so far as his own evidence was concerned, many of them left the room, until at last only two or three were left when he was conducting his examination. With respect to these goods I have some knowledge, after handling dry goods for forty years. There is not an intelligent man in this House who, if the goods were laid before him, would not say that the very best were Canadian goods.

A hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman may laugh, but let him go down and look at the samples of English goods in stock. I do not deny that the first issue of Canadian stock was not very good; but these goods are now manufactured as perfectly as any goods manufactured in England. The department deserve credit for procuring contractors who can, with the appliances they possess, turn out a satisfactory and valuable article, besides giving employment to our own people. With respect to contracts being given without advertising for tenders: In that respect hon. gentlemen opposite should not complain, when it is remembered that only 5 firms tendered after advertisements had been issued throughout the country. One I believe undertook to supply stock in Ottawa, and as some portion of the stock had to be farmed out the contractor was not able to turn out a very excellent article; but those who had tendered under the advertisements of 1886-87, who had been tried and given satisfaction, and they being the only firms in Canada

who could undertake such large contracts and go to such an enormous expense to prepare themselves to take them—I say the reason given by the Minister for not going to an expense of $1,000 or $2,000 to advertise in every newspaper of the country, when there are only four firms who are thoroughly qualified to do the work, is a reason that should cover the whole case. It was stated by Sergeant Crean, of the Queen's Own, that for such tunics as are now furnished by the department he would have to charge $10.25 to get up, whereas the Government contract with the Canadian manufacturers was but $5. Sergeant Crean was charging from $2 to $3 for altering tunics, but it was shown they were of the issue of English goods, not Canadian. At this time of the evening I do not desire to prolong the debate, but I felt that as a member of the Committee I had a right to say that, so far as my judgment goes, I am perfectly satisfied that as regard the administration of the Department of the Minister of Militia there is no ground for this vile attack upon the Minister, an attack that was utterly uncalled for after the evidence submitted to the Committee.

Mr. HICKEY. I did intend to make some lengthened remarks on this question, but as the hour is late I shall content myself with only a few observations. I believe that the very full and very eloquent speech of the Minister of Militia has completely met the charges which so maliciously and so unnecessarily have been brought before this House by the member for North York (Mr. Mulock). As to the quality of the goods supplied to the militia, it was quite evident to the Public Accounts Committee, of which I am a member, that the Canadian goods were superior to the English goods. It has been urged by the member for Halifax (Mr Jones), and some other hon. members on the other side of the House, that we paid a higher price for the Canadian article than we did for the English; but even admitting that, the fact was clearly proved to the Committee that the Canadian goods were at least 50 per cent. better than the English goods. It was shown also that the make and finish of the Canadian clothing was unexceptionable, and any man who has a streak of patriotism in his veins ought to be proud that such goods were manufactured here and purchased in our own country. We know that advertisements for tenders for these supplies had been published up to 1886. In England—great England—whose practice we were asked to follow, does not advertise for tenders for such supplies, but issues circulars the same as the Department of Militia did in this instance. The fact that only five firms in Canada responded to the advertisement up to 1887 was a sufficient reason for the Militia Department to appeal to those to do the work in future, and no hon. gentleman who reasonably considers the matter will deny this. It has been charged against Mr. Sanford that he got this contract for corrupt purposes, but it has been shown that while Mr. Sanford's tender was lower than any other, the Minister of Militia refused to give him the contract, and said to him: You must lower your price by 15 per cent. or you cannot have the contract. Mr. Sanford and his company could not accept this offer in justice to themselves, but rather than that this work should go out of the country, they conferred with the manufacturers of the cloth, and with the tailors who were to make the clothing, and these two parties both agreed to lower their prices so that the contract might be continued in Canada. There was a patriotism in that action which should be made known to the public and which is worthy of praise. Through the efforts of the Militia Department, and through the desire of Mr. Sanford (whose enterprise and energy as a business man every Canadian must be proud of, as well as they should be proud of his high character) that this industry should be developed in Canada, we have succeeded in producing that fine quality of scarlet cloth which cannot be excelled in any country, and which is worth 50 per cent. more than the scarlet cloth manufactured in England, the greatest manufacturing country in the world. I hold that through the efforts of the Minister of Militia we have been enabled to have this quality of goods manufactured in Canada—a quality far superior to that exhibited by the couple of gentlemen from Toronto who imported the material from England. The success of our Canadian manufactures in this industry is an important matter for the country, and every Canadian ought to be proud of the success achieved. Some gentlemen on the other side have tried to blame Senator Sanford because, as they say, he had written to the department to the effect that some goods which were not so well-fitting as others should be sent to the country districts. As a member of this House I feel bound to protect Senator Sanford in his absence. The fact is that these goods which were objected to were of the same cloth exactly as the best goods manufactured, but they were not as well sheared as the others, and it was natural to suggest that the battalions in the country districts would probably have less objection to them than the city corps would. That suggestion after all was not such a desperate thing as some hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches would have us believe. It has been repeatedly told us by the member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), the member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), and the member for North York (Mr. Mulock), whose animus in this matter has originated in prejudice and ignorance, that we pay a higher price for Canadian than for English goods, and that the Canadian goods were inferior. Never was a statement more false made to intelligent men. I am quite sure that any gentleman who will go down and visit the stores, and examine the uniforms and materials there, will be satisfied that any person who would grumble at the supplies given out by the Minister of Militia would be very hard to please indeed. The Minister of Militia has very fully answered the charges which have been made against him, and I believe that every hon. member of this House who wishes to take an impartial view of the subject will believe that in the matter of this military clothing the country got good value for its money. The fact is that the issue of 1887 was 15 per cent. lower in price than the issues of 1884 and 1885. Under the system of advertising for tenders adopted in 1885, the contract was jobbed out to everybody, the qualities got mixed up, through no fault of the department, because the contracts were taken by persons who had neither the experience nor the facilities to make the uniforms in such a manner as would be creditable to the country, and the Queen's Own, no doubt, got some of these uniforms which were purchased as a result of the advertising system. The Minister of Militia like a wise man, like a faithful man, and like a patriotic man caring for his people (and especially for the militia over which he was the special guardian), saw that this system of 1885 would not suit the requirements of the service and immediately he took steps to accomplish the great work which he has achieved of having the clothing supplies for the militia manufactured in our own country. That is a result which every Canadian ought to be proud of. The hon. member for Halifax referred to the overcoats supplied by Mr. O'Brien, but we must remember that in the Public Accounts Committee neither the hon. member nor his friends ventured to criticise the quality of the overcoat, because it was much superior to anything that could be purchased in England; neither did they criticise the price, with which they appeared to be satisfied also. I may state that one member of the Opposition, who is a merchant and who is well qualified to speak on the subject, said that the Canadian goods were 50 per cent. better than the imported goods. Before the Public Accounts Committee all the inferior goods produced and which were found fault with, were not of Canadian make. I believe that any gentleman in this House who has witnessed the character of the person who to-night moved this resolution condemning the Minister of

Militia, will be satisfied that the resolution did not come from any desire on his part to promote the best interests of the country. It should be remembered that Sergeant Major Crean, who was a witness, whose letter the Minister of Militia read to-night, acknowledged that the Canadian goods, before the Committee, were perfectly satisfactory; and the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) knowing this well, knowing that most of those inferior goods were not of Canadian manufacture and were not made by Mr. Sanford, tried to leave the House under the impression that the objectionable goods were of Mr. Sanford's make and ought to be condemned. In view of all the circumstances, I believe that the House is justified in supporting the Militia Department and the policy it has pursued.

Mr. TYRWHITT. Probably you, Sir, and many other members of this House, are not aware that I am a resident of the county which is represented by the hon. mover of the resolution now before the House. Having watched his course during the number of years that we have had the opportunity of being here together, I am extremely gratified to find that he takes such an active interest in militia matters, and I should be still more gratified did I not believe him to be actuated not so much by a desire to see the militia of the country prosper, as to gain a little favor in the eyes of the militia in the county in which we live. I may say, for the information of hon. members with whom I am not acquainted, that I have been in the active militia for about 26 years, or two-thirds of my life, and during that time I have attended almost every camp in this country east and west. I have never during that time missed any camp or missed taking part in any service in the country in which it was possible for me to be engaged. Though I cannot profess to be a very great judge of clothing, I certainly must have had some little experience with it, though I should have been more satisfied possibly if the debate in the House had reference to matters with which I have been more particularly connected, that is the active service in the field, and the manner in which that part of our duties should be conducted. The hon. member for North York has challenged myself and other members from the Toronto district to deny that discontent exists in the volunteer force there. I most emphatically deny, Sir, that any such animus or discontent, or any such mutinous spirit among the men, as the hon. member has described, exists in that district even in the slightest degree. I may also inform that hon. gentleman and the House that the officers in command in that district see to it that no such mutinous spirit is allowed to exist. I may state that one member of my own regiment undertook to correspond with the Militia Department during the last annual drill without my knowledge, and I think it is a great pity that the hon. member for North York should not have been put into communication with that individual. He was a private in No. 4 Company, named Wolfe. I shall be very happy to give the hon. gentleman his address, and I have no doubt this man will be glad to furnish him with some very valuable information as to his treatment during the time he served in the force, and the cause of his leaving it. I heard accidentally that this member of my regiment had been corresponding with the Militia Department at Ottawa and making complaints. Amongst other things, I believe he complained that the quantity of rations allowed to the force was insufficient, that he was improperly treated, and that he had too much work to do—it was drill morning, noon and night, and very often he was on guard at night. Having heard this casually, I did not consider it my duty to investigate the matter very thoroughly. However, a short time afterwards, I overheard this man making use of this mutinous language, and I may describe to the hon. member for North York the treatment which we accord to those who exhibit that sort of spirit. I had this man brought into my presence, I ordered him on knapsack drill for the remainder of the camp, and to be dismissed from the force at the expiration of the camp. I am not quite sure whether that is good law, but it is the system I have followed during the time I have been in the service. I have known that system to promote—I was going to say good feeling—certainly good discipline in the force, and I have never had any difficulty in obtaining good, intelligent and efficient men. I may also say that under this system, which is not peculiar to the 36th Regiment alone, but which prevails I think throughout the Toronto district, in the camp last year my battalion was 20 over strength, and the difficulty the commandant of the camp had to encounter was not to fill up the ranks, but to know what was to be done with the spare men. So popular was the service, possibly owing to this treatment which we accord to the men who serve under us, that we were troubled with having too many men flocking to our standard. In making out my parade statement in Toronto, I found that I had exactly my strength, but the next day I found that I was twenty over strength. I suppose that these men, knowing that I had been 26 years in the service, and knowing the strict discipline enforced, smuggled themselves into our ranks; and I believe the same was the case with other battalions. Now, I know whereof I speak, for the simple reason that I have been in a camp with the different battalions in the Toronto district. I think I am safe in saying that I know every officer in that district; I am also safe in saying that I know personally a very large percentage of the men serving in the different regiments; and I can say that the service is most popular in the Toronto district, and that we are troubled with a superabundance of men. That does not look as if the service were unpopular or as if the force generally were dissatisfied with the Minister of Militia. Now, the mode of obtaining information which has been pursued by the hon. member for North York is, I must confess, to my mind, looking at the matter from a military point of view, a rather improper one; and I will take this opportunity of warning him that if I find him corresponding with any of my junior officers, and attempting to create discontent in my ranks, I will take proceedings to have him punished. I consider that if the hon. member had wished to procure evidence—and I think the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) will bear me out—it was his duty to have gone to the commanding officers of the different regiments, and asked their permission to obtain the information he desired. In every regiment we can find soreheads. In almost every section we can find men dissatisfied with the existing state of things. But I am happy to say that the Toronto district is an exception at any rate. Another thing I would like to say is that in the Toronto district we recognise no politics in the force whatever. The best captain in my battalion to-day is a member of the Reform party, and a very active one.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) That is quite natural.

Mr. TYRWHITT. For the simple reason that we acknowledge no politics. We never allow politics to be discussed, and it is only proper that the Militia Department and everything connected with it should be non-political. This resolution has gone over a very extensive sphere, but I think the object of the hon. member for North York was to prove more particularly that the country had not received value for its money in the way of clothing. I am not a very good judge of cloth myself, but I have seen and worn a great many different uniforms. I have never found any difficulty in fitting my men with the uniforms supplied to us by the different Ministers of Militia. In fact, until I entered this House I paid very little attention as to who occupied the position of Minister of Militia. I contented myself with working in the militia in the sphere to which

I belonged. But with regard to the clothing, I have taken some little interest in it since I have entered the House. The clothing of my corps has been altogether of English manufacture, and, except that the sizes are small and we should prefer larger sizes, for the reason, perhaps, that my part of the country grows men a little over the average size, I have no complaint to make. I take enough interest in the militia to visit the stores every year, since I have been coming to this House, and am pleased to say that the clothing manufactured in Canada is, in my opinion, much superior to that which was supplied us formerly. I know nothing of shoddy, but I know I have never in my experience seen a scarlet tunic wear out quickly under fair treatment, and as for this discoloration, and all these fine points brought forward, I can only attribute them to causes other than those described. In speaking of the fine regiments which come to camp with me annually, I will not say anything of the Toronto corps, except that I, as well as other Ontario people, am justly proud of the excellence which the Toronto regiments have attained. On this point I will quote a remark made by Sir Henry Wilmot, President of the National Rifle Association, who, perhaps owing to my being present, alluded to the Toronto regiments and spoke of them as two of the finest regiments in Her Majesty's service. I can only repeat what I have said that no such mutinous spirit as has been ascribed to the militia exists in my district at any rate. There is one little matter which has been before the House and which the hon. member for North York never fails to introduce, and that is the kit allowance of the York-Simcoe Battalion. I know the members of that corps pretty well. I think they number about 350 men, and I flatter myself that 350 of them are personal friends of mine. Possibly the hon. member for North York imagines I am here neglecting the interests of my friends. I must say I agree with him to a certain extent in the conduct he has ascribed to the Minister of Militia; and I must say that it has been my experience almost every time I approached the hon. gentleman with a view of getting any money, that it is not only very hard to get him to pay his just debts, but sometimes he takes very peculiar views on the subject. One was that we were not entitled to a kit allowance, although I am pleased to see we are going to receive what I always contended we should receive; and I feel it my duty to thank, not the Minister of Militia, but the First Minister, who, I believe, through the influence he used with the Minister of Militia, obtained for us this favor which the Minister of Militia, in his wisdom, thought heretofore we were not entitled to. For my part I am prepared to defend in the future, as I have attempted to do in my quiet way in the past, the few thousand men who have passed through my hands in the counties of York and Simcoe.

Mr. PRIOR. I did not intend to make any remarks on this subject to-night, but I will say this in regard to British Columbia that the clothing for the militia there has been more statisfactory within the last couple of years than it was before. I do not think I need say anything more, because I think the Minister of Militia has, in a most brilliant and able speech, convinced this side of the House, at all events, that he has done his best to give good clothing to the militia. I rise, however, to take exception to the extraordinary remarks of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) when he commended the hon. the senior member for Halifax for not assisting the militia when they were going to the North-West, because they were ordered out instead of being asked to volunteer. This is the first time that I have heard anybody take exception to the militia being ordered out. I, as an officer of militia, am proud to stand here and express the sentiments of my brother officers in saying we are ready to be ordered out by any proper authority, and I cannot see why the hon. gentleman came to the conclusion that the militia should be expected to volunteer on every occasion. We are paid by the Government and are ready to do our duty and risk our lives if necessary. There is not a man in the ranks wearing the uniform of Her Majesty who is not willing to be ordered out on every conceivable occasion when the proper authority calls on him to support law and order. It would not be right that the assertion of the hon. gentleman should go to the country, and that outside of this House people should think that the militia of Canada expected to be allowed to volunteer and was not ready to go out when ordered.

Mr. DENISON. I only wish to say a few words in reply to the question of the hon. member for North York, asking if there is any disaffection in the Toronto district. There was some grievance there before this Session. I refer to the York-Simcoe kit allowance, and if that matter had not been settled, probably I would support this resolution. But the Government have removed that grievance, and the men are satisfied. As to the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Militia, I do not see how the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) could have construed them as being anything against the Queen's Own. I understand the Minister to speak in the highest terms of the regiment and I am sure that those are his opinions, because the Queen's Own is one of the best regiments in the militia.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Hear, hear.

Mr. DENISON. It has always been ordered out when there was work to be done and the men are always to be depended on. I have only one other word to say, and that is in regard to the uniform. I know that the uniform served out to my own corps has been most excellent, and we have never had any occasion to complain of the uniform which has been served out to us.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I desire to say one word in explanation. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) stated, I think, that I had appointed Lieutenant Colonel Bacon to take command of the Wimbledon Team, and that he was one of the clerks in my department. It is true that Colonel Bacon is a very valuable member of the Civil Service, who renders invaluable service in my department, but, before he became a member of the Civil Service, he was known to the militia force of Canada as being a Brigade Major in one of the districts where the force is very strong, the district of Montreal. He was not appointed to command the Wimbledon Team by me, for the simple reason that I have no authority to appoint him. The Commandant of the Wimbledon Team is appointed by the Dominion Rifle Association, and his name is submitted to me through the courtesy of the gentlemen composing that association. I concur with every recommendation made to me by gentlemen who take such a deep interest in that association as they do, and I am sure that Colonel Bacon will do his duty as the commandant of that team, as he has always done it whenever I have had the opportunity of testing it, and I am certain that he will give satisfaction in the command which is entrusted to him by the Dominion Rifle Association.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mulock:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Fisher,	Nevett,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gauthier,	Paterson (Brant),
Barron,	Godbout,	Platt,
Beausoleil,	Guay,	Rinfret,
Bernier,	Holton,	Robertson,
Bourassa,	Innes,	Rowand,
Brien,	Jones (Halifax),	Ste. Marie,
Campbell,	Lang,	Semple,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd)	Langelier (Montm'ency)	Somerville,

Casey,	Langelier (Quebec),	Sutherland,
Cimon,	Lavergne,	Trow,
Colter,	Livingston,	Turcot,
Davies,	Lovitt,	Waldie,
Desaint,	McMillan (Huron),	Wallace,
Doyon,	McMullen,	Watson,
Edwards,	Mills (Bothwell),	Weldon (St. John),
Ellis,	Mitchell,	Welsh and
Fiset,	Mulock,	Wilson (Elgin).—54.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Audet,	Ferguson (Renfrew),	Montplaisir,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Patterson (Essex),
Barnard,	Freeman,	Perley,
Bell,	Gigault,	Porter,
Bergeron,	Girouard,	Prior,
Boisvert,	Grandbois,	Riopel,
Bowell,	Guillet,	Robillard,
Boyle,	Haggart,	Ross,
Brown,	Hesson,	Rykert,
Bryson,	Hickey,	Shanly,
Burns,	Hudspeth,	Skinner,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Small,
Carpenter,	Jones (Digby),	Smith (Sir Donald),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kenny,	Sproule,
Chouinard,	Kirkpatrick,	Stevenson,
Cochrane,	Labelle,	Taylor,
Cockburn,	Landry,	Temple,
Colby,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Thérien,
Coulombe,	La Rivière,	Thompson (Sir John),
Curran,	Lépine,	Tisdale,
Daly,	McCulla,	Tyrwhitt,
Daoust,	McDonald (Victoria),	Vanasse,
Davin,	McDougald (Pictou),	Ward,
Davis,	McGreevy,	Weldon (Albert),
Dawson,	McKay,	White (Cardwell),
Denison,	McKeen,	White (Renfrew),
Desaulniers,	McNeil,	Wilmot,
Desjardins,	Madill,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Dewdney,	Mara,	Wilson (Lennox),
Dickey,	Marshall,	Wood (Brockville), and
Dickinson,	Masson,	Wood (Westm'l'd)—95.
Dupont,	Mills (Annapolis),	

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for Quebec East has not voted.

Mr. LAURIER. I am paired with Sir John Macdonald.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for Victoria, N.S. (Mr. Macdonald) voted. I understand that he is paired with Mr. Perry. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKeen) also voted, and I understood that he was paired with Mr. McIntyre.

Mr. McKEEN. I had an arrangement with Mr. Perry to pair when we left here to-morrow. I could not see the whips, and I do not know whether any arrangement was made or not.

Mr. TROW. This happens to be to-morrow.

Mr. SMALL. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Wilson) has not voted.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Shelburne has not voted.

Gen. LAURIE. I have paired with the hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden).

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for Victoria was also paired.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). I would like to know with whom I am paired?

Mr. TROW. With Mr. Choquette.

Mr. LAURIER. I rise to a question of order. I understand that the hon. member is paired. Sometimes members are paired by the whips, and we ought to understand whether these pairs are to be respected or not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not a question of order. The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow) had a right to call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman was paired,

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

but it is not a question of order or a question upon which the Speaker can rule.

Mr. LAURIER. I think it is a question of order. Time and again pairs have been arranged by the whips without the members knowing with whom they were paired. Of course the arrangement is purely voluntary on the part of the members, but, if it is to be repudiated, we ought to understand it.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for West Lambton has not voted.

Mr. LISTER. I am paired with the member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff).

Mr. TAYLOR. As one of the whips, I may say that I have no knowledge of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McDonald) being paired.

Mr. MITCHELL. I can only say that Mr. Choquette told me, as he was leaving the House, that he had paired with the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McDonald).

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

To defray the expenses of examining lands in the Canadian Pacific Railway belt..... $2,500

Mr. McMULLEN. How does the hon. gentleman expect to expend this money?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We expect to have every section examined and a report made on it. In the Canadian Pacific Railway reserve the company select lands that are fairly fit for settlement. There is a question with regard to a very large quantity of land which they refuse to take, and the Government wish to inspect it in order to know whether the company shall receive it or not.

Mr. McMULLEN. Don't your survey show what quality of land this is? Has not a very careful survey been made?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Not sufficient by any means.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are these lands which the company refuse to receive within the 20-mile belt, and if so, are they largely within that region which stretches westward of Regina?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are within the 20-mile belt, and the bulk of them are west of Regina.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because a good deal was said, as the hon. gentleman knows, at the time that location was taken up, as to the utter unsuitability of that land for settlement. I desire to know whether the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have made up their minds that a great deal of the land through which the railway passes is not fit for settlement.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have travelled a good deal over the country, and I hold very strong opinions in regard to this subject.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman think there is an average rainfall that will enable the country to be used?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think so; that has been our experience so far. It is a very rolling country, and there are many valleys of great width, 2 or 3 miles wide, and the soil is magnificent; in fact there is no better soil in the whole of the North-West.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then how comes it that no portion has been homesteaded?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is no fuel.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the Canadian Pacific Railway contribute to this inspection, or is the inspection wholly ours?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is wholly ours; they have made their inspection.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention to compel the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to take the land which their inspection proves to be fairly fit for settlement.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is the intention, and also the understanding that the Government shall have the last say with respect to the lands.

Mr. WATSON. There is a large quantity of land in Manitoba which at present is supposed to be Canadian Pacific Railway land, but that company apparently do not feel disposed to take control of it, unless some one wishes to purchase it at a very high figure, and then the company say it is their land. There are large tracts in Manitoba which would be thickly settled if they were thrown open for homesteading, but they are at present locked up as Canadian Pacific Railway lands. The Minister should take the earliest possible opportunity to have the lands inspected, and either compel the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to take them or let the Government take them out of the hands of the company and throw them open for settlement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Suppose the Canadian Pacific Railway Company cannot agree with the Government, how is the matter to be determined? I do not think that the Government can force the company legally to take certain lands. Is the Government prepared to take the responsibility of compelling the company to take certain lands?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is the position the Government take.

Government Printing Office..... .... $10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We were to have a statement of the total cost.

Mr. FOSTER. The cost of plant up to date is $63,849. A question was asked in regard to printing the voters' lists. The total cost up to 11th February was $21,502.79, since then $100, total $21,602.79.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total estimate of the cost to be incurred?

Mr. FOSTER. I will furnish those particulars.

Mr. McMULLEN. I observe, according to the Auditor General's Report, that $63,900 had been paid for plant up to 30th June last.

Mr. FOSTER. The plant was bought last year.

Mr. BOWELL. If hon. members will turn up *Hansard* they will find the details given in full.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the proportion of the cost of printing the voters' list covered by the amount of $21,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That amount covers the setting of the type for the entire list. Of course I cannot state what the further cost will be.

To pay Dr. Jukes for medical services..... ..... $700

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Why has this item been allowed to stand so long unpaid, if it is a proper claim?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This claim has been made by Dr. Jukes for some time, and it was for a larger amount than appears in the Estimates. It was for attendance on prisoners and lunatics during the years named. The work was heavy some years and light others. The Regina jail will soon be completed and then this attendance will cease.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Dr. Jukes is surgeon in the Mounted Police, and is therefore an employé of the Government, and therefore either there should have been an agreement between the Government and Dr. Jukes that he should be allowed a certain amount for his work, or that the work was covered by his other pay. It certainly appears from having remained unpaid for six or seven years as if the Government did not consider themselves responsible.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman will understand that this duty is quite outside his regular duties, and a very disagreeable duty it is to my own knowledge.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is another of the cases which we have been bringing before the notice of this House of civil servants applying on every little pretence for an increase of salary. Dr. Jukes gets $1,400 a year, and yet he must charge for extra services. Every man who occupies a position in the service must have his little bill for extra work.

Mr. BOWELL. Oh, not every man.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, there are a great many of them and they are increasing rapidly, I am sorry to say.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the sum is ridiculously small for the duties which Dr. Jukes had to discharge. It it his duty to attend to the Mounted Police, but it is not part of his duty to attend to the lunatics and prisoners who are sent into jail. This is the work for what the extra charge is made, and I think, as I said before, it is a ridiculously small sum.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). If what the hon. member states be true that this amount is ridiculously small, then I think the Government have been acting unfairly towards Dr. Jukes, and that the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has reason to complain. If Dr. Jukes had a right to this money this item should not have been allowed to stand since 1883, and he should have been paid before this time. It shows a dereliction of duty on the part of the Government, but I think my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is right in what he said, that it was a claim that the Government did not acknowledge and neglected to pay it until it became outlawed. I would suggest to the Minister of Customs that this is an item that ought to be struck out, and which he probably would strike out under other circumstances. Either the Government have been using Dr Jukes wrong or he is not entitled to this amount. At this unreasonable hour of the night I think we should not be asked to pass an item of this kind.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman's views are correct I would suggest to my hon. friend the Minister that Dr. Jukes should be paid interest.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Why not pay it if he is entitled to the amount?

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps we will.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Committee rises let me give some information which I was asked for last night. The Intercolonial Railway earnings and expenditure for the eight months ending February, 1889, are as follows:—Earnings, $1,969,597.38; expenditure, $2,316,756.00. Sold to Caraquette railway, two locomotives at $3,500 each; money paid on delivery.

Resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2:20 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 26th April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 146) to amend the Revised Statute respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

QU'APPELLE AND LONG LAKE RAILWAY CO.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient, in order to enable the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company to complete their railway from Regina to some point on the South Saskatchewan River, at or near Saskatoon, and thence northward to Prince Albert, to enter into a contract with such company for the transport of men, supplies, materials and mails, for twenty years, and to pay for such services during the said term, *eighty thousand dollars per annum*, in manner following, that is to say:—The sum of fifty thousand dollars to be paid annually on the construction of the railway, to a point at or near Saskatoon, such payment to be computed from the date of the completion of the railway to such point; and the remaining *thirty thousand dollars annually* on the extension of the railway to Prince Albert; such payment to be computed from the date of such last-mentioned completion: Provided that, in case the second portion of the said railway shall not be built and operated to Prince Albert within two years after its completion to the South Saskatchewan, as aforesaid, the payment of fifty thousand dollars shall cease until the whole railway is finished to Prince Albert.

Motion agreed to.

TOWN OF COBOURG—RELIEF.

Mr. FOSTER moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may, on such conditions as he deems expedient, release the Corporation of the Town of Cobourg from the payment of the balance due by the said Corporation under the Act of the Parliament of Canada, forty-ninth Victoria, chapter thirty-three, intituled: "An Act for the relief of the Corporation of the Town of Cobourg," together with all interest now unpaid thereon; provided always, that one of the conditions of such release shall be that the said Corporation shall abandon all claims they have in respect to the Port Hope and Rice Lake Road, whether as to the collection of tolls or in any other respect whatsoever.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH-WEST RAILWAYS—LAND SUBSIDIES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies of land hereinafter mentioned to the railway companies, and towards the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:

To the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company (Limited), in addition to the grant provided for by section 1 of the Act 48-49 Victoria, chapter 60, Dominion Lands to an extent not exceeding two thousand six hundred acres for each mile of the company's railway from Dunmore Station, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to Lethbridge, on the Belly River, the present terminus of the said railway, a distance of one hundred and nine and one-half miles, such additional grant to be made only on condition that the gauge of the said railway be made of standard width.

Also to the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company (Limited) Dominion Lands to an extent not exceeding six thousand four hundred acres for each mile of the company's railway from Lethbridge to the International Boundary, a distance of about fifty miles.

To the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company, Dominion Lands to an extent not exceeding six thousand four hundred acres for each mile of the company's railway from Cheadle Station, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to its terminus at a point in or near township twenty-nine, range twenty-three, west of the 4th meridian, a distance of about fifty-five miles.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

To the North-Western Railway Company of Canada, Dominion Lands to an extent not exceeding ten thousand acres for each mile of the company's railway from Calgary, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, northerly to a point on the North Saskatchewan River, at or near Edmonton, a distance of about two hundred and ten miles.

Also to the North-Western Railway Company of Canada, Dominion Lands to an extent not exceeding ten thousand acres for each mile of the company's railway from Calgary, southerly to Lethbridge, a distance of about one hundred and twenty miles.

To the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company, Dominion Lands to an extent not exceeding six thousand acres for each mile of the company's railway from Portage la Prairie to the southern boundary of Lake Manitoba, a distance of about seventeen miles.

Motion agreed to.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned to the railway companies, and towards the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:—

For a railway from some point on the Joggins Railway, near the Heben River, to Young's Mills, in the Province of Nova Scotia, a distance of five miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and not exceeding in the whole $16,000

To the St. Clair Frontier Tunnel Company, for the construction of a tunnel under the St. Clair River, from a point at or near Sarnia, to a point at or near Port Huron, a subsidy not exceeding in the whole $375 000.

To the Pontiac and Renfrew Railway Company, for six miles of their railway from the north bank of the Ottawa River, opposite Braeside, to the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway, near the Quion River, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and not exceeding in the whole $19,200.

To the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company, for thirty miles of their railway, from the east bank of the St Charles River, to or near to Cape Tormente, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and not exceeding in the whole $96,000.

To the Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Company, for a bridge over the St. John River at Fredericton, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding in the whole $30,000.

To the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company, for ten miles of their railway, from New Moscow, to a point at or near Harrowsmith, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and not exceeding in the whole $32,000.

For a railway from a point near Sicamous, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to a point on Lake Okanagan, for fifty-one miles of their railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and not exceeding in the whole $163,200.

To the Cornwallis Valley Railway Company, for one mile of their railway from the end of the line subsidised by 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, to Kingsport, in the Province of Nova Scotia, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $3,200.

To the Lake Témiscamingue Colonisation and Railway Company, for fifteen miles of their railway, from Mattawa station on the Canadian Pacific Railway towards the Long Sault, or from the Long Sault towards the Mattawa station on the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000.

To the Maskinonge and Nipissing Railway Company, for fifteen miles of their railway from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near Maskinonge or Louisville, towards the Parish of St. Michel-des-Saints, on the River Mattawa, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000.

To the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company, for twenty miles of their railway, from the city of Kingston towards Smith's Falls, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $64,000.

To the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company, for forty-nine and one-half miles of their railway, from Woodstock to Hamilton, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $158,400.

For a railway from St. Césaire to St. Paul d'Abbottsford, in the Province of Quebec, five miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $16,000.

To the Great Eastern Railway Company, for twenty miles of their railway, from the east end of the line subsidised by the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, at St. Grégoire, towards the Chaudière Junction Station on the Intercolonial Railway, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $64,000.

To the Drummond County Railway Company, for four and one-half miles of their railway, from the end of the line subsidised by the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, to Ball's Wharf, on the St. Lawrence River, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $14,400.

To the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company, for twenty miles of their railway, from the end of the line subsidised by the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, at St. Catharines, towards the city of

Hamilton, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $64,000.

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for twenty miles of their railway, from the end of the section of thirty miles from Lake St. John towards Chicoutimi subsidised by the Act 51 Victoria, chapter 3, towards Chicoutimi, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $64,000.

To the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company, for fifteen miles of their railway, from the village of Tara to the town of Owen Sound, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000.

To the Hereford Railway Company, for fifteen miles of their railway, from Cookshire to a junction with the Quebec Central Railway at Dudswell, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000.

To the Massawippi Junction Railway Company, for fifteen miles of their railway, from Ayer's Flat to Coaticook, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000.

To the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, for twenty miles of their railway, from Westport to Palmer Rapids, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $64,000.

To the Thousand Islands Railway Company, for four miles of their railway, from a point near the St. Lawrence River, in Gananoque Village, to Gananoque Junction of the Grand Trunk Railway, and for thirteen miles of their railway from Gananoque Junction of the Grand Trunk Railway to a junction with the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $54,400.

For a railway from Cape Tormente towards Murray Bay, twenty miles, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $64,000.

To the Amherstburgh and Lake Shore Railway Company, for twenty miles of their railway, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $64,000.

2. *Resolved*, That so much of the subsidy of $3,200 per mile which, under the provisions of the Act 49th Victoria, chapter 17, and of any subsequent Act, may be paid to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company in respect of the last thirty miles of their railway, eastward from Metapediac, shall be applicable to the section of the said railway comprised between the fortieth and the seventieth mile thereof, eastward from Metapediac, instead of to the said first mentioned section of thirty miles, making six thousand four hundred dollars per mile, applicable to the secondly mentioned section of thirty miles; but the foregoing provision shall be subject to the condition that the said company undertake to complete the thirty miles of their railway from the seventieth to the hundreth mile eastward from Metapediac, within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, to be fixed by Order in Council, and without any further subsidy from the Government of Canada, and that they deposit with the Minister of Railways and Canals, as security to the Crown that they will well and truly carry out their undertaking, their bonds to the amount of two hundred thousand dollars.

3. Every subsidy so granted, shall be granted on the terms, and subject to the conditions, upon and under which subsidies were granted by the Act passed in the Session held in the fiftieth and fifty-first years of her Majesty's reign, chapter twenty-four, in aid of the railways and railway bridges in the said Act mentioned.

Motion agreed to.

MORTGAGE ON PROPERTIES AT KINGSTON.

Mr. FOSTER moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to make provision by statute to enable the Minister of Finance and Receiver-General to carry into effect, the recommendation contained in the Report of the Committee on the Public Accounts, in relation to a certain mortgage on properties in the city of Kingston, given to the Crown by the Hon. George H. Markland, which report was concurred in by the House of Commons on the 16th day of May, 1888.

Motion agreed to.

INSURANCE RETURNS.

Mr. FOSTER laid on the Table of the House an abstract of the business of Insurance Companies. He said: I would state, in reply to an enquiry made yesterday in relation to the annual report, that Government have until the 1st of March to make the report. The abstract which I lay on the Table is prepared before the companies are inspected, and as soon as that is over, the report will be prepared. The very last day yet has been July 1st. It extends the delay in reference to the main report.

PRIVILEGE—RETURNS IN HANDS OF MEMBERS.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to state that a report of the Public Accounts Committee was sent down for the information of this House, containing the evidence taken in the investigation which took place with regard to an account which was presented by Mr. Smyth, of Chatham. That report cannot be obtained by members of the House. I have made enquiry at the Records Office, and found that it has been taken out by the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), and has been in his possession for more than a week. I cannot obtain possession of the document. Now, I fancy that the evidence was reported for the benefit of this House, and that it ought to be accessible to any member of this House who wishes to look over it. I think there ought to be some means of obtaining that evidence from the member for Cornwall, who now has it in his possession. When I enquired at the Records Office to day, Mr. Polkinghorne promised to go down to the hotel and ask the member for Cornwall for the document. He was informed by the medical gentlemen who were attending him that he could not see the member for Cornwall, therefore he was unable to get the document. I think you ought to order that that document be kept in the Records Office, so that it may be seen by any member who wishes to see it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it would be a very proper rule that the papers should not be allowed to be taken out of the custody of the proper officer. That rule has never been obeyed, unfortunately. For instance, in the case under discussion last night, the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) had the papers for a week, and nobody could see them, and so it is with other hon. members. When any hon. member gets possession of the papers that he is interested in, he keeps them as long as he can, but I think it would be a very good rule to prevent that for the future. I do not mean to make any charge against the hon. member for North York, for he only did what every other member does.

Mr. LAURIER. There should be a tacit understanding that these papers should not go out of the building.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They ought not to go out of the building.

Mr. MULOCK. It is quite correct that I borrowed the evidence which has been alluded to by the First Minister, but I borrowed it through the Clerk of the House, and held it to be returned at a moment's warning whenever required. I held it subject to that understanding, and it is not correct to say that it was not in the custody of this House prior to this debate. I returned it some time prior to the debate. I borrowed it a second time, and I did not have exclusive possession of it during the whole period referred to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is unfortunate with respect to the point that has been raised, but the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Bergin) is really very ill, and his medical men will not allow him to be disturbed.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I should like to get possession of the document, if only for one hour. There should be some arrangement for getting documents for the use of members.

Mr. MULOCK. When I borrowed the papers referred to from the Clerk of the House, I requested him to notify me at once in case any person desired the papers, and I would return them the moment they were applied for.

MONTREAL HARBOR POLICE.

Mr. CURRAN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I take the liberty of asking if the Government have finally decided the question as to whether the harbor police of

Montreal are to be disbanded prior to the fall of this year, or not?

Mr. TUPPER. The Government, in response to appeals from members representing the different districts of Montreal, have reconsidered the decision at which they recently arrived with respect to the maintenance of the harbor police at Montreal for the coming season, and on reconsideration it has been deemed advisable to meet the desires of those hon. members in this regard and not to cut off suddenly that service, so that for this season only the police will be continued at Montreal as heretofore.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In arriving at that decision the Minister will not be carrying out the understanding arrived at with the House when this vote was allowed to pass through. He then intimated the course which he subsequently adopted with respect to the harbor police of Montreal, a course which I think was the proper one. It is to be regretted that, at the solicitation of the members for Montreal, the hon. gentleman has gone back on the statement made to the House when the vote for that purpose was submitted.

Mr. TUPPER. I have not at all gone back on the statement made in Committee of Supply, as the hon. gentleman has suggested. I made no pledge to the Committee that the harbor police of Montreal would be abolished. I did tell the Committee, and I acted upon the statement, that a substantial effort would be made to reduce the very large expenditure in regard to both the police at Montreal and at Quebec. As was pointed out, the expenditure exceeds the receipts. I may add to the statement I made a moment ago, that the dues on shipping arrived at the port of Montreal will, of course, be levied as heretofore, and the police will be retained this season.

MAIL SERVICE WITH ENGLAND.

Mr JONES (Halifax). I should like to enquire of the Finance Minister, in the absence of the Postmaster General, whether, in the arrangement with the Allan Company for the coming year for the carrying of the mails, there was any understanding with them that the Dominion Line were not to participate in the contract? I put this question in consequence of enquiries sent to me on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. There was no such understanding. The company were permitted to make any arrangement they chose with the Dominion Line.

LAKE ST. LOUIS BUOYS AND LIGHTSHIPS.

Mr. MITCHELL. I called the attention of the First Minister to a request I made regarding a matter of some importance to the commercial people of Montreal. I sent a telegram over to him, and he said he would give an answer to-day.

Mr. TUPPER I regret that I was not able to be present at the session of the House yesterday. The only difficulty that has occurred in regard to the contractor who has the contract for placing the lightship in Lake St. Louis and buoys there, is, that he hesitated, until special orders were sent him, to place the buoys and lightship, on account of the ice not having yet come down. Instructions have been sent him, however, to place them immediately.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have had another letter from the gentleman who is one of the chief forwarders in the trade, and it rather reflects on the hon. gentleman's management.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to make a statement, at the suggestion of some of my friends. At their suggestion I put a notice on the paper for a motion on going into Committee of Supply. It was discovered that the leader of the Opposition intended to move in the same direction, and my friends asked me if I brought the matter up that I would give notice when I would proceed with it. I do not intend to do so, for this reason: I have received a communication from the leader of the Government which places the matter with respect to that motion in a satisfactory position.

PAIRS.

Mr. TROW. I desire to make an explanation with regard to the votes of two hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. McDonald of Victoria and Mr. McKeen of Cape Breton. I was under the impression that the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McDonald) had paired with the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette). It appears, however, that a pair between them was in contemplation, but it failed, and the hon. member changed the pair to the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall), who did not vote. Consequently, the matter was made all right, and the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McDonald), was justified in voting as he did. I regret that I called his vote in question, as it was a misunderstanding betwen myself and the hon. member for Montmagny. In regard to the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKeen), I was strongly under the impression that he and the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Perry) had paired from yesterday evening. I now understand that he was under the impression that it was from this morning. I believe both hon. gentlemen are honorable men and that a misunderstanding occurred, and Mr. McKeen was justified in giving the vote he did.

CAPE BRETON RAILWAY.

Mr. FLYNN. I call the attention of the First Minister to an answer given by him to a question I put on the 17th inst. I asked:

"Has a contract been entered into by the Minister of Railways and Canals for the erection of stations and other buildings on the line of the Cape Breton Railroad from Sydney and North Sydney to the Grand Narrows? If so, to whom was the contract given? What was the amount of the contract? Were tenders invited for the work? How many tenders were received? Was the lowest tender accepted?

The hon. gentleman replied:

"The answer to the first question is, yes; to the second, to Sims & Slater; to the third, it was a schedule price contract; to the fourth, yes; to the fifth, 18; to the sixth, yes. The work from Sydney and North Sydney to the Grand Narrows is being carried on by the Government at the contractors' expense.

I am informed by Mr. Sims that he has not entered into any contract. He had a contract, with Mr. Slater, with the Government in the winter of 1887. They failed to fulfil the contract, and it was taken from them by the Government, and the Government have prosecuted the work ever since, and Messrs. Sims & Slater have not entered into any further contract.

Mr. SPEAKER. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that this is not a proper subject to bring up at the present time.

Mr. FLYNN. I desire to explain, as this is the only opportunity I will have.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise to order. The hon. gentleman asked a question and was answered, and he now rises to make an argument to show that the answer was incorrect. If he desires to do so, he must give notice of a motion.

Mr. LAURIER. The right hon. gentleman, I think, does not rightly apprehend the motive of my hon. friend, who thinks there was a misunderstanding as to his question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then he should have communicated with the Government on the matter.

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

Mr. FLYNN. I was about to say that there was no contract with Sims & Slater since the contract was entered into with them in the winter of 1887. The work was taken from them without any fault being found, and it has been carried on by the Government ever since. I was informed by a letter from a person in Sydney, that all the buildings, and sidings, and round houses, between North Sydney and the Grand Narrows had been given to a friend of the Government to build, and given by private arrangement, and that no tenders were invited. This friend of the Government has now got the contract for these buildings without competition, and the work involves an expenditure, as I was informed, of nearly $100,000. I thought that if that was the case I should put a question on the Notice Paper and get the information I desired from the First Minister. If I allowed this to pass without comment, the public would be under the impression that tenders were invited, that eighteen tenders were received, that the lowest tenderer was awarded the contract, and that everything in connection with this matter was fair and honest. I know, from the information I have received, and from the answer given me in this House, which was not an answer at all to my question, that the facts are simply these: The buildings about these stations, on that part of the road, were given by private arrangement without the Government inviting the public to tender, and while there were competent persons in the Island of Cape Breton to do the work as well as any person they could import from the Province of New Brunswick. The answers to my questions were not true answers and they were misleading.

PROTECTION OF FISHERMEN.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a Bill which was introduced and carried through the Senate some time ago, and which I consider to be of such importance as to justify me in calling his attention to it before the House closes, in order that, if possible, he may adopt the Bill as a Government measure and have it made law. The Bill is one for the better securing of the safety of fishermen. The House knows that for years past there has been a lamentable loss of life caused by the fishing vessels sending out dorys with men in them, and which are not supplied with either compass or food or water. The Bill in the Senate is for the purpose of preventing that system in future, and providing that no dory or other boat shall be launched or shipped from any shipping vessel unless that dory or boat is supplied with a compass and with a certain quantity of food and water. The Bill is a very short one, containing only two clauses, and I am sure that it will commend itself to the approval of this House. It passed the Senate without any opposition, and received the warm approval of the leader of the Government in that Chamber. It would not take five minutes to pass the Bill here, I am quite sure, for the object is an excellent one, and the evil against which it legislates is known to all maritime members. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should give the Bill precedence over all others, and let it be passed this year. I hope the hon. Minister will be able to say that the Bill receives his approval as it did the approval of his colleague in the Senate.

Mr. TUPPER. The Bill has been mentioned to me by its introducer in the Senate, and, personally, I think, that before the Bill becomes law, certain changes will have to be made. It refers to the control over the bank fishermen, and as such is legislation of an entirely novel character. I certainly think that this is a Bill which it would be wise to consider well before passing it into law. While the principle of the Bill is commendable, I do not feel prepared to recommend to my colleagues to proceed with it this Session. I stated as much to the gentleman who had the Bill in charge in the Senate, and I shall, later on, bring its provisions before the attention of the Government.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am glad to see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has expressed his approval of this Bill.

Mr. TUPPER. Yes; of its general principles.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Looking at the Bill itself, I think there are some alterations which will have to be made, but I have long thought that legislation is desirable in this direction.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is not the proper time to discuss the merits of the Bill.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There has been a motion to adjourn.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes: but I submit, Mr. Speaker, this is not the proper time to discuss the details of the Bill.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I trust that the Government will take the Bill into consideration, and deal with it next Session.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

SUPPLY—BEHRING'S SEA SEIZURES.

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

Mr. PRIOR. Before the House goes into Supply, I wish to make a few remarks on a subject which I consider to be the most important matter now engaging the attention of the Government—I refer to the seizure of Canadian vessels by American cruisers in Behring's Sea, in the year 1886-87. This matter was fully discussed by hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House during last Session, so that I need not go into the details at any length now; but as there may be some gentlemen present now who did not hear the discussion last Session, I will state in a few words how the seizures came to be made. In the year 1821, Russia issued a proclamation claiming jurisdiction over the whole of Behring's Sea. This was taken objection to by the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States, and so strenuously did they oppose it that, in 1824 and 1825, treaties were signed between the Government of Russia and the United States, and between Russia and Great Britain, by which Russia gave up all claim to the sole jurisdiction over these seas. In 1867 the United States Government bought Alaska from the Russian Government, and the Russian Government then and there ceded to the United States all the rights, privileges and franchises which belonged to them at the time. I would ask the House to take notice of these words; that Russia only gave the rights and privileges which belonged to her at the time, and of course these were the only rights which she could give. In 1870 the United States Government gave a charter to a company, called the Alaska Commercial Company, for the privilege of taking seals on the islands of St. Paul and St. George, two islands situated in Behring's Sea. In 1886 the United States cruisers seized three Canadian vessels which sailed from Victoria, B.C., while they were pursuing their avocation of sealing in Behring's Sea, at a distance of from 68 to 139 miles from any land. These vessels were seized by these United States cruisers, and their cargoes of sealskins were confiscated, and the captains, mates and crews of the vessels were imprisoned and fined. Many of them were turned out under conditions of great hardship to find their way back to British Columbia. One very important circumstance in connection with this matter is, that some of the sealskins which were seized had been taken from seals captured a long way outside of Behring's

Sea, and a long time before the vessels got into Behring's Sea. They commenced sealing down about San Francisco, and gradually worked their way up to Behring's Sea. In 1887 the United States cruisers seized six more Canadian vessels, at distances averaging about 90 miles out. They also seized eight of their own vessels for the violation, as they said, of the law, that only vessels belonging to the Alaska Company had any right to take seals in those waters. Now, Sir, what I particularly wish to call the attention of this House to is the fact that up to the present time no settlement has been arrived at between the two Governments, and no compensation whatever has been given to those men who have been such great losers by the seizure of their property. It has been utter ruin to some of these men. One of them whom I remember particularly, an energetic and worthy business man, whose schooners had been seized, has been obliged to go into bankruptcy; and a great many of them have been greatly crippled in their commercial enterprises in consequence of these seizures. If I remember rightly, the value of the first three vessels seized, the value of the sealskins, the compensation for injuries sustained, and the value of the probable catch would amount to something like $153,000; and eight more schooners were seized in the following year. The seizure of these schooners has also entailed a great loss on many other citizens of the town I represent, from the fact that they have invested a great deal of money in these sealing schooners; and at the present time they are utterly useless, because they are afraid to send the schooners up to Behring's Sea, on account of the threats made and the proclamations issued by the United States Government; and up to the present time no assurances have been given by the Dominion Government or the Imperial Government that they would be protected if they went there. I have here a telegram from Washington, dated April 15, which appeared in the Victoria *Colonist*, as follows:—

"It is reported that Lieutenant-Commander Stockton, of the *Thetis*, has received special instructions regarding the course to be pursued in the event of British sealers being found in Behring's Sea during the coming season. Lieutenant Stockton is said to be instructed to be very vigilant in following out his orders, and capturing any foreign, as well as American, vessels found in the Behring waters."

So we see that at the present time our sealers with their cargoes are just as liable to be seized, and their captains and crews to be ill-treated, as they were in 1886. I also see a notice in the press that on the 26th of March four of these Canadian schoners, the *Grace*, the *Dolphin*, the *Ada* and the *Anna Beck* were sold by public auction at Port Townsend, in Washington Territory, by the United States marshal. Those vessels were seized in 1886-87, and they were sold for next to nothing; they were simply sacrificed; and at the present time three more are rotting on the beaches in Alaska Territory. Now, I would ask the right hon. leader of the Government to explain to this House what the reason is that no settlement has been come to between the two Governments? We were told last Session that this Government have persistently urged on the Imperial Government the necessity of taking action in the matter, and bringing it to a speedy settlement. But it is now nearly three years since the first seizure was made, and, so far as I can learn, we are no nearer to a settlement than we were then. We were also told that the Government were obtaining data on which to base a claim for compensation from the United States Government; but surely, Sir, nearly three years is sufficient time in which to gather the data required to put in a proper claim. I hope the hon. gentleman will give us a full and explicit explanation. Last year the correspondence brought down, in answer to a motion made by my hon. friend the member for Vancouver (Mr. Gordon), showed conclusively that up to that time this Government had done their utmost to induce the Imperial Government to take speedy action in the matter. But that was a year ago, and I know that the hon. members of this House would like to hear what has been done since. It seems to me that, during the very long period which has elapsed, this matter might have been settled. Consider, for instance, the dispute between the United States, Great Britain and Germany, regarding Samoa. I do not think it is more than six months since the first trouble occurred there; and I see by the press that the members of the conference on that subject have been chosen, and I do not suppose it will take more than from thirty to sixty days to bring the matter to a satisfactory settlement. I only wish I could say as much with regard to the Behring's Sea difficulty. I will not discuss whether the question of jurisdiction over the seas could not be settled first, without waiting for the data upon which to base a claim for compensation. I will leave that question to other gentlemen in this House who have had a legal training, and who can do better justice to it than I can. I only hope they will take the matter up. But I would impress upon the Government the necessity that exists for bringing this matter to a speedy settlement, and for endeavoring to get justice for those men who have been such heavy losers from the seizures. Last year, when speaking on this subject, I stated that a large portion of the American press, as well as a great portion of the American people, were not in accord with the opinions put forward by the President of the United States. So far from that feeling having lessened, it is stronger to-day than it was then. I have here a pamphlet published in San Francisco, where there are a great many people interested in this question, and where the feeling in regard to it runs pretty high. The pamphlet has been very extensively distributed throughout the United States; and, with the permission of the House, I will read what it says in regard to one portion of this claim:

"We will now look at the chart of the Behring's Sea and see on what grounds our Government claims this. You will notice a long chain of islands, called the Aleutian Islands, extending in the form of a circle to the westward, dividing the Pacific Ocean from the Behring's Sea. These islands are undoubtedly of volcanic formation, and while they extend some 1,200 miles to the westward, they do not enclose the Behring's Sea. The Island of Attou is our extreme western possession. The distance from the Island of Attou to Copper Island is 175 miles, and to the nearest point of the Kamchatka coast or Siberian side, 370 miles. Now, if our Government can claim and control a sea with a passage 370 miles across, we want to know how she is going to do it, and on what grounds. Certainly not that it is an enclosed sea. More especially, when you again look at the chart, you see that the Island of Attou is at the extreme end of the chain of islands, and as you follow this chain of islands back to the eastward as far as Unimak Pass, that between these islands are wide passages, allowing vessels of the largest dimensions to pass in and out of the Behring's Sea at will, a distance of some 1,200 miles to the Siberian coast, in a direct westward line. By carefully perusing this chart it must convince the most skeptical that our Government has no claim to the Behring's Sea as an enclosed sea.

"We now come to the question of the jurisdiction of the Behring's Sea as taken by our Government, caused by the seal question. For this reason the chart of the North Pacific Ocean and the Behring's Sea is sent to you, so that it may show just how broad the claim our Government has taken in this matter. You will notice on the chart of the Behring's Sea the line called the United States imaginary boundary line; called this for lack of no better name. This line has been laid out or imagined to exist in an open sea 1,200 miles across in its widest part, something never before claimed by any other power in the history of the world. The impression has gone out that the Behring's Sea is an enclosed water and under the full control of the United States and Russia. Just how or where this claim was first obtained no one seems to know. It sprang into existence like a mushroom and apparently with about the same strength and standing. Our Government could, with the same consistency, all of a sudden, claim the control of the Gulf of Mexico. It is considered by all maritime laws that a nation can only control a certain distance of the sea from her shores. This has been the established custom as a maritime law for an indefinite time, and our Government insists that our American fishermen shall have all right, outside of the three-mile limit from land, in the controversy between the Canadian and American fishermen, and would not consider the ten miles headland point as asked by the Canadians, but when they come on the Pacific in the Behring's Sea they go directly back on what they claim on the eastern side, and say we own all this sea and if you are found in it your vessels are subject to seizure and yourself fined, making no allowance whatever for what portion you may be in, whether one mile or 100 miles from land. Our Government then going directly back on what it claims from the Canadian authorities on the other side, we ask, can this claim be held when it comes to a final issue? So far it has been done by force, but might is not always right, and can anyone claim but what our Govern-

ment will have yet to pay for the damages to the Canadians and her own citizens for the losses they have sustained by the seizure of their vessels and forfeiture of same by our Government in its raid among the sealers in the year 1887 in the Behring's Sea ?"

That is from an American pamphlet, distributed widely all over the States, and it shows pretty well what is thought about the question on the Pacific coast. I have here also a copy of the Victoria *Daily Colonist*, which gives an extract from a paper called the *Argonaut*, published in San Francisco, one of the leading papers in California. In regard to the proclamation of Mr. Blaine lately issued, by which it is evident he is determined that the United States shall still hold jurisdiction over the sea, the *Argonaut* states :

"Two dangers impend. The first is that, for the sake of still further enriching the Alaska Commercial Company, the Government will continue to violate a principle of international law which has been emphatically asserted from time immomorial by the United States. That principle is, that no nation can claim jurisdiction over uninclosed waters beyond a certain distance from low water mark. The distance has been variously stated at one mile, or one league, or three leagues, or one hundred miles (in the Treaty of Utrecht). That principle, which was first stated by Grotius in 1609, was adopted by the United States at the very beginning of their national career. It was asserted by James Madison, when he refused to acknowledge the sovereignty of Algiers over the Mediterranean, and went to war rather than pay tribute; it was asserted by John Quincy Adams as to this very sea of Behring, when Russia insisted that it was a closed sea; Mr Adams denounced the 'vain and extravagant pretensions' of Russia, and had the satisfaction of hearing from Governor Speranski, of Siberia, that the claim had been abandoned; it was again asserted, in 1848, when Mr. Tyler refused to pay Sound dues to Denmark; a national congress met at Copenhagen, and Great Britain, Russia, France, Prussia and the United States agreed that Denmark had no jurisdiction over the Sound, which was an uninclosed sea, and that the dues must be abolished; it was re-asserted by Mr. Seward as late as 1866, when Russian cruisers attempted to interfere with American whalers in Behring's Sea."

I think, after hearing these extracts read, every hon. gentleman will agree with me that the United States must know perfectly well that they are in the wrong, but are determined to violate international law in order to protect the Alaska Commercial Company. There is no doubt, according to Governor Swinford's report, that this company, which pays something like $239,000 per annum to the United States Government, is the power behind the throne, and no doubt they use their money and influence in the lobbies of the House of Representatives to keep the United States Government to their word and to the action they have taken in the matter. I can only say that I earnestly hope the right hon. the leader of the Government will persist in still urging the Imperial authorities to bring this matter to a final issue and to give these men, who have lost so much, compensation, and that within reasonable delay, or they may be irretrievably ruined. I would also press upon the Government, if they have not already cabled to England, the necessity of doing so without delay, urging the Imperial Government to send one of the war vessels now on the Pacific coast to protect British sealers there. If an English gun-boat would show her nose around the Aleutian Islands, we would hear no more of the British flag being hauled down or of our citizens being ill-treated.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman is right in saying that the subject-matter he has brought to the attention of the House is one of the greatest importance that can engage our attention; and, late as the Session is, the importance of the subject justifies him fully in calling the attention of the House to it. The personal grievances of the owners of the vessels seized and confiscated by the United States Government would in themselves justify him in bringing the matter to the attention of the Government, but the question involves considerations more important even than the personal ones which attach to the owners of the vessels. There are national questions of the highest and very gravest importance involved in the seizure of these vessels and the refusal, up to the present, on the part of the United States, to give any compensation or make any apology. Nothing, to my mind, could be a stronger comment on the difficulties which exist, under our present system, between Canada and the United States than the facts which the hon. gentleman has presented. The Opposition in this House appreciated this some time ago, and they brought to the attention of the House the absolute necessity of our obtaining, in some way or another, more direct communication with the United States Government. I have read very carefully the very lengthy correspondence which has been submitted to the House on this question, and I am not prepared to say that the Canadian Government, for the first one or two years, were open to any reproach in the matter, but they are tied down and hampered by the fact that their communications cannot be made directly to Washington, that no protest can be made officially by them to the powers that be, and that no effective action can be taken by them to remedy the grievances which Canadian subjects are subjected to. They have to send their protest, their minutes of Council, and other papers, to the Home Office, to be forwarded by the Home Office to the Foreign Office, and by the Foreign Office to the British Ambassador at Washington, and by the British Ambassador at Washington to the Secretary of State; and so, after passing through a dozen or two hands, at the end of six or eight months the answer arrives back. It is perfectly evident that it is almost impossible to have our grievances remedied or rights maintained until we have conceded to us a larger measure of government in relation to these matters. If we had the right to have a recognised agent appointed at Washington, to whom we could transmit these complaints and papers, and who would have the power and authority to treat directly with the Secretary of State, no man can doubt but that long ago these grievances would have been remedied. Now, what are the facts? As far back as 1886, we find that three British vessels were seized for the alleged offence of fishing in Behring's Sea at a distance of from 60 to 120 miles from any land. The vessels were seized and confiscated, the cargoes were confiscated, and the captains of the vessels were imprisoned for three or four months. One of the captains escaped and wandered to the woods and lost his life. The vessels have been sold for a nominal sum, and no redress has so far been obtained from the Government under whose authority these vessels were seized. In 1887, there was a repetition of the same action. Three more vessels were seized and the same proceedings followed. They were libelled in the Admiralty Court of Alaska, they were condemned and sold, their cargoes were confiscated, the captains were imprisoned, and the owners are without any remedy. I acknowledge frankly that the matter was taken up in what appeared to be a firm and determined mode by the Canadian Government. They represented to the English Government the enormity of the outrage perpetrated on British subjects, they pressed the matter, in my humble judgment, with sufficient firmness, and did what appears to have been all that lay in their power at first to induce the Imperial Government to take such action as would have these grievances remedied. Here we stand to-day, three years after the outrages were committed, and up to this time nothing has been done, and the people are without any remedy. I wish to call the attention of the Government and the House to the fact that, although this matter appears to have been pressed at first by the Canadian Government, with promptness and firmness, there came a time when their efforts seem to have stopped. In the spring of 1888, two years after the first step had been taken, from all that appears by the papers brought down to the House, the Canadian Government seem to have ceased. Wearied out, perhaps; possibly coming to the conclusion that they could not do anything, they seemed to have stopped, and nothing more has been done. This case, therefore, is of importance, not only from the personal grievances which the individuals have suffered, and for which they are to this day without any remedy, but it is important also, from the international nature of

the claim. If it is true, that Canadian interests can be outraged in this way, and no remedy can be achieved, it is well for us to know it. If the British Government are not able to protect our fishermen in Behring's Sea or wherever else they may fish, carrying the British flag, it is well that the Canadian public should know it. We know that the relations between the Imperial Government and the United States Government were somewhat strained during the year 1888. We know that, owing to the dismissal of Lord Sackville from his position as Ambassador at Washington, the relations between the Government of Great Britain and the Government of the United States were not as cordial as they were previously. But there ought to be no reason, because, for Imperial reasons, the relations between those two Governments are somewhat strained, and are not as cordial as they ought to be, and as we all wish they were, why Canadian interests should suffer; and I repeat that, if we had, as we have demanded time and again, the right to negotiate commercial treaties and to have an agent at Washington to represent our claims and interests, I have no shadow of doubt that this matter would have long ago been settled. I can see no substantial reason why the United States should not grant compensation for these outrages. The hon. gentleman has referred to the historical aspect of the question. We know that in 1821, the Emperor of Russia issued an edict forbidding any fishermen from fishing within 100 miles of Alaska. That was resisted strongly by the American Minister, and his representations were such that in 1825 a treaty was agreed upon between the United States and Russia which put an end forever to the pretensions of the Russian Government. In the same year or the year following, a similar treaty was entered into between Great Britain and Russia, conceding the same rights and privileges to British subjects as were conceded in the American treaty; and from and after that time the Russian edict was a dead letter as far as British subjects were concerned. That treaty remained in force and Russia did not claim subsequently any exclusive right over the waters of the Behring's Sea up to the time when she ceded Alaska to the United States. The Marquis of Salisbury, in a despatch which he sent to Sir Lionel Sackville-West in September, 1887, in reviewing these provisions, called special attention to the fact that in the cession of that country of Alaska by Russia to the United States, Russia did not pretend to cede any rights to the waters over which it is now claimed that the United States have exclusive jurisdiction. The noble Marquis says in that despatch:

"The claim thus set up appears to be founded on the exceptional title said to have been conveyed to the United States by Russia at the time of the cession of the Alaska Territory. The pretension which the Russian Government at one time put forward to exclusive jurisdiction over the whole of the Behring's Sea was, however, never admitted either by this country or by the United States of America. On the contrary, it was strenuously resisted, as I shall presently show, and the American Government can hardly claim to have received from Russia rights which they declared to be inadmissable when asserted by the Russian Government. Nor does it appear from the text of the Treaty of 1867 that Russia either intended or purported to make any such grant; for, by article 1 of that instrument, Russia agreed to cede to the United States all the territory and dominion then possessed by Russia 'on the continent of America and in the adjacent islands,' within certain geographical limits described, and no mention was made of any exclusive right over the waters of Behring's Sea."

So it would appear, from the terms of the treaty by which Alaska was ceded to the United States, that the Russian Government did not pretend to cede, and did not, as a matter of law or fact, cede any other rights to the United States than the rights Russia herself possessed "on the continent of America and in the adjacent islands." And, as Russia had, by the treaties of 1825 with the United States and with Great Britain, yielded up the claims she had previously put forward to the exclusive right to Behring's Sea, there does not seem to be the slightest pretension for the argument which the Judge of the Admiralty Court assumed, that the whole of Behring's Sea belongs, as a matter of territorial right, to the owner of the State of Alaska. Now, the American Legislature passed a statute some years ago prohibiting the killing of seals in these seas; but, on looking at the terms of the statute, I find that it does not pretend to claim any jurisdiction over the waters of Behring's Sea beyond the limits recognised by all nations as those limits which the territorial owners have rights over. It only pretended to legislate against the killing of seals on the Islands of St. Paul and St. George, or the waters adjacent to those islands, and the construction which the Judge of the Admiralty Court put on that provision, that the waters adjacent to the islands extended 100, or 200, or even 400 and 500 miles from those islands, seems to me to be utterly untenable, and I believe it would never be recognised by any court, and could never be successfully asserted by the United States Government. In the first place, the words themselves will not bear that construction; in the second place, the words in the treaty of cession from Russia to the United States, do not bear that construction; and in the third place, the United States are estopped by the formal manner in which they vigorously and effectually protested against the assumption of a similar claim put forward by Russia when she owned Alaska. The thing seems to be utterly absurd and will not bear argument for a moment. Now, what do we find? We find that the cruisers of the United States, acting in pursuance of instructions from Washington, which instructions are directly at variance, as is shown in the official papers brought down, with similar instructions issued when Mr. Boutwell was Secretary of the Treasury—acting in pursuance of those instructions, they have seized vessels and continued to seize vessels fishing in pursuance of their lawful avocation upon the high seas, one and two hundred miles from land. It is incredible that such pretensions can be recognised by the Government of Great Britain or by Canada. These seal fisheries are no doubt of the most valuable kind; we have rights in them as citizens of the world; any vessel has a right to go to these seas and to fish there. To allow such a pretension to be successfully maintained by the United States would be to surrender on our part those national rights which we inherently possess. The grievous character of the complaint was very well summed up in the minute of council which our Government forwarded to the Imperial Government in the fall of 1887, in which our Government appear to have been sufficiently impressed with the magnitude of the interests involved, and with the serious character of the grievances under which these people labor. It is stated there:

"It is respectfully submitted that this condition of affairs is in the highest degree detrimental to the interests of Canada, and should not be permitted to continue. For nearly two years Canadian vessels have been exposed to arbitrary seizure and confiscation in the pursuit of their lawful occupation upon the high sea, and Canadian citizens subjected to imprisonment and serious financial loss, while an important and remunerative Canadian industry has been threatened with absolute ruin."

No language could put the fact stronger than the language of this minute of council, and if you substitute three years in place of two years, we have a capital epitome of the facts as they exist at the present time. The question which this Parliament has to ask, the question which this country has to ask, the question which those who suffer from these illegal seizures are asking now, is, what is the Government doing in the matter? I cannot find that since the spring of 1888, anything has been done. I find that in February, 1887, in reply to repeated remonstrances and protests from the Imperial Government, Mr. Bayard, the Secretary of State, wrote a despatch to the British Ambassador in which he stated that orders had been issued discontinuing the proceedings against these vessels, and discharging them from detention, and releasing the prisoners. Well, Sir, marvellous to relate, it is almost incredible that the despatch reciting

that orders had been issued by the United States to its officers in Alaska directing them to give up this property, to discontinue proceedings, and release the parties imprisoned—singular to relate, that order was ignored by those officials and treated with contempt, and for a period of another year, although that despatch was issued and sent, no attention whatever was paid to it; the parties were not released from imprisonment, the vessels were not released from detention, and no compensation was offered. The Marquis of Salisbury, in a subsequent despatch, declared that he drew the inference from that despatch that it was the intention of the American Government not to continue the system of depredation—I suppose that would be the correct word—which they had carried on in the summer of 1886, and I think he was fairly justified in drawing that inference. It is true it was stated in the despatch that this release was granted without expressing any positive opinion upon the case. But the facts were before the Secretary of State at that time, and it is inconceivable that he should have granted an unconditional release of the vessels and the prisoners unless he had made up his mind that they had been illegally seized. It is true, no express undertaking was entered into by the United States Government that they would not repeat the seizures made in 1887, though I think that his lordship was fairly justified in drawing the inference that he did, that the seizures would not be continued. But in 1887 we find United States cruisers again seizing these vessels, we find the Secretary of State repudiating the inference which the Marquis of Salisbury had drawn from the despatch of February, 1887, and we find British and Canadian ships driven from the high seas by the same high-handed acts in 1887 by which they had been driven away in 1886. Now, I have no charge to make the against this Government except that I cannot find, in the papers, that they have used all reasonable diligence in pressing the claim since the spring of 1888. They seem to have dropped, so far as the papers show, pressing the matter any further. If that is so, they are properly chargeable with culpable negligence. Of course we will hear what the First Minister has to say when he comes to address the House, as I have no doubt he will, on this important matter. I cannot think, myself, that the action of the American Government is such that the citizens of that country ought to be proud of it. I think their conduct has been reprehensible in the extreme, I think their conduct calls for disapproval, I think the conduct of Mr. Bayard is such as to call for disapproval. I think there is nothing in his action—and I have read his correspondence over carefully from begining to end—showing that he had a sincere desire to do right in the premises. The fact is that he seems to be fencing from month to month and year to year, against the expression of any positive opinion one way or the other, strongly as he was pressed to do so. But I think the matter ought to be pressed, I think the matter is of such importance that it cannot be allowed by this Parliament to lie dormant, I shall be delighted to hear from the leader of the Government, or from any other member of the Government, that they are now taking effective steps to ensure that British interests shall be protected on the high seas of Behring's Sea, the same as they are protected on the high seas of the Atlantic. At a time when the United States were protesting with all their force against what they alleged to be arbitrary and illegal detentions and seizures of their vessels within three miles of the land on the Atlantic coast, they are practicing and claiming sovereignty over the sea one and two hundred miles from the shore on the Pacific coast. Sir, these pretensions seem to be such as cannot be recognised or submitted to, and I hope that the Government will be able to give some assurance to the House that this claim has been pressed, to some extent effectively, during the past year, and that it is being pressed now, I hope also that those who have suffered such serious loss in their fishing interests, will have some early assurance given to them that the damages of the past will be repaired, and that in the future they will be allowed peaceably and quietly to carry on their fishing avocations on the high seas. I shall wait with some degree of anxiety the explanations which the hon. gentleman may have to make.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope that at this period of the Session we will not be drawn into a discussion of the question of whether Canada should make commercial treaties directly with the rest of the world. We have had that already before the House, and I have no doubt that when Parliament meets again, we will have a discussion of the subject. The hon. gentleman affirms that he has no manner of doubt—those were his words—that if Canada had a representative at Washington, compensation would have been granted long ago; in five minutes afterwards he said that the American Government had made an unfounded claim to the exclusive right to all these seas. Now, if they had exclusive right to all these waters, and if these waters were trespassed upon by British or any other foreign vessels, no question of compensation could arise.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I said the Secretary of State appeared to fence, and did not appear to give any direct statement as to what his claims were, and that there was circumlocution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think there is more than the Secretary of State on the fence at this moment. The hon. gentleman did say, that if we had only had an ambassador at Washington, compensation would have been granted. First, there must be the admission that there was a claim for compensation. The United States has resisted that, and, as the hon. gentleman says, there was no positive assertion on the part of the Secretary of State on the subject.

Mr DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, that is so. But there is no admission, in any way, of a claim. The hon. gentleman says, that if we had only had an ambassador there, it is quite certain we would have been granted compensation. Although we have no ambassador there, American ships have suffered exactly the same wrongs as British Columbia vessels. Their vessels have been seized, and many people have been ruined; they have made complaints loud and long to Washington, and to Congress, as American citizens, pointing out that they have been bankrupted and ruined. The newspapers of San Francisco, to which the hon. gentleman behind me referred—and I may say, that I think my hon. friend handled the matter with more judgment than did the hon. gentleman who spoke last—have declared that American citizens have been used and abused by this Alaska Commercial Company, and that the American Government have been wanting in their duty towards their own citizens, in allowing this aggressive monopoly to act in such an atrocious manner, as they have done in Behring's Sea. The hon. gentleman should remember, that this question is not only a Canadian question. It is not like the question of our own fisheries; it is not like any question arising between the United States and Canada in regard to our own inland waters. It is a question that affects the whole world. It affects specially the interests of the maritime nations, and all the maritime nations are concerned in resisting what I must call the iniquitous attempt of the United States Government to claim Behring's Sea as a *mare clausum* These nations are all concerned. Canada, from its proximity to those waters, is specially interested, because we have large fishing interests and hope to develop fishing enterprises both in whale and seal fisheries. But we know also that England has whale and seal fishing vessels wandering over every sea, Arctic and Antarctic. So it is with the

fishermen of the Netherlands, and Germany now is pushing her way into every sea as a maritime nation. It is an international question; it is not a Canadian, a Dominion or a provincial question; and when we find that England has, on our strong remonstrance, taken action, we have no doubt that she will press it. England has pressed it, and is pressing it. We know perfectly well that in any international question of this kind great delays always occur, where one of the negotiating parties is anxious to postpone the negotiations. Perhaps, for the reason the hon. gentleman gave, the strained relations which for a very short time existed between England and the States formed one reason why the United States has fenced the question and not come to any conclusion, or it may be for other reasons, perhaps not quite as creditable even as that. We have now a new Government in the United States and a new President, and we have a Minister sent specially from England. I believe that Sir Julian Pauncefort is a man who is singularly adapted to deal with these questions, having been the permanent head of the Foreign Office for a good many years. He is thoroughly acquainted with the question of all our relations with the United States, not only with this question of the Behring's Sea, but with our Fisheries question; and as he is a vigorous man, thoroughly experienced in all these subjects in which we are interested, I think we are very fortunate in having him at Washington. Whether he will be more successful than his predecessor was in bringing these negotiations to a conclusion, we cannot say. With respect to the conduct of the Canadian Government, the hon. gentleman was good enough to say that we had in 1886, 1887 and 1888 pressed the claims of Canada with sufficient persistency. I can only assure the hon. gentleman that the British Government have thoroughly and frankly responded to our claim, and have asserted that our contentions are correct, that our claims are just, and that the claims of the Americans are unfounded. The negotiations will go on, and no one can foresee what the result may be. One thing is clear, that if the United States are resolved to insist on their pretension, that Behring's Sea is closed to the whole of the world but the United States, a grave complication will arise. To what extent that complication will extend no one can foresee, and I do not even desire, by a single expression, to point out what I perhaps fear or apprehend might be the ultimate consequence of a permanent determination on the part of the United States to insist upon their claim that Behring's sea is a *mare clausum*. But I will say this, that Canada has not been forgetful of its interests or its rights, and has resisted the wrongs offered her; and I freely admit, with the hon. gentleman, that these are wrongs—wrongs suffered by American citizens inflicted by their own citizens, as well as wrongs inflicted on foreign subjects, and wrongs which some day or other, in my opinion, must be compensated for. I would say only one thing further, and it is this: That the late Governor General—and, perhaps, the hon. gentleman knows it, and it was intimated in the public press—took great interest in this question. I am not committing any breach of confidence or etiquette in stating that, besides taking such interest as he was bound to take as Governor General, he took a warm personal interest in all the questions connected with the fisheries and with this special question, and when he went to England he took memoranda with him from the Canadian Government—and he went to England only last year—with the understanding that before he left for India he would press, personally, upon Her Majesty's Government the great wrongs that Canada had suffered originally by the position taken by the American States, and the great injury that our subjects had suffered by delay in granting compensation. All I can say is, that we have done everything we possibly could do. I believe Her Majesty's Government have been unceasing in their desire to have a successful result follow the negotiations. I believe, why, I am sure, though I have it not in writing, but I am as sure as if I saw the writing, that Sir Julian Pauncefort is specially charged with this question and with others to bring them to a speedy conclusion, and I hope to a successful one. If naught else can be done—I do not know it as a fact, but I have little doubt on the question—he can call the attention, the serious attention of all the maritime powers to this question, because it is to the interest, as I have already said, of all these nations to prevent an important sea of that kind from being closed against the enterprise and commerce of all the rest of the world.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know that it is any consolation to Canadian citizens whose property has been seized and who have been maltreated to know that American citizens have been equally maltreated. They have got far better opportunities to obtain redress than our Canadian citizens can possibly have from the American Government, and therefore we can dismiss that portion of the hon. gentleman's plea. I do not think it affects the situation one way or the other. The case is this: We do not mean to allege that the British Government are indifferent to what has occurred, nor do I mean to allege that the Canadian Government are indifferent to what has occurred. I do say that this is, as my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has justly pointed out, another of the proofs which are accumulating from day to day and from month to month and from year to year, that this roundabout system under which we now live and by which if a Canadian citizen suffers injury, application has to be made to the Foreign or Colonial Office as the case may be, then to the British Minister at Washington, then roundabout to our own Secretary of State, and then back to the Foreign Office—is antiquated and unbusinesslike to a degree, and is tending powerfully to complicate in a mischievous manner the relations between Canada and the United States. I say that this is a case in point. I am as well aware as the hon. gentleman is that Canada is not strong enough by force of arms to compel the United States to do her right, if the United States be determined to do her wrong. But I do say that this is one of these instances in which there is hardly room for reasonable men to doubt that if the Canadian Government had possessed an authorised agent at Washington who could have put himself daily and weekly (and not at intervals of eight months) in communication with the American authorities, that we would have had—not, perhaps, a certainty—but an infinitely better chance of having the wrongs done to our fellow citizens redressed, than by the process which now goes on. The hon. gentleman did not deny, and he could not deny, that three years have elapsed since these seizures commenced, and that we are as far now from having these wrongs redressed as we were at the beginning.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And it is six years for the United States citizens who have the same wrongs unredressed yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be, but I entirely deny that there is any parallel between the action of the United States towards their own citizens and the action of the United States officers towards the citizens of another State. The United States may choose for their own purposes to prohibit their citizens, and they have a right to prohibit their citizens on grounds of public policy, from fishing in Behring's Sea or anywhere else, but they have no right to prohibit our citizens. It is all very well for the right hon. gentleman to point out that this affects all maritime nations. That is true technically, but, practically speaking, it is England and her colonies who are almost the only parties concerned in this matter, for I do not believe that a single vessel of another nationality has been

seized or interfered with in this matter of fishing in Behring's Seas. As to the contention of the United States, I am not going to discuss that now, but it appears to be absurd on the face of it. We would have infinitely better grounds, and infinitely more justice on our side if we asserted that the Gulf of St. Lawrence, or, still more, the Hudson's Bay, is a *mare clausum*. We have ten times more justice on our side for claiming that than the United States have to assert that Behring's Sea is a *mare clausum*. Although we are not of ourselves able to force the United States to do us justice, yet we would have an infinitely better chance of getting our demands attended to if we had an agent who would be in constant communication with the United States authorities. These interminable delays, as we have seen in the fishery negotiations, as we have noticed in the case of that Blue-book in my hon. friend's hands, by which it takes eight months, when it might be accomplished in a few days, for a communication to be made by our authorities and an answer received—those delays, as we have shown time and again, are not conducive to the good conduct of the nation. If we had this direct communication with the United States Government we would have an infinitely better chance although, perhaps, not a certainty, of getting these things satisfactorily settled, than we can under existing circumstances.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I fully agree with the remarks which have fallen from the hon. gentlemen who have spoken with regard to the importance of this case It seems to me, without discussing the general question, that there has been some fault, to a certain extent, on behalf of the officers interested in this matter for the Canadian Government. When these vessels were seized, and the judgment by Judge Dawson delivered in the district court of Alaska (which judgment I have read, and I must say that it seems to me, in point of law, utterly untenable), we should have taken steps to have appealed from that decision to the highest court of the United States.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The United States informed us that there was no appeal from that court.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). That is not the case, so far as I understand. My recollection of the code of the United States tribunals is this: that there is an appeal from the district court to the circuit court, and from the circuit court to the United States court, but my impression is that after Judge Dawson gave his decision the motion for appeal was dismissed by him on the ground that the time for appeal had lapsed, and that it was then too late for the officers interested, on behalf of our Government, to take an appeal. My hon. friend will find in the correspondence between Lord Sackville and Mr. Bayard, that the United States Government was asked to waive the question of appeal and allow the matter to be brought before the Supreme Court, which, apparently, they declined to do. It seems to me that this is unfortunate, because we have, as the Americans can point out, a judgment against these vessels, which has not been appealed from and under which they have been sold. Therefore, to a certain extent, their courts have maintained the position of the American Government. It appears to me that if an appeal had been brought before the Supreme Court of the United States, they would have adopted the doctrine which has been laid down by their distinguished jurists on national law, and reversed the decision of the district court. If this appeal had been taken it would have facilitated very much the settlement of the question. It is quite true, as the First Minister says, that this is a national question and that other countries have an interest in it. That may be so, but, nevertheless, we find that in 1821, when the difficulties first arose over the claim of Russia to those seas, that although it was then a national question, only two countries interfered, and, finally, the treaties which have been referred to were concluded between the United States and Russia, and Great Britain and Russia.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is 60 years ago.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Quite true; but they were the only countries who entered into protest against the assumption of Russia. Subsequently the treaties were made, upon which treaty Judge Dawson seems to have found a doctrine of estoppel, which, I must say, would be new to any lawyer who has carefully read the judgment in this case. The United States having purchased Alaska from the Russian Government, they are now claiming what they repudiated on the part of Russia in 1821 and in 1825. The Behring's Straits cannot be considered a *mare clausum* in the same sense as Hudson's Bay. The position taken by the United States in 1821, sustains the view taken by the Court of St. James in regard to that matter. My hon. friend referred to what has been done by this Government, and there is no doubt, that a very able minute of council was sent home, of which my hon. friend has read an extract, and in which the Government forwarded the claims of those parties who have suffered so severely; and the manner in which those sealers were treated by the American authorities, I think, calls for the most severe condemnation, and was hardly worthy of a civilised nation. That minute of council was sent, and then it appears nothing more was done. The United States Government, however, proposed at that time to have a convention, and communications were opened between Great Britain and the United States with that view, and other nations were invited to concur. The hon. First Minister states that the late Governor General took a great interest in that matter, and took home a communication; but it seems to me that the Canadian Government must have been very dilatory, because we find that while the negotiations were going on with regard to the convention, a despatch, dated 20th June, was sent by Mr. White, Secretary of the American Legation in London, to Mr. Bayard, which I will read:

"SIR,—I have the honor to inform you that I availed myself of an early opportunity to acquaint the Marquis of Salisbury and the Russian Ambassador of the receipt of your instructions, numbered 864, of May 3, and shortly afterwards (May 16) His Excellency and I called together at the Foreign Office, for the purpose of discussing with His Lordship the terms of the proposed convention for the protection of seals in Behring Sea. Unfortunately, Lord Salisbury had just received a communication from the Canadian Government, stating that a memorandum on the subject would shortly be forwarded to London, and expressing a hope that, pending the arrival of that document, no further steps would be taken in the matter by Her Majesty's Government. Under these circumstances Lord Salisbury felt bound to await the Canadian memorandum before proceeding to draught the convention."

It will be seen, that on May 16, when the Russian Ambassador and Mr. White called on the Marquis of Salisbury, they were informed that the English Government were awaiting a communication from the Canadian Government, and that a memorandum on the subject would be forwarded. But, on the 20th of June, nearly a month afterwards, when Mr. White called on the Marquis of Salisbury, no note had been received, and the English Government had been obliged to send out a telegram for that memorandum to be sent forward. Whether it was sent forward, or whether any other steps was taken, does not appear from the papers. Nothing further occurred between the United States and the English Government until the month of October, when the difficulty took place with regard to Sir Sackville West, causing his return to London. The fact that both Governments were willing to enter into a convention for the purpose of settling all these questions with regard to Behring's Sea, which is probably a matter of importance to both American and Canadian fishermen, seems to indicate that the delay was due to the neglect of the Canadian Government. The British Government were apparently desirous of consulting the wishes and interests of our Government in this matter in every way; but Lord Salisbury's hands

were apparently tied because of the non-receipt of the memorandum from the Canadian Government. However, I hope that the matter will be pushed now that there is a new Government in the United States, and that diplomatic relations have again been entered into with Great Britain, and that justice will be done to those individuals who have suffered so severely at the hands of the American authorities.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Although our friends on the opposite side of the House have given us the credit of having represented pretty fairly and strongly the rights of our people on the high seas, we could expect them to make that admission without accompanying it with some items of blame against the Government of Canada, whether their contentions were well founded or not. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down, in making that admission, states that there are two particulars in which Canada has failed. One of these is in not having taken an appeal from the magistrate in Sitka to the United States Supreme Court, and he entertains the idea that if such an appeal had been taken, it would have been decided by the United States Supreme Court that the contention of the United States Government in regard to Behring's Sea being a closed sea was an erroneous one. I need hardly say that it is not for the Government of Canada to take an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. It is only the owner of one of the vessels who would be in a position to assert the right of appeal; and for the Government of Canada to submit themselves to a foreign jurisdiction in regard to the rights of Her Majesty's subjects on the high seas would be a very questionable step indeed. It may be that if any of those parties had chosen to assert an appeal, the Government of Canada might have given them its support. It is a fact, however, that they never did so, although we have not remonstrated against their pursuing a course of that kind. Now, the cases that arose on the Pacific coast are entirely distinct from those which arose on the Atlantic coast. In the latter cases defences were raised in our own courts by owners of American vessels which were found in our waters It is a well-known principle that vessels coming within the jurisdiction of a foreign country must submit themselves to the municipal laws of that country; and therefore it was right for the owners of vessels seized on the Atlantic coast to set up their claims in the courts of Great Britain. They were within our waters and subject to our laws as much as citizens of the United States coming into Nova Scotia would be subject to the laws prevailing in that Province. On the other hand, Canadian vessels seized by the American authorities on the high seas are in no way within the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States; and Her Majesty's Government, at the instance of the Government of Canada, took the view that the questions at issue were not questions which either of the Governments ought to submit to the adjudication of the courts of the United States, but related to the treatment on the high seas of Her Majesty's subjects in the pursuit of their lawful calling. It has been overlooked that some of the seizures which took place were those of American vessels, and an appeal was asserted on their behalf. The whole question of the right of appeal was not overlooked. The best advice that could be obtained on that subject was clearly that no appeal would lie from the magistrate at Sitka.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). He is a judge of the district court.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He was a magistrate merely, and there was no means of getting a decision from the Supreme Court except by a suit instituted in one of the courts in the States, and an action was commenced in the State of Massachusetts by one of the American owners, which action is now pending.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). "The United States district court in and for the district of Alaska, of the United States of America."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He is simply a magistrate, and nothing else, although he is vested for certain purposes with the powers of a United States' district judge; but in this respect he does not correspond to the United States' district judges in the States. However, that is somewhat beside the question. If an appeal lay, it would have been successfully prosecuted by the American owner. It seemed well established that an appeal did not lie. It was admitted by the authorities in Washington that no appeal would lie, and that therefore it became purely an international question. When we applied to the United States Government for redress there was no attempt on their part to assert that it was a matter for the courts of the country to decide, as they have always contended when there was any remedy by way of litigation, even until the last stage of such litigation was concluded. The other objection to our procedure in this matter is that there was delay on our part in entering into the convention to which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) has referred. When the House is reminded what kind of a convention was proposed, they will see how preposterous it was that we should ever enter into it, and how utterly immaterial it was whether we ever made any answer or not to the absurd proposal of the United States Government. What was their proposal? The hon. member for St. John states it to have been a proposal to form a convention for the settlement of all questions, relating to Behring's Sea and the killing of seals. It may have had that high-sounding title, but, in point of fact, it was a proposal that all the nations of the world, except the United States, should be forbidden in the Pacific Ocean to hunt seals. The fact is, that the United States own, as part of the territory of Alaska, the only islands on which the seals are known to land. Those islands are under lease to that absolute monopoly, known as the Alaska Seal Company, and the proposal of the United States authorities was that, for the preservation of these seals, all killing at sea should be forbidden, and that the seal should only be allowed to be taken on land, and inasmuch as they own the only shores on which the seals land, and had leased them to the Alaska Seal Company, the proposal with regard to this convention was a proposal that all nations of the earth should be forbidden to pursue the seals on the high seas, and should leave the seal fishing industry as the monopoly of the Alaska company. That proposition fell through, and it should have been treated with nothing but indignation, moderated only by the civility which is necessary to keep up international intercourse. Therefore, when the hon. gentleman accused us of having prevented the settlement of the question, by delaying that convention, he shows that he has misunderstood the object for which the convention was proposed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is not my purpose to detain the House at this stage of the Session by an elaborate discussion of the merits or demerits of the American claim to the exclusive jurisdiction of Behring's Sea. It is to be regretted that the hon. gentleman who brought this question to our attention did not bring it up at an earlier period, when greater consideration could have been given it. I am sure that hon. gentlemen on this side refrained from bringing it before the House for discussion out of courtesy to that hon. gentleman, and it is, therefore, all the more to be regretted that he did not bring the question forward at an earlier period. I do not understand that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) or the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) complained of want of diligence on the part of the Government in pressing this claim when the dispute first arose, but they called the attention of the House to a fact upon which the Ministers have given no information

for there does not appear to have been any correspondence or discussion on this question since May, 1888. They ask the Government to account for their seeming want of diligence since that time. It may have been that the Government allowed this question to remain in abeyance immediately after the discussion of the fishery dispute, but however that may be, as this is a wholly separate and distinct question, one which was not in any way confused with the fishery dispute during the negotiations, it was a matter of some importance that the pretensions of the United States should not have seemed, for a single moment, to be recognised. Now, I would say, in the first place, that it is a pretty well-settled rule of international law that the condition of things which exists when a dispute begins between two states ought to continue until the question in dispute is disposed of. There can be no doubt whatever that this sea was treated as an open sea from 1825 down to 1885, and it is important that the freedom which was exercised—wrongly exercised, according to the contention of the United States—down to that period of time should be continued; and it does seem to me that the British Government ought to have been careful to have put a cruiser into those waters for the purpose of resisting, if necessary, the pretensions of the United States beyond the ordinary limit recognised by international law. That has not been done, and the failure on the part of the Imperial Government to do that is a dereliction of duty. The United States would not for a moment have permitted such a claim to have been made by the Canadian Government, if such a claim had not continued to exist for an indefinite period of time, and so we ought not to permit the United States Government to make this claim without its being disputed; and I am perfectly sure that, however strong the United States Government may feel their claim to be, it is a claim that ought not to have been called into action until recognised by the opposite party. Now, we have never recognised their pretension, and they ought never to have undertaken to enforce that pretension, and we ought not to have permitted it. Now, the right hon. the First Minister says that the Alaska Seal Company are enforcing their claim as vigorously against other American fishing vessels or sealers as against Canadians, but I understand the difference to be this, that it is the interest of the United States that the claims or pretensions of the Alaska Sealing Company should be upheld. The upholding of that claim upholds American sovereignty and American exclusive jurisdiction over these waters, so that it is their interest to maintain the pretensions of that company against any other American sealers; and it would be the greatest possible delusion on our part to feel that we were safely resting our case upon any pretensions put forward by any other parties in the United States. Our safe position is to resist the pretensions which the American Government are putting forward. The position of the United States in this question is not the position of Russia in 1825. Russia owned the Asiatic as well as the North American coast. She owned the Aleutian or Fox Islands to the south just as the Americans do at the present time. If that had been a very much smaller body of water than it is, the rule that was laid down in the seizure of the *Washington* in a portion of the Bay of Fundy shows that, when Russia became possessed of one coast and the United States of another, there was no possibility of treating Behring's Sea as a closed sea, even if there had been an opportunity of claiming it as such before the cession of Alaska. It seems to me that there is no ground whatever for this pretension. There is no analogy between this case and that of the Hudson's Bay which was referred to by my hon. friend from Oxford. That is a *mare clausum*, lying within the jaws of the land, and in the case in regard to the Bay of Fundy, Trinity Bay and other bays, they are bays lying within the land, they are not used by any vessel navigating the high seas, which may come close to the shore, and may for this reason have an easement on the waters, even under the control of another foreign state. But this is a part of the high sea itself. It is not enclosed. There is Behring's Strait to the north, there are hundreds of miles of water lying between one island and the other, and between the mainlands. Here is a sea from 3,000 to 4,000 miles in width, and it seems preposterous to treat that as a closed sea. I am not finding fault with this Administration, but they have not yet disclosed how far they have exercised due diligence, since April, 1888, and I am sure it would have been satisfactory to the House to have learned how far they have exercised due diligence. It is clear, however, that the condition of things which existed before the American pretensions were set up must be the condition of things which should continue, and must be insisted upon, not so much by this Government, perhaps, as by the English Government, until the Canadian claim is recognised or the question is otherwise settled. It appears, however, as if the English Government had not exercised that diligence which we are entitled to expect at their hands. It is their duty to protect our rights, and to resist—by force if necessary—American encroachment until this question is disposed of and a different condition of things established successfully from that which existed before. That has not been done. Until the American Government do that, they must be content to allow the original condition of things to continue. They may enter their protest. They may say: You have no right to fish here or to do any sealing here; but, until they establish that, and until it is recognised as the proper rule, the former practice must continue. Anyone who will trace up the growth of this feature of international law will see that formerly the sealing and fishing were appurtenant to some shore. That was recognised in 1713, under the Treaty of Utrecht, when the French were excluded from fishing within thirty leagues of the Nova Scotia shore. In 1783, the Americans resisted that arrangement, and it was abandoned; their right was recognised to fish on the banks, and their liberty, though not their right, to fish in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, which was a *mare clausum*. Now, it is said that the sealing is appurtenant to the shore, and that you have no right to fish out on the high seas. That contention was abandoned in 1783, and I say it is the duty of the Government to press this matter vigorously on the attention of the English Government and to insist on the freedom of those seas until a different rule is established.

DUTY ON MINING MACHINERY.

Mr. BARNARD. I desire to make a statement with the object of showing to the House and to the Government the importance of placing mining machinery on the free list for a few years, with the hope of inducing the Government to accede to the requests which have been made to them by the representatives of the Province of British Columbia and the Legislature of that Province, and in the petitions received by them from the Boards of Trade at Vancouver and at Victoria. It is a matter of very great importance to that Province, which is, to a very great extent, a mineral Province, and I think it is a matter of very great importance to the whole of this Dominion that the mining industry should be encouraged, and that every step should be taken both by the Dominion Government and by the Provincial Governments to encourage the development of our mineral wealth. I am a firm believer in the National Policy, and I believe that the object and aim of that policy is to encourage the development of our national resources as well as to foster our different industries. I believe there in no Province in the Dominion that will benefit more by the National Policy than the Province of British Columbia. I believe that Province is destined to become one of the greatest manufacturing Provinces in the Dominion, and possibly one of the

greatest manufacturing centres on the continent of America. Although, up to this time, we have not benefited to any great extent, directly from that policy, we have benefited indirectly, because we attribute the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the revenues which were derived by the Government through the inauguration of such a policy. I think the present rate of duty on mining machinery, which is about 30 per cent. all round, is preventing the development of the mining resources of British Columbia. There is no doubt, that we have a variety of ores there. We have gold, silver, copper, lead and iron, and other ores. There is no doubt that the mineral belt—the development of which has resulted in building up the State of Colorado and the Territory of Montana, and which is now making Washington Territory and Idaho—does not stop at the boundary line, but goes north; and it is a misfortune that the only portions of the mineral belt which are being developed, are those in Alaska and south of the boundary line. We find gold and silver quartz mines north of the Alaska boundary and south of the boundary within the borders of the United States; and we have every reason to believe, from the indications which are to be seen everywhere in the Province of British Columbia, that the mineral belt in that Province is of greater area than in any of these States which have been built up by their mineral wealth. The only objection that I can find is felt by the Government to placing mining machinery on the free list is that there are a few small factories in eastern Canada—one or two in Ontario, and a few in Nova Scotia—that are manufacturing mining machinery on a small scale. I contend that it is in the interest of these factories and of the manufacturers themselves, for a few years, to have the machinery which is required for the development of our mines placed on the free list. The miner has great difficulties to contend with. In the first place, a mining country is always, to some extent, an inaccessible country. The miner has probably to secure his provisions at a high rate, he has to go some distance away from communication, and has to spend probably one or two summers before he discovers a mining location. He finds that after he has spent some little time it is necessary to procure machinery, and then he sees that he is hampered by the enormous duty he has to pay. British Columbia differs in many respects from Nova Scotia in the character of her ores. At present I believe these manufacturers are making some mills for the gold quartz mines in Nova Scotia. In that Province their ore is free milling and, from what I can learn, machinery has been manufactured solely for the reduction of free gold ore. In British Columbia we have very little free gold ore; in fact we have found, so far as our mines have been developed, that free gold does not extend to any great depth, but it turns into sulphites, or the gold is contained in other metals, and requires a different treatment from the treatment of the ore in Nova Scotia. We have in British Columbia several varieties. Where free gold is found with sulphites it is necessary that it should first be reduced, either by stamps or rolls, and then other machinery is necessary, which is not manufactured in Canada, for concentrating the baser metals and for the roasting of that metal after concentration, and the treatment of the mineral after it has been roasted. Then we have, in addition to that, chloride sulphur ore. This also requires a different class of machinery from that manufactured in this country. Then we have silver part chlorid or decomposed, and part sulphurets containing gold. These require roasting. Then there are galena ores and silver ores, with baser metals which requires smelting. Now, for concentration of any kind or for smelting, there is no machinery manufactured in Canada, as far as I can ascertain, and I have been in correspondence with many of these manufacturers who claim to manufacture mining machinery. The greater part of our ores in the Selkirk range that are at present being developed, and have been rendered accessible by the Canadian Pacific Railway, are ores carrying silver. These ores require both plain and coarse concentration. After concentration they are shipped to the smelting works. There is no machinery manufactured in Canada which can be used for smelting works. A short time ago an English company was formed for the purpose of establishing smelting works on a small scale in Vancouver. This company procured from Fraser & Chalmers, of Chicago, all their machinery, their boilers, their engines, their water jacket furnaces, and a variety of other articles. I have the invoice here, but it would take up too much time to read it. The most expensive article used by them in these works is the water jacket lead pipes. These cost $2,000 apiece, and have never been manufactured in Canada. The only bit of machinery I see here that is manufactured in Canada, is the Blake crusher. They obtained that at the same time from Fraser & Chalmers, in Chicago, which firm manufacture quartz mining machinery more largely than any other firm in America, and smelting machinery of all descriptions. A Blake crusher was required in connection with their mill. But there are other crushers manufactured besides the Blake crusher, I refer to the Comet rock crusher for concentration. The Blake crusher is usually used in stamp mills. Then there is the Dodge rock crusher and the Foster rock crusher for blasting furnaces, which are not manufactured in Canada. Now, as I have said before, the only class of machinery manufactured here is that required for free gold milling. We have no free gold ore yet discovered in British Columbia. It may exist, but our experience is that after a little depth the ore is found in other minerals, and other processes are required. I trust that the Government will see their way to placing for a few years reducing, mining and smelting machinery on the free list. At present we have these companies manufacturing mining machinery in Canada: The J. G. Brown Manufacturing Company of Belleville, the F. G Beckett Company of Hamilton, the Truro Manufacturing Company, and the Engersoll Rock Drill Company of Montreal; and if it could be shown to these companies that it is to their interest that this machinery should be put on the free list for a few years in order to develop the mineral wealth of British Columbia, I think they would not object. As soon as we have that wealth developed a demand is created for more machinery, and when a demand is created these companies will reap the benefit. It will then be to the interest of the country that the duty should be put upon these articles of machinery in order to foster their manufacture, for I am satisfied that factories for this purpose will spring up in British Columbia. I trust that the Government will consider this matter and before long assist the development of our Province in this respect.

DUTY ON SAW LOGS.

Mr. BARRON. I feel that I must take this opportunity of expressing my opinion upon a subject which has already been mentioned in this House, and which I shall embrace in a motion before I sit down. I represent a riding that is deeply interested in the increased duty on saw logs exported from Canada. I have been twitted, inside this House and out of it, with speaking from the standpoint of my own constituency. I think it is well for new members to speak from the standpoint of their own constituency, and I believe if each member of this House were to do so the combined opinion would have more effect than the remarks made sometimes purporting to express the opinions held throughout the country. It would be, perhaps, unwise in me to speak at length upon this subject, seeing that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) spoke, a few days ago, in regard to the increased duty on exported logs. I am well aware of the fact that his remarks must minimise anything I may say to-day. They must, in fact, drive into

insignificance anything I may say, and being conscious of that fact I do not propose to deal at length with the subject. But I may say that this matter is deeply interesting to, and is agitating, to a very great extent, the people of the northern parts of the Province of Ontario. Let me draw the attention of the House, and especially of the Minister of Customs, to the way in which it affects some lumber manufacturers, especially in the riding I have the honor to represent. In past years purchasers of shingles, and the different kinds of manufactured lumber, have been in the habit of coming into our yards and buying the stuff from the manufacturers free on board on the cars in these particular yards, but lately it has been found that purchasers of lumber from the United States, when they come to Canada to buy, at all events from the smaller dealers, have said that they cannot buy lumber delivered in the yards in Canada, but they must ask the manufacturers of this country to deliver the lumber, especially shingles and other manufactured stuff, in the yards on the other side of the line. When asked why this change in the mode of doing business has arisen, answer is made by the American buyers that, inasmuch as this Government have seen fit to increase the duty on exported logs, they are timid and frightened and not aware as to what course the American Government may take respecting the duty on manufactured lumber going into the United States, and they tell the manufacturers in this country—at all events I am so informed by manufacturers in my riding—that they do not want to run the risk of this duty being increased by the American Government. The Canadian manufacturers say: Well, if you do not like the risk, we also do not like the risk. The result is that trade is more or less paralysed. I understand the reason which has been advanced for putting on this increased duty is that it may encourage the manufacture of logs into lumber in this country, and that it is in order to increase the labor employed, and thus to augment the circulation of money here. I do not propose to give the details upon which this statement is built, but if any member of the Government, or any member of the House, desires this information, I will hand it to him. I desire to show the Minister of Customs that Canada gained annually by the importation of logs from the United States to manufacture in this country. The particulars are as follows :—

	Men.	Earnings.
Canada gained annually	1,068	$222,000 00
Lost	22	4,500 00
Canada's annual net gain	1,046	217,500 00
Or for nine years gained	9,612	2,000,000 00
And lost	198	40,500 00
Canada has had the best of it	9,414	1,959,500 00

That is the labor aspect, and those figures cannot be contradicted, and I am willing to hand the details over to any member of this House to check over and ascertain if they are not correct. I say that the trade is being paralysed, especially that done by the smaller manufacturers of lumber. It may not be the case to the same extent with the large manufacturers of lumber, such as those at Ottawa. It is another reason for the uncertainty as to what the American Government will do, in view of the aggressive policy of this Government, especially in reference to the increased duty on logs, and the position is such as to more or less paralyse the trade of the smaller manufacturers throughout the northern portion of the midland district of Ontario. In order to show that there is some idea of retaliating, let me read a portion of a letter written by no less an authority than Mr. Hotchkiss, United States Consul at Ottawa, to the Hon. G. L. Rives, Assistant Secretary of State, Washington, under date January 19th, 1889. I shall not take up the time of the House by reading the whole of it, but I shall read portions of it which I think will startle hon gentlemen supporting the Government in imposing increased duties from time to time. Mr. Hotchkiss says:

"The dissatisfaction which this increased import has caused in the ranks of the northern lumber fraternity of the United States is of so serious a nature, and the provocation to retaliatory action is so well defined, I have been led to address an unofficial communication to the Hon. Mr Bowell, Minister of Customs, in the hope, though latent, that I might possibly be instrumental in inducing a reconsideration of the measure"

Further on Mr. Hotchkiss says:

"The American limit holders of pine in Canada have an immense amount pecuniarily at stake in this question of export duty, and on the mere rumor of an intentional large increase of cut of logs the present winter, the imposition of this increase of 33 per cent. was declared. They have bought their holdings in good faith, and the pine logs produced therefrom is the only article produced in Canada which is subjected to an export duty."

We have the statement of the Minister of Finance the other day, in response to the statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that the Government have power, under the statute, at any time, by Order in Council, to reduce this duty; and I have no doubt that every hon. gentleman opposite will, on this motion which I shall soon submit to the House, vote nay against the proposition to reduce this export duty. But I have no doubt also in my mind, and sometimes I may prophesy correctly, that it will not be very long after the Session is over before the Government will reduce this increased duty. I only hope that such will be the case, and, I believe, such will be the case, but we will have the astonishing circumstance that to-night hon. gentlemen will rise behind the Finance Minister and vote against the amendment.

Mr. HESSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARRON. No one doubts that the hon. gentleman would vote anyway the Government wished him to vote. I remind the House that there has been a united desire on the part of lumbermen in this country that the increased duty shall be removed, and that we shall go back to where we were before. The Lumbermen's Association of Ontario passed a resolution in favor of the reduction of this export duty. A deputation of lumbermen from Quebec, Toronto, the Ottawa Valley and other places waited upon the Government asking to have this export duty reduced, and I believe memorials have been presented to the Government from the Board of Trade of Quebec, and the Board of Trade of Toronto. But the Finance Minister, notwithstanding all these demands, said he was induced to do what he did by a deputation that waited upon him a short time ago in regard to this matter. I am sorry to say that perhaps the Minister of Customs and some other members of the Government are too often influenced by deputations. We see almost every day deputation after deputation for increased duties—to do what? It is not for the benefit of the general consumer, but for the benefit of individuals, and in order to increase the ill-gotten gains of some men in this country. I say, Sir, that the Government is too much influenced by deputations which come before them. In this case there have been deputations of the most influential nature, asking to have the export duty on these logs brought back to what it was before, and although I feel that this motion will not carry, I believe it will not be very long after this House closes before the Government of the day will do in effect what we are now asking them to do, and which I ask them to do by the following amendment. I move

That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that all the words after "That" in the main motion be left out and it be resolved: "this House regrets that the Government should have increased the duty upon saw logs exported from Canada."

Mr. CHARLTON. I took occasion, Sir, on Tuesday night last, to make a statement to the House in regard to this question of the export duty on logs. I made that statement at the request and by the authority of the Lumbermen's Association of Ontario. I set forth in that statement the reasons which, in the opinion of the great majority of the lumbermen of this Province, should induce the

Government to remove the export duty upon logs, and I stated distinctly that I refrained from making any motion with reference to the matter because the lumber trade of this country did not wish to embarrass the Government in the action they desired them to take on this question. I consider, Sir, that the motion which has just been put into your hands is ill-advised in the extreme. It is a motion that has been made without consulting the interests of those whose interests are affected by it, and I stand up to protest against the interference by any person in this House with a great interest in this country which has chosen for itself a line of action, and has the right to have its wishes as to what line of action it shall pursue respected in this House. It is very true that pressing invitations have been made to the Government, and it is very true that the answer of the Government has not been made yet, but it is also true that no unfavorable answer has been received by the trade from the Government, and I think we have good ground for hoping that the Government either intend to abolish that duty, or to modify it in some respect. I, therefore, deprecate the introduction of this resolution. I say it is ill-advised, and it is contrary to the desires and interests of those who are interested in the matter. Without entering into a discussion of the question, I may say that the Government is placed in just as bad a position, on account of the statements which I have made in this House, if they do not remove this duty, as they will be placed in by voting upon this resolution. The Government cannot allow this resolution to pass, and its result will only be to embarrass the Government in dealing with this question. For that reason I hope my hon. friend will withdraw his motion, and I can assure him, and the parties in favor of the removal of the log export duty, that if it is not withdrawn there is a strong business industry in this country which will consider this a reckless trifling with their interests.

Mr. O'BRIEN. There is no member in this House who has a deeper interest in the question of export duty on logs than I have or than those whom I represent have, because a very large proportion of the industries of the great district of country extending for more than a hundred miles across the coast of the Georgian Bay and 40 miles to the east, is directly interested in the lumber trade. It is all very well for the owners of timber limits to deal with this question, but the people of the country have something to say in the matter. There is a larger and greater interest in the general public of Canada than is represented by the lumber interest, great and important as that interest is. This is a question which has to be decided in the interest of the people of this country generally and not in the interest of the few who own valuable timber limits and who have made large profits out of them. At every sale of timber limits which has been made by the Ontario Government during recent years (and I speak under correction if I am wrong) American lumbermen or their agents in Michigan and elsewhere have been making the largest purchases and offering the highest prices, and we know that there is no better investment to-day than the pine tree; I do not care whether it is in Michigan or in Ontario. We can quite understand that the owners of timber lands in Michigan, are most desirous to get a supply for their mills at a distance, without cutting their timber limits nearer home. If they can come to Ontario; if they can cross Lake Huron and cut into the limits on the east side of Georgian Bay, and obtain a supply for their mills for some years to come, they are making the best financial operations that they possibly can. But what would be the result of that to the people of this country? I may state to the House, that a few years ago, a Michigan firm made the most elaborate preparations for taking Canadian logs across Lake Huron. They built barges, or they were preparing to do so, and they had the plant prepared for loading the barges with sawlogs and for unloading them. They had the control of certain limits in Canada and had not the Government stepped in and imposed an export duty upon logs, millions and millions of feet of timber would have been carried across the Georgian Bay and across Lake Huron and manufactured in Michigan and our own people would have lost the whole profit from the industry in connection with the manufacture of that lumber in Canada. I say that this is a question which the people of the country are interested, and the Government of this country are bound to consider the industrial interests of the people of this country who obtain their livelihood by the manufacture of lumber, as well as the interests of the lumber kings and those who are owners of limits. When this question was being discussed some time ago I happened to meet a large lumber manufacturer who also deals in square timber. We were talking then about commercial union and reciprocity in lumber. I said to him: I do not think it would be a good thing if the Americans had free access to our forests for it will be a great loss to the people of the country that the manufacturer of the lumber should be transferred from the Province of Ontario to the State of Michigan. His reply to me was: What is the difference? We get the money for the timber all the same. I said that is all very well for you, you are an individual, you are a wealthy man, you can take your two or three hundred thousand dollars cash from the sale of your limits and go to London and Paris or elsewhere to spend it, but how would it affect the people of the county which I represent and who hitherto have made their living out of the industry of manufacturing the lumber in Canada? Of course he did not answer that. His view was a perfectly selfish one and the Government are bound to consider that there is a selfish interest on the part of the lumbermen in this matter and that the Government is bound to protect the people of this country. I trust that when the Government is dealing with this question they will deal with it not simply from the view of the lumber manufacturers, but they will deal with it from the view of those who are deeply interested in the question and who depend for their livelihood on the manufacturer of lumber in this country. When that duty was first put on, this elaborate scheme for the transport of logs across Lake Huron was abandoned. It would not pay. Another firm thought they would try rafting, but when the duty was increased, they made up their minds that the risk was too great, and the logs were all sawn at Midland. They took a mill there, and our laborers and mechanics, and the makers of our machinery, all got the benefit. That is a practical development of the National Policy. But what could they have done if the export duty had not been in force, and if all those logs had been transferred to the United States to be sawn into lumber there? That is the view I take of this matter, and I decidedly protest, in the name of those who are interested in the manufacture of lumber, against the proposition which has been made. There is another question, although perhaps it may not be one with which this Government has any practical right to deal. The people of this country have an interest in preserving the timber of this country. I venture to predict that in 20 years from this time, a pine board will be almost as dear in the Province of Ontario as black walnut was a few years ago. In the districts of Muskoka and Parry Sound, which are the principal sources of supply in ordinary lumber for the Province of Ontario, the process of destruction of the forests is to-day so rapidly going on, that it is estimated that in twenty years there will not be a single sawlog to be got. At this moment the best mill owners are taking out of the woods, in the most flagrant defiance of the interests of the settlers, logs which a few years ago, a man would have been ashamed to see in his pond. They are taking out everything with a green top which two men can carry

on their shoulders. That is the way the destruction of the forests is going on in Ontario. We are told that we have magnificent resources of timber farther north, towards James' Bay. We may have, or we may not, but from what I have seen of the timber of that district, I do not think we shall get very much out of it, and I think the Dominion Government is well out of that territory. But the lumbermen in Ontario are every year going farther back; and the Government of this Dominion would be false to their trust if they did not consider how valuable every pine tree is becoming to this country. For my part, I do not wish to see the lumber trade stimulated, or the lumber going out of this country any faster than it is going, because I know that in a generation hence people will ask, how is it that the people of Ontario were such absolute fools as to sell all their timber resources? We might as well sell all the top soil off our fields; and in the course of a few years, unless some substitute is found, the people of this Dominion will deeply regret that the Government has not taken some steps to prevent the wanton destruction now going on. In the name of the lumber interest of this country, and more particularly in the name of those engaged in the manufacture of lumber, I protest against any steps being taken which will have the effect of transferring the manufacture of lumber to the other side. Our policy has been to allow the free importation of all raw materials; and to allow the export of sawlogs to the other side would be not only a contravention of the National Policy, but also a contravention of every principle of common sense and sound economical science.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it is to be regretted that the Government increased the duty on pine timber; I do not think it was in the public interest; and, besides, it has always been a grave question whether Parliament really has the right to impose an export duty at all or not. I do not propose to raise that question; but I wish to call the attention of the House for a moment to what seems to me to be an extraordinary doctrine laid down by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). If I understand him rightly, he says there are certain classes of questions of public policy with which this House ought not to interfere, but which are matters of private arrangement between certain interested parties, or certain delegates or representatives of those parties, who appeal to the Government in some other capacity than that of representatives of the people. Well, Sir, I do not admit that for a moment. I think the members of this House fairly represent every possible class of the community. As a representative of a constituency, I do not appear here as a delegate of any particular class of the community, nor have I any right to promote the interest of that class as distinct from any other portion of the people who are assumed to be represented in this House. It seems to me, Sir, that it is our duty here to adopt whatever policy may be in the interest of the public at large, and not in the interest of any one particular class. At the same time, Sir, in my opinion the best interests of the lumbermen of this country would be promoted by the adoption of the principle enunciated in the resolution submitted by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron). Certainly it is not in the public interest that we should invite retaliation, and it was not necessary in the interest of any section of the lumbermen of this country that this additional duty should be imposed. So far as I understand the views expressed by the hon. member for North Norfolk, he does not object to a reduction of the duty. The very things which we are proposing by the resolution is that which the lumbermen themselves have asked for, namely, that those duties which the Government have recently imposed should be taken off; and can it be for one moment supposed that the Government are going to refuse to the House a reasonable proposition which they were ready to concede to the lumbermen? Has it come to this: that the representatives of the people in the House of Commons have less influence, or are entitled to less consideration at the hands of the Government, than the delegates or the representatives of the lumbermen of this country, however influential a body they may be? It is, a sound maxim in mathematics that the whole is greater than any of its parts, and that the whole is equal to the sum of all its parts; and I assume that the House of Commons speaks, not for a part of the people of this country, but for the whole people, and that it includes the lumbermen as well as others; and if it can be for a moment supposed that the lumbermen of this country have no confidence in Parliament, that they are not willing that any portion of Parliament shall be the exponent of their views, the sooner we reform Parliament the better. If there is any wrong done to the lumbermen in that particular, it is time that wrong should be redressed, and that that important section of the community should have an opportunity to give adequate expression to their views in this House, as well as every other section of the community. I do not understand that the lumbermen of Canada have withdrawn their confidence from Parliament. I will not offend hon. gentlemen who are lumbermen by saying that they represent the lumber interest, but I say that they, like the rest of us, represent every interest, and I hope they specially understand the lumber interest, and I do not for a moment suppose that they feel they cannot trust Parliament as the exponent of their views.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was saying before recess, that the position taken by the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is a position not only at variance with the principle of Parliamentary Government, and the representative character of this House, but it is also noticeable, that the resolution itself, expresses sentiments exactly in accord with those expressed by the hon. gentleman a few evenings ago, in putting the question to the hon. Minister. The hon. gentleman said, when he interrogated the Government, that these facts, referring to the increased quantity of lumber produced in the Southern States:

"These facts place their interests on a much more favorable basis than they would have stood upon under Mr. Cleveland's Cabinet; and it is morally certain, that the continuance of the present export duty, or the continuance of any export duty, will have a most powerful bearing on this question. When Congress comes to revise its tariff at its next meeting, the existence of that duty will powerfully influence Congress in refusing a reduction of the duty, and possibly increasing it."

Then further the hon. gentleman said:

"It is absurd to imagine that, if the Americans enact in their next Tariff Bill that they will retaliate by imposing a duty on lumber from Canada equal to the export duty which we place on logs, this Government would be so blind as to subject the country to such inconveniences and such loss rather than abrogate the export duty on logs."

This is a contention precisely in the line indicated by the present resolution. We say that we think the step taken by the Government in increasing this duty was in every way a mistake. Even admitting the contention of the Government, that it was desirable that this lumber should all be cut in the Dominion of Canada instead of any portion being exported and cut in the United States, nevertheless, as it was in the power of the American Government to impose an increased duty on lumber and thus seriously affect the manufactured product of this country when sent to the American market, it was a serious mistake on grounds of public policy, even though it were wise policy to adopt as a mere fiscal regulation. Further on the hon. gentleman continued:

"I do not know that I have said anything to my hon. friend the Finance Minister which is new in that case. It is a little over two

months since one of the most influential and wealthy deputations that ever waited on the Government waited upon them in the Privy Council Chamber, and the members of that deputation feel that they are entitled to an answer, that the importance of the question warrants them in expecting an answer as to the view the Government take of their representations and their petition."

These were the views expressed by the hon. gentleman, when interrogating the Government the other evening, and they are in accord with the public policy laid down in this resolution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You are quoting a former debate.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No; it is a discussion on the same subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But a former debate all the same.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that it was a mere interrogation of the Government as to their lines of public policy, and the Finance Minister said in reply to the hon. member for North Norfolk on that occasion very much what the hon. member for North Norfolk has said to my hon. friend the mover of this resolution. The hon. the Finance Minister indicated to him that he had made rather a foolish speech, that it was against the public interest and not calculated to further the object he had in view. The hon. the Finance Minister said:

"The chief argument of these gentlemen has been the argument which my hon. friend has used to-night, that is, the probable danger or fear that the pursuance of this course of policy will have the effect, in the country south of us of inducing them to enact legislation which will make it more difficult for the lumber of this country to find access to the markets of the United States. I think my hon. friend, in presenting the case, has probably strengthened the hands of those parties in the United States who have a direct interest in not allowing Canadian lumber ingress into that market."

This is the charge made by the hon. the Minister of Finance against the hon. member for North Norfolk, namely, that he strengthened the hands of those who are seeking to exclude Canadian lumber from the American market. He then further says:

"This has been pointed out by my hon. friend in strong and vigorous language, and he has pointed out the strong interest the produced of lumber in the United States have in this competition and the success they have had in the competition so far."

I need not further refer to this preliminary discussion of this subject which took place here the other evening. That discussion shows that the hon. member for North Norfolk was anxious in the interest of lumbermen to ascertain the views of the Government on this question, and the Government declined to give any intimation of what they would do. The hon. the Minister of Finance said:

"I have no doubt the Government will act as they consider best, in view of all circumstances, for the general interests of the Dominion, not excluding the lumber interest."

That was the answer the hon. gentleman got. Now, as a representative of the people and not merely the lumbermen, my hon. friend proposes this resolution, which affirms the views entertained by hon. gentlemen on this side. It is not a question of convenience. It looks very much as if the Government were anxiously waiting to see what the Americans will do; and if Congress were disposed to increase this duty on lumber by way of retaliation, our Government are prepared to take the duty off logs, but if they do not see any intention on the part of Congress of so doing, then they will be prepared to keep the duty on. Although that seems to be the view of the Government, so far as they are disclosed by the discussion, I think it is not, at all events, the view of hon. gentlemen on this side. I have said, and I agree in this respect with the statement of the hon. member for Muskoka, that besides the lumber interests there are other interests affected. Supposing the hon. gentleman could impose so high a duty as altogether to exclude American competition in the purchase of timber limits in this country. I suppose he might think that would be a proper measure in the public interest, but I do not think any Government in this Dominion, except perhaps it might be the Government of Manitoba, would take that view. I think that, so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, it would seriously affect its public revenues, it would seriously affect the value of the timber and the timber limits, it might have the effect of transferring a large portion of the pecuniary interests of the public in the actual value of these timber limits in an open market to those parties on this side of the boundary who might make these purchases. While it is very well for us to do everything we can to promote and protect the interest of our population, it is no part of the public duty, it is no part of the duty of the Government, or of the representatives of the people, to do so by transferring the actual property of the community at large to any one section or portion of the community at a value less than that which it would bring in the open market, and with fair competition. However that may be, there can be no doubt that this resolution simply invites the Government to say what they will do. The Prime Minister shakes his head, but I think that is a fair inference from the resolution. We affirm a proposition which is in exact accord with the views the representatives of the lumbermen have, within the past two or three months, expressed by their deputation to the Government. We have asked for the removal of those duties which the Government have recently imposed upon the exportation of logs. The hon. gentleman has not said whether the Government are prepared to do that or not. Every economic consideration which can present itself to any member of this House must have presented itself to the members of the Government, whose duty it was to consider this proposition. There can be nothing known three months hence or two months hence which is not known now. There is no conclusion which can be reached by the Government two months hence which may not be drawn by them now, and which they are not able to reach at the present time. They are as capable of drawing the proper inferences to-night as they will be after Parliament has risen and there is this difficulty that we are in a position to express our views on the question to-night, and we may not be able to do so two months hence. We have waited patiently up to the last moments of the Session to allow the Government to comply with the wishes of the lumbermen without any interference on our part, and now we take the opportunity of saying to the Government: we concur with the opinions the lumbermen have expressed, and we believe that this is not only in the interest of the lumbermen, but in the interests of the public at large, that it will be advantageous to the whole community, will facilitate the trade relations between Canada and the great republic to the south of us which the hon. gentleman has had for so many years so much at heart.

Mr. DAWSON. I think there must be some mistake about the importation of logs from the United States. I know that, in regard to one place which has been referred to and which was referred to in a published report which was very widely circulated, it was represented that a large quantity of logs came down the Rainy River to Rat Portage and that a large quantity also came down the Red River to Winnipeg. The greatest quantity that ever came down the Rainy River in one year from the United States side was 10,000,000 feet board measure, and that is certainly not a very large quantity. Some years ago a large quantity of lumber used to come down the Red River from the State of Minnesota, but of late years the quantity has very greatly diminished. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who spoke just now, spoke of the interests of the community

and the interests of the lumbermen. The interest of the lumbermen and the interest of the community are identical. When I speak of lumbermen, I do not speak of those merchant princes who buy limits and export logs, but of the large number of men who work in the woods, and I think, if we can get them employment at home in our own country by manufacturing the logs into boards here, it is much to be desired. In Algoma, the district which I represent, there has been up to this time a duty of $2 a thousand on logs, and now it is increased to $3 a thousand. What has been the effect of this? It has had the effect of bringing lumbermen from the United States, from Michigan, where the lumber is exhausted and where there is abundance of capital, and a number of those men have come across and are now engaged in the lumber trade in Algoma. The consequence is that new mills have been put up, that there is ample employment, and that the settlement of the country extends, because there is nothing calculated to promote the settlement of a forest-covered country like the lumber interest. On the north coast of Lake Huron, there are mills at Thessalon, at Mississagua, and at Spanish River, and at Little Current we have two large mills now in operation. The effect of this on the country is all that can be desired. Settlement is pouring in everywhere, and is now extending 40 miles back from Lake Huron along the coast. I do not know of any considerable importation of logs from the United States side unless it is in New Brunswick. Of course, from the rivers which rise in the State of Maine and flow down to the St. John, there is a considerable importation, but west of this there is no place where there can possibly be any considerable importation of logs. The logs are pretty much exhausted on the American side of the line, and in any case we do not require them on this side, because they are much cheaper in our own country. In keeping up this export duty on logs, speaking of the districts with which I am acquainted along the waters of Algoma, along the coasts of Lake Huron and Lake Superior, and in that direction, I believe the action of the Government has led to the manufacture of lumber on our own side of the line, to the putting up of mills and to a good effect on the country at large.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I listened to the remarks made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) on this subject, and I think they would have been more apposite if he had read the resolution. He says this is simply affirming the opinion which had been announced before by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that the duty should be reduced. It is not so. That is not the motion. The motion is a censure on the Government for having increased the duty. If the resolution had been simply expressive of the opinion of this House that the duty ought to be reduced, the hon. gentleman's statement would have been more accurate, but the fact of the matter is this duty, instead of being opposed to the wishes of the lumbermen and of those who had saw mills and were engaged in the manufacture of lumber, was imposed in accordance with their wishes. At first the duty was $1 a thousand, and then, at the special instance of the whole lumber interest, it was increased by the Government to $2 a thousand, and at the time that duty was put on, the lumbermen were exceedingly dissatisfied because it was not larger. They said that $2 would not be sufficient to prevent the export of logs, and they pressed the Government to increase it to $3, and some of them went so far as to ask an increase to $4 per thousand. The Government said: Well, it is part of our policy to encourage the manufacture of lumber in our own country, and we will increase it to $2, and if that won't do, we will increase it to $3. It was afterwards increased to $3, at the request of the lumbering interest; and it was not until some time afterwards, in consequence of the fear of threatened retaliation at Washington, that the lumbering interest changed their mind. I have myself received deputations, and they all said: We asked for the duty, we believed it was a just and proper duty to impose, but we are afraid, we are apprehensive of this retaliation, therefore, although we admit that the duty was imposed at our request, although we admit that it is a just duty, yet, from the apprehension of hostile action at Washington, we would prefer to take the duty off. That is exactly the position of the case. Now, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that this motion is made at an improper time, and in an improper way, and can possibly do no good. It is a censure passed upon the Government for imposing a duty at the request of one of the greatest interests in the country. Look at the petitions we are receiving now from the lumber interests; in not one of the petitions sent to the Government, and they are numerous, is it affirmed that the duty was not properly imposed; but they say: We are afraid that our interests may be affected by the continuation of the duty. Of course, no supporter of the Government can vote for that resolution, and I do not think that any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who knows the facts of the case, and the interest involved, can properly give a vote of that kind. But when the vote is passed, and when the House declares in effect that the duty ought to be kept up to $3, it puts an obstacle in the way of the Government in negotiating at Washington, on this as well as on other subjects. It is a great mistake, and I regret that this motion was not withdrawn according to the suggestion of the hon. member for North Norfolk. The hon. gentleman who moved this resolution said: I know perfectly well that the Government can take the duty off, I am sure they are going to take the duty off. If that be the case, what is the necessity of that motion? What is the necessity of bringing up this question at this inopportune time, just before there are good hopes of negotiating with the United States. When the hon. gentleman said that he was quite certain that the duty was going to be taken off, he showed that it was simply a factious party motion made by the hon. gentleman, more in the interests of what he thinks party than in the interests of the country. There cannot be any doubt of that. But my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says: "Oh, well, we know that it is in the power of the Government, if the United States threaten the Government to impose a duty, we will take the duty off." Is there not another way of putting it? So long as we have this duty on, we are certain to say to the proper authorities in the United States: We have a right to put that duty on because you have an import duty on our lumber. You cannot impose an export duty, your constitution won't allow it, but you have import duties upon our lumber.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So have we on theirs.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We can say, as a matter of negotiation: We have got this export duty, we have got that advantage, because there is no constitutional restriction on our side against the export duty. Of course, notwithstanding the opinion of the hon. member for Bothwell to the contrary, we have put this duty on, and we give you fair notice that if you take up this question in a liberal spirit as you promised to do in 1871 at the time of the Washington Treaty, if you will deal with our lumber interests in a liberal spirit, we will do the same. If you take off your duties from our lumber, we will take off our duties of import and export. We want to be in the position of saying so to the United States, and that is the policy that ought to be carried out. But this motion is simply an obstacle in the way of doing so, because, after a solemn instruction from the majority of this House that we were right in imposing this duty, it is an expression to a very considerable extent of the opinion of this House that

the duty ought to be continued. This motion therefore would harass the Government and put an obstacle in the way of the Government in dealing with this question. I quite agree with the hon. member for North Norfolk in that regard. It is too much to hope for after the speech of my hon. friend from Bothwell, but I had hoped that he would have persuaded the mover to withdraw this resolution.

Mr. PERLEY. After the remarks of the right hon. leader of the Government, I may be permitted to give some practical explanations regarding this lumber interest. My experience has been large in that business, and I can say with regard to this export duty on sawn logs, that the facts are as stated by the leader of the Government. Two years ago a deputation asked me to go with them to present their views to the Government on the matter. That deputation was composed of prominent lumbermen in this country, and I had the honor to accompany them in the interview with the Government. The ground taken there was that a much higher rate of duty should be placed upon logs for export, and the opinion ranged all the way from $2 to $4. After full deliberation it was agreed that if we placed the duty at $2 a thousand, the same as it was on sawn lumber, there would certainly be no cause for complaint. That ground was taken in view of negotiations on the trade relations between Canada and the United States, which were then expected to be taken into consideration. The opinion of the logmen was that $2 on logs was quite inferior to $3 on lumber; that the fact of the logs being sawn in the United States instead of Canada, would give them the advantage of having what we term the refuse, the slabs and the edgings and all those things, which they would get for nothing. It was justly argued that $3 per thousand, $1 more than was placed upon lumber, would only be a fair adjustment of the matter. That is, no doubt, a correct and a justifiable estimate of the advantage that lumbermen taking logs across to saw in the United States at $2 a thousand would gain over the sawmill men of this country. That has always appeared to me to be an unjust advantage and a detriment to the interests of this country, not only to the lumbermen, but to the general trade interests and to the employment of labor here. I have taken some pains to get at the facts with regard to the value of the waste, and I find that it is worth, at least, 60 cents per thousand as we work it up. The labor is a very important item in the working up of the waste, and I consider quite equal to as much more; consequently the advantage we would get from working it up would be equal to $1 a thousand, at least. I am satisfied that that statement is correct. Upon the basis of $2 per thousand on sawlogs I take it that people taking those logs across the line to saw on the other side have had an advantage which they thus appreciate over sawing lumber in Canada, and the purchases of limits and the getting out of logs for that special purpose appears to have enormously increased, as was reported to the Government last fall. In the interest of this country the Government considered the propriety of raising the duty to $3, which two years ago they took the power to do. As a matter of fact I am willing to submit to any saw-mill man who has had experience, whether this does any more than equalise the advantages which these people have as compared with the mill men here. I am well aware that deputations of lumbermen gathered to ask the Government to take off the extra duty, and not only to do that but take the duty off altogether. Some of my partners joined in that request. Consequently my position may be considered somewhat embarrassing, but I do not consider it so. I hold that in giving my vote in this House I must lay aside personal and private interests if I have any which may conflict with my public duties here, and deal with questions submitted upon the broad ground of public interest. Upon that ground I suggested it would be a proper thing for the Government to increase the export to $3. I did it from my honest conviction of the fairness of the thing as between that and $2 per thousand on lumber to the United States, and I think I am able to show any practical man in the business that such is the case. The next step was the movement to have not only that dollar, but the whole export duty taken off. I have heard a great deal said about that question. After having heard the statements and explanations of the lumbermen, I must, however, say that I have never heard any but one argument in favor of the removal of such duty, and that argument is the fear of inspiring retaliation by the United States Government and imposition of an increased duty upon lumber. I may be dull in my comprehension and consideration of such matters, but I have no fear of anything of the kind. I have a higher opinion of the Government and the people of my native country than to consider that they will resolve upon retaliatory measures as against Canada. I have never heard in all my travels among, and intercourse with, the people of the United States any expression to that effect. As regards the duty upon lumber, I find by the statistics that less than 30 per cent. of the whole product of the lumber of the country goes out subject to duty and that goes to the United States. The consumption of lumber in Montreal alone, as I stated to the House, amounted to 20 per cent. of all the products of the Ottawa section last year. I am told there has been an increase of 5 per cent. in that city since I gave that statement. I am perfectly satisfied there is a steady increase in the home consumption in this section of country of from 5 per cent. to 6 per cent. every year. I am further satisfied that the export of lumber to the United States subject to duty is diminishing every year; consequently there is no object for the United States to increase, but, on the other hand, to decrease their duties, and that the interests of that country will soon induce that Government to remove the duties on lumber. Whether they do so or not, or whether, as has been stated by the right hon. leader of the Government, they are prepared to enter into negotiations on that basis, I have no doubt the export duty on logs will be a factor in the case, and until that occurs I do not see any reason why the export duty should be taken off logs. Every one knows perfectly well, who is acquainted with the trade, that the business of taking logs across the line to have them sawn there is confined to a district in western Ontario. It does not interfere with our local interest, but it is well known that parties from the United States, who have been buying limits for that purpose with the existing duty of $2, appeared to be perfectly satisfied, and were making preparations to increase their business to large proportions. As to the $1 a thousand, it is a matter well understood by the lumber interest as only fair. Furthermore, I submit that in case the $1, or the whole export duty, be removed, instead of it being held as a matter of negotiation, the tendency would be to build up a power whose interests would lead them to oppose in every way, however formidable they might be, the removal of the United States duties on our lumber. For these reasons I do not see why this Government should give way in this matter, and why they should say to the United States that we will remove our duty now, and will trust to your removing yours at some time in the future. Upon these grounds I oppose the motion offered by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron). I can quite appreciate the efforts of the hon. member for North Norfolk and acknowledge his great ability and his long practice in the lumber trade, but with the statements that unless our export duties are removed, it may be used as a leverage against our exports of lumber to the United States, I do not agree at all. I am perfectly satisfied that the Government will deal with the question in such a way as shall be for the best interests of the country in connection with the great question of the trade between Canada and the United States.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The conclusion to be derived from the argument of my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Perley) would be that there should be almost a prohibitory duty on the export of lumber, and my hon. friend as I understand was one of the delegation who went to the Government for the purpose of having the increased duty taken off. Ontario does not do the entire lumber trade of Canada and the Province from which I come is largely interested in this trade and is rather peculiarly situated with regard to the export duty. The great river which runs through our Province takes its rise in the United States and some of its largest branches are in the American territory. A large number of logs come down that river and are shipped from the city of St. John to the United States. This is an important matter to us, because in reality about one-half of the lumber shipped from St. St. John to the States is American lumber and an export duty would seriously hamper our trade and put the lumber trade of New Brunswick almost entirely in the hands of the Americans. Up to a short time ago we did not feel the export duty to any large extent, because for a considerable while we had been supplying the American mills with cedar logs for "shingles" and also for "piling" which were shipped to the United States. There is another point in which the Province of New Brunswick stands in a peculiar position with regard to this matter. When the Ashburton Treaty was made by which the navigation of the River St. John was ceded, the lumber of the American territories was subjected to the same burdens and obtained the same rights and privileges as the lumber of New Brunswick. After that treaty came into force our Province put an export duty on all lumber shipped from the Province and that was in force at the time of Confederation. The right of imposing a duty was preserved to us by the British North America Act and the matter so remained until the Treaty of Washington when by that treaty the Imperial Government was requested to urge upon the Dominion Government and upon the Legislature of New Brunswick the abolition of the export duty. In consequence of that treaty and after negotiation between the Dominion Government and the Province, the Province of New Brunswick agreed upon certain considerations to renounce and give up that right of imposing an export duty. They did not, however, transfer that right nor did they assign it, but they abandoned it. It seems to me that under these circumstances we are placed in a very peculiar position in New Brunswick and that either we have the right which was extinguished and abandoned by the arrangement between the Dominion Government and the Provinces to impose the export duty or having given it up, it would be a breach of faith on the part of the Dominion to impose that duty. The duty so far as we are concerned is not very onerous as regards the amount, but it is onerous upon small lumbermen who make very little profit outside a livelihood, as well as upon some of our people who have obtained employment in this business. It might be contended that all logs coming down the St. John River would be liable to a duty, and if that was the case, we would be put to great disadvantage, because the Americans would claim they were not entitled to pay an export duty, and if they did not our lumbermen would be placed at very great disadvantage. It would be the smaller lumbermen, who engage in cutting the cedar for shingles and piling for the United States market, who would suffer most.

Mr. MITCHELL. There ought to be but one opinion on the course which the Government should pursue with regard to this export duty on legs. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) has very clearly explained what the law was at the time of Confederation when the Province had an export duty upon lumber cut in American territory, floated down to British territory on the St. John River, and then exported to the United States. For a consideration which was paid by the Confederation the Province of New Brunswick abandoned that right, but the British North America Act expressly reserved that the Province of New Brunswick had the power to put on that export duty. As my hon. friend says the Province of New Brunswick received a consideration to abandon that right, but it does not necessarily follow that that right was assumed by the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. BOWELL. Might I ask the hon. gentleman whether that arrangement applied, as intimated by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), to the export duty on logs cut in the American territories and floated down the River St. John to be exported at the city of St. John, or did it apply also to the New Brunswick forests?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It was paid on both.

Mr. MITCHELL. It did apply to the lumber cut on American territory and floated down to St. John. But outside of the legal question whether the Parliament of Canada has a right to impose an export duty on lumber going to the United States, which is the only market for unsawn lumber from the Province of New Brunswick, outside the Province, as a matter of policy we ought to set our faces against the imposition of an export duty on any of the natural products of our country. In the great country to the south of us, it is contrary to the constitution to impose an export duty on anything. It is against the interests of that country to do so, and it is against the interests of this country that it should be done here for the sake of a few lumbermen in particular localities. It is going, at all events, to injure the people of the Province from which I come. What will be the effect of it? From what I can learn from gentlemen who are intimate with those who control the legislation of the United States to-day, I believe that, in addition to the Tariff Bill, this question has been taken up and deliberated upon, and the men who control that character of legislation have decided that if this export duty is continued, they will add to the duty of $2 per 1,000 feet now paid on Canadian manufactured lumber, the $3 which we impose on the export of round logs, making $5 which we shall have to pay. The hon. gentleman who represents the city of Ottawa (Mr. Perley) and who is so largely engaged in the lumber trade, is presumed to know a great deal more than I do on this subject; but why, if that state of facts is correct, he can see it to be in the interest of the community he represents, and the interest of the business in which he is engaged, to have a duty of $5 on sawn lumber going into the United States I cannot imagine. It appears to me a most ridiculous kind of legislation, and I do hope this House will not run the risk of creating a feeling of antagonism in the United States which will result in great injury to our lumber trade. Sir, the lumber business of this country cannot stand it. It may be that the pine lumber of the Ottawa district and other western districts can stand it; but the business in cheap spruce, which is the character of the lumber got out in the Maritime Provinces, will not stand it at all. It will close up a market which is open to us now, and destroy a business upon which our people in some measure depend for getting the imports which they bring into the country.

Mr. TISDALE. I had no idea of saying anything on this question, and probably I should not have done so except for the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I am glad to say that in regard to a great deal of the legislation of this House, I pretty much agree with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell); but I regret very much to hear so independent a man as he generally is, voice the sentiments he has voiced to-night. The sort of arguments the hon. gentleman has just addressed to this House shows two things: first, a want of proper

appreciation of the independence of this Legislature and of the people of Canada, and, secondly, a want of knowledge of the character of the independent people of the United States. There are no people in the world for whom I have more respect for enterprise and for the protection of their liberty, than the people of the United States, and as a rule they are fair people when you stand up to them, and they are, therefore, the last people in the world who will respect any Legislature or any people who truckle to them, or who show no sense of their own independence and their own rights. I know a great deal of the independent people of the United States. While I am a Canadian, I have had a great deal of business intercourse with them, and I have travelled much among them; and on the face of this earth there are no people who appreciate more than they do the independence of any nation which, while it does justice to them, stands up for its own rights; and I say it is an abnegation of the rights of the independent Canadian people, to say that we must defer to them and shape our legislation to please them. As a Canadian I repudiate such a proposition; and any hon. gentleman who has travelled as much among them as I have, will find that they do not respect any independent nation which does not demand the right to control its own liberties and its own legislation. The mover of this resolution has made a great mistake; I regret it exceedingly, and I will tell you why, and I believe that any man who has a knowledge of the lumber business of this country, and of the United States will agree with me. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has a knowledge of both, and that hon. gentleman, if he has not spoken, will I venture to say agree with me that this is a most inopportune and regretful time to bring up this question and to tie the hands of the Government in regard to it. Whether rightly or wrongly, the Government have imposed this additional duty. I am not here to discuss that duty on its merits, or to discuss the question whether we should have an export duty, but I am here to discuss the broader question. We hope that there will be negotiations with the new Administration in the United States in regard to the fisheries, the lumber and other matters; and, therefore, it is a most inopportune time to bring this question up; and if the hon. mover of the resolution has any interest in the large lumber trade of this country, I hope he will withdraw it. Whatever party is in power, let them go untrammelled into the negotiations on this important question. But when the hon. gentleman stands up in this House and says that it is a necessity to this country that we should shape the legislation of this independent tribunal, which is only second to the English House of Commons in the world, in order to please the United States, or that we are to be afraid to legislate according to what we believe to be right, because the United States do not like it, he makes a great mistake; and, further, this trade, of which I profess to have some knowledge—I have now an important interest in the lumber trade.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. TISDALE. Why should I not? The man who says that the citizens of one country shall not have business in another country——

Mr. MITCHELL. Who says it?

Mr. TISDALE. The "hear, hear" was ironical. I am not afraid to proclaim that I have important business interests in the United States, and I know men there, friends of mine, who have great interests in the lumber trade of this country, and we know that the financial men of London have interests in all parts of the world. Why should not free and independent men of business, who wish to exercise their energies and their brains, strike out in other countries? I say it is a proof of enterprise, that is all. We are glad to get Americans to invest their capital here, and I am glad to say that there are some Canadians who will also invest their capital and trade in the United States. My hon. friend from North Norfolk, my opponent, politically, but a successful man in many respects, a man who fearlessly represents his views, has made large ventures in the United States, and I am glad to say he has been successful; and when hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear," because I say I have interests in the United States, I merely throw this out as a justification, if any were needed. We need not be afraid of the United States in regard to this question of duty one way or the other. The white pine timber of the United States is largely confined to three States: Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan, and is becoming rapidly exhausted. I speak of what I know. A few men, comparatively speaking, own what is left; and in the small district of Georgian Bay and up the Nipissing district, we have a thousand fold, if not ten thousand fold, of white pine growing in the United States. We have a heritage there equal to all the timber interests left in the United States.

Mr. MITCHELL. Nonsense.

Mr. TISDALE. Let the hon. gentleman examine it. What have they got? They have got west of the Rocky Mountains the Douglass pine, and no white pine. They have in the Southern States any quantity of yellow pine, but it is so heavy to transport and difficult to work that it cannot compete with our white pine. They must have our white pine. I do not want hon. gentlemen to misunderstand me, I say it would be a great boon to us to have the States market open to us; I say it would be a great boon to us to have our export duty taken off, if the Americans will take off the lumber duty, but if they will not do that it is only fair and equal that we should not take off ours. Just let you propose to them, if they had our white pine, to introduce any policy that would allow us to bring their natural product, white pine, into Canada and manufacture it, and you would soon find out what they would do.

Mr. MITCHELL. What would they do?

Mr. TISDALE. They would not allow it; they would clap on a duty of $10 per thousand feet.

Mr. MITCHELL. They cannot prevent it by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TISDALE. Then they would do it in some other indirect way.

Mr. MITCHELL. Point out the way.

Mr. TISDALE. There are three propositions I want to submit. First, and I have never said a word about it before—but I am tired of listening to some hon. gentlemen on the other side trying to shape our legislation to please the United States. First, it is an abnegation of our independence. If we are to be a nation, we ought to be ashamed of not being able to say we will shape our legislation to suit our country. Second, the independent American citizen will feel a contempt for any nation that he thought would abnegate its independence. Third, our white pine they must have, and if we put the duty up to $5, they will have to pay it, because there is no other place than Canada where they can get it. Fourth, if you want to deal with the American people, you will find they are a very practical people. I like them. There is only one country in the world I like better, and that is Canada. I would not even bar Great Britain as a people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TISDALE. Do not misunderstand me.

Mr. MITCHELL. Where is your loyalty now?

Mr. TISDALE. There is one thing that I regret in this House, that when a man gives expression to something that may tell against himself according to what other hon. gen-

tleman may think of him, though they are his honest sentiments, they cannot believe he is sincere. That is the only way in which I can explain the expressions of disapproval that I hear. Hon. gentlemen opposite did not allow me to get through. I say again, and I do not want to be misunderstood, there is only one people, they are the next people to Canada, that I admire most, but I did not say I admired their laws and institutions more than those of Great Britain. I say, however, as a people, going amongst them and trading with them, if you take the educated classes, there are no gentlemen or ladies in the world who are their superiors. I am speaking what I believe, and I do not care whether it suits hon. gentlemen on the other side or on this. I am speaking from personal knowledge and from the sentiments I feel. I say their institutions are not equal to ours; but they believe they are, and let them keep that belief. The great inducement after all in commercial matters among nations is to have something, as the Americans express it, "to swap," and if we give up everything, if we take away every inducement, if out of fear of them we abnegate our independence, what are we to do when we ask the Americans to do something, and have nothing to offer them?

Mr. MITCHELL. I will tell you what I would do.

Mr. TISDALE. I did not interrupt you.

Mr. MITCHELL. You asked what I would do.

Mr. TISDALE. I must say that the third party as a rule is fair, but it is hardly fair, and I appeal to the hon. gentleman as an old parliamentarian, of old experience and great ability, but who has made the great mistake of trying to run a party with only one member, I appeal to him for fair play. I regret that a man who ought to have a better appreciation and knowledge of the American character—a man of grit right through—should rise and say that we ought to legislate to please the United States. We are either to become a part of the United States or to be an independent country. If we are an independent country let us shape our legislation with all modesty, but with all firmness and according to what we believe is right. The courageous man is one who, when he thinks a hundred men are wrong, stands up and faces them. So, if we are a small nation compared with the 60,000,000, let us take an independent stand, let us take the first independent attribute of a nation, by making laws in our own interest; and if we cannot run our country as an independent country then let us ask the United States to run it.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has chosen to refer to me as running the third party with but one supporter. I say that is not true to start with, because three-fourths of the people in this House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

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

Mr. SPEAKER. The adjournment cannot be moved because there has been no intervening motion since it was last moved.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to a question of order. I simply say that if I manufactured 50,000,000 feet of American lumber as the hon. gentleman does, I would speak as he does.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) and the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), declare that in their judgment the existing legislation of Canada, which imposes an export duty on lumber from the Province of New Brunswick, is unconstitutional. I would ask the indulgence of the House while I address an argument to the House to the contrary.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I did not say it was unconstitutional.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I understood the hon. gentleman to say so. I took down the words of the hon. member for Northumberland, and he explicitly declared that in the British North America Act, the power to impose an export duty on lumber from the Province of New Brunswick, was expressly reserved to the Legislature of that Province. I think that the hon. member is wrong in that statement, and that the text of the Constitution will not sustain him in that position. There can be no doubt that, in the distribution of powers between the Canadian Parliament and the Legislatures of the Provinces contained in the British North America Act, there is one category of powers, twenty-nine in number, which are exclusively reserved to this Parliament; there is another category, sixteen in number, contained in the ninety-second section of the Act, of matters which are exclusively reserved to the Provincial Legislatures, and again in the ninety-third section the matter of education is exclusively reserved to the Provincial Legislatures. There are other powers which are concurrent. Section 91, sub-section 3, authorises the Parliament of Canada to raise money by any system of taxation, unless it is limited by some other section, and that I consider allows the Parliament of Canada to impose an export duty on lumber from any Province. The other section, to which the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) undoubtedly referred, is the 124th section, which reads as follows:—

"Nothing in this Act shall affect the right of New Brunswick to levy the lumber dues provided in chapter 15, of title 3 of the Revised Statutes of New Brunswick, or in any Act amending that Act before or after the Union, and not increasing the amount of such dues; but the lumber of any of the Provinces other than New Brunswick shall not be subject to such dues."

I call the attention of the House to the fact that that attribution of a power to the Local Legislature of New Brunswick is not declared to be an exclusive power. The adverb "exclusively" is conspicuously absent. In section 92, the word "exclusively" is incorporated in the opening paragraph—"the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters," &c. In the clause as to education, the adverb "exclusively" is also used. I say that the omission of that word in section 124 is significant, and it is a fair conclusion that the power so given was not exclusive but concurrent. I agree with the argument of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) and the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that the Parliament of Canada in 1873 did buy out from New Brunswick, by agreeing to pay $150,000 in perpetuity, New Brunswick's exercise of the right to levy that duty on lumber, but I contend that that legislation can neither augment nor take from the powers conferred upon the Province or those conferred upon the Parliament of Canada by Imperial legislation. For these reasons, I think the Parliament of Canada is quite within its powers in imposing an export duty on New Brunswick lumber shipped from the ports of New Brunswick. I do not desire to conceal from the House that the Treaty of Washington, Article XXXI, imposes upon us the duty of relieving lumber which is cut on the upper waters flowing through New Brunswick territory but cut in American territory from these export charges, and I understand, from what the Minister of Customs has said, that care has been taken to provide for that, and that those who ship from American territory by these rivers to American ports are not compelled to pay duties on that lumber.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Then I understand that the Americans do not pay duty on their lumber, and that the exporter in New Brunswick does.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). That is what I understood the Minister of Justice to say.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must express my surprise at the line taken by the First Minister in endeavoring

to prevent, if his influence could prevent, the Opposition from discussing this subject of public policy and of great moment, apart from its bearing upon an important industry in this country. This whole discussion is only a strong illustration of the impolicy of this House surrendering to any Government its undoubted right to decide whether an additional tax should be put on the people of this country or not. I have never approved of allowing the Government to add to the taxes of the people by proclamation or Order in Council, as was unfortunately done by the clause of the Act which allowed the Government to raise the duties on sawlogs from $2 to $3. I think that it is always a dangerous power, and here we have a proof of it. We find that the Government, acting in concert with a particular deputation, who afterwards changed their minds, thought fit to raise this duty some months ago from $2 to $3, and now the Government find themselves in a serious dilemma. I want to call the attention of the House to the line taken by the hon. the First Minister. He declared that, if this motion is voted down, the Government would be bound to respect the instructions of the House. Well, this is a new light to the Government, I am sure. It it not many weeks ago that my hon. friend beside me moved that we should maintain the *modus vivendi*. His motion was voted down. Did the Government then feel themselves bound to respect the instructions thus given to them by the House ? Did they not, a few weeks after the House had deliberately instructed them, as the hon. gentleman says, reverse the instruction of the House, and did their faithful followers take umbrage at their action in regard to that matter ? The hon. gentleman blames us because he says we ought not to interfere with the power of the Government to negotiate with the United States. I ask what sort of way is it to induce the United States to negotiate with us on fair terms, deliberately to have recourse to a policy which can only be interpreted, and which is being interpreted as a challenge to the United States. Bearing in mind all that has taken place and the time when this duty was imposed, that was a direct challenge to the people of the United States, or to certain sections of them, to go on and increase the duty on our lumber; and I say that, for that reason if for no other, it was a most ill considered proceeding on the part of the Government. What has been the course of the Opposition on this matter ? They have waited for months in order that the Government might have full opportunity to consider the situation and to inform the House as to what they were willing to do, and it was not until after the Government had had two full months to consider this question, having obtained all the information they possibly could, they refused to take this House into their confidence, refuse to tell us or to tell their supporters whether they will or will not take this course, that this motion is put before the House. The Government have a right to decide on the policy they will adopt and to appeal to their supporters to support them in that policy, but it is not just, it is not right, it is not respectful to the House or to the country that we should be called upon to separate while the Government, after ample opportunity, refuse to give us the information which was applied for by the hon member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I took occasion at that time to express my opinion of the unfortunate position the Government were placing themselves in. I do not say that it was unnatural for them, when a large number of the lumbermen applied to them to raise the duty, to have done so, although I think it was ill-considered and inexpedient, and that they should have looked at the whole relations between Canada and the United States, and should have been most reluctant at that particular time to do anything which was likely to call out a hostile feeling from a powerful interest in the United States. Still, there might have been some excuse for that. They were asked to adopt that policy. Now they are asked to reverse it. I would not blame them, if they requested a reasonable time to consider the matter, but they have taken two full months to consider it, and now they refuse to tell us, just when we are about to separate and will probably not come together again for nine or ten months, what they are going to do on this question. I say that the Government are taking to themselves prerogatives which a free Canadian House of Parliament should never let them take; I say it was their duty to have answered the question of my hon. friend; I say it is their duty to tell the House, yea or nay, what they propose to do in this matter.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Barron:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Fiset,	Mitchell,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	Mulock,
Barron,	Flynn,	Neveu,
Beausoleil,	Gauthier,	Paterson (Brant),
Béchard,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Bernier,	Godbout,	Rinfret,
Brien,	Guay,	Robertson,
Campbell,	Holton,	Rowand,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Innes,	Ste. Marie,
Casey,	Jones (Halifax),	Scriver,
Casgrain,	Lang,	Semple,
Choquette,	Langelier (Montmor'cy)	Somerville,
Colter,	Langelier (Quebec),	Sutherland,
Davies,	Laurier,	Trow,
Dessaint,	Livingston,	Turcot,
Doyon,	Lovitt,	Watson,
Edwards,	McMullen,	Weldon (St. John),
Ellis,	Mills (Bothwell)	Wilson (Elgin).—54.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Audet,	Ferguson (Renfrew),	Mara,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Masson,
Barnard,	Freeman,	Mills (Annapolis),
Bell,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Perley,
Boisvert,	Grandbois,	Porter,
Bowell,	Guillet,	Prior,
Boyle,	Haggart,	Rykert,
Brown,	Hall,	Shanly,
Bryson,	Hesson,	Skinner,
Burns,	Hickey,	Small,
Carling,	Hudspeth,	Smith (Sir Donald)
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jamieson,	Smith (Ontario),
Chapleau,	Jones (Digby),	Sproule,
Cochrane,	Kenny,	Taylor,
Cockburn,	Kirkpatrick,	Temple,
Colby,	Labelle,	Thérien,
Coulombe,	Labrosse,	Thompson (Sir John),
Curran,	Landry,	Tisdale,
Daoust,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Tupper,
Davin,	La Rivière,	Tyrwhitt,
Davis,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Vanasse,
Dawson,	Macdowall,	Wallace,
Denison,	McCulla,	Ward,
Desaulniers,	McDougald (Pictou),	Weldon (Albert),
Desjardins,	McGreevy,	White (Cardwell),
Dewdney,	McKay,	Wilmot,
Dickey,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Dupont,	McNeill,	Wood (Brockville),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Madill,	Wood (W'morel'd).—90

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for East Bruce (Mr. Cargill) and the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) have not voted.

Gen. LAURIE. I paired with Mr. Borden.

Mr. CARGILL. I paired with the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for Lambton has not voted.

Mr. LISTER. I paired with the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff). I would have voted for the amendment.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Department of Indian Affairs—Manitoba and the North-West Territories $28,796

Mr. FOSTER. The increase in the salary paid the principals for the three Indian industrial schools at Qu'Appelle, High River and Battleford, $600—these principals were paid $1,200 each. In the main Estimates they were only estimated for at the rate of $1,000 each. It is proposed to retain their salaries at $1,200 each, so that there is no increase in the salary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are these schools under the control of missionaries, or are they public schools established by the Government?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are entirely Government schools. I mentioned when the main Estimates were being considered, that we proposed in future, in schools of this kind, to commence the salaries of the principals at a lower rate. At that time I thought to be able to reduce the salaries, but representations have been made that these gentlemen have done so well since the schools were started, that I think it would be unfair to reduce their salaries now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do the Indian pupils lodge and board at these schools?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes. The pupils come from all the different Indian bands, and they are lodged and clothed entirely by the Government. In the Qu'Appelle school, when this return was made, there were 97 pupils; there are now 125. In the Battleford school there were 44; in the High River school there were 27 when this return was made, and some few have been added since. They are taught the English language, some of them are speaking English fluently, and are writing it very well. We take them in from six years old to ten years. We expect them to remain until they are 16 or 18 years old. In the older schools we are endeavoring to teach them trades, and some of them who have left are doing pretty well. A few have gone back to the reserves. There are some in Qu'Appelle Valley who are doing very well indeed, putting in crops this year, and they correspond with the department about their affairs. These three schools were all established about four years ago. Some of these pupils, after being four years in the school, have left at the request of their parents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A grant to the Roman Catholic schools at Lesser Slave Lake, $300. I see you are going in for the union of Church and State to some extent here.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has there been any objection on that score?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. FOSTER. They have not found it out yet.

Mr. DEWDNEY. A school has been established in Manitoba about 12 miles from Winnipeg, on the Red River. It is a Protestant school, in the diocese of the Bishop of Rupert's Land.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that the hon. gentleman is distributing his favors impartially all round, I do not know that I shall object to that. Whatever I may think of the union of Church and State, I am inclined to think that in the case of Indian schools, these bodies are prepared to take care of them better than we can.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). For the time being.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But it is a pretty large grant. Do the Anglican Church furnish some of this, or is it the intention of the Government to build these schools, and hand them over to that church? Or does the Dominion retain authority over them?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This school is similar to those I first spoke about. The Government are paying the whole expenses of that school.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do the Government merely loan this school to the Anglican Church?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We furnish the property and they run it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do they not contribute?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; not in this case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In other cases the grants are in aid?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Some are entirely supported by the Government, others are partially supported by societies and partly by the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Where will this school be?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Near the old stone fort, between Winnipeg and St. Peter's Reserve.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When these schools were first aided, amounts in aid were granted from year to year to the various denominations, and the Government reserved the right to supersede denominational schools by Government schools whenever it might be in the interest of the country to do so. It is very important that a proper record should be kept by the department of the progress made, and some comparison instituted between the different schools. They might all be compared with schools under Government control. It would be a mistake if the Government did anything to tie their hands so that any denominational body could say that the Government were obliged to support their schools and that it be a breach of faith to withdraw the present support.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We receive as accurate records each month of the rate of progress made in the schools as is furnished by a public school.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a very important matter, but it is important not only to obtain the regularity of attendance but also the intellectual progress made, and proofs of the efficiency of the system. It is specially important that the Government should retain their independence to supersede these schools whenever in the public interest it is deemed expedient to do so.

Mr. McMULLEN. I protest against these items now under consideration. If schools have to be organised for the Indians and conducted at the expense of the Government, the Government should control them and support the teachers. This is inserting the thin end of the wedge. In this case we are going to build a school and hand it over to the Anglican Church, at a cost of $10,000. It is a wrong system, and is the re-introduction of connection between Church and State. If it is absolutely necessary to have these schools, let them be established by the Government, but not under the guidance of any particular denomination. I enter my protest against these votes.

Mr. WATSON. I had hoped to see in the supplementaries a grant to the school at Portage la Prairie. It was established 3 or 4 years ago, and is attended by the children of Sioux and Cree Indians, a number of whom have made considerable progress. It is a boarding school, with an average attendance of from 15 to 18. They have bought a building for a schoolhouse, and where the people in the locality have granted assistance, the Government should encourage them by aiding them.

Mr. DEWDNEY. As it is a boarding school, I do not see any objection, and I will take the matter into consideration.

Mr. WATSON. It is a boarding school, and the children are not allowed to go home to their parents. In consequence of these children being at school, there has been a marked improvement not only in the children but in their parents, and they are endeavoring to imitate the whites.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman give particulars with respect to the proposed grist mill at Prince Albert?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It has been the custom to assist in erecting mills in the neighborhood of Indian reserves. Unless we have a mill near a reserve it is useless to try and raise grain. This will be for a steam mill situated in Prince Albert district. With these mills we make a special agreement that they shall give so many days to grinding the Indians' grain, and grind it at a lower rate than is charged white people.

Mr. WATSON. It is very important that the mill should have a certain capacity. Nearly all the mills erected in the western country have been bonused by municipalities which required that they should be of a certain capacity. When this is the case they benefit not only the Indians, but the settlers in the district. The Government should see that the mill is of as large capacity as possible.

Mr. MACDOWALL. There is no municipality in the neighborhood to which the member has referred. The only municipality in the whole Saskatchewan country is the incorporated town of Prince Albert, and consequently there is no municipality to assist in the erection of a grist mill. I agree that it is a good thing to bonus the mill and that it will do a great deal of good not only to the Indian Department but to the settlers in the neighborhood.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman probably thinks that when I speak of the "West" I only refer to the North-West, but I refer to Manitoba as well, and all the mills erected in Manitoba are bonused by the municipalities. I have no doubt that if a mill is erected in any portion of the Territories, that it is found necessary for the people who live in that particular settlement to assist in some way in encouraging the persons who wish to erect a mill.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I merely thought the hon. gentleman was referring to the item under discussion.

Mr. WATSON. I know there are no municipalities in the North-West.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before leaving the items for Indian Affairs, I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior if the Government find they can do anything towards assisting the Indians on the Thames to hold their agricultural exhibitions.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I had a communication with Mr. Vankoughnet, and he agreed that it was important and desirable to assist any society of that kind among the Indians, but he stated that we had no funds for the purpose. He suggested that the only way it could be done was by placing a vote in the Supplementary Estimates, but I feared to recommend it to my colleagues as I do not know what the result might lead to. I perfectly agree with the advisability of assisting those societies where possible. I have spoken since to the Minister of Agriculture and he said that it was not possible to give this assistance out of his funds.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I see that there are appropriations for assisting Indian schools, and I think that is a very good thing, because the Indians are making excellent progress in educational matters. In fact, it is astonishing to see how clever some of them are and what a beautiful hand they can write, although some of them do not spell very well. If the Indians get the rudiments of education it is just as important that they should be taught to be industrious. They have not usually been remarkable for industry in farming, but still they are making progress. The Oneidas, Chippewas and Muncies, three bands in my district, have established agricultural exhibitions. The Oneidas have made very great progress and their exhibition, which I had the opportunity of attending last fall, was a very good one. I also believe they had an exhibition in Toronto as well as at London. Their grain and roots and other products were certainly creditable, in fact the exhibition I saw on their reserve was just as good as it formerly was in some of the best townships among the white people when they started out first. The Muncies' Agricultural Society has been in operation for two years. I saw their exhibition last fall, and although it is very new and very crude, it was still creditable to the condition in which the tribe is. I have not seen the Chippewa shows, but I understand that they were very creditable. In the case of the Oneidas they have a good show ground, well fenced, and they charge an admission fee for entrance. The Muncies have purchased an exhibition ground, but they have not been able to fence it, and a small grant either to help them to fence it or to be expended in prizes would go a long way towards encouraging them in agriculture. They are making considerable progress, and a little encouragement of that kind to provoke emulation amongst them would be of immense advantage. I was told that last year the Indians were purchasing good cattle with the avowed object of exhibiting them at the shows. We can easily see what impetus it will give them in the march of progress if they are encouraged to purchase and to breed good stock and to raise good grain. If the Government could see their way to make a small grant to each of the tribes it would do a great deal of good.

Post Office Department..... $90,360

Mr. McMULLEN. How many letter carriers are there now in Toronto?

Mr. HAGGART. I think between 75 and 80, which number we propose to increase by 13, in order to supply the increased population, caused, I suppose, by taking in some of the suburbs.

Mr. DENISON. Toronto has been really undermanned for some time. It has been hard for the department to be convinced that the population has been growing so rapidly as it has. We add a small city every year.

Mr. McMULLEN. About what number of people in a city is a letter carrier supposed to accommodate? Is there any system?

Mr. HAGGART. There is a system, I believe. I have introduced a new system into the city of Toronto, which I intend to apply to other cities.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How many families to each carrier?

Mr. HAGGART. About 77.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like some explanation of the additional amount required for mail service over the Canadian Pacific Railway. The sum total is very large, and in the case of Manitoba $32,200 extra is required.

Mr. HAGGART. It is estimated by the mileage. As you are aware, the distance from Montreal to Vancouver is 2,900, and the car accommodation is increased one-half, necessitating an increase in the cost from 8 cents to 12 cents a mile. The amount is distributed according to the distances travelled in each Province.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I would call the attention of the Postmaster General to a letter I sent him the other day with regard to the case of a post office clerk named Campbell, who lost his life the other day on the Maine Central Railway. The hon. gentleman said the rule was to give

two months' gratuity in case of the death of public officials. That is when they die in the course of nature, but this man was 15 years in the service, and he lost his life by the burning of the mail car. I believe his family are in rather straitened circumstances, and I think the case should receive special consideration. I trust my hon. friend will deal liberally with the widow and orphans of this man under these circumstances.

To pay extra allowance of $240 per annum to W. Wallace, ex-postmaster at Victoria, B.C., from 1st January, 1888, to 30th June, 1890..... $600

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the reason of this?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Wallace, after a very long service at Victoria, was superannuated, and in consequence of that long service ten years was added to his superannuation. In the absence of the Postmaster General of that day, he was superannuated at 5 years instead of 10, and the Treasury Board passed the pension at that rate. On the error being discovered, the Order in Council put it at 10 instead of 5, but when it came to be considered it was found by the Minister of Justice that the power of fixing the salary having been exercised, Mr. Wallace could not get the 10 years, and it was necessary to come here to have the pension made right. Mr. Wallace went home as an invalid. His wife is still a greater invalid, and he writes that he cannot come back to British Columbia, where he wishes to end his days, without having this pecuniary assistance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is his total superannuation allowance?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. $672.

Mr. McMULLEN. Of course I have always taken exception to the superannuation system, and I consider this another case where a man, perfectly capable of discharging his duties, was removed to make place for a man who formerly had a seat in this House. I have nothing to say against the occupant of the position, but Mr. Wallace, when superannuated, was perfectly able to fill the position, and, according to report, he was persuaded into sending in his resignation, and this $200 is to quiet him and to prevent the circumstances under which he tendered his resignation being much known.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not so.

Intercolonial Railway..... $13,500

Mr. FOSTER. This is an amount in addition to the Supplementary Estimates required to pay for land damages and legal expenses, and a number of unsettled claims.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The other evening I referred to some cars of Harris & Co., which were condemned by the department. Messrs. Harris & Co. wrote feeling that I intended some reflection on their work, and I wish to disclaim any such intention. They do their work very well. What I did refer to was the statement in a newspaper that the cars were built on a plan that was disapproved, but the plan was persisted in and the work done by Harris & Co. Subsequently to make them fit, they had to be repaired at an increased expense in the works at Moncton, but I had no intention of attributing any blame to Harris & Co.

High Commissioner for Canada in England—Further amount required for contingencies..... $1,200

Mr. FOSTER. This is the item for contingencies. The hon. gentleman thought I must have estimated for that before. I was quite sure I had not, and I find on enquiry that I had not estimated for it. If you turn to the main Estimates on page 9, you will find $6,500 for contingencies that was formerly paid out of the immigration vote. The error the hon. gentleman was naturally led into arose from the fact that in that vote are included taxes and insurance on official residence, which should not have been included in that, or, if included, the sum should have been $1,200 more.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman will look at the main Estimates and add this $1,200, it will give a total of $15,503, of which he himself states only $13,053 was transferred from immigration.

Mr. FOSTER. That ought to have been transferred from immigration. The statement is in the note at the foot.

Resolutions reported.

CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Salaries and Contingent expenses of the Senate..... $60,638

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It will be remembered that there was a commission appointed, from which I did not expect much result, which was composed of members of this House and members of the Senate, with the view to reduce the expenditures of these two bodies. I regret that my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) who, in right of the third party, was created a member of that commission, is not present, but I think that this is a fitting opportunity to ascertain what has been the fruit of the labors of that commission; how much saving they have made or expect to make, and in what direction?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The commission appointed by this House and the Senate, or rather the joint committee, has sat several times, and has come to a number of decisions. The report is now being prepared, and I suppose we will be able to present it either on Monday or Tuesday. We recommend a number of savings for the future—less in regard to present salaries than in regard to those which will have to be paid as vacancies occur. We have also taken up the question of stationery and other expenses connected with both Houses which we also report upon. We have also taken up the question of certain officers whose residences are in these buildings, and we report about them also. If our report is accepted, those changes will have to take place during the year. I am not in a position to say what will be the amount of saving effected by that report, but I know it is more for the future, when vacancies occur, than in regard to present officers, though we have also recommended a reduction in the number of certain classes of officers and also the reduction of the number of temporary clerks.

Manitoba Penitentiary..... $50,526 48

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this penitentiary, I am sorry to say that I am not satisfied at all with the explanations which were given with respect to it. It appears to me that in spite of all the Minister of Justice was pleased to state, this penitentiary has been managed in a very extravagant manner, and that a great number of items which we are called upon to concur in, were not justifiable. I am willing to admit that there was a certain deduction to be made, as stated by the Minister, with respect to the amount for fuel, which, as I understood him, was purchased in a greater quantity than was required for a particular year. But that, after all, only amounts to a small sum, and would not reduce the total expenditure by more than $30 or $40 per head, for each convict. Now, I do not think that it is right that we should allow these items to pass unchallenged. Although I am not desirous of entering into a lengthy discussion over the matter, I think we must record our disapprobation of the mode in which that expenditure has been conducted. Therefore, I will move;

That the item be not concurred in, but that it be Resolved, That, as it appears from the report of the Auditor General that the cost of each convict in the Manitoba Penitentiary is, on the average, $707.51 per head, as against $203.38 in the Kingston Penitentiary, $305.50 at St. Vincent de Paul, $274.34 at Dorchester, and $475.53 in British Columbia, and that it is expedient that the said vote for $50,526 be referred back to the Committee of Supply with instructions to reduce the amount to $40,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. This item has been before the Committee for three years in succession. Last year the members on this side endeavored to make an impression upon the Government that some change should take place in order to have a *per capita* reduction of the expenditure of that penitentiary, but no reduction has taken place. A year ago the Committee also was urged to look closely into the items of this expenditure. Notwithstanding that, the increase has gone on. I think it is quite clear, upon the investigation that took place before this Committee, that the man in charge of the penitentiary is very extravagant, and is only anxious to get everything he can out of his country and spend it. I do not know whether the inmates benefit from it or not. I think it is evident that there is gross extravagance in the manner in which that institution is managed. Even in Victoria where everything is so high, the rate of expenditure is much less than in Manitoba.

House divided on motion of Sir Richard Cartwright:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Fiset,	Neven,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),
Beausoleil,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Bernier,	Guay,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Hale,	Robertson,
Brien,	Holton,	Ste. Marie,
Campbell,	Innes,	Scriver,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Jones (Halifax),	Semple,
Casey,	Lang,	Somerville,
Casgrain,	Langelier (Montmor'cy),	Sutherland,
Choquette,	Langelier (Quebec),	Trow,
Colter,	Livingston,	Watson,
Davies,	Lovitt,	Weldon (St. John),
Dessaint,	McMullen,	Welsh, and
Doyon,	Mills (Bothwell),	Wilson (Elgin).—47.
Ellis,	Mitchell,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	McNeill,
Barnard,	Foster,	Madill,
Bell,	Freeman,	Mara,
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Mills (Annapolis),
Boisvert,	Gordon,	Montplaisir,
Bowell,	Grandbois,	Porter,
Boyle,	Guillet,	Prior,
Bryson,	Haggart,	Robillard,
Carling,	Hesson,	Skinner,
Carpenter,	Hickey,	Small,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jamieson,	Smith (Ontario),
Chapleau,	Jones (Digby),	Sproule,
Cochrane,	Kenny,	Taylor
Colby,	Labelle,	Thompson (Sir John),
Curran,	Langevin, (Sir Hector),	Tisdale,
Daoust,	La Rivière,	Tyrwhitt,
Davin,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Vanasse,
Davis,	Macdowall,	Wallace,
Dawson,	McCulla,	Ward,
Denison,	McDonald (Victoria),	Weldon (Albert),
Desjardins,	McDougald (Pictou),	White (Cardwell),
Dewdney,	McGreevy,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Dickey,	McKay,	Wood (Brockville), and
Dickinson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Westmorel'd.-73.
Dupont,		

Amendment negatived.

Mr. GUAY. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I observe that the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. De St. Georges) is in his seat and has not voted.

Mr. DE ST. GEORGES. (Translation.) In my absence I was paired with the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Chisholm), and I respect the arrangement. If I had been allowed to vote, I should have voted for the amendment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

House of Commons, Contingencies $24,000

Mr. CASEY. I desire to record once more my protest against this large amount voted for contingencies. The Government should be able to estimate more closely the amount required for legislation during the year, and no such large sum should be placed in the Estimates of this House. Contingencies should only cover items which cannot be reasonably estimated, and this amount could be more closely estimated.

Patent Record $8,000

Mr. CASEY. What good purpose is served by the publication of the *Patent Record?* I have received it for 16 years, and it has no doubt been sent to all members of this House. It is wholly useless except to inventors and those who wish to know what patents have been issued,

Mr. CARLING. There was a reduction of $1,500 made last year in this expenditure. The *Record* has been published many years and it is considered to furnish valuable information.

Health Statistics $10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I had hoped that the Government in moving this item would have been prepared to state what decision they had come to, or whether any decision was possible with respect to the proper employment of this money which at present is to a very great extent wasted. It is too small an amount to enable us to obtain reliable statistics, and it is pretty much frittered away.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Inaccurate statistics are worse than none at all, and the statistics we have are inaccurate; no general result can be deduced from them, and they are of no possible benefit. I look at this $10,000 as money practically thrown away.

Experimental Farms $70,000

Mr. MITCHELL There is entirely too much money spent on these experimental farms. The amount should either be reduced or struck out. The expenditure is of no use whatever.

Census and Statistics $15,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. While I have no objection to this item, I call the attention of the Minister to a suggestion I made a good while ago which, if acted upon, would prove advantageous to the country. In most other countries except Canada, in taking the census, care is exercised to give a general statement of the character of the houses inhabited by the population, whether they are of brick, wood or stone, whether they contain two rooms or four rooms, and of how many storeys they consist. There is very little difficulty in doing this because every house is visited, and in other countries it is regarded as a very important item as showing not merely the condition of the population but the progress made from decade to decade. If this matter is not being considered by the Minister he should consider it in preparing for the census to be taken in 1891.

Mr. CARLING. Of course the census cannot be taken until April, 1991, and I will consider the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman.

Militia—Drill pay $290,000

Mr. CASEY. I should like to ask the Minister of Militia whether he is prepared to carry out the suggestion I have frequently made with regard to the drill instruction pay. We have discussed the matter frequently. The last time we discussed it the hon. gentleman agreed that this pay of $40 given to captains nominally for drill instruction, and which we all know has to be handed over to the band fund or something of that kind, should be put under some other heading which would show what it was really voted for. If I remember correctly, the hon. Minister agreed with my views when we discussed the question. I would like to ask him what

decision he has come to if he has not explained it before, and if he has, a reference to the page in *Hansard* will do me?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I knew the hon. gentleman was called away at the time when these Estimates came before the House, and it affords me great pleasure to give him the information which he asks. As the hon. gentleman has stated, we frequently discuss the question together, and I concurred with him, and to a certain extent have been able to carry out the suggestion he made. The amount which we paid for drill instruction has been reduced, except to those companies which have received a certificate from the inspecting officer of their perfection in drill. Those who have not received the certificate to which I have referred have received only half the amount. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that it would be impossible to remove that contribution which was made to the officers who keep their corps in a state of efficiency. I hope we will be able, when the Estimates come down next year, either to put this item under a different head or in a different shape to what it is now.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister has correctly represented my ideas. I did not ask that this amount should be struck out, but that it should be put under its proper heading. I am glad to hear that he intends to carry out that suggestion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What decision has the Minister come to as to the point which was raised yesterday about the appropriation for this property which is to be purchased at Kingston?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The item shall be brought down as the hon. gentleman suggested.

Harbors and Rivers—Ontario $257,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the total amount that the Minister stated would be wanted for the Kingston Graving Dock and for this improvement at Port Arthur Harbor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think this vote will complete Port Arthur Harbor. The Kingston Graving Dock will cost between $350,000 and $400,000 altogether.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I cannot allow this item to pass without taking exception to the policy which the Government are pursuing with reference to public works of this character, in making public works in all the ports of the Dominion except Halifax. I protest against a policy which is in the interests of two or three cities and not in the interest of the city I have the honor to represent.

Public Buildings—New Brunswick $14,150

Mr. MITCHELL. In connection with this vote for public works in New Brunswick I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works what has been the result of the feeling appeal I made for that little item of $1,000 for a steamboat wharf at Negnac. I do not often make an appeal to the Government, but I expected that the appeal I made would excite their sympathies if not their sense of justice, for I could hardly expect to excite their sense of justice. I thought I had touched the feeling of the Minister of Public Works, because he looked over at the Minister of Finance as much as to say there is a case which would be proper to look after and to make an appropriation for. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works what he has to say about that little item for Negnac?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That little item has been considered by the Government, but we did not see our way to put it into the Estimates this year.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will you do it next year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will consider.

Mr. MITCHELL. Inasmuch as I do not vote with the Government I cannot get a single thing for my constituents. I represent one of the most important constituencies of the country and the fact that they send here a representative who occupies a prominent position in this House ought to commend a little respect for some request which he has made. I regret that the Government has not consideration enough, and prudence enough, and policy enough to concede to the request I have made.

Mr. CASEY. In connection with this item for post offices I wish to call the attention of the Government to a matter which I spoke of on a motion which I gave notice of in regard to public buildings. I find they have been erecting very extensive public buildings throughout the Dominion in places of small size. For instance, at Aylmer, in the Province of Quebec, a town of 2,000 or 3,000 people, they are erecting a costly post office, while for many towns in Ontario of larger population and greater business importance, they are doing nothing. Early in the Session I called their attention to the claims of the town of Ridgetown for a post office, and I shall continue to remind them of the claims of that town as long as they continue to put public buildings in places of smaller population and where less business is being done.

Harbors and Rivers—Nova Scotia $22,100

Mr. McMULLEN. I beg to move:

That this vote be not concurred in, but that it be Resolved, That it appears from statements made in this House that the sum of $500 demanded for the East Pictou River improvement is not for the purpose of benefiting the navigation, but to assist lumbermen to float timber down said river; that it is inexpedient that the Dominion should charge itself with the task of improving any river for such purposes, and that the said vote of $22,100 be referred back to the Committee of Supply, with instructions to reduce the same by stricking out the said item of $500.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Public Buildings—Repairs, furniture, heating, &c. $170,000

Mr. McMULLEN. We have drawn the attention of the House several times to the extravagant expenditures connected with the public grounds in the city of Ottawa. In that connection we drew attention to the expenditure on Major's Hill Park, which is virtually wasted. Any person who will look over it and estimate what the improvements have cost, will come to the conclusion that a number of men must be engaged there to stand looking at each other and virtually doing nothing. We have paid no less than $2,500 for broken slate for the walks, and I see we have provided a number of seats for the accommodation of the citizens of Ottawa. We have no objection to encouraging the laying out of parks in the city of Ottawa with a grant now and then, but I do not think it is right to impose on the country the expense of converting a rocky, barren piece of ground into a pleasant cultivated place for the convenience of the people of Ottawa at an enormous cost. I move:

That this vote be not concurred in, but that it be referred back to the Committee of Supply, with instructions to strike out the item Major's Hill Park, Ottawa, $7,000.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. CASEY. In regard to the item for repairs, furniture, &c., as one who has had long experience of the way affairs are managed here, I think that vote could be materially reduced. We know that every year we come back here, new furniture and carpets are found to a large extent in the committee rooms and in all parts of the House. When the carpets get a little used up or the furniture gets a little shabby, they are either thrown away or given away and new carpets and furniture are obtained. The idea that $170,000 can be required for necessary repairs and new furniture to these buildings is perfectly absurd?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is for repairs and furniture all over the Dominion.

Mr. CASEY. The system of heating these buildings is most extravagant. It was first resolved that the House should be heated by hot air, which was to be previously warmed in vaults beneath the buildings and sent up through holes in the flooring. That not having been found satisfactory, the system of heating by radiators was adopted, and there is now a double expense—the expense of heating air in the vaults and the expense of the radiators; and with all this and with all the ventilating devices, the building is ill-heated and ill-ventilated. As to the fuel, we go on using wood, and I cannot imagine why we do so except to benefit the contractor, a strong supporter of the Government. The system of using wood for fuel is absurd when there are so many other cheaper kinds of fuel obtainable. As to the electric light system, I never could understand why in a city where that system is in operation, we should deem it necessary to have our own dynamo and steam engine to drive it. This must be more costly than to buy our electric light from the company which supplies the city. Why should we have electric light and gas? Either discard the one or the other, even although a prominent supporter of the Government is manager of the Ottawa Gas Company. It is simply a piece of jobbery to keep the gas when we have this electric light system. Again, when we have our own dynamo and are not dependent on the electric system of the city, I do not see why the electric light should not be going as long as it is required in the buildings, thus dispensing with gas. The present system of ventilating the water closets is also very defective, the result being to drive the foul air into the corridors. I would call the attention of the hon. the Minister to that question.

Dredging—Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick..... $40,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When the Committee was in session over this item I called the attention of the hon. gentleman to New London Harbor and the necessity for having it dredged this year. I have heard from Prince Edward Island since that the hon. gentleman intends sending the dredge up one of the rivers instead. No doubt it will be useful there, but the New London Harbor is situated at the north side of the Island, and unless it is dredged it will be impossible for people to use it in the fall at all. As it is, vessels going round there in the fall have to pay enormous insurance. I think the harbor should receive the consideration of the hon. gentleman.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:10 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 27th April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PONTIAC AND PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it be declared that the provision in the Act 51 Victoria, chapter 3, respecting the Pontiac Pacific Railway Company extends the several subsidies in aid of the said company for four years from the passing of said Act, that is to say, from the 22nd May, 1888.

He said: In the Pontiac and Pacific Railway Co.'s Act last Session, there is the following clause:—

"To the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, for bridging the several channels of the Ottawa River at Culbute and west thereof, a subsidy of $31,500, to be paid out monthly, as the work progresses, upon the certificate of the Chief Engineer of Government Railways, in the proportion which the value of the work executed bears to the value of the whole work undertaken, and for three miles of their railway extending from a point three miles east of Pembroke to Pembroke, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $9,600: provided that the entire work subsidised upon this railway shall be completed within four years from the passing of this Act, the subsidy granted by this Act not to exceed in the whole $41,000."

The clause should have stated that the subsidy would be extended over 4 years, but instead of doing so it stated that the works subsidised should be extended over 4 years. It is now proposed to correct that clerical error, and extend the subsidy for 4 years.

Motion agreed to, and resolution considered in Committee and reported.

QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to again mention that the report of the Public Accounts Committee, containing evidence taken before that Committee with respect to Mr. Smyth's account, is not yet forthcoming. I enquired at the Records Office just before the House met, and the clerk having charge of the documents laid before the House, said he had not been able to obtain it. I should like to know what steps I am to take in order to get possession of it, for the documents of the House should be at the service of members of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER. Owing to the very serious illness of the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), it has been impossible to obtain possession of the document to-day, but I hope it will be the last time it will be necessary for the hon. gentleman to mention the matter. Very strict instructions have been given to the different clerks of the Committees not to allow any of the statements of records to be taken away, and this was done without the knowledge of the Clerk of the House.

Mr. DICKINSON. I beg to draw the attention of the House to an article that appeared in the *Free Press* of this city last evening. The article is as follows:—

"Manitoba's representatives in the House of Commons are much dissatisfied because the only subsidy to be voted this Session in aid of railways in that Province is a land grant to the Lake Manitoba Canal and Railway Co., a corporation in which Mr. M. K. Dickinson, ex-M.P. for Russell, is the central figure. Possibly the grant to this company may account for the vote of the member for Carleton against Col. O'Brien's resolution calling for the disallowance of the Jesuits' Bill."

I have only to say, Sir, that Mr. M. K. Dickinson, the gentleman referred to, has no connection whatever with that company, and has no interest in any grant that company may receive. I may say that, personally, I was not the promoter of that company. I have no connection whatever with the company, and have no interest in any grants that that company may receive. I here state that the base, implied charge in that article is without foundation and truth.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. As a representative of Manitoba, I may state that there is no such opposition at all among the representatives of Manitoba.

TODD'S PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. Before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I wish to call the attention of the Government to the fact that a very important book is being distributed to the members of this House, but, unfortunately, the members who were not here last Session are not receiving it. I think that we who were not here last year should have the book, and I hope that some step will be taken to distribute Mr. Todd's work on the Parliamentary Government of England to the new members as well as to the old members. Some

of the old members have not only left the House, but departed this life, and I do not see why the book should be sent to their former addresses.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A certain number of the new edition of the work of the late Mr. Todd was purchased and distributed during the existence of the last Parliament. The members of the last Parliament got the first volume of the work, and that volume would be of little use without the second volume. It is for Parliament to say whether a vote shall be taken to provide members of the present House, who were not members of the old House, with copies of both the first and second volumes. I have had a communication with my hon. friend from Shelburne (General Laurie) on this matter, and I think we will make it all right.

CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The House, I dare say, will remember that in the course of the budget speech of the Minister of Finance, he took occasion to give us a total statement of the amounts which were likely to be required for capital expenditure, and which the hon. gentleman made up as follows, apparently. The hon. gentleman, on that occasion, gave a detailed account, showing the capital charge for canals, for Government railways, for public works, for railway subsidies, and for Dominion lands; and he estimated the sum total at $12,789,789. This, according to his express statement, was quite sufficient to give us a depth of water of 14 feet, from Lake Superior to Montreal. Now, since that time, we have had an opportunity of testing the accuracy of the hon. gentleman's statement in detail, and any hon. gentleman who will take the trouble to refer to what occurred in the Committee of Supply, will observe that the estimate then made by the Minister of Finance falls very short indeed of the sums for which we are likely to be liable. Now, of course, it is possible (although I think improbable) that one or two of the items may be a little less than the sums which were estimated for by the hon. gentleman. On the other hand, I think there is an equally strong probability that other sums will be very considerably in excess; and, as far as I can see at present, looking at the proposals now before us, and which we are only able to consider for the first time now, as far as I can see, where the hon. gentleman estimates that $12,789,789 are likely to be required, our total expenditure on capital account can hardly be estimated at less than $30,000,000, not to speak of contingent liabilities. These sums I would make out somewhat as follows: On reference to the *Hansard*, I perceive that the hon. gentleman finally estimated, as necessary to be expended for the canal system, $13,551,109, being very nearly a million in excess of the sums total which he thought were likely to be incurred for all purposes. So far as I can perceive, for the Intercolonial Railway and subsidiary lines of Government roads, it is scarcely possible that we can expect to get off for a smaller expenditure than $3,000,000, and in these current estimates, as the House will see, sums amounting to very nearly $1,500,000 are required. We have got, to-day, subsidies brought down by the First Minister in his capacity as Minister of Railways, and we have in these public accounts the details of other items for which we are liable, which show that the total charges in the way of subsidies for railways can hardly be estimated at less than $6,000,000, all told. Probably, I think, they will considerably exceed that. Then, Sir, we have, to-day, a proposal for an annuity of $80,000 a year for some 20 years, if the hon. gentleman is going to proceed with that. We have also the knowledge that we have an annuity for 20 or 25 years of $183,000, to be paid on account of the Short Line as far as St. John, and we have got an annuity besides of $175,000 for a long term of years for the Chignecto Canal. This, capitalised, I beg to point out, would be fully equivalent to $4,000,000. Then, Sir, we have a proposition before us for a road from Harvey to Moncton, which, even on the hon. gentleman's own showing, would probably involve an expenditure of not less than $3,000,000, but which, if the statements made by those who are acquainted with the country are to be relied upon, will be nearer four or five million dollars than the sum estimated by the First Minister. Even taking this smaller amount of $3,000,000, and adding to that amount the amount probably likely to be paid for minor works, we find that a sum of about $1,000,000 additional will be required, making, in all, a claim of about $30,000,000 on capital account, instead of $12,789,789 which the hon. gentleman appeared to think, when he made his budget speech, would be amply sufficient for all purposes. In addition to this the hon. gentleman has brought down proposals, which, I presume, will become law, involving an expenditure for subsidies of $750,000 a year, for many years to come. From that may be deducted, perhaps, $125,000; but even so, there would remain a very large amount, in all, nearly $700,000, as an addition to our fixed charges, while the interest on these various sums which I have enumerated cannot be much less than $1,050,000. Of our contingent liabilities and our guarantee I will say nothing, except to observe that they must be taken into account in estimating the wisdom of this capital expenditure which we are called on to make. Nor will I do more at this time than allude to the fact, which every member of this House is painfully aware of, that, frequently, these grants involve further demands—that a proposition to pay three or four million dollars, or it may be five millions, for a line like that from Harvey to Salisbury, is not at all likely to pass this House without involving, in future Sessions, the addition of very much larger sums, probably many millions, to the public indebtedness. Sir, it is quite clear, when we look at the Estimates which the hon. gentleman has laid on the Table, and when we see that, in addition to the original Estimates brought down, he has been obliged to demand about $1,250,000 more for the service of the current year, it is reasonable to estimate that the expenditure for the current year will amount to $37,893,000, and when we remember that we shall probably have further estimates brought down next year for the service of 1890, it is painfully clear that the hon. gentleman's expenditure is likely soon to swell up to $40,000,000 a year. It may not reach that amount this year, but I am afraid that before two years shall have passed over our heads, we shall be confronted with a gross annual expenditure of not less than $40,000,000 a year; and what makes the case worse, the interest on this capital expenditure and these subsidies, which will be granted, if at all, for long terms of years, will involve an addition of very little short of $2,000,000 a year to our annual fixed charges alone, Now, Sir, the whole of these questions, in which public works are involved, deserve a little consideration from this House. Putting wholly aside the question of whether a number of items are or are not charged properly to this Intercolonial expenditure, that is to say, whether they should not go to swell the annual deficits in place of being charged to capital, we know from the hon. gentleman's own Public Accounts, that the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway in 1888 amounted to $363,000 over and above our regular receipts; and the hon. gentleman, the other day, in reply to a question of mine, showed that for the first eight months of 1889 the deficit amounted to $350,000. If that condition of thing continues, we shall be confronted with a deficit of about $500,000 on the Intercolonial, and I need hardly tell the House that a great deal of this expenditure, which the hon. gentleman now asks

the House to incur, is going to add enormously to the huge deficit which exists on that railway. I take the case of the canals, so that the House may understand that it is not on the Intercolonial alone that we are threatened with heavy deficits. I find that in the last year of the administration of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) the total receipts from our canal system amounted to $363,357, and the expenses to $346,996, leaving a small balance to the good. In 1888, the year for which these votes are asked, our total receipts, including $30,000 received from miscellaneous sources, amounted to $310,000, and our expenses amounted to $695,367—$544,000 for what are called ordinary expenditures, and the balance for sums which are chargeable to income; and in this current year, 1889, judging from the Estimates, about $800,000 will be incurred, although there is very little chance that the receipts will increase one single farthing; and, I may add, that takes no notice of the fact that under the administration of my hon. friend the civil government expenditures for railways and canals were united with those for other public works, and consequently, if I were making a perfectly fair comparison, I would be obliged to add a considerable sum for the extra expenditure incurred at headquarters. Now, Sir, this is the more important, because, I am bound to say, I think the hon. Minister of Finance, at the commencement of his official career, was earnestly desirous of retrenchment. I think the statement which he made here, that he hoped to confine our expenditure to the figures which he brought down, and that there was very little reason to fear that any great increase would take place, was honest and well intentioned. But, Sir, in spite of what I am willing to say was his sincere desire to retrench, we find that he is obliged to add very nearly $2,000,000 a year to our fixed charges under the special propositions he now lays before us, not to speak of the fact, which is quite clear, that our other expenditures, instead of being diminished, are likely to be increased from time to time. Now, I have called attention over and over again to two facts, one positive and the other relative. I say we are apparently obliged to raise $32,000,000, likely soon to be $33,000,000 or $34,000,000, by taxes upon our people. Even admitting that the statements given by the hon. gentleman are correct, even admitting that we possess a population of about 5,000,000 souls, which I think, for my part, to be a considerable exaggeration. it is quite clear, that we are obliged, taking the ordinary standard of wages in this country, to deduct from the earnings of our people, a sum which would be sufficient to maintain 100,000 families in perfect comfort in this Dominion, at wages rather larger, I am afraid, than those ordinarily paid to the mass of our artisans and laborers. Take another standard of comparison, which hon. gentlemen will do well to bear in mind. We find, by their last returns, that the United States are expending something like $280,000,000 a year, apart from the sum that goes to the reduction of their debt. If we, with a population one-thirteenth or one-fourteenth of theirs, are committing ouselves to an expenditure of nearly $40,000,000 a year, it requires very little calculation to show that we shall be in the unenviable position of expending nearly double the gross amount per head that they are expending in the United States. And this represents but part of our burden. I am speaking of the amount that goes into our Treasury, and every man, whether he is a protectionist or a free trader, knows perfectly well, that, under the protective system, the amount taken out of the pockets of the people, is vastly in excess of that which goes into the Treasury. The other day, I put a question across the floor to the hon. Minister of Customs. From the returns given by him, it is apparent that, for this year at any rate, our exports are diminishing. This year, they amount to a little over $59,000,000, and they were $300,000 or $400,000 less up to the time that answer was given, than they were for the preceding year. Our imports, on the other hand, had increased considerably. Now, Sir, on the showing of the hon. gentleman, or his predecessor, that is a very bad state of things. Here we find our exports stationary, and our imports largely increasing. Consequently, on their showing, the balance of trade is becoming heavier and heavier against us from day to day. Now, I note that some of the hon. gentleman's supporters—I do not think the hon. gentleman himself—allege that this is a matter of very small consequence, because, forsooth, our returns of receipts and expenditure show a surplus of about $4,000,000. I am perfectly aware how that was produced, but, in order to prevent any mistake, I will explain to the hon. gentlemen how the account stands. Our charges, as the hon. gentleman well knows, for interests and sinking fund, now amount as nearly as possible to $1,000,000 per month, or $12,000,000 per year, and I find that in this account, which shows an apparent surplus of $4,000,000 to the 1st April, only $5,000,000 are charged for interest and sinking fund. In other words, if the interest which should have been charged, and which undoubtedly has been paid up to the 1st April, had been charged, this alleged $4,000,000 of surplus would have vanished altogether. There was a nominal $4,000,000 of surplus, but as only $5,000,000 out of the $12,000,000 have been charged for interest, it is quite clear that on the 1st April no surplus at all would exist if our books were accurately balanced, and that the alleged $4,000,000 surplus in our exchequer is entirely deceptive. I am not imputing that to the hon. gentleman nor censuring him for it, because I know that for various reasons it has been our habit to delay charging those matters for a long time; but it is right that the House should understand what the real position is, and that the hon. gentleman's press should cease to talk about the alleged surplus of $4,000,000 which has no existence and will vanish so soon as the sums due by us in England and elsewhere are properly entered in our books. I may briefly, before putting the motion that I am about to place in your hands, Sir, sum up the results of the policy of economy announced by the hon. gentleman. Hon. gentlemen are desirous, I know, of being economical, for certain reasons, at this particular time, but, in spite of their desire to economise, we find, as a practical result of their policy, that about $2,000,000 a year are going to be added to the fixed charges of this Dominion. We find that the estimate of $12,750,000 which the hon. gentleman brought down, if you choose to take account of all the items that have been lately introduced, will increase to $30,000,000, instead of remaining at $13,000,000. We find that the balance of trade on which hon. gentlemen opposite used to lay great stress, is, according to the statement the hon. the Minister of Finance made in the House, exactly $19,000,000 against us for the first eight or nine months of this year, our imports being $78,000,000, and our exports $59,000,000. Though I do not attach so much importance to that as hon. gentlemen opposite, still, when we recollect all their declamations on the other side on that head, they must admit that that is a serious state of things. I find also that if the hon. the Finance Minister will add up the sums due for interest, so far from there being any large amount of surplus, the fact is that ends barely meet at this moment, when he is proposing to incur very large and, in my opinion, very injudicious additional expenditure. We know there are heavy conditional liabilities, a large part of which, in all human probability, we will be called on to meet, and we know perfectly well, if anything can be predicted which has not already happened, that the result of this policy must be very largely to increase the enormous loss which already exists on the Intercolonial Railway, and to which I have called attention. Therefore, feeling that it is my duty that, before the House votes these large sums on capital account, I should, at any rate, state what are the

actual facts of the case, and give the reasons which appear to me to be sufficient why this House should demur to a great many of these proposals, I beg to move:

That the resolutions relating to railway and other expenditures, be not now read a second time, but that it be Resolved, That in the course of his budget speech, it was stated by the Minister of Finance, that an expenditure of $12,738,849 would suffice to meet all the engagements of the Dominion on capital account up to the 1st July, 1892, and would secure a fourteen foot canal system from Lake Superior to Montreal.

That it now appears, from subsequent statements made by the said Minister of Finance and other members of the Government, that the requirements of the Dominion on capital account must be estimated for as follows:—

1. For Canals, as aforesaid, $13,551,109.
2. For Intercolonial and subsidiary lines of road, $3,000,000.
3. For subsidies, $6,000,000.
4. For annuities capitalised, $4,000,000.
5. Road from Harvey to Moncton, $3,000,000.
6. For minor works, $1,000,000; being in all, about $30,000,000.

That the Government have further agreed to expend $750,000 per annum, for terms of years, in subsidising certain lines of steamers, less the amount now paid to the Allan and Dominion lines.

That the said annual charge for subsidies, and for interest on the said $30,000,000, will involve an addition to the fixed charges on the revenue of $1,700,000 per annum.

That the estimated expenditure for the year ending 30th June, 1888, is $37,893,384

That the inevitable effect of a large portion of this expenditure on capital account will be to diminish the traffic and to further increase the heavy deficit now existing in working the Intercolonial Railway.

That, under these circumstances, the conduct of the Government in assuming these other and further obligations, is reckless and improvident.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. How can you put in a resolution on Concurrence?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can make it on Supply, if you object to this. I am pointing out the reasons which render this capital expenditure inexpedient, and the hon. gentleman, having a logical mind, will admit that it is perfectly in order.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose neither my hon. friend, nor the House, will expect me, at this late period of the Session, to enter into any lengthy reply to the figures which my hon. friend has addressed to the House, and, indeed, as he knows, and the House can well understand, it would be impossible for me to do so, without having had his figures, and being able to consider them for a little time. I will, however, point this out to the House, that, despite all the remarks of my hon. friend with reference to the present year, and its estimated expenditure and income, and in spite of all that he has said with reference to the surplus, as given in the last monthly returns, I think the House will find out next year the fact, which will be a great deal better than the suppositions of my hon. friend, that not only will the expenditure that I estimated for the present year not be exceeded, but that the surplus I estimated will not be diminished. Looking at affairs as they are at present, with the few months to run for the remainder of the year as prosperous as the preceding ones, not only will the expenditure be no greater than my estimate, but the revenue will be a little in excess of it, and the surplus for this year will, I think, certainly not be less than that which I estimated. My hon. friend has taken the ingenious way of adding up all our possible liabilities, and taking into account railway subsidies and steamship subsidies, and expenditure on capital account on railways, with reference to which the expenditure is not certain, and with reference to a good deal of which the additional expenditure will not commence for a considerable time, and possibly, in some cases, for more than a year or two. He has taken all those as if they were certain liabilities, and entailed a charge which would commence upon the revenue at the present time and continue for the period of which I spoke. I simply referred in my budget speech to the engagements the country was under for the three years, not what possibly might be engaged in, and, having made a statement in reference to that, I also said that if no extraordinary expenditures were incurred other than those, and the years were equally prosperous, I thought the estimate I made for capital account would be sufficient to carry us through the three years. Whatever may happen through extraordinary expenditures which, in the opinion of the Government and of Parliament, may be necessary to incur, I think it will be found that my forecast as to the engagements under which we are will turn out to be true. I think it is not necessary, as I said before, for me to take up the time of the House in endeavoring to follow the remarks of my hon. friend without having the figures before me, and I hope that events will show in future, as they have in the past, that the extraordinarily dark forecasts in which my hon. friend occasionally, as a financial pastime, indulges, will not be proved to be true by the march of events.

House divided on amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Eisenhauer,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Ellis,	Neveux,
Beausoleil,	Fiset,	Paterson (Brant),
Brien,	Fisher,	Platt,
Campbell,	Flynn,	Rinfret,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Gillmor,	Ste. Marie,
Casey,	Innes,	Semple,
Casgrain,	Jones (Halifax),	Somerville,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Trow,
Choquette,	Livingston,	Waldie,
Colter,	Lovitt,	Watson,
Davies,	Mackenzie,	Weldon (St. John),
Doyon,	McMullen,	Wilson (Elgin).—40.
Edwards,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archibald,	Dupont,	Mara,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Barnard,	Gigault,	Perley,
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Porter,
Boisvert,	Grandbois,	Prior,
Bowell,	Guillet,	Putnam,
Brown,	Haggart,	Riopel,
Bryson,	Hall,	Robillard,
Burns,	Hickey,	Shanly,
Carling,	Jones (Digby),	Skinner,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kenny,	Small,
Chapleau,	Kirkpatrick,	Smith (Ontario),
Cochrane,	Labrosse,	Stevenson,
Cockburn,	Landry,	Taylor,
Corby,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Temple,
Coulombe,	La Rivière,	Thompson (Sir John),
Daoust,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tupper,
Davin,	Macdowall,	Tyrwhitt,
Davis,	McCulla,	Wallace,
Dawson,	McDonald (Victoria),	Ward,
Denison,	McDougald (Pictou),	Weldon (Albert),
Desjardins,	McKay,	Wilmot,
Dewdney,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dickey,	Madill,	Wright.—73.
Dickinson,		

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) has not voted.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I paired with the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson).

Mr. McMILLAN (Vaudreuil). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Thérien) has not voted.

Mr. THERIEN. I have paired with the hon. member for L'Assomption (M. Gauthier).

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I paired with the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier).

Gen. LAURIE. I paired with the hon. member for King's, Nova Scotia (Mr. Borden).

Oxford and New Glasgow Railway construction.. $300,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When the House was in Committee of Supply, certain facts were brought out re-

specting this railway which were of a very remarkable character. It is not often that we find that the House has been induced to enter into an expenditure, which is certainly not less than $1,500,000, by statements made officially by Ministers which have been utterly and completely disproved within so very short a time as these appear to have been on the evidence of no less a person than the First Minister himself. I dare say the House will recollect the circumstances connected with the construction of this branch, or this Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, and to these I will only allude very briefly. It is enough to say that in the first instance the House was induced to render aid, I believe, to this railway on the assumption that a company would be formed which would construct it and defray the balance of expenses out of their own private means. That company having utterly failed to discharge their engagements, an appeal was made by the Government, through the Minister of Railways at that time, to construct the road, and the Minister, in advocating its claims, made the following very remarkable statement, to which it is right that the attention of the country should be drawn. The hon. Minister stated:

"I can best illustrate to the House the position if I say that that corner of the Chamber is New Glasgow, that corner is Oxford Junction, on the Intercolonial Railway, and that corner is Truro. At present the people of the whole of the eastern portion of Nova Scotia, the whole of the great County of Pictou, the County of Guysboro', the County of Antigonish, and the whole Island of Cape Breton in addition, have, in order to reach Moncton, in New Brunswick, to travel to Truro; and this intersection, taking the hypothenuse of seventy-five miles—that the construction of the road which I proposed to this Parliament to secure shortens the distance between the whole of that great portion of Nova Scotia and the rest of Canada by no less than from forty to forty five miles, for every pound of freight and every passenger that is carried.'

Now, if ever there was an explicit and distinct statement made to the House on the authority of the Minister specially charged with these matters, it was this statement made by Sir Charles Tupper, that the construction of a line of railway which I understand does not exceed 80 or 85 miles in length would shorten the distance between those points by 40 or 45 miles. The House will remark that, in constructing a short line like that, there is hardly any possible ground for saying that a Minister could be mistaken to the extent of 40 or 45 miles. The matter was taken up in this House, as anyone will see by referring to the debate which took place on April 5, and we find that, after a full discussion, the right hon. the First Minister informed the House that he believed the distance would be shortened by about seven miles instead of by 40 or 45 miles. Other gentlemen contended that the shortening was even less. Some said four miles, some said two miles, but I give the House the benefit of the statement made by the present acting Minister of Railways, the First Minister, and I assume that his statement that the line would be shortened by seven miles is the correct one. Everyone must admit that, when a Minister of the Crown comes down to the House and formally states in his place and on his responsibility that a particular route will shorten the distance between two given points by 40 or 45 miles, and when thereafter the Prime Minister, himself, charged with the conduct of the department, states that the utmost distance that he can claim the road will be shortened by, is only seven miles, unless some very clear explanation, which has not been vouchsafed to this House as yet, can be given by the Government, they stand convicted of having induced this House to enter on the expenditure of a million and a half under representations which can only be characterised as entirely false and misleading. It is a very serious matter. I do not remember ever to have known a case in which so very gross a misrepresentation was made before. As I think that these facts, unless they can be explained—and I shall be glad to hear them explained, if they can be—cannot be allowed to pass without a record being put in Parliament of the way in which Parliament was deceived on that occasion, I beg to move:

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,

That the said resolution be not agreed to, but that it be Resolved, That it appears, from statements made in this House by Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Finance, that, "the construction of the road (Oxford and New Glasgow Junction), which I proposed to this Parliament to secure, shortens the distance between the whole of that great portion of Nova Scotia and the rest of Canada by no less than from forty to forty-five miles for every pound of freight and for every passenger that is carried."

That, on the faith of this statement, the House was induced to undertake the construction of this road as a Government work, and to incur an expenditure of not less than $1,500,000.

That it now appears, from statements made in this House by the First Minister and others, that the distance, instead of being reduced from forty to forty-five miles, has only been reduced by a distance variously estimated at from four to seven miles, and that the statement above mentioned was without foundation in fact, and that the House was induced to undertake the construction of the said road by false representations.

House divided on amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Eisenhauer,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Ellis,	Neveux,
Beausoleil,	Fiset,	Paterson (Brant),
Brien,	Fisher,	Platt,
Campbell,	Flynn,	Ste. Marie,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Gillmor,	Semple,
Casey,	Innes,	Somerville,
Casgrain,	Jones (Halifax),	Sutherland,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Trow,
Choquette,	Livingston,	Waldie,
Colter,	Lovitt,	Watson,
Davies,	Mackenzie,	Weldon (St. John),
Doyon,	McMullen,	Wilson (Elgin).—39.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archibald,	Gigault,	Mara,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gordon,	Montplaisir,
Barnard,	Grandbois,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Guillet,	Perley,
Boisvert,	Haggart,	Porter,
Bowell,	Hall,	Prior,
Brown,	Hickey,	Putnam,
Burns,	Jones (Digby),	Riopel,
Carling,	Kenny,	Robillard,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kirkpatrick,	Shanly,
Chapleau,	Labrosse,	Skinner,
Cochrane,	Landry,	Small,
Cockburn,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Smith (Ontario),
Colby,	La Rivière,	Stevenson,
Daoust,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Taylor,
Davin,	Macdowall,	Temple,
Davis,	McCulla,	Thompson (Sir John),
Dawson,	McDonald (Victoria),	Tupper,
Denison,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wallace,
Dewdney,	McKay,	Weldon (Albert),
Dickey,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilmot,
Dickinson,	McNeill,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dupont,	Madill,	Wright.—70.
Foster,		

Amendment negatived.

Intercolonial Railway..... .... $320,000

Mr. DAVIES. The annual and increasing deficits which have occurred on the Intercolonial Railway for some years past challenge the serious attention of this House and country. Apart from the insane policy that the Government has lately adopted, of building competing lines to our own railway, a policy which results in largely increasing the expenditure while at the same time reducing the receipts, and a policy which the House may have an opportunity of passing an opinion upon at a later stage, when the Government bring down their resolutions for the construction of a railway from Harvey to Moncton, there is another policy they have adopted, the result of which has been largely to cause the increase of these deficits; that policy is to discriminate in favor of one special industry as against other industries of the country. During the last financial year, the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway amounted to $363,000; for the first eight months of the present year it amounts to $350,000, and, as was stated by the hon. gentleman a few moments ago, if the deficit

goes on at the same ratio for the next four months, it will amount to half a million of money. This is a state of facts which deserves to challenge the very careful and serious consideration of this House. I find that we have been in the habit of carrying coal from the Spring Hill mines on the Intercolonial Railway at a non-paying rate, at a rate which causes a loss of from $1 to $1.50 a ton in the carriage from Spring Hill to Montreal. An hon. gentleman—I think it was the Minister of Railways—boasted, at an early part of the Session, that the carriage of coal on the Intercolonial Railway aggregated 200,000 tons, and if these figures are correct, they show a loss on that one article alone of 200 000 dollars. There may be those who can persuade themselves that it is a fair and just tax upon the general interests of the country in favor of those who are specially interested in the Spring Hill mines. I do not think so, and I propose to tender a resolution asking the House to disapprove of that policy. But the actual loss which the country incurs by carrying that coal at non-paying rates, does not represent the real loss which the country is called upon to suffer. The carriage of this enormous quantity of coal has resulted in the purchase of a largely increased quantity of rolling stock, and the increase of the rolling stock has necessitated a large expenditure in providing car sheds in which to house that stock. I find that last year they spent for increased rolling stock on the Intercolonial Railway, $258,334; I find by the report of the Chief Engineer that a large portion of this is fairly chargeable to the increased quantity of coal which the railway has been called upon to carry. He then goes on to say that he anticipates, during the coming year, a still further increase in the volume of that traffic, and he calls upon the House to vote a large sum of money to provide what he calls stable room to house this increased stock. That being the case, I think that we may fairly state that the annual loss to the country, in order to favor the special interests of these gentlemen who own stock in the Spring Hill mines, does not fall short of $300,000 a year. Before moving my resolution, I will quote the passage from the Minister's report which I rely upon largely for the truth of the statement which I have made, and which I incorporate in this resolution. The report says:

"For several years past I have drawn attention in the annual report to the extremely low rate at which this coal is carried. There can be no doubt that it is one of the chief causes of the annual deficit"

I, therefore, move:

That it appears, from the report of the Minister of Railways, that one of the chief causes of the very large deficit of $363,000 incurred in the working of the Intercolonial Railway for the financial year ending June 30th, 1888, was the carrying of coal from the Spring Hill Mines at rates far below paying ones. That such a policy, while very advantageous to the shareholders of the Spring Hill Mines, is unfair to the Farmers, Fishermen, Artisans, and other tax payers and industries of this Dominion, and results in taxing the vast mass of the community in the interests of a small and wealthy class. That the policy of discriminating in favor of the carriage of coal on a Government railway and against Farm produce, Lumber, Flour, Fish and other articles does not meet with the approval of this House. and that the Vote No. 201 for Intercolonial Railway of $3,200,000 be not agreed to, but be referred back to the Committee of Supply, with instructions to reduce the same to the sum of $3,000,000.

Mr. DICKEY. I wish to say a few words, because I think the hon. gentleman is under some misapprehension. This is not a rate for Spring Hill mines, this is a rate for the whole of Nova Scotia, and all the coal fields of Nova Scotia get the benefit of it, the Pictou coal mines, and numerous other coal mines in the Province, and it is an entirely misleading statement to make to say that it is a policy in favor of one particular company. As to the general question, I have not time now to discuss it, and I would not weary the House by discussing it; but this rate is for the purpose of promoting interprovincial trade. The hon. gentleman stated that it was an unjust discrimination as compared with the rate upon flour. I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that the rate upon flour to the Maritime Provinces is considerably less than the rate upon coal from the Maritime Provinces, the rate on flour being 23-100ths of a cent as against 50-100ths of a cent for coal. I also think there is a misapprehension as to the amount of loss incurred in carrying coal at this rate, and I will give my reasons for holding that opinion. On a number of roads in the United States coal is carried at less than it is carried on the Intercolonial Railway. Coal is one of the lowest classes of freight, and can be carried cheaper than almost any other article. An instance to hand is the Grand Trunk Railway. The Grand Trunk Railway carries coal from Chaudière Junction to Montreal for 5-10ths of a cent per ton per mile; deduct a payment of 1½ cents per car per mile to the Intercolonial, and if you take ten-ton gondola cars you find the Grand Trunk receives for carrying coal from Chaudière Junction to Montreal only 35-100ths of a cent per ton per mile as against 30-100ths which the Intercolonial Railway receives, and I do not think that is a very serious matter. I presume the hon. gentleman would not charge the Grand Trunk Railway with unduly favoring one particular industry. Western coal is hauled from Buffalo to Chicago, 530 miles, at $1.65, or 2-10ths of a cent per ton per mile, so I do not think this rate of 3-10ths of a cent per ton per mile can be such a very serious matter. The Michigan Central, the New York and St. Louis, the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern, and the Grand Trunk, each receive 38-100ths as against 30-100ths by the Intercolonial Railway. That rate is for coal in box cars, which has to be handled, and not for coal in gondolas, as in the case on the Intercolonial Railway, and this very nearly represents the 8-100ths additional which these roads receive. The Grand Trunk Railway has bought coal this year at Suspension Bridge from the Pennsylvania mines at $1.73 per ton. This coal is hauled 300 miles to Suspension Bridge, and allowing 73 cents for the coal loaded on board the cars at Pennsylvania, which is a small enough estimate, the railway company would get exactly 3-10ths of a cent per ton per mile for the haul to Suspension Bridge, and this is a shorter haul than that on the Intercolonial Railway. I will go back for a moment to the Grand Trunk Railway rate. They get from the Chaudière Junction to Montreal very little more than the Intercolonial Railway rates, but that is a shorter haul, involving the expense of shunting and that service which makes all the difference in railway freight. One word more. This rate was imposed in 1879. In 1883 the convention with the Grand Trunk was adopted and the present rate made. A few months afterwards, on the faith of that rate, and with a view to getting the Montreal market, over $1,000,000 were invested in the enterprise at Spring Hill. The effect has been to build up a large population at that place, and not only a large population, but a very thriving population and an industrious population, every man of them doing an honest day's work and being able to spend largely and become a consumer of dutiable goods. This rate prevailed until a few months ago. It was then raised by the Railway Department, but the Government were afterwards asked to reduce it. It was found that, a very few weeks before the rate was raised, a new line had been opened from the Pennsylvania mines, from Massena Springs to Montreal, which had brought Pennsylvania coal hundreds of miles nearer the Montreal market; it was found that if this rate was to be raised the Intercolonial Railway would have to meet Pennsylvania competition, Pennsylvania coal having obtained at that very moment better access to the Montreal market. It was found that this would also paralyse the industry at Spring Hill and would throw at least 500 men out of employment, it would ruin a number of merchants and paralyse the whole section. Not only so, but it would injure the Pictou mines and the Cape Breton mines by throwing a large surplus of coal on the local markets, thus

depressing prices there. When these facts were pressed upon the Government they very properly returned to the old rate at which they had been carrying coal for a number of years. These considerations, I think, are quite sufficient to justify the action of the Government. I submit that the Intercolonial Railway is not to be run upon narrow business principles. The late Government, led by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), ran the road upon commercial principles, and I think the experience was such as not to justify any Government, which expects any degree of satisfaction in the Maritime Provinces, to adopt that principle again. The Maritime Provinces see the canals of this country which cost this country $53,000,000. They see them run without a pretence of the expense being balanced by the receipts. There is no murmuring upon that account. They are run for the purpose of stimulating the trade of the country, and, therefore, I say that the attack upon the Intercolonial Railway management comes with very bad grace from anybody in this House, and I think it comes with particularly bad grace from the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) and the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), who ought to have the interests of the Maritime Provinces at heart. I do not believe in sectional appeals, but I think it is fair, when a question of this kind is brought up, to remember that the Maritime Provinces have paid their share of the Canadian Pacific Railway construction; that they have paid their share of the canal construction, and they have never raised any sectional cry or taken any such step as this; and when a policy of this sort, for the purpose of fostering one of the most important industries of the country, is carried out, I think we should hear no opposition to it. The hon. gentleman seems to think that the Intercolonial Railway is run in the interest of the coal owners, but I hold that this rate is in the interest of every factory in Quebec, because if we were not able to send our coal there the Americans would at once raise the price of coal and it would cost every one of the manufacturers in Quebec more than they pay now. Therefore, this rate is a protection to every manufacturer east of Montreal against exorbitant charges for coal; and I hope that the House will not adopt the resolution.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman should wish the Government to carry coal from his own county at a loss. It is only natural that he should wish that the industry should be benefited, which I admit is a very important one in that section of the country. The hon. gentleman says that this rate is open to the whole Province of Nova Scotia, and so it is; but that only makes his case worse, because if Pictou were shipping coal over the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, the distance would be greater and the loss to the country would be much heavier, and consequently it is an advantage to the country generally that the Pictou coal owners do not avail themselves even of the very low rate to any great extent; and notably the chief shipment of coal goes from Spring Hill. The fact is, this is just a question between the hon. gentleman and the managers of the Intercolonial Railway. I have no great confidence, I admit, in the managers of the Intercolonial Railway, for I think the road has been run on very bad business principles and without any reference to economic administration. The year before last we had representations from the managers of the Intercolonial Railway, accounting for the deficiency in the receipts on the ground that we were carrying coal at a loss, and I remember that when I asked the late Minister of Railways if we were losing money he frankly admitted that we were. Again, last year, in the report of the Department of Railways, which has been quoted so frequently, they say that the loss is entirely owing to the carrying of the coal over the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr DICKEY.

Mr. DICKEY. No.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says "no," but if he makes an estimate himself he must arrive at the same conclusion as the head of the department did. Two hundred thousand tons of coal were carried over the Intercolonial Railway last year, and, taking it at a half-cent rate, which is the lowest which it is carried at in the United States (as I am informed by my hon friend from Grenville, Mr. Shanly), we are losing from a dollar to a dollar and a quarter on every ton of coal carried over the Intercolonial Railway, and that would account at once for $200,000 of the deficiency in the working expenses of last year. We hear occasionally from gentlemen interested in this industry, of the progress the Intercolonial Railway is making, and they point to the increase of the coal traffic over the Intercolonial Railway as an illustration. The more it increases the worse for the country generally. It may be better for the Spring Hill coal owners, but we are here to legislate, not for Spring Hill alone, but for every industry in the country; and that resolution in your hands, Mr. Speaker, is a protest against one large industry, valuable and important as it is, I admit—and I do not desire in any way to minimise its advantages to the country—but, at the same time, I say that no hon. member who is interested in an industry in his county, can expect this country to go on year after year, carrying the products of that one industry at a very heavy loss, in the face of the remonstrances from the heads of the Railway Department. The Government should not have required a resolution of this kind at all, and the Minister of Railways should have acted himself in this matter. It appears that whoever was administrating the affairs of the department during the illness of the late Mr. Pope, did very properly act on this recommendation, and he put on a rate which he considered would be paying, but owing to influences to which I have frequently referred, they lowered that rate. The department says it does not pay, that the coals are carried at a heavy loss, and the hon. gentleman says: "Never mind the loss, we have an industry down there in which we put money, and there are stores, and shops, and houses and men to be employed down there, and the Government must pay $200,000 a year to keep them up." I protest against that policy if we are not going to apply the same principle to every other industry of the country.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Davies (P.E.I.):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Eisenhauer,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Ellis,	Neveux,
Beausoleil,	Fiset,	Paterson (Brant),
Brien,	Fisher,	Platt,
Campbell,	Flynn,	Ste. Marie,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Gillmor,	Semple,
Casey,	Innes,	Somerville,
Casgrain,	Jones (Halifax),	Sutherland,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Trow,
Choquette,	Livingston,	Waldie,
Colter,	Lovitt,	Watson,
Davies,	Mackenzie,	Weldon (St. John),
Doyon,	McMullen,	Wilson (Elgin).—39.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archibald,	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gigault,	Patterson (Essex),
Barnard,	Gordon,	Perley,
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Porter,
Boisvert,	Guillet,	Prior,
Bowell,	Haggart,	Putnam,
Brown,	Hall,	Riopel,
Burns,	Hickey,	Robillard,
Carling,	Jones (Digby),	Shanly,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kenny,	Skinner,
Chapleau,	Labrosse,	Small,
Cochrane,	Landry,	Smith (Ontario),
Cockburn,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Sproule,

Colby,	La Rivière,	Stevenson,
Daoust,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Taylor,
Davin,	Macdowall,	Temple,
Davis,	McCulla,	Thompson (Sir John),
Dawson,	McDonald (Victoria),	Tupper,
Denison,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wallace,
Desaulniers,	McKay,	Weldon (Albert),
Dewdney,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilmot,
Dickey,	McNeill,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dickinson,	Madill,	Wright.—71.
Dupont,	Mara,	

Amendment negatived.

Fisheries..... $231,500

Mr. FLYNN. I wish to bring a matter of considerable importance to the attention of the Government. I presume that the cruisers for the protection of the fisheries will be sent out this year, as heretofore. Last year they did not make their appearance on the coast before the 1st of June. As the hon. Minister of Marine is well aware, up to that time the American fishermen are prohibited from fishing on their own grounds. The mackerel come down towards the end of May, and this year I presume they will come down much earlier. The American fishermen last year followed them down to Chedabucto Bay, where our fishermen had their nets set, and the American fishermen, who brought purse seines with them, not only put out their seines for mackerel, but actually cut the nets of our fishermen which were set, and they did this within the three mile limit. The matter was immediately telegraphed to the Halifax papers, and the cruisers were sent out, but they arrived a day too late. These American fishermen drove the fish right down the coast. The consequence was that there was a complete loss to our people of the spring fishing. I desire to bring this matter to the notice of the Minister, in the hope that the cruisers will be earlier on the coast this year than they were last year. They should be there about the 20th, or the 25th of May.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before this resolution passes, I wish to offer my congratulations to the Government on having adopted for the current year the *modus vivendi* in respect to our fisheries, a policy which the First Minister proved so eloquently and conclusively a few weeks ago, in answer to our motion, to be so injurious to the general interests of the Dominion.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to call the attention of the Government to a matter which I hope will be attended to, now that they are providing proper fishways for the fish. Complaints were made in Manitoba last year, and they are also being made this year, that a dam on White Mud River, at Westbourne, prevents the fish going up. The principal fish that go up that stream are jackfish and suckers, and the fishway is not suitable to allow these fish to go up. Settlers for 100 miles of that river and its tributaries have not been able to get any fish at all this year in consequence of the erection of this dam. I hope the Minister will see that such a fishway as will allow these fish to go up will be placed in that river. As the hon. gentleman knows, suckers are very good food in the spring, but a fishway somewhat easier of ascent than the ordinary fishway is required to allow them to go up, because they do not jump and cannot go up rapid water like other fish.

Mr. TUPPER. I may mention to the hon. gentleman that after he brought this matter to my attention the other day, I communicated with the fishery inspector in Manitoba and sent him to the place in question. In reply he sent me the information that the fishway was made right, and that the fish were now going up to the satisfaction of all concerned.

Dominion Lands, chargeable to Income.. ..... $185,748 25

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will not, on the present occasion, do more than read the resolution which I propose to move, inasmuch as it probably contains all the facts, and I am afraid that expatiating on them at the present hour in the present temper of hon. gentlemen opposite, would not be likely to do them any particular good. The resolution, I may state, involves the three several items of headquarters management, the vote now under discussion and the vote which is customarily charged to capital. I move :

That it appears from the Public Accounts that the cost of managing the public lands in the North-West amounted to the sum of $461,474 in the year 1887, and $436,820 in the year 1888.

That the total receipts from all sources amounted to $191,781 in 1887, and $217,083 in 1888, showing a deficiency in two years of $479,432.

That in the year 1880, the First Minister, being then Minister of the Interior, stated that he estimated the net proceeds to be received from these lands before 1890 at $68,900,000, after deducting the costs of survey and administration.

That on the 4th May, 1883, Sir Charles Tupper informed the House that the Deputy Minister of the Interior calculated that the receipts from said lands "would amount to $58,000,000 from 1st January, 1883, to 31st December, 1891, both days inclusive."

That the total expenditure for North-West lands up to the 1st July, 1888, on capital account is stated at $5,778,777, and the total receipts credited against the said expenditure were $4,275,536, leaving a deficit of $1,503,251 on capital account only.

That the expenditure of the said Department of the Interior is extravagant, and that the said vote of $185,748 for Dominion Lands be not agreed to, but that it be referred back to the Committee of Supply, with instructions to reduce the same to the sum of $100,000.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will take this opportunity of referring to a circumstance which occurred a few nights ago in Supply, when this matter was under discussion. I made a comparative statement with regard to the expenditure of the Department of Interior for the years 1873 to 1878, and the subsequent years, and quoted some figures which were doubted by the hon. member for Bothwell. At the moment I was unable to satisfy myself, as I had not the figures with me, as to whether the statement I had made was as contended by the hon. gentleman. His contention was that the Indian expenditure for those years had been included in the Department of the Interior. I could not believe at the time that such was the case, and subsequently made enquiry, and I have in my hand the figures as they are and as I gave them to the House. The expenditure of the Department of the Interior for 1876-77 was $36,409.74 and Indian expenditure $9,672.26, making a total of $46,082. For 1877-78 the expenditure of the Interior Department was $33,356.13, and of the Indians $11,254.14, making a total of $49,610.27. So that the Indian expenditure was deducted from the figures by which I made my comparison. Not only was the cost of the Indians deducted but also the cost of the ordnance lands and the value of lands under military land leases. I make this explanation in order that the hon. member for Bothwell and the hon. member for South Oxford may be convinced that the statement made by them was incorrect. My Deputy Minister, a gentleman whom they have known longer than I have, they should have known was incapable of putting false figures into my hands. There were some very harsh words used by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) with reference to the Deputy Minister.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not say a word about him.

Mr. DEWDNEY. And the hon. member for Lambton, as to his putting false figures into the hands of the Minister in order to make this comparison adverse to the opposite party. The hon. member for Bothwell knows that my deputy is not capable of doing acts of that kind.

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

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am quite sure the hon. gentleman will admit the figures were correct. I hold in my hand a statement of the expenditure of the Department of Dominion Lands from December, 1883, to December last year, which I do not wish to take up the time of the House by reading but would like to have placed in record in *Hansard*;

DOMINION LANDS.

STATEMENT of Expenditure and Revenue in connection with Dominion Lands, from 1st July, 1873, to 30th June, 1888—15 years.

Fiscal Year.	Expenditure.					Revenue.			
	Civil Government.	Dominion Lands, Income.	Dominion Lands, Capital.	Total Expenditure.	Percentage of Expenditure compared with Revenue.	Total Revenue.	Cash.	Scrip and Warrants received as cash in the Accountant's Office.	North-West Half-breed acres, scrip located.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1873—1874.....	48,249 11	3,354 98	279,341 30	330,945 39	1194 per cent.	27,697 55	27,697 55	....	....
1874—1875.....	42,714 77	16,704 90	168,514 02	227,933 69	796 "	28,626 15	28,626 15	....	....
1875—1876.....	38,740 68	47,260 47	165,580 80	251,581 95	2606 "	10,035 81	9,715 81	320 00	....
1876—1877.....	36,409 74	35,604 61	84,917 20	126,931 45	88 "	144,029 06	7,073 90	136,955 16	....
1877—1878.....	38,366 13	44,339 76	43,288 76	125,994 65	89 "	140,051 78	19,892 24	120,159 54	....
1878—1879.....	47,157 63	42,260 98	49,612 31	138,925 92	54 "	265,848 98	44,944 14	210,904 84	....
1879—1880.....	52,906 58	66,772 94	81,030 04	200,709 56	110 "	182,442 18	100,756 32	81,685 86	....
1880—1881.....	55,629 77	67,745 97	334,681 41	457,957 15	226 "	201,952 32	131,124 02	70,828 30	....
1881—1882.....	57,256 13	81,899 57	511,882 32	651,038 02	36 "	1,795,047 32	1,744,456 48	50,590 84	....
1882—1883.....	69,973 80	115,746 90	562,221 30	747,942 00	71 "	1,042,657 65	1,009,019 15	33,638 40	....
1883—1884.....	85,195 77	166,698 69	728,441 33	980,535 79	98 "	992,566 17	961,636 50	40,919 67	....
1884—1885.....	85,146 70	178,727 29	303,592 68	567,466 65	129 "	439,493 20	393,618 20	45,875 00	....
1885—1886.....	102,089 42	194,965 58	139,316 99	486,371 99	105 "	415,525 76	176,795 78	214,657 97	24,072 00
1886—1887.....	99,181 45	195,725 71	162,391 67	457,298 83	92 "	497,301 35	191,781 78	281,799 57	23,720 00
1887—1888.....	102,345 99	184,548 04	135,047 82	421,941 85	76 "	553,003 94	217,083 07	309,936 87	25,994 00
	961,248 97	1,442,556 29	3,719,769 93	6,123,165 19		6,726,269 71	5,054,221 09	1,598,262 62	73,786 00

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not going into the discussion of the comparative merits of the Government of which I was a member, and the present Government. If we had been ever so extravagant, that would have been no defence for the Administration of to-day. They must answer for their own acts, and it is hardly possible to make a comparison on the lines the hon. gentleman has laid down, of to-day with what happened in the administration of affairs of that country twelve years ago, when there existed no means of communication between one portion and another, such as are afforded at present. But I will say this, that our expenditure was almost incomparably less in proportion to the amount of work done than the expenditure of to-day. The hon. gentleman, in a statement made a few days ago—a statement which indicated his anxiety for a discussion, and which I regret was not made at an earlier period of the Session—instituted a series of comparisons by percentages, as if there could be any comparison of percentages between a country in its first stages of settlement, and after settlement had been carried on for a dozen years or more. The hon. gentleman knows well, that in the settlement of the North-West, there would be necessarily a smaller amount of revenue received in proportion to the amount of settlement, and the amount of work done, than at a later period; for it was only after settlement had been carried on for several years, that revenues began to be received. That was the assumption of the hon. gentleman's chief, when he predicted that the revenues received from lands at a later period than the one of which he was speaking, would be very much greater than they were at that particular time, or else he never would have assumed that the revenue to be derived from the sale of public lands would be sixty odd millions in excess of the actual expenditure, for at the time the statement was made the revenues received were altogether less than the expenditure. Therefore, when the hon. gentleman undertakes to institute a comparison by percentages, he undertakes an impossibility. But what may be fairly compared is the actual expenditure that took place in the period when the hon. member for East York had charge of public affairs, and what has taken place at present. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the number of employés in the public departments here and compare the one period with the other, he will see that extraordinary progress has been made by way of increased employment and increased cost. The hon. gentleman knows that at that period the Department of the Interior, and the department included the Indian Branch as well as the public lands and the Ordnance Branch, expended something like $44,000 all told. The expenditure in salaries to-day is, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, $82,000 for the public lands branch alone and $42,000 for the Indian Branch. He will also see that there is a charge of $35,000 for extra sessional clerks employed in the department, which he had not the courage to so charge at present, but charged to expenditure on public lands in the North-West Territories. Then for salaries to parties connected with the land branch in the North-West: in 1878, the expenditure was about $20,000, while to-day the hon. gentleman is asking $185,000 for the same purpose. The expenditure then for salaries of Indian agents, and others connected with the Indian service was $18,000, while to-day the hon. gentleman is asking $162,000 for the same service. Now, if you put the $162,000 and the $185,000, and the $42,000 and the $82,000 against the expenditure of $18,000, $20,000 and $44,000, the House will see the difference between the cost of conducting the administration in 1878 and the expenditure of to-day. It is impossible that the hon. gentleman can show that the expenditure of to-day is as economical as it was then; it is impossible for him to show that the increase of the work connected with the public service is proportionally greater than it was in 1878; so that is quite beyond the capacity of the hon. gentleman, as it is beyond the capacity of any other hon. gentleman, to prove that the administration of the Indian branch and the public lands branch is as economical as it was in 1878. The hon. gentleman has adopted a policy which makes economy impossible. I am not at this last moment of the Session going to discuss that question with the hon. gentleman, but I may say that if the opportunity had been offered at an earlier period, I would have proposed a resolution some what more comprehensive than that proposed by my hon. friend, and I would have taken the trouble of showing to the House—what I will not undertake to do to-day, but I promise him that I will do it next Session, if he is anxious for the institution of comparison—what the expenditure of his department has been, and I am satisfied that with one-half the expenditure, the efficiency of the public service could be properly maintained.

Mr. DAVIN. This late period of the Session is an inconvenient time to discuss such a large question as the comparison between the policy of this Government towards the North-West, and the policy of their predecessors. But I may say this, that of course there is no comparison whatever in the extent of the work done by the Department of the Interior to-day, and the work done when it was under the guidance of my hon. friend, the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). Why, Sir, at the time the hon. member was Minister of the Interior there was the merest fraction of work to what now has to be administered, and for him to take the figures that he has done, and then the figures that the Minister of the Interior is assuming for to-day, and making a comparison with them, showing that his department was more economical than it is at present, seems to me a piece of absurdity, especially at a time like this. Now, if this was a fit time to make a comparison, I might make one between the policy of my hon. friend from Bothwell and the policy of the Government of the right hon. gentleman. Why, if any man will get the Orders in Council passed by Mr. Laird, when he was Minister of the Interior, and the Orders in Council passed by my hon. friend from Bothwell, he will be face to face with the most inept management of the North-West Territories and Manitoba that could possibly be conceived. A child placed in charge of the Department of the Interior, would have devised a better scheme for governing the North-West and dealing with North-West affairs than Mr. Laird; and the hon. gentleman, when he came into power, succeeding Mr. Laird as Minister of the Interior, did not repeal these Orders in Council, they remained there, and what was the consequence to the North-West? Any body will see that if the hon. gentleman and his friends had remained in power, instead of having the population we have now in the North West and Manitoba, a population which is grossly misstated from this side of the House—instead of having a population like that, we would have had a paltry array of empty benches. That had nothing to do with the point with which we are dealing here, but if it were necessary I could show that the statement made here and the statements I have heard made elsewhere, about the population of the North-West, and the present population of Manitoba are incorrect. I could show from the census of 1885 and the census of 1881 that those comparisons are fallacious and misleading, and if they are made *bonâ fide*, they reflect upon the intelligence of the hon. gentleman who made them, and if they are not made *bonâ fide* they reflect upon his ingenuousness. But it is not part of my intention to go into that. All I have to say now is that if this were the proper time to go into it, I would be glad to do so; but I hope it will be raised next Session, if we are all here, as I hope, with God's blessing, we shall be, when I shall be glad to make a comparison between the treatment of the North-West and of Manitoba by the Government and the Ministers of the hon. member for East York, and by the Government and Ministers of the right hon. gentleman. If that question is raised again I shall be glad to have a hand in; and I shall be glad to show that from the point of view of statesmanship, from the point of view of economy, from the point of view of everything that ought to guide a Minister in dealing with such a large interest, there is no comparison whatever between the two Administrations.

Mr. WATSON. I was surprised to hear an hon. gentleman coming from the North-West and knowing the state of affairs as well as that hon. gentleman knows them, who has just taken his seat, attempt to apologise on behalf of the Government for the very small number of settlers in that country, and claim that the land policy of the present Administration has been favorable to the settlement of that country. Why, Mr. Speaker, we could almost hear the echo of the words uttered in this Chamber only a day or two ago by that hon. gentleman, when he criticised the land regulations of this Government as the most unjust and unwarrantable thing ever perpetrated on British people who expect fair play; that the Government were deceiving those people who went to settle in that country, who could not acquire what they claim they should acquire when they arrived in that country. I venture to say that one-half of the cost of the Department of the Interior, particularly the Ottawa portion of it, is caused by the iniquitous land regulations that have been enforced by the present Administration. I venture to say that the hon. gentleman will find that two-thirds of the work that has to be done is owing to the changes that have been made in the land regulations in the North-West, He says that a child could devise a better scheme of land regulations than was given to the people of the North-West by Mr. Laird. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that to my mind, and I think to the mind of the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House, there never has been on the Statute-book, since Mr. Laird went out of office, land regulations as favorable as those that were enforced at that time. Then, there was a free homestead of 160 acres to a settler, on condition of actual settlement, all the lands being open to settlement, no reservations being made, either of odd or even-numbered sections for any purpose. It must be apparent to the minds of members on both sides of the House, that if the policy of that Minister had been continued for the North-West, there would be now none of these grievances that have been ventilated in this House from time to time by the hon. gentleman from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). I think we would not now witness the spectacle of an hon. member from the North-West coming here and apologising—for I cannot accept anything less than an apology for his statement—that the census returns were not true.

Mr. DAVIN. It is true. Look at the census.

Mr. WATSON. According to the census of 1885, there are 108,000 whites and half-breeds in Manitoba and 40 in the North-West Territories. In regard to the statement made by the Minister of Interior, when he read a comparison between the administration of the North-West in 1873 and the present date, at that time I was not in a position to get up on behalf of a gentleman who, as he said, had not an opportunity of defending himself in this House, but he stated that the document he was reading to this House at that time was prepared by the Deputy Minister. If such was the case, I believe that the language that was used by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Lister) was used properly, but I could not believe that such was the case, and I have satisfied myself that it was not. Of course, figures furnished by the hon. gentleman were figures which he could only have acquired from the officers of his department, but the construction placed upon those figures was not placed upon them by the Deputy Minister. I am glad to hear the explanation which the Minister of the Interior has made to the House, because, as far as I know, the Deputy Minister of the Interior worthily fills his position. He is a very hard working officer, and, after the statement made by the Minister, I feel it my duty to state, having had a good deal of business to transact with that gentleman, that he is a man who endeavors to do his duty as Deputy Minister.

Mr. McMULLEN. When the Minister of the Interior made his statement, he tried to show that the late Government had expended every dollar they had received in the management of the North West, and a little over, and he then compared the ten years of the present Government's administration of the North-West with that, and claimed that they had not spent more than a percentage. I will read the hon. gentleman's words:

"During the period of five years for which hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible, the cost of management which is now charged to Do-

minion lands income, was 42 per cent. of the revenue, while for the ten years of Conservative rule, it has been but 20 per cent. of the revenue. Adding together the cost of Civil Government, and management in Manitoba and the North-West, the total expenditure during the five years of Liberal Administration was $351,735, against a total revenue of $350,440, or 100 per cent of the revenue, whereas, during the ten years of Conservative Administration, the cost of Civil Government and management in Manitoba and the North-West has been $1,053,070 against a total revenue of $6,375,828, that is to say, instead of swallowing up the whole revenue it has been but 32 per cent of it."

Now, I hold in my hands a statement of the annual expenditure for all purposes of the Department of the Interior for the ten years, taken from the records of Parliament, and I will read it:

EXPENDITURE, Department of the Interior, for years ending 30th June, 1879 to 1888, inclusive.—INSIDE SERVICE.

Year.	Salaries.	Contingencies.	Minister.	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1879	9,109 87	8,607 34	7,706 98	25,424 19
1880.....	10,402 50	10,631 26	8,000 00	29,033 76
1881.....	45,554 54	12,041 50	8,000 00	65,596 04
1882	40,674 95	14,016 18	8,000 00	62,691 13
1883.....	51,631 81	14,333 57	8,000 00	73,965 38
1884.....	60,254 22	20,323 55	7,293 00	87,870 77
1885.....	62,961 17	17,960 53	7,000 00	87,921 70
1886.....	67,174 58	31,414 84	7,000 00	105,589 42
1887.....	74,320 78	23,360 67	7,000 00	102,681 45
1888.....	78,060 67	22,127 02	5,658 30	105,845 99
	498,145 09	174,816 46	73,658 28	746,619 83

OUTSIDE SERVICE.

Year.	Dominion Surveys.	Lands, salaries, &c.	Total.	Grand total.
	$ cts.	$ cts	$ cts.	$ cts.
1879.....	89,311 34	47,717 05	137,028 39	162,452 58
1880.....	83,676 91	93,469 19	177,146 10	206,179 86
1881	323,573 35	78,854 03	402,427 38	468,023 42
1882.....	408,455 34	185,326 55	593,781 89	656,473 02
1883.....	517,595 73	160,372 47	677,968 20	751,933 58
1884.....	727,464 95	167,875 07	895,340 02	983,210 79
1885.....	304,190 22	178,727 29	482,917 51	570,839 21
1886.....	139,316 99	194,965 58	334,282 57	439,871 99
1887.....	127,416 71	231,366 45	358,813 16	461,494 61
1888.....	106,185 39	216,538 61	322,724 00	428,569 93
	2,827,216 93	1,555,212 29	4,382,429 22	5,129,049 05

What were the receipts? The total receipts for the ten years, as shown by the hon. gentleman's own speech, were $4,961,215. Deducting that sum from the total expenditure of $5,129,049, it appears that the expenditure has actually exceeded the entire receipts of the North-West by $157,834. The hon. gentleman stated in his speech that, including expenses of the outside board and expenses of every kind, we had only spent 79 per cent. of the entire receipts of the North-West, when he had really expended $157,834 more than the entire receipts. I considered it to be my duty to bring this matter before the House to bear out the facts that I stated in the House on a previous occasion. The Minister of the Interior challenged a statement I produced with respect to the expenditure of recent years, and he proceeded to show that that statement was incorrect. He then went on to assail the late Government with respect to this expenditure and showed by a statement he produced to the House that they had expended 100 per cent. of the receipts; in other words, that all the money received by the Government from the North-West had been expended in payment of officials and surveys, and he claimed for his own Government that there was quite a surplus after paying all the expenses. I deemed it to be my duty to present this statement of facts in order to put that statement on record, and I challenge the hon. gentleman or any officer of his department, even the Deputy Head, whom I look upon as a most efficient man, to criticise the statement I have made and show that it is incorrect in any particular.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The figures are all wrong.

Mr. McMULLEN. I say that they are all correct. I defy the hon. gentleman to prove that this statement is not accurate. When Ministers present statements to the House and the country, we have a right to expect that they will be correct statements. But we have been so accustomed for years to receive statements with respect to financial matters and the condition of the different departments that were incorrect, and we have been in the habit of permitting them to escape without that criticism and revision which they should receive, that I considered it to be my duty, in order to place on record a refutation of the statements made by the hon. gentleman, to present this statement to the House. I hold it to be correct in every particular. It shows a most deplorable state of things in the North-West, and when we consider the facts in connection with the administration of affairs in the North-West, that every dollar received is swallowed up, it is a matter that requires to be brought before Parliament. What I find fault with is this, that statements submitted to this House are frequently inaccurate, and I hold that when hon. gentlemen opposite present statements to Parliament with respect to expenditure, whether in the North-West or elsewhere, they should be based upon facts and presented in such a way that the House can place confidence in them. When we come to criticise very many of their statements, we find they do not bear investigation, but have been concocted for the purpose of misleading the country as to its true condition. I have proved conclusively from the figures taken from the records of Parliament that the statement presented by the Minister of the Interior was not correct.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It was correct.

Mr. McMULLEN. And that the figures were not true, and that they were calculated to mislead the House and the country with regard to the expenses in the North-West.

House divided on amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Eisenhauer,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Ellis,	Neveu,
Beausoleil,	Fiset,	Paterson (Brant),
Brien,	Fisher,	Platt,
Campbell,	Flynn,	Ste. Marie,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Gillmor,	Semple,
Casey,	Innes,	Somerville,
Casgrain,	Jones (Halifax),	Sutherland,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Trow,
Choquette,	Livingston,	Waldie,
Colter,	Lovitt,	Watson,
Davies,	Mackenzie,	Weldon (St. John), and
Doyon,	McMullen,	Wilson (Elgin).—39.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archibald,	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gigault,	Patterson (Essex),
Barnard,	Gordon,	Perley,
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Porter,
Boisvert,	Guillet,	Prior,
Bowell,	Haggart,	Putnam,
Brown,	Hall,	Riopel,
Burns,	Hickey,	Robillard,
Carling,	Jones (Digby),	Shanly,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kenny,	Skinner,
Chapleau,	Labrosse,	Small,
Cochrane,	Landry,	Smith (Ontario).
Cockburn,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Sproule,
Colby,	La Rivière,	Stevenson,
Daoust,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Taylor,
Davin,	Macdowall,	Temple,

Davis,	McCulla,	Thomson (Sir John),
Dawson,	McDonald (Victoria),	Tupper,
Denison,	McDougall (Pictou),	Wallace,
Desaulniers,	McKay,	Weldon (Albert),
Dewdney,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilmot,
Dickey,	McNeill,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dickinson,	Madill,	Wright.—71.
Dupont,	Mara,	

Amendment negatived.

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

After Recess.

Immigration $95,135

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Before Concurrence is taken on this resolution I wish to offer a few remarks with regard to the immigration policy of the Government. At this late stage of the Session I shall be as brief as possible, because I have no desire to extend the Session, but the remarks which I intend to make are such as ought to be heard in this House and in the country. I see that the immigration expenditure for 1887-88 was very large, although not as large, perhaps, as it was in some former years, but still it amounted to nearly a quarter million dollars. I find under this expenditure that the salaries in Canada were $35,106.11; in England, not including the expenses of Sir Charles Tupper, $7,955.26; agents in Europe $6,625.08; gratuity to the late agent at Belfast $1,000; contingencies, Canadian agencies, $20,797.96; contingencies, European agencies, $13,024.44; general immigration expenditure, $159,280.24; Montreal Women's Protective Immigration Society, $1,000—total $244,789.04. The salaries and contingencies in Canada alone amounted to $55,904.07. The expenditure of this large amount of money for contingencies in Canada leads, I believe, to a great deal of money being spent which is not expended in the interests of the country, but which is expended for the purpose of giving a livelihood to men who have been ardent supporters of the Government, and who, for political reasons, are put in positions of trust, under the Immigration Department. I find that there are agencies established in the Provinces at Hamilton, Kingston, London, Ottawa, Port Arthur, Prescott, Toronto, Coaticook, Danville, Melbourne, Montreal, Quebec, Richmond, Sherbrooke, Halifax, St. John, Brandon, Deloraine, Emerson, Gretna, Winnipeg, Calgary, Moose Jaw, Medicine Hat, Regina, and other places, and I believe that a great many of these agencies are altogether unnecessary, and that the expenses incurred in carrying on the business of these agencies might be saved with great advantage to the people of Canada. As was remarked the other night, the attention of the Minister was called to an expenditure in one item alone by which it appeared Mr. J. J. Daley, the immigration agent in the city of Montreal, was allowed last year no less than $1,283.70 for cab and horse hire. The Minister could make no explanation of this item, and all through the Auditor General's reports from year to year, we find just such items as this—a scandalous exhibition of the wasteful expenditure of the people's money which in no way benefits the people of Canada or the country at large. In addition to all these numerous immigration agencies in the different towns of the Dominion, we have travelling agents besides. We have men who are authorised to travel all over the Dominion of Canada and some of them travel in the localities and are to be found where bye-elections are held,—one particularly is Mr. Webster. We have another agent, who had a roving commission given to him in 1887, Mr. Henry Smyth, ex-M.P. for Kent, who resides in the town of Chatham, and who, according to the evidence given by Mr. Lowe, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, before the Public Accounts Committee, was instructed that he was at liberty to rove all over the North American continent. He had rather an extensive field to travel over. I do not think it is at all for the benefit of this country that we should have these travelling immigration agents, who are supposed to work especially in the older Provinces. The only thing that they can accomplish is to induce the settlers in Ontario, and the older Provinces, to go to the newer Provinces, and I do not think that this system benefits the country generally. If the Government expended their energies and their money in bringing to the country new settlers, instead of transferring some of the best settlers of the older Provinces to the newer Provinces, they would be accomplishing some good for the country. The Government have failed altogether in their immigration policy, and they have failed also in the many promises that they have made to this House from year to year, with regard to the increased number of immigrants who would rush to the North-West and cultivate the fertile fields there. It has been shown that these promises of the Government have all failed, and that the population of the North-West is not increasing by the immigration which has been brought into it from foreign countries, but that it has been increased mainly by the immigration from the older Provinces of the Dominion. This cannot be said to be a benefit to the Dominion generally. I wish particularly to call the attention of the House to the account which was rendered by Mr. Henry Smyth, ex-M.P. for Kent, and which underwent investigation before the Public Accounts Committee. The matter was thoroughly gone into there and evidence was taken bearing on the character of the account. I may say here that this account, which was rendered by Mr. Smyth, is, perhaps, the most remarkable document that was ever rendered in the shape of an account by any individual in this country. It is remarkable from the fact that the man who rendered the account to the Government repudiates it now, and says it is not to be relied upon in any respect whatever. He says that the dates are not to be relied upon, and all he knows about it is that he expended the money which he obtained. I say here boldly, and without fear of contradiction, that this money was obtained fraudulently from the Government. I do not know why the Government paid this amount, but it must be because they thought Mr. Smyth deserved some support for the assistance which he gave them as a party man both in and out of this House. The Government must have known when Mr. Smyth was appointed that he was not well posted for the work he was going to undertake, and they must have known that he had no right to collect the amount of money he received in connection with this account, because when Mr. Smyth was appointed to fill the duties which were expected from him he received a letter of instructions from the Minister of Agriculture, in which he was told what his duties were, and in which he was also told:

"That all expenditure for railway fares and other conveyances must be accompanied as far as possible with vouchers, and in all cases the dates and names of railway stations between which tickets are purchased, should be furnished in accordance with the requirements in such matters of the Audit Act"

And he was further required to report to the department monthly. Mr. Smith occupied this position for six months; he was appointed for six months, but claimed that he worked longer; and during the whole of that time, while pretending to discharge the duties of his office, he never reported to the department or the Minister in accordance with this letter of instructions, and when he rendered his account to the department he did not accompany it with any vouchers whatever for the expenses he had incurred, as he had been instructed to do. There are other remarkable features in connection with this account. According to it we find that Mr. Henry Smyth started on his way westward on 1st July, when he took a sleeping car ticket to St. Paul. From that time

he travelled consecutively day after day, giving the places where he purchased tickets, the places he went to, and the hotels he stopped at All through the month of July and August, day after day, and even on Sundays, he never ceased doing business; and he kept on right through September and until the 4th of October, when, according to his account, he came back to Chatham for the first time after he had left on the 1st of July. Then he stayed four days in Chatham, and on the 9th of October he bought a ticket for Kansas City. Then he continued to state where he was, day after day, what railway fares he paid, what hotels he stopped at. The account states that in one place he stopped with W. W. Lewis, an old Chatham, Ontario, man, and after this statement he puts the words, "no expense." He wanted to show to the Government that he was particularly honest, that he was a good and faithful servant, and that when he stopped with a friend there was no expense to the Government. He also stopped with James Wrencher, an old Kent man, and marked on his account "no expense." But he kept on with his travels without interruption all through the months of October and November until the 30th of November, when he came back in a sleeper to Chatham. When the matter was investigated in the Public Accounts Committee we found that Mr. Smyth's account, which represented that he had expended $1,542.95, was inaccurate, unreliable and untruthful from beginning to end; in fact, that it was a fraudulent account which this Government had paid to Mr. Smyth. Mr. Smyth had not complied with the instructions given him by the department. He never produced any vouchers for the expenses he had incurred, nor had he made any report to the department. In his evidence before the Committee Mr. Smyth told us that the dates were all wrong and were not to be relied on; he did not remember anything in connection with the expenditures except that he had spent the $1,542; that was the only thing he could remember. He said that he was not responsible for the account, that he had deputed a man who had been a confidential clerk of his, a Mr. Mitchell, to make out this account, and that he had given Mr. Mitchell a pass book and diary in which all the dates and expenditures were noted down. We had this Mr. Mitchell before the Public Accounts Committee and what did he say? He said he had tried to make out the account according to the memoranda and diary he had got from Mr. Smyth, but he could not make it out, and he went to Mr. Smyth for instructions, and he instructed him how to make out that account. But when Mr. Smyth came before the Committee he pleaded not guilty, because he said that Mr. Mitchell whom he had hired, had not made out the account properly; and it was convenient for Mr. Smyth to lose his pass-book and diary, so that no evidence could be given against him in regard to that point. When Mr. Smyth gave his evidence, he changed the character of his defence altogether; he took a new tack. We had evidence that Mr. Smyth was in Chatham during the time he charged as has having been out west, and if he had not changed his defence he would have been tripped up at every point. What was the best defence he could put in? He claimed that he made not one trip, but four or five, to the west that summer, and we found great difficulty in extracting from him any particulars as to the dates when he started, how long he stayed, or when he came back. However, after perseverance I got him to state that he started from Chatham for St. Paul, he could not say whether it was on the 1st or the 15th of June, but he said he was sure he went there. On the second trip he started about the 1st July, and he stated positively that he was away for at least six weeks. Now it was proven conclusively before the Public Accounts Committee by a respectable citizen of Chatham, Mr. Martin, that Mr. Smyth was in Chatham on the 6th July, and that Mr. Smyth had presented certain certificates with regard to a loan which he was trying to secure on a certain property in the neighborhood of Chatham. These documents were produced before the Public Accounts Committee by Mr. Martin, who declared that Mr. Smyth had brought them into his office on the 6th July. Thus, despite Mr. Smyth's declaration that he had started on his trip on the 1st July, we find he was in Chatham on the 6th. Further, Mr. Martin declared that Mr. Smyth was in and out of his office in Chatham negotiating this loan almost every day in July up to the 1st August, and later on until October. Yet Mr. Smyth, in his evidence before the Committee, declared that he started on the 1st July and was away at least six weeks from Chatham. Smyth, in his evidence, further said that he came back to Chatham in the latter part of October. Mr. Martin proved before the Public Accounts Committee that Smyth was in Chatham and signed an agreement in his office on the 12th October, at the time when Mr. Smyth said he was away in the western States. Then when Mr. Smyth was questioned as to dates, he said that he started the latter part of October, but could not give any evidence as to how long he stayed or when he came back. He was in Chatham on the 2nd and 3rd of November at an election trial held there to unseat the member who now sits in this House representing the County of Kent; yet by his own account he claims that on the 2nd November he was at Plum Creek, away out in the west. On the 15th November, Smyth gave evidence at the election trial at Chatham, when, according to his own account, he was out West in Omaha. On the 16th November, he instituted a suit for perjury in Chatham, and gave evidence in the suit against one Thornton. Fancy a man who makes out an account of this character and fraudulently gets payment of it, charging a man, at the very time he represented he was in the Western States, with being guilty of perjury. I would like to know what kind of a servant this is for the Government to engage to discharge important functions. On his last trip, Mr. Smyth started from Chatham on the 24th November for Omaha. His account, as made out and rendered to the department, is only up to the 30th November. He claimed that he had put in the whole of his services, according to his account, up to the 30th November, but when he came here he discovered that he would not be able to satisfy the Committee that he had rendered the services, if he did not add another month, and he stated before the Public Accounts Committee that he started from Chatham on the 24th November. In answer to questions put to him in the Public Accounts Committee, he gave day and date, and the name of every place where he stopped at, up to the 23rd December, when he claims he came back to Chatham. He positively declared that he never was in Chatham or in Canada at all from the 24th November, when he started for Omaha, until the 23rd or 24th December, but was continuously in the Western States during the whole of that time. He declared he was willing to swear to this. This was another matter in which he was positive. He was not positive in regard to anything except that he spent the money and during this whole month was in the Western States discharging his duties as immigration agent. Well, you will scarcely believe that, after declaring that he could swear to the truth of the statement that he was not in Chatham from the 24th November till the 24th December, he immediately turned round and within ten minutes declared, under cross-examination, that he believed he was in Chatham on the 3rd December, when the Conservative convention was held there for the purpose of nominating a candidate to oppose Mr. Campbell, the Reform candidate, and member for the County of Kent. Mr. Smyth was in Chatham the 3rd of December, and Mr. Martin, who resides in Chatham, and gave evidence before the Committee, declared that he saw Smyth on the 3rd December, and had spoken to him. Mr. Smyth could not deny this. Mr. Smyth declared again he was in Chatham at a second convention which was held by the Conservatives on the 17th December, although, only a few minutes before, he declared that he had

never been in Chatham from the 24th November till the 23rd December. I congratulate the Conservatives of the County of Kent on the honesty and integrity of the men they select to canvass the county in their interest. Here we have this man declaring, all within a quarter of an hour, that he was out of the country for a whole month, and that he was in the country during the same period. I think it is fortunate for Mr. Smyth that he could not produce his so-called vouchers for this expenditure, and that he lost his diary and pass-book. I believe he lost them on purpose. I do not believe he desired to produce them, or dared produce them, before the Public Accounts Committee, because I am satisfied that if he had, they would have convicted him of gross fabrication. In connection with this matter, I will say that the members of the Government who were present at the Public Accounts Committee, deserve some credit. I know they are capable, and their followers are capable of supporting some things that will scarcely bear the light of day. They have done so in times past; but on this occasion I will give them this credit, that not one Minister of the Crown who was present during the whole of that examination, which extended over two days, ever said one word in defence of Mr. Smyth, or made any attempt to assist him. They knew too well, from the character of the evidence he had given, that he had committed a fraud upon the country and dared not defend him. For this the Government deserve credit, but at the same time I contend that, as they have been imposed on, they, as the guardians of the money of the people, should take some steps to make this man pay back the money he fraudulently obtained. I would suggest, therefore, that the right hon. the First Minister take this into his serious consideration—to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To-morrow is Sunday.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It will be a good Sunday's work. Now, I do not wish to detain the House any longer. I would just say this, that I think the case was completely proven to the satisfaction of the members of the Government and every man who sat on that Committee, and I think it is high time that this system of appointing agents to act under the Immigration Department should be put a stop to. I think that this huge boodle fund which is voted every year for the purpose of feeding the hungry hangers-on of the Tory party should be put a stop to. We all know the history of this fund in the past. We know that a few years ago they used to spend over $100,000 a year for the purpose of giving boodle to the Tory newspapers throughout the country, and we know that we paid them four, six, and in some cases fourteen prices for the work. This I proved to the entire satisfaction of the House on a former occasion. We know that this money has been squandered on every occasion in order to assist needy friends of the Government, and I do not wonder that the evidence which was taken before the Public Accounts Committee in this case and reported to this House was conveniently put out of the way so that extracts could not be read in this House. I do not wonder at all that some earnest, devoted friend of the Government should have thought it his duty to lay hold of this evidence and keep it in his grasp till the House rose, so that the House would not be put in possession of all the facts in connection with this investigation. I believe Mr. Smyth made at least one trip to the North-West during the summer of 1887, and that that trip was for the purpose of taking a load of horses out there to a ranche. He made this trip not in the interest of the people of this country, but in his own interest. I think the Minister ought to give some explanation as to how he came to pay this man when he refused and neglected altogether to comply with the letter of instructions which the Minister gave at the time of his appointment. I believe the whole matter was a fraud from beginning to end. I believe it was a deliberate fraud on the part of Mr. Smyth, and I blame the Government for appointing a man of that character to discharge such duties. I am firmly convinced that this account which he rendered to the department was made up from railway time tables, and that he was not out of Chatham during that summer except for short periods. I have, therefore, the more reason to urge the Government to take the course which I say they should. With regard to Mr. Webster, we know that he appeared before the Public Accounts Committee and boldly and openly admitted that he had done good service to the Government in election campaigns and in bye-elections. We know that he was busily engaged in addressing public meetings in the County of Haldimand at the time he was being paid by this Government his salary and expenses as immigration agent. His accounts show the dates when he made the charges, and we have the records of the House to show when the Haldimand election was held, and these bear out the statement of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Colter) that this Webster was engaged in electioneering work in that county at the time when he was being paid by this Government. Believing, therefore, that the greater portion of the appropriation for immigration is wantonly wasted, I beg to move:

That it appears from evidence reported to this House from the Committee on Public Accounts that one Henry Smyth, heretofore employed by the Department of Immigration, had furnished a return of expenditure under false dates, and for services which he did not render; and that one W. A. Webster, likewise an employé of the said department, was shown to have been actively engaged in bye-elections while drawing pay from the department; that it is improper and inexpedient that the public funds should be used for the payment of such persons, and that the said vote for $95,135 for immigration be not agreed to, but that it be referred back to the Committee of Supply, with instructions to reduce the same to $50,000.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Somerville:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Eisenhauer,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Ellis,	Neveu,
Beausoleil,	Fiset,	Paterson (Brant),
Brien,	Fisher,	Platt,
Campbell,	Flynn,	Ste. Marie,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Gillmor,	Semple,
Casey,	Innes,	Somerville,
Casgrain,	Jones (Halifax),	Sutherland,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Trow,
Choquette,	Livingston,	Waldie,
Colter,	Lovitt,	Watson,
Davies,	Mackenzie,	Weldon (St John), and
Doyon,	McMullen,	Wilson (Elgin).—39.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archibald,	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gigault,	Patterson (Essex),
Barnard,	Gordon,	Perley,
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Porter,
Boisvert,	Guillet,	Prior,
Bowell,	Haggart,	Putnam,
Brown,	Hall,	Riopel,
Burns,	Hickey,	Robillard,
Carling,	Jones (Digby),	Shanly,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kenny,	Skinner,
Chapleau,	Labrosse,	Small,
Cochrane,	Landry,	Smith (Ontario),
Cockburn,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Sproule,
Colby,	LaRivière,	Stevenson,
Desoust,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Taylor,
Davin,	Macdowall,	Temple,
Davis,	McCulla,	Thompson (Sir John),
Dawson,	McDonald (Victoria),	Tupper,
Denison,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wallace,
Desaulniers,	McKay,	Weldon (Albert),
Dewdney,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilmot,
Dickey,	McNeill,	Wood (Westm'land) and
Dickinson,	Madill,	Wright.—71.
Dupont,	Mara,	

Amendment negatived.

Murray Canal..... $140,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did the hon. gentleman state that would finish the Murray Canal?

Mr. FOSTER. That is to complete.

Further amount required to meet the expenditure connected with the Royal Labor Commission..... $40,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I put the question to the Government in the absence of the First Minister, as to their intentions with respect particularly to the question of the abuses in the matter of child labor that had been disclosed in the evidence of this Commission. Some discussion ensued with the Minister of Justice, but I intimated at the time that I thought the Government should state definitely what decision they had arrived at, and whether they proposed to take any action in the way of making the law more stringent in order to prevent such abuses as had been revealed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only repeat what the Minister of Justice said: That the report was only lately printed and distributed; that we have had no opportunity and no leisure in fact to examine it, and, therefore, have come to no conclusion upon it. I believe the reports are very elaborate and the evidence very voluminous. Both reports will be read and the evidence perused, and the Government will be prepared next Session to come down with such legislation as the Commission shows is in the interests of the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course as regards general matters, I admit the justice of the hon. gentleman's plea. But in regard to the particular question as to abuses in the matter of child labor to which I called attention last year, I thought then, and I think still, that it should have engaged the attention of the Government, because the hon. gentleman and the House know that utterly irremediable mischief may easily be inflicted on a great number of those unfortunate children while the Government are thinking about it in the interim from Session to Session.

Intercolonial Railway—Rolling Stock $170,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is an item to which I think the attention of the House should be called, that is the use of the Governor General's warrant for so large a sum as $170,000 for rolling stock. It does not reflect much credit on the administration of that department that it should have been necessary to have had recourse to that expedient in order to provide rolling stock. $170,000 taken in that way seems to be a decided abuse of the power which was conferred for the purpose of guarding against utterly unforeseen accidents. I do not think it is a proper use of the Governor General's warrant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As to the general rule, I admit the hon. gentleman is correct and that the Governor General's warrant ought not to be used excepting in an emergency or in special cases as they arise. In this case, however, if I remember rightly, the late Minister of Railways found he was obliged to increase the rolling stock very rapidly in consequence of the large increase in the coal trade. There was great lack of means of transporting coal from the Maritime Provinces. It is, however, an objectionable practice, and I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the Governor General's warrant should not be used with facility.

Department of Marine—salaries..... $2,482 50

Mr. McMULLEN. I beg to move:

That it appears that the Minister of Marine stated in his place in the House that the appointment of Mr. Chipman to a new additional chief clerkship in his department at a salary of $2,300 would impose no additional tax on the people of this country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

That it subsequently appeared that the said statement had no foundation in fact, and that the said resolution be not agreed to, but that it be referred back to the Committee of Supply, with instructions to strike out the item: Salary of C. C. Chipman, $2,300.

I desire to read the words to which I refer. On 15th February, in answer to Sir Richard Cartwright, the Minister Marine and Fisheries said:

"I would say in regard to this matter, and as offering some explanation to the hon. gentleman, that it would not be possible, or, at all events, I do not suppose the hon. gentleman would propose that if an officer with a less salary could do the work in London, this officer should lose his salary altogether. This officer receives simply the same salary this year as he received last year. There is not one farthing increase to the public."

And again he stated in reply to the same hon. gentleman:

"The transfer imposes no additional tax on the people of this country."

I contend that the item now before the House shows very clearly there is an increased tax. It shows that the $2,300 proposed to give this man increases the amount of expenditure in the Department of Marine to that extent, and although the Minister led the House to understand that no increase should take place, we have now in the Estimates the most positive evidence that an increase does take place. The hon. gentleman, in presenting his argument in favor of the transfer of Mr. Chipman from London, declared that as Minister he had the right to choose his own private secretary. It is well known that there is no department to which a private secretary is attached, who is receiving the very large salary paid to Mr. Chipman. It was altogether unnecessary that a man drawing such an enormous salary as $2,300 per year should have been appointed as private secretary to the Minister. There is no other Minister who has a secretary at that cost. Under these circumstances, and considering the representations of the Minister when the item was under discussion, I present to the House the resolution I have offered, that the item be struck out owing to the fact that the Minister mislead the House when he made the proposition in the first place.

House divided on amendment of Mr. McMullen:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Eisenhauer,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Ellis,	Platt,
Beausoleil,	Gillmor,	Ste. Marie,
Brien,	Innes,	Semple,
Campbell,	Jones (Halifax),	Somerville,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Laurier,	Sutherland,
Casey,	Livingston,	Trow,
Charlton,	Lovitt,	Waldie,
Colter,	McMullen,	Watson,
Davies,	Mills (Bothwell),	Weldon (St. John), and
Doyon,	Neveu,	Wilson (Elgin)—33.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Mara,
Barnard,	Gordon,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Porter,
Boisvert,	Guillet,	Prior,
Bowell,	Haggart,	Putnam,
Brown,	Hall,	Riopel,
Burns,	Hickey,	Robillard,
Carling,	Jones (Digby),	Shanly,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kenny,	Skinner,
Chapleau,	Kirkpatrick,	Small,
Cochrane,	Labrosse,	Smith (Ontario),
Cockburn,	Landry,	Sproule,
Colby,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Stevenson,
Daoust,	La Rivière,	Taylor,
Davin,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Temple,
Davis,	Macdowall,	Thompson (Sir John),
Dawson,	McCulla,	Tyrwhitt,
Denison,	McDonald (Victoria),	Wallace,
Desaulniers,	McDougald (Pictou),	Weldon (Albert),
Dewdney,	McKay,	Wilmot, and
Dickey,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (West'l'd)—65.
Dupont,	Madill,	

Amendment negatived.

M. GRANDBOIS. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Thérien) has not voted.

M. THÉRIEN. I have paired with the hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Gauthier).

Railways and Canals—Mr. Schreiber's salary..... $2,000

Mr. ELLIS. I do not rise to object so much to the increase to Mr. Schreiber as Chief Engineer of Government Railways, but to say that Mr. Schreiber as General Manager of the Intercolonial Railway is very distasteful indeed to the people of the Maritime Provinces. I attribute very largely the deficit in the working of that railway to the bad management of Mr. Schreiber, and to the fact that the freight of the road is not looked after with that care which it ought to be looked after in the interests of the people of the chief cities of the Maritime Provinces. So far as St. John is concerned, Mr. Schreiber is most distasteful to the people there, not only to those who are opposed to the Administration, but to the friends of the Administration as well. The chief organ of the Minister of Finance in that city has continually attacked Mr. Schreiber for the bad judgment he displays in the government of the road, for his general impertinence to the people and for his neglect of the public interest.

Kingston Penitentiary..... $15,860

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. the Minister of Justice inform me if in the papers he has sent across to me there is an estimate of the cost of the supply of gas to the Kingston Penitentiary at present?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have looked carefully through the papers and find that I have no satisfactory estimate upon that point. Of course, I will make every enquiry possible to ascertain that the expense attending the change is not an unreasonable one before the change is made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would be expedient before going to the expense of purchasing this electric light apparatus for the prison, to find out whether it can be supplied by the Kingston Electric Light Company or not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I certainly shall consider that. One difficulty we apprehended was the want of certainty in getting the supply from a public company. I believe that most large establishments using the electric light have a plant of their own.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On the other hand the apparatus the hon. gentleman proposes to introduce is of course as likely to get out of order as the apparatus in the city of Kingston is likely to be. I presume that the Minister intends to retain the gas fixtures as a kind of second string to his bow.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it would not be safe to dispose of the gas fittings for some years. Of course it is true that our own apparatus is likely to break down, but not so likely as the city supply, which is dependent on a great many accidents. The matter will be carefully considered.

To meet the expenses of Dominion Franchise Act . $250,000

Mr. PLATT. The amount of this item and the purpose for which it is voted demand that it should be challenged by this House in the interest of the public on every occasion. I consider the expenditure of public money for the preparation of voters' lists for Dominion purposes as useless, nay, Sir, it is worse than useless. This vote does not show by any means the amount of expenditure which this revision entails on the country. We may take it for granted that this vote will be inadequate to meet the expense; but the revision likewise involves an equal expenditure on the part of individuals in the country, and besides that it entails loss of time and paralysis of labor the value of which it would be difficult for us to estimate, and all this to obtain a list which is far inferior to the list now in our hands in every constituency in the country. I beg to move in amendment:

That the said Resolution be not now agreed to, but that it be Resolved, That a complete and satisfactory voters' list is now and will continue to be available for Dominion election purposes in every Province of Canada, and that such list may be secured for Dominion purposes without expenditure from the public Treasury."

Amendment negatived on a division.

Harbors and Rivers—New Brunswick..... $17,500

Mr. FOSTER. When this item was up in Committee the hon. senior member for St. John County (Mr. Weldon) took exception to the vote for building a wharf on Richibucto River, and I think he expressed the opinion that no vessels, or very few, went above the bridge. I took occasion to enquire as to whether that were true or not, for the information of the Government and the House, and I think the hon. gentleman would like to hear the information which I have received. I have this telegram from Mr. Brail, of Kingston:

"94 vessels passed upwards through draw of Kingston bridge last season. Same number, laden, passed through downwards."

Roads and Bridges..... $35,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that there is a revote here of $35,000 for a new iron truss bridge to replace the Union Suspension bridge at Ottawa. Is that the total cost of replacing the bridge?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. FLYNN. The other night I directed the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that a site had been purchased for the erection of a public building in the town to Arichat a few years ago at a cost of $1,000, and that tenders had been invited for the erection of a building; but for some reason, which has never been explained, no contract has ever been let for the construction of that building. I presume that the Minister must have known that the town was of sufficient importance to justify the erection of a public building, because previous to the purchase of the site, considerable correspondence was entered into with the department on the subject. Engineers were employed to survey and report to the department, and after they had made a full report to the Minister, giving all the information necessary, a site was purchased, and tenders were invited; but up to this hour no explanation has been given why the building has not been erected. As I shall probably be asked on my return for some reasons, I shall be unable to give any, unless the Minister of Public Works can state them before this item is concurred in.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When the hon. gentleman spoke of this post office, as there was nothing in the Estimates regarding it, I could not give him any explanation; but as I expected that the hon. gentleman would bring the matter up again, I took care to obtain the information. The site was purchased on the 9th of August, 1883 or 1884, for $1,000. After purchasing the property we found that the present building could be repaired, and improvements and repairs were made at a cost of $575; and we purchased some stoves, pipes, &c., for $51; making altogether an expenditure of $1,635. Having done that, the Government thought they could delay the erection of a new building for some time, and that is the reason it has not been erected.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider resolution (p. 1572) to authorise the granting of subsidies to cer-

tain railway companies and towards the construction of certain railways therein mentioned.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We are entitled to hear from the First Minister how it is the virtuous resolutions which he was given credit for, of bringing these innumerable subsidies to a termination seem to have evaporated so completely. We were given to understand that the hon. gentleman's conscience was smiting him for all the money he was getting through for the benefit of his supporters and other people, and that he had determined to put a stop to the innumerable grants made, but this does not look like it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will consider my explanation very satisfactory when I tell him that the number of applications of more or less merit, some of great merit, for aid in the way of railway subsidies in the whole Dominion amounts to the moderate sum of $21,000,000 or thereabouts; and when I tell him that I believe that the whole of the aid asked for now will be under $2,000,000, the hon. gentleman will quite appreciate how rapidly I am approaching to the state of excellence he would like to see me reach.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I appreciate another thing, and that is how thoroughly the lesson the hon. gentleman has been teaching the various constituencies has been learnt. I am not surprised to find that $21,000,000 or $31,000,000 have been applied for from one end of the Dominion to the other. The prospect is an interesting one. $21,000,000 divided by $3,200 per mile, which seems to be the fixed rate, would give something like 6,000 miles of railway.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very large.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It shows that the system he has inaugurated of subsidising railways indiscriminately, for although some of the railways are of great service, a great many are of very doubtful utility, has had such an effect on the public mind from one end of the Dominion to the other that the hon. gentleman is perfectly overwhelmed with applications, and I am afraid, sooner or later, according to the exigencies of the situation, we will find a great number of these $21,000,000 will come before us if we are all alive and remain here to witness the annual depletion of the Treasury initiated by the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman does well to make the proviso, if we are alive, for I believe if we only grant $2,000,000 out of $21,000,000, some of us will not be alive to speak of those, not to mention any new ones that may come in as well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that a sort of life insurance of the hon. gentleman?

For a railway from some point on the Joggins Railway, near the Heben River, to Young's Mills, in the Province of Nova Scotia, a distance of five miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and not exceeding in the whole $16,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This policy was initiated in 1883. What has been the annual amount that Parliament has paid?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The average amount granted up to this last year was under $2,000,000, and there has been a sudden outburst here, as in the United States, a frenzy for railway extension, which has culminated in this extravagant demand.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It will take only about ten years to give the whole country the $21,000,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Does this connect with the Intercolonial Railway?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has departed from the usual practice of bringing down the correspondence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be on the Table to-night.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is not a new road, but an extension of a road already existing. What is the length of the road?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Sixteen miles.

Mr. LAURIER. Is this for the general advantage of Canada?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it is. It will bring a large lumber trade to the Intercolonial. We have heard a good deal about the deficit on the Intercolonial, and this is one means to remove that deficit.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would save trouble if the hon. gentleman would give us a definition of under what circumstances a road is not for the general advantage of Canada, because, looking over the list which I have before me, of the grants to various railways, I should think it would be a most difficult thing to imagine how, from one end of Canada to the other, any railway could be constructed which is not "for the general advantage of Canada," under the construction put upon those words by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. FLYNN. I think I am able to answer that point. There is one portion of the Dominion to which I expected to see a subsidy granted for the Inverness and Richmond Railway, but that seems to be considered not a railway for the general interest of Canada. That is a most important road, and I understood that the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) had been urging on the Government that a subsidy should be given for that road. I believe the reason has been assigned by him that the Government would not give a subsidy unless the Local Government had entered into a contract with the company, which they had already subsidised to the extent of $3,200 a mile. That cannot be the reason, because the Government have given subsidies in other cases when the Local Government had not entered into contracts. I should like to know what the Government intend to do in that matter, and that is principally in the interest of the people of Inverness, because, though the terminus of the road is at Fort Malcolm, in the County of Richmond, the principal portion of the line runs through the County of Inverness.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the hon. gentleman should put the construction upon that which he does, simply because the railway does not appear here, which may be one of the $21,000,000 to be considered in its turn. I think one reason is that there is and has been a large expenditure of late for railways in Cape Breton. Cape Breton had no railway communications at all, but now the Intercolonial Railway is being extended into Cape Breton. That involves a large expenditure there, and every part of the country must have its turn. I think Cape Breton and this road may stand over now for its turn.

Mr. NEVEU. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I cannot allow these resolutions to pass without making some remarks. I see by these resolutions that the Government have not vouchsafed to subsidise the projected railway from St. Félix de Valois to St. Jean de Matha, in the County of Joliette. The company is incorporated and has asked from this Parliament a subsidy of $3,200 per mile, on a distance of eight miles, a sudsidy which the Government has granted to all the subsidised railways. This railway will render great service to the population and to trade, for the parishes which it is intended to traverse are very populous and raise a great quantity of agricultural produce. Furthermore,

this railway will connect the parishes through which it runs with other railways already built, such as the St. Félix de Valois Railway and the North Shore Railway. I see by these resolutions that the Government subsidises certain railway lines which do not appear to have the same importance as the one I have just spoken of. You will observe, Mr. Chairman, that before the building of the railway from Joliette to St. Félix de Valois, any company which would undertake the construction of a railway from Joliette to St. Félix de Valois would have incurred a very considerable expenditure. But at the present time when the railway is completed from Joliette to Saint Félix de Valois, which is the most expensive portion, inasmuch as the land in that locality is more rolling,—the remainder of the railway is easy to make. But still some thousands of dollars are required to build it. It is, perhaps, somewhat late for the Government to introduce new resolutions this Session, but I trust that they will take the matter into consideration, and that next year they will grant the required subsidy and do justice.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. The railway project referred to by the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Neveu) is not a new enterprise, and I believe the Secretary of State will remember that in 1880 or 1881, when he was Prime Minister of Quebec, the parish of St. Jean de Matha was induced to have surveys made, understanding that this railway was to be built. That parish voted a large amount of money for the preparation of plans and estimates for the construction of the road. Since that date no steps have been taken. It was understood that a company would be formed to construct the road, that it would be aided by the Government, and that it would be made part of the Canadian Pacific system. The parish of St. Jean de Matha is one of the largest on the north shore, and is most important in regard to its products of lumber and minerals, as well as its agricultural products. In the district of Joliette, some valuable mines have been found, and there are undoubtedly other rich minerals in that neighborhood. This was only to be the commencement of a railway which will go to the heart of the Laurentian mountains as far as Mattawin, and I hope the Government will inform themselves as to the importance of this enterprise. While I am on my feet, I may say that I have been surprised that the Government have not proposed to give any aid to the Montreal and Lake Maskinongé Railway. That has been pressed upon the Government for a long time past. In 1886, $3,200 was voted for ten miles of the railway between St. Félix de Valois and St. Gabriel de Brandon. It was considered by the engineers that the point selected for the commencement of the road was not in a convenient place, and that it should be at a distance of about two miles from that. The plans were submitted to the Government, and approved by Order in Council, and a contract was entered into. Of that road, 13 miles have been built, though the subsidy has only been voted for ten miles. The company has gone to the expense of building three miles of road so as to have a first class communication between the Canadian Pacific Railway and St. Gabriel de Brandon. The company made representations to the late Minister of Railways, the late Mr. Pope, on several occasions; and Mr. Pope stated many times, both to myself as president of the company, to the Hon. Mr. Thibaudeau, one of the directors of the company, and to Mr. Armstrong, who built the road, that an additional subsidy for the three miles would be granted the first time that new railway resolutions were brought down. Consequently, when I looked over the resolutions presented to the House and did not find any reference to this road, in favor of which numerous promises had been made by the Minister of Railways, I was very much surprised. This extension line has not been constructed without due consideration by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who are now operating the road, and by the promoters, who acted under encouragement given by the Government. The engineer of the Government made a survey of the route, which was approved, and the road was built in accordance with the report of the engineer. I find that the Government have failed entirely to keep their promises, since nothing has been put in the Estimates to allow the company to meet the additional expense they have incurred, and the additional responsibility they have taken.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The answer given by the First Minister to the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) justified this vote on the ground that a large sum of money was being spent in Cape Breton just now, and that other places must have their turn. If the hon. gentleman had allowed his memory to go back a year or two he would remember that the Session before last when the High Commissionner was here, he proposed votes for four branch lines in the County of Cumberland, and last year we had more. I am not objecting to any branch lines there, but I think the County of Cumberland has its share, and if the Government are disposed to spend money, there are a good many other places in Nova Scotia that are entitled to consideration. In the western part of the Province the road connecting Annapolis with Shelburne and Liverpool, I think, is a road deserving of aid, particularly as those people have no railway communication whatever, whereas Cumberland is intersected with railways and branch lines from one end to the other. I do not object to their getting a road, but I do object to their absorbing everything. The Government have in addition made an appropriation of about three million and a half to build the Chignecto Ship Canal, which I am afraid is so much money thrown away, at least that is the general impression. It appears that almost every time an election takes place in the County of Cumberland they come down with new applications, but I am in hopes that at the rate they are going on, there will not be many places which are not intersected by roads, so that we will have no further application from them unless the High Commissioner comes back again. Now, the Joggins Road, I believe, runs to a shipping port, and this seems to be a private line reaching to Young's Mills. It does not seem to be a public road at all. But we are having a road which may, as the leader of the Government says, bring traffic to the Intercolonial Railway. If it is to bring traffic to the Intercolonial Railway, I hope the leader of the Government will see that the lumber is not carried as cheaply as coal, because it would hardly be worth awhile to give a subsidy to extend a road to obtain traffic on which we loose as much money as on carrying coal.

Gen. LAURIE. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has alluded to a road, the subject of which I have pressed upon the consideration of the Government. I am sorry they have not seen their way to do anything for us this year. I suppose the reason is because there are so many different schemes proposed. Last year the then Minister of Finance stated that railway communication in my county was under the consideration of the Government, and I suppose that until opposing interests are to some extent reconciled we must bide our time.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Where is Young's Mills?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is on the Heben River.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This is owned by an American living in Calais.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe he is doing an enormous business.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Is there no town in this place? Is it nothing but a mill owned by a private individual?

Mr. DICKEY. This is called Young's Mills, because that is the name of the settlement at the terminal point of the road. It is on the Heben River. The road runs up the river through a marsh and through a very fertile country, producing a large quantity of hay. I believe there are four mills on the river between the two points, and they export a large quantity of lumber which now has to be rafted down the river. This lumber will go, like the other lumber in Cumberland, largely to the English market.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What company is constructing the road?

Mr. DICKEY. I presume that the Joggins Railway Company or the Minudie Railway Company will construct the road. Either of them is prepared to do it.

Mr. KENNY. This company has been recognised by the Provincial Government, which has subsidised the Joggins company. This is an adjunct of the Joggins Railway Company.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the First Minister ought to tell us whether there is an organisation of any kind making an application, or whether it is only a private individual.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have been in the habit of adopting two descriptions of votes, one to incorporate railway companies and another to a railway from a certain point to a certain point, with the object of inducing some railway company to take up the project. There are two rival companies applying for this work, and the Government will consider which company is the better one to whom to give it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) To the remarks of the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Neveu) I will reply in French, in spite of the majority of the House being English, seeing that he has spoken in French. This will serve equally as an answer for the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil). The hon member for Joliette has spoken of eight miles of railway between St. Félix de Valois and St. Jean de Matha, which he would have liked to see subsidised. This question I must admit has not been considered by the Government. The death of the hon. Mr. Pope, has, necessarily, created difficulties in the matter, and has prevented us from receiving the same information which he was now in possession of. It is the same answer I have to make to the hon. member for Berthier respecting his three miles. It is too late now to add anything to the resolutions; but during the recess the matter will be considered, in order to ascertain how far we will be able to meet the wishes of the hon. members.

To the St. Clair Frontier Tunnel Company, for the construction of a tunnel under the St. Clair River, from a point at or near Sarnia, to a point at or near Port Huron, a subsidy not exceeding in the whole $375,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see how the First Minister can possibly reconcile to his conscience the aiding and abetting of an enterprise evidently for the nefarious end of promoting the speedy transport of Canadian goods to the United States and *vice versa*. But meantime, and leaving that question to be settled between himself and his conscience, I should like to know what the estimated cost of the tunnel is. It is part of the Grand Trunk system. For other reasons I do not object to this proposal, and if proposals of this kind are to be gone into at all, this is one of the schemes which is decidedly for the general benefit of Canada, from my point of view, though not from the hon. gentleman's point of view. But I should like to have all the information the hon. gentleman possesses as to the probable cost, and what probability there is for this being speedily completed, and also the length of the tunnel.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman need not concern himself about my conscience. He has said that from his point of view, this project would be of general benefit to the country: so he and I for once agree on this point. The length of the tunnel proposed will be 5,280 feet, and of the approaches 9,870 feet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When the hon. gentleman says the approaches are about 10,000 feet, does he mean that the approaches are 10,000 feet plus the length of the tunnel?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Plus the length of the tunnel. The estimated cost is $2,500,000. The work of construction is well under way, and good progress is being made. When finished, it will give easy and direct connection between the Grand Trunk and the western railway system of the United States. The proposed subsidy is $375,000, being 15 per cent. on the estimated cost, that being the percentage we have given to bridges which cost over $100,000. The application is made on behalf of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and it was pressed because the company said, that this was a very expensive and hazardous enterprise, and if there is anything uncertain it is the cost of sinking a submarine tunnel. There may be a flaw in the bottom where the tunnel is to be built, and such has been the history of the tunnels in London and other places, and the work being so very hazardous, the Grand Trunk Railway Company thought they could fairly apply to Parliament to assist them. We thought it was a matter that could be fairly submitted to Parliament. The understanding is, however, that should the estimate exceed the sum specified, the Grand Trunk Railway Company are to have no claim whatever for an increased percentage.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On the question of submarine tunnels, there is an enterprise in which the right hon. gentleman expressed an exceedingly warm interest previous to the last elections, and there is on record here a letter written by him to a leading gentleman in Prince Edward Island, in which the hon. gentleman stated that he would give Government assistance for a survey to be made of the Straits of Northumberland with the object of ascertaining whether it was feasible to construct a tunnel from the Island to the mainland. That survey was made. That survey established, I believe, beyond all possible doubt the feasibility of the construction of a tunnel. That survey established the further fact that the distance to be tunnelled would be six or six and a quarter or at the outset six and a half miles. It established the further fact that the difficulties to overcome are not nearly so great as are generally supposed to exist; and it is now believed, and I believe the opinion has been expressed by scientific men whose opinion is worth something, that the tunnel could be constructed probably for an expenditure of $5,000,000. That being the case it brings the matter within practical politics. The hon. gentleman, in the letter to which I have referred, and which no doubt he well remembers writing, says that if after surveys had been made construction appeared to be within reasonable grounds, it would be a matter for Parliament to consider. I entertained the hope, therefore—and it must be remembered that the hon. gentleman alone can bring down a resolution to test the opinion of Parliament on the matter—that the hon. gentleman would have laid the results of the surveys before Parliament, and asked the opinion of Parliament whether or not, backed up by his own favorable opinion, such a tunnel could be constructed. There is no doubt that heretofore the matter has been treated in a jocular way, because it was thought that it would cost ten or twelve million dollars. I held that opinion then, and I thought that it was a very much larger sum, and that it would be unreasonable to ask the Parliament of Canada to grant it. If a tunnel can be constructed for $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 it

becomes a matter to be seriously considered by this or any other Government in a very short time. I have no doubt the construction of such a tunnel would have a traffic far exceeding any other tunnel which could be built in any part of Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In potatoes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not only in potatoes. The hon. gentleman knows the Island is noted for the production of a great many articles besides potatoes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. For eloquence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) All kinds of agricultural products are produced in the greatest abundance, and the products of the dairy are now assuming no insignificant proportion. I suppose the Island is more thickly populated than any other place in Canada of the same area, and there is no land in Canada that produces more than the Island does. I do not want this matter to be lost sight of. I hope it will receive consideration, and that the results of the surveys will be presented to Parliament, and that the conclusion at which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues may have arrived at with respect to the construction of the tunnel will also be communicated to the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that if that could be constructed at any reasonable cost it would be well worth building to settle the question of communication with the mainland. The survey was made, but there are a good many contradictory opinions with respect to its feasibility or of its being permanent when built. We have to consider the great depth of the water there, and one of the schemes was to abandon the idea of building a tunnel there, and that it should be a tubular iron structure resting on stone piers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That has been abandoned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Those who know all about the circumstances say that the icebergs would certainly sweep it away the first season after it was built. The whole scheme is surrounded with so much difficulty that the Government have not come to any conclusion in the matter. It is obvious that if there was any serious risk of the tunnel when constructed being broken up in a year or two it would be a very unwise expenditure. However, the Government will bring down, next Session, all the various reports we have on this subject for the information of the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The scheme to build a tubular tunnel resting on piers, and which was known as the subway scheme, emanated from the Hon. Senator Howland, and was very energetically agitated by him for two or three years. After having taken the opinion of a number of eminent engineers in different parts of the world and gone to a great deal of expense in the matter, I think the Senator came to the conclusion that that scheme was not a practical one, and he gave his adhesion to the other scheme which has I believe the approval of several eminent engineers not only in this country but in the old country as well. I believe Senator Howland has letters from Mr. Walker, the contractor for building the tunnel under the Severn, a man who knows precisely all the ground there, and to whom copies of surveys were sent, and I believe Mr. Walker expressed a very favorable opinion as to the practicability of the construction of this tunnel.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; but the Severn is not six miles wide.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I). Yes; but that gentleman had surveys of the straits, and expressed an opinion favorable to the scheme.

The Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company, for thirty miles of their railway from the east bank of the St. Charles River, to or near to Cape Tourmente, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and not exceeding in the whole, $96,000

Mr. LAURIER. Is not this road already constructed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is being constructed. I believe it is finished from Quebec to Ste. Anne de Beaupré.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much has it got from us already?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Nothing; this is the first vote.

The Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Company, for a bridge over the St John River at Fredericton, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding in the whole $30,000

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What is this vote for?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is the bridge at Fredericton over the St. John River. It is a very substantial work of steel superstructure and massive masonry piers with a swing to permit navigation to pass through. It has besides a mile of an approach on either side. The works which are now complete have been carried on by the Fredericton Bridge Company under a loan of $300,000 from the Dominion Government which amount has been paid under the certificate of the Chief Engineer of Government railways. The bridge is a most useful structure, as it affords communication between railways on both sides of the river and is open to all railways on equal terms.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The bridge and the approaches are complete, and the Government has advanced nearly $300,000 loan to this company, and I do not see on what principle this money is now given. I understand these railway subsidies are for the purpose of enabling a work to be built, but it appears to be entirely against the principle to make a grant when the work is completed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They got a loan to build a bridge, and the Government promised to submit this vote for the favorable consideration of Parliament, and upon that promise the company went on and continued the work.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). At the time of the proposition for a loan, there was nothing said before the House of any private agreement on the part of the Government that they should advance this money. The Dominion bridge at the mouth of the St. John River is much more important than this bridge, and the same principle might be applied to it. The Government made the proposition to give a loan to this company, and now we find that the First Minister has said that there was some agreement to give them $30,000. Has there been any advance made on account of this $30,000?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who composes this bridge company?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe Mr. Gibson, who perhaps the hon. gentleman has heard of, and I think the member for York is also a shareholder. I do not know the others. I know those two gentlemen are connected with it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are the company, perhaps?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That I do not know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is extremely proper and desirable that we should know, particularly under the circumstances stated by my hon. friend. Moreover, I think in all these cases we ought to have among the papers a list of the shareholders of the various companies applying.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would be a terrible work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; but it is a thing we ought to be possessed of, particularly in a case like this. I want to know from the hon. gentleman what the cost of this bridge has been, and at what rate of interest we had advanced the $300,000, less the instalments by which we are gradually to liquidate it, pending, I suppose, absorption on account of the Short Line, as the hon. gentleman hinted just now.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). At present that bridge connects with the Northern and Western Railway, which runs from St. Mary's to Chatham, and there connects with the Intercolonial Railway. It does not connect with the New Brunswick road; but really the bridge has been open for traffic over a year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The cost of the bridge is $376,000. The bridge has now been operated for a year, as the hon. gentleman says. I was there last September and saw the final stones laid before the opening of the bridge.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). This is a strange amount of information we are getting. We have advanced $300,000 for the construction of this bridge which has cost $375,000, and the question now is has the interest been paid up to the present time? Very likely we are going to lose the $300,000 and the interest in the bargain, and we are now asked by the First Minister to vote another $30,000 without a particle of information. Then it turns out that a member of this House has a very great interest in this bridge. It is not shown that the bridge, although constructed, has performed any very useful purpose, or has been used to any extent at all. I think the First Minister had better let the resolution stand until he brings down some information giving us some reason why we should vote this money.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think there is any necessity of letting the resolution stand. The hon. gentleman must know that at the time the loan of $300,000 was authorised by Parliament, explanations were given satisfactory to Parliament as to the loan. That loan is secured on the bridge, and I have no doubt that if the hon. gentleman goes down to Fredericton, he will admire it esthetically and architecturally; it is a very handsome bridge over a fine river.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Has the interest been paid?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I think not, and I think the Government would have been exceedingly unwise to press the company to pay the interest when they were expending all their energies on building the bridge itself. No doubt the bridge is good security for the money. This $30,000 which was promised, is simply the 15 per cent. which has been given to other railway bridges which have cost over $100,000. This is a subsidy, a free gift, in aid of the construction of the bridge. The loan is secured on the bridge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us, as a business man, that he considers it a safe transaction to lend $300,000 on a property which by his own showing only cost $375,000?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I do not mean to say that if I were a money-lender, which I never will be, I would not require a larger margin than that. But that loan was made for the purpose of constructing a public work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What rate of interest does it bear?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 4 per cent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He must be a very verdant member of Parliament who says that any portion of this $300,000 will ever be returned, or who will deny that the practical effect will be that we are going to pay the whole cost of building the bridge. We advanced $300,000 a few years ago under circumstances in which I think the most perfect good faith was not kept by the Government with the House. The House was led to believe that this was a perfectly good loan and perfectly well secured, and it was not hinted at that time that there was any private or secret agreement that this money should be given.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was no secret agreement.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The advance was made under circumstances which I think the hon. gentleman has a right to explain to the House. The $300,000 which was voted, and the $30,000 to be given to-night will very nearly build the whole bridge. There is no evidence before the House that the bridge cost even $376,000, as the hon. gentleman states. For all we know, the $330,000 has already more than built the bridge, and the fact that a member of Parliament is a leading owner of the bridge is a very suspicious circumstance. I do not believe that it is right that members of Parliament should come and support the Government and get these loans and grants year after year. How is it possible that there can be any independence in Parliament at all? These public works are made for those followers of the hon. gentleman opposite who are the most subservient—that is the English of it; and I suppose hon. gentlemen from the west will be able to explain to their constituents how they voted so cordially $330,000 for the building of a bridge at Fredericton, which is not a public bridge, but which is used by Mr. Gibson's railway and no other.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Short Line.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Short Line is not there, and never will be, I hope.

Mr. ELLIS. The fact seems to be this, that the bridge is built across the river and there is practically no business on it. I think two trains a day may cross it, and now it is proposed to expend $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 on another railway to bring business to this bridge. There ought to be some explanation of how the money is to be expended. The bridge has already got $300,000 from the Government, and the company had bonding powers under which they probably raised some more. It does not appear to me that they have spent any of their own money at all, and there ought to be some explanation as to how the $30,000 is to be used and what it is given for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the right hon. the First Minister, as he is so abundantly satisfied with the security of the bridge, what is the annual income of the bridge and how is it made up. Is this $30,000 to be paid in cash, or to be deducted from our loan?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When this is carried we will have a debit and credit account.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you going to stop it out of the $300,000 they owe us?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know how much they owe us; I do not know how much the interest is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This company owes us $300,000. Here is a grant of $30,000 to them. Does the hon. gentleman propose to pay this $30,000 to the bridge company in cash? Or does he propose to apply it to the reduction of their debt?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That I have not considered. Now that the hon. gentleman has raised the question, I will consider it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have the right to understand, because it makes a material difference. It

might diminish my opposition considerably if the hon. gentleman were going to apply this $30,000 in the reduction of the debt, inasmuch as I am inclined to look upon it as a debt. The payment of $30,000 more under the circumstances would be decidedly objectionable. What is the estimate of the annual profit of this bridge, or the annual revenue.

Mr. TEMPLE. The bridge is finished only two months. I am in hopes the profits will be thousands of dollars when we have the Short Line built.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So that unless the Short Line is built, there will be no profit at all?

Mr. TEMPLE. There are three or four roads connecting on both sides of the river with this bridge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Apart from the Short Line, what profit does the hon. gentleman, who is largely concerned in this road, expect to achieve? What is the annual income likely to be got from the toll?

Mr. TEMPLE. The cost of keeping up the bridge will not exceed $2,000 a year, and we expect to get $30,000 a year out of it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The hon. gentleman said he had arranged on the principle of giving 15 per cent. to the bridges. When the Dominion bridge was built no such an arrangement was made. It was understood that this bridge was to be built on the same terms as the Dominion Bridge Company built theirs, but no 15 per cent. was given them.

Mr. McMULLEN. The right hon. the First Minister has refused to answer the question put by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) with regard to the manner in which the Government intend to apply this $30,000. He says he is not prepared to say whether the Government will vote $30,000 from the amount due the Dominion on account of their loan for the construction of the bridge. But whether the Government are going to pay that amount to the owners or to use it to moderate the debt is not known. Perhaps the hon. member for York in whose hands the right hon. the First Minister evidently is, will say whether he intends to apply the money to the debt already due. The hon. member for York admits that he anticipates annually a receipt from this bridge of $30,000 and he says the cost of keeping it up will be only $2,000 a year, leaving a net profit of $28,000 a year. In the face of a statement of that kind, the Government should explain how they come to grant $30,000 towards a bridge which the owner declares is a good paying institution, and which bears all the marks of a "job." We are also asked to grant a bonus of $3,200 a mile to the building of one mile of road. Is this a cut to some mines or what is it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will explain when we get to that item.

Mr. McMULLEN. This resolution is nothing short of a political scandal. This bridge, it is estimated, will give a revenue of $30,000 and only cost $2,000 to keep in repair, and yet the hon. gentleman is to give the company a further bonus of $30,000. This is an outrage upon the ratepayers of this country.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down concluded that there is something irregular and improper in granting $3,200 to one mile of railway. The hon. gentleman interested is not here to defend himself, but he is quite as incapable of perpetrating a job as the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. McMULLEN. I rise to a question of order. I was about making further remarks upon this point when the right hon. the First Minister stopped me, and said he would give explanations when the item came up. I think that the hon. member for Halifax should have applied to him the same rule that was applied to me.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would like to know whether the bridge company have got bonding powers, and, if so, if they have issued any bonds, and what amount they have sold? This information is necessary, as we are the principal creditors.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As we have the first mortgage, it is of no consequence.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am aware of that, but I want to know what this company has now. If we have lent them $300,000 and give them $30,000 more, and the bridge costs $375,000, it seems that they have $45,000. I want to know if they have issued bonds; if they have sold those bonds, what they have realised on the sale; I want to ascertain whether the company to-day has not actually received more than the bridge cost? The First Minister says we have nothing to do with that. Have we not? Is it not in the interest of Canada that our credit should be good abroad, when we are asked to give bonding powers to a company so that they can go to a foreign market and sell bonds, and that it can be found afterwards that those bonds are worthless? The Minister must have surely forgotten himself when he says that we are secure and that he does not care whether people have lost money or not. I ask the First Minister, and, if he cannot tell us, perhaps the hon. member for York (Mr. Temple) can tell us how many bonds he issued, what amount of those bonds he sold, and what amount he has received for those which he has sold?

Mr. LAURIER. Surely, in face of the statement which has just been made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Temple), the Government cannot intend to proceed with this resolution. The policy which has always been adopted and followed as the basis of these railway grants is that we assist in building railways. It is a fact that people who put their money in railways generally find poor returns for their investments, and, perhaps, because of that, railway development has not been so satisfactory as it otherwise would have been, but the Government has adopted the policy of assisting railways that would not otherwise come into existence. There was no other reason for the adoption of that policy by the Government, and for those grants not being opposed on this side of the House, but when the promoter of this bridge states that he expects a return of $30,000 a year out of the amount of $33,073 capital, it is monstrous to pretend that this money is required to assist him. I put it to the Prime Minister himself to say what assistance is necessary when, on a capital of $33,073, there is a return of $30,000 a year, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman himself. The appropriation, therefore, has no basis at all. It is not to assist a railway and it has no basis in the policy which has been adopted by the Government, and we must divide the House upon that question.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Government may be wise in their generation, because, instead of buying up districts by large grants for public works of doubtful utility, they are now buying up members by direct vote, and perhaps a direct vote to a member of this House of $30,000, though it may be large, may be cheaper to the Dominion than a vote for a public work which would be of no utility to the country. I should like to know what would be thought in the Imperial Parliament if a discussion similar to this came on there, if it were stated that a member of the Imperial Parliament was sitting in the House and listening to a discussion in regard to a vote which the Prime Minister had submitted to the House, for a grant to a work in which he was directly interested? Can we imagine for a moment what the feeling in England would be? Does anyone suppose that there would be an hon. member in the Imperial Parliament who would take the responsibility of

defending such a grant? We know that no Ministry there would propose it, and consequently no member would have to justify it. Public opinion there is different from what it is, unfortunately, in this country, because public opinion here has been so demoralised by these grants which have been made to enterprises from one end of the country to the other, in which members are interested, that I suppose the Government are trading upon the fact that no healthy, wholesome public opinion exists at all. But for that, they would not venture to bring down such a proposition as this to make this grant to a member of this House. We have seen other votes which have been equally reprehensible, but not so candid. We have seen votes for railway enterprises in which members on the other side of the House were interested. But in most cases those works were not all completed. There was an element of uncertainty as to their completion, and the money was voted for the purpose of completing them; but, in this case, the work is completed. This amount is not granted in the shape of aid to an enterprise which is considered of itself desirable, because the work has already been done. That stands in a very different position from that of any other grant whatever. However desirable it may be to assist a public enterprise which is to accommodate the public in the general interest of Canada, that is one thing, but it is altogether another thing when you ask for a vote of money for a work which is completed and in operation, and, according to the hon. gentleman's own account, is returning a handsome amount for the expenses. It is an outrage on constitutional government and the country should understand it. I return, however, to my first proposition, that it is, perhaps, the cheapest way of buying members of the House. If those who are for sale can be had for $30,000, no doubt the First Minister can buy them up one after the other. I do not mean to apply that to all hon. gentlemen on that side of the House—far from it—but, when they sustain such votes as this, their sense of public and political morality cannot be as high as we would desire it to be. When they vote for such an improper appropriation as this, it would almost indicate that they themselves would be willing to accept the same position. I do not mean to say they would, and possibly many of them would not, but the inference is not unnatural; and the hon. member for York (Mr. Temple) can have the consolation of thinking—if he requires any consolation—that those who vote to give him that money would take it themselves if they had the opportunity. I think this proposal should be reconsidered by the Government, and that it should not be allowed to pass without the strongest opposition from all those who remain here to guard the public interest. At this period of the Session, we may not be very strong numerically, but we are here to raise our voices against such a misappropriation of public funds for such a purpose, and I am sure that, while there is one man on this side of the House, he will raise his voice against such a flagrant violation of the rights of the public of Canada. I do not envy the hon. member in accepting this money under the circumstances, nor do I envy the feelings of hon. gentlemen on that side who are called upon to defend it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not surprised in any way at the language of the hon. gentleman, unparliamentary as it is, because abuse and calumny are part of his stock in trade, it is his only stock in trade. I remember the time when in intellect and in *morale*, he would not go so far as he has done to-night. Here is an enterprise in New Brunswick, and because a member of this House has interested himself in it, he is to be abused and attacked by the hon. gentleman, who objects to any reasonable assistance being given to any of the enterprises with which he may be connected. Is it to be understood that no member of this House can join in any enterprise in Canada? Is it to be understood that he is to be prohibited from taking any stock or share in any railway, or in a bank, or any other enterprise, and that if he does he is to be abused and attacked and charged with violating the Independence of Parliament Act? Is he to be abused because Parliament is asked to assist an enterprise in which he has been enterprising enough to put his money? It is shameful, it is disgraceful, to the hon. gentleman, it is unworthy of him; but calumny is the badge of that tribe.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What tribe?

Mr. TUPPER. The tribe the hon. gentleman belongs to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Besides all that the hon. gentleman must not only abuse Parliament, but he must abuse the whole country. He says there is an utter want of moral sense in this country. If Halifax had not redeemed its *morale* by electing my hon. friend who sits behind me (Mr. Kenny) I might, perhaps, consider that there was no moral sense in the city of Halifax in electing the hon. gentleman. Now, what is this transaction? A railway bridge company applied to Parliament to build this bridge. There was nothing wrong in that, there was nothing wrong in my hon. friend holding stock in that, there was nothing wrong in the fact of the company, of which he is a director and shareholder, applying to Parliament for a loan. He got the loan; Parliament had a right to vote it, and there is no reason for any attack or slur upon anybody because that grant is made. Then, after the loan was made, and before the bridge was finished, the company applied to have the same rule meted out to them as is applied to other enterprises of the same kind, that is, for a subsidy of 15 per cent. The Government said: Yes, we think your enterprise ought to have the same assistance as other bridge companies. That is the whole of it. My hon. friend says that he expects to get 15 per cent. I would be very sorry to take his stock off his hands, and so would the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who said a little while ago that he would like very much to know what the receipts had been. My hon. friend who is so attacked and reviled says that he could not tell because the bridge had only been opened recently. I am quite satisfied that his 15 per cent., or his $30,000, is a myth.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, as the hon. gentleman made the statement himself, and as he is a large shareholder, I think that his authority, pending other details, must be taken. Now, it is a very old trick of the First Minister, whenever he has no argument, to get into a rage. I am bound to say that he gets out of it again with remarkable rapidity. But my hon. friend here, and the supporters of the hon. gentleman opposite, know perfectly well that where there is no satisfactory answer, then the hon. gentleman is always capable of putting himself in what fairly resembles a passion, in very short notice, as he did with the hon. member for Halifax just now, What is the case here? The hon. gentleman says that nothing has been done for this bridge company that has not been done for other companies. Does the hon. gentleman mean to state that he has loaned at 4 per cent. per annum four-fifths of the whole cost of constructing bridges to all the other bridge companies in this Dominion?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I refer to this vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All that was put into this bridge company by Mr. Gibson and the member for York (Mr. Temple), and the other parties, was just 20 per cent. of the whole cost. They put in $75,000. The hon. gentleman would not tell us whether he proposed to reduce their 20 per cent. by $30,000, or whether he would apply it in the reduction of the mortgage we have got. Now, we are called upon to take the statement of the hon. member

for York as to the profits he expects to make. He expects to make $28,000 a year, he may be right or he may be wrong. He has got to pay out of it $12,000, so that his investment, on his own showing, would return him $16,000 on an investment of $75,000. That is the statement he made to us, and it is to relieve a struggling industry of that kind, that he now proposes to grant $30,000. These are the statements made to us. They may not be perfectly verified by the facts, but at any rate, the man who is best qualified in the country to state the facts to us, has made that statement on the floor. Now, I cannot agree at all with the hon. gentleman. He knows right well that English constitutional practice is entirely adverse to this system of allowing members who have large interests in enterprises of this kind, to come to Parliament for large sums in aids The thing strikes at the root of all sound parliamentary institutions. I have nothing to say to the hon. member in his individual capacity other than this, that no man can receive such favors from the Government, as the member for York has received, and maintain his independence, it is not in human nature to do it. It is not in human nature that, during the last Session or two, while he has been expecting, as the hon. gentleman has explained to us, this large gift—because $30,000 out of an expenditure of $75,000 is a very large gift in proportion—it is not in human nature that that hon. gentleman could have given an independent vote on the floor of this House, having always present to his mind that this company, in which he is largely interested, was going to receive from the Government a great advantage in loaning them on very insufficient security $300,000 at 4 per cent, and that they further expected a very large percentage, on the very small sums they have invested, to be returned. Now, I repeat, you cannot under any circumstances, no gentleman in this House need pretend that he can maintain an independent attitude toward the Government from which he is in expectation of receiving favors, and from which he has received large pecuniary favors. You may not be able to draw an Independence of Parliament Act which shall exclude men from holding stock in banks and other institutions which have dealings with the Government—that, I admit, is almost impossible; but it is in the power of the Government not to put themselves in such relations as they have chosen to put themselves to hon. members on either side of the House, and particularly to their own supporters. That is entirely contrary to the spirit of our constitution, which requires that the Government shall so use their power as not to put gentlemen behind them under pecuniary obligations to them, as has been done in this case, and is being done by this identical vote.

Mr. KENNY. I desire to say a word or two in reference to the remarks of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). That hon. gentleman has grossly insulted the members on this side of the House; he has had the effrontery to say that members on this side of the House have been bought by subsidies. When an hon. gentleman makes such a charge as that, I think he should be prepared to prove it, or, if not, it is evident that he judges others by himself. The hon. gentleman is nothing if he is not abusive, and this evening he has excelled himself. He has referred to the fact that an hon. gentleman is identified with a public work, which is of great utility to the community in which that hon. gentleman lives, and on that account, because that public work has been aided by the Dominion Government, that gentleman is to be held up to public censure. The hon. gentleman who has made this attack did not consider it any impropriety on his part to stand up and advocate a subsidy for a line of steamers for which he was the agent, and to advocate that too in opposition to the well-understood wishes of the community which he represents, as expressed in meetings of the Chamber of Commerce of Halifax and of the Board of Trade of that city. That hon. gentleman with those resolutions in his hands, showing that the merchants in that community desire that a fast line of steamers should be established, advocated a slower line of steamers, such as the *Vancouver* and the *Parisian* and steamers of that class, for one of which lines he happens to be the agent. I do not mean to say that the mere fact of an hon. gentleman being the agent for a line of steamers or identified with any other enterprise is a reason why he should not advocate it here, if it is in the public interest; but when the hon. gentleman poses as a great moralist and attacks the whole of the hon. gentlemen or a number of members on this side of the House, I think he should come here with clean hands. Two years ago that hon. gentleman stood up here and advocated that we should not have steamers to the West Indies, because, forsooth, those steamers might interfere with sailing vessels in which he was interested. Is he the member to stand here and teach morality to this House of Commons of Canada? I regret exceedingly that any hon. gentleman coming from Halifax should have so far forgotten himself as to have exhibited himself in the light in which that hon. gentleman has addressed the House this evening. I have no personal knowledge of the bridge at Fredericton, I have never seen it. I hope to have the pleasure of seeing it and crossing it as soon as the Short Line Railway is built, but I always understood it was a work of public utility. I did not, however, rise to refer to that point, but I rose to resent the insinuations which the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has thrown across the House, that members of this House can be purchased by subsidies for any work.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is evident to hon. members of this House that I have one follower in this House at all events, even, as an hon. friend beside me says, if he is the one who has just taken his seat. Ever since I came into this House that hon. gentleman has always thought it to be his duty to follow me on every subject on which I spoke, whether he knew anything about it or not. It did not appear to make the least difference whether it was a subject which he had considered, or whether it was a subject which he had never considered before, and respecting which he imparted no information to this House. The hon. gentleman said that I insulted members on that side of the House. I said "there were, no doubt, many hon. gentlemen on that side of the House—" and if the hon. gentleman did not consider he belonged to the exception, that was not my fault; I did not place him in that category, at all events. The hon. gentleman and the leader of the Government were good enough to say that my remarks were not parliamentary, and that in fact they were abusive. The warmth with which the leader of the Government replied to my observations gave evidence as to how true the arrow had struck. The hon. gentleman is too well up in parliamentary rules and practice to be indignant unless he feels the course he is pursuing is open to condemnation and will not bear public discussion, and that was the reason the hon. gentleman felt so strongly the force of the observations which I addressed to the House on that occasion. But I was amazed when the right hon. gentleman addressed to me observations respecting my conduct in this House. If there is a man in this country whose parliamentary course has been open to public criticism and condemnation, it is the course of that hon. gentleman on the Pacific scandal and other matters of that kind, his telegrams to "send me the last ten thousand," "these hands are clean," and "I wish to God I could catch Riel," when he was paying him £600 a year to keep out of the country. The hon. gentleman must think I am as new to parliamentary life as my respected colleague has proven himself to be to-night and on other occasions—my respected follower as I am reminded. But my colleague says that I stood up here and advocated

a subsidy to a line of steamers of which I was the agent. I beg to say to my colleague in as strong language as parliamentary usage will permit, that he was completely in the wrong. I never made any reference to the Dominion Line in all the observations I addressed the House, because they were not applicants for this subsidy. My reference was to the Allan Line, with which I have no connection direct or indirect, and, therefore, the hon. gentleman should be a little more acquainted with the subject on which he is speaking before he stigmatises my conduct and places himself in that position which he occupies to-night, and in which he places himself on every occasion Then my colleague said I took exception to the grant to the West India line of steamers because I had vessels in that business. I had vessels in that business, and so had every merchant in Halifax, and all the merchants in Halifax and along the coast were opposed to that scheme, and it was merely for political considerations, because the hon. gentleman thought it would injure me, that he brought that question here and brought it up on other occasions. But the hon. gentleman, when he was running an election there, took the extraordinary course of putting my name to a forged document.

Mr. KENNY. I did not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). With reference to that transaction, and he had not the manliness to withdraw it when it was brought to his notice, I say that hon. gentleman is not the man to bring up that question to me in this House. If he chooses to follow the Government, let him follow and support them. We know he will support them on all occasions whether they are right or wrong. He belongs to a class described by Macaulay as following a wicked government:

> "His loins girt up to run with speed
> Be the errand what it may."

No matter what the Government may desire to do, no doubt my colleague will be ready for the occasion. Ever since I came into this House, and I think hon. gentlemen on both sides will bear me out in this statement, there has been a persistent daily, weekly attack by my colleague with respect to every public utterance I have made, and he has endeavored to place me in a false position before this House and before this country. I am well known in this House, I am well known in the country. I was known in public life before the hon. gentleman ever entered it. I was so well known in my own county and city that I left my colleague very considerably behind at the poll, and had it not been for the 400 or 500 railway and other Dominion voters who were coerced to vote for him and others on that occasion, the hon. gentleman would have been relegated to private life. But despite 400 or 500 of those voters who voted for him and against me, I am here to-day as the representative for Halifax and the senior member for that city; and, therefore, if the hon. gentleman chooses to direct public attention to the relative positions we occupy in that constituency, why I very much regret he has acted in this manner. I very much regret indeed that he has forced me in self-defence here to do what my friends have urged me to do on previous occasions, and retaliate against the unfair insinuations which day by day he has made against me in this House, and which I can tolerate no longer. Those who know us both in the county which we represent will judge us both at our fair estimate, and I am not afraid for one of the position in which they will place me.

Mr. KENNY. Nor I.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have unearthed through the confession of the member for York (Mr. Temple) a most scandalous job which deserves the condemnation of this House. The First Minister has endeavored to draw a herring across the track by losing his temper and professing to reflect on the course pursued by the Opposition when dealing with these questions. He has said that he has enjoyed the confidence of the country, and he has the evidence behind him in those men who are prepared to support him whether he is right or wrong. The country has realised the consequence of transactions such as this, for from the time the First Minister has held office, over $100,000,000 of debt has been added to our burdens as a result of similar transactions to the one we are now considering; as a result of how the money is lent out to private individuals, in some cases, and to supporters of his Government. If we go over the members' list in this House there are a great many men who ought to blush when they think of the amount of boodle they have been receiving by grants to railways and grants of one kind or another. I say that it is unfair that we should be asked quietly to consent to an action such as has been brought before the Committee without resenting the conduct of the Government in this abominable transaction. Here is a man who came and got a loan to construct a bridge. He put $75,000 into it, but he is getting $30,000 back from the Government, which leaves a balance of only $45,000 in the work over and above the amount which the country has given at a rate of 4 per cent. In four years, according to the hon. gentleman's admission, he will have every cent of principal that he has put in, and interest to boot, out of the undertaking. The First Minister says: He has confessed too much. I would not take the stock off his hands. He has made a confession to this House that the hon. gentleman will not realise. What does the First Minister know about it? The member for York (Mr. Temple) knows all about it. He knows very well what the probable annual receipts will be; but not thinking of the difficulty he was going to get the Government into he confessed the whole thing, and the First Minister tries to waive off the effects of that confession by saying the hon. gentleman is mistaken, and he tries to show us that we should quietly consent to the money being voted for this structure. We have a great many such jobs as this, east and west and south, in every section of the country, and after the confession made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Temple), it will be found how ridiculous, how absurd, how unreasonable it is to think the people will consent to such nefarious jobs being perpetrated by the Government.

Gen. LAURIE. In reference to the remark which fell from the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) to the effect that the hon. the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) had been returned because of the influence brought to bear on railway men and the coercion exercised against them, I may state that I have it from the railway men employed on the part of the railway which runs through my section of the country, that every one of them received letters from members of the committee appointed to promote the election of my hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), stating that the Government was sure to be defeated, and if they dared to vote for the Conservative candidate that every one of them should be dismissed as soon as the Liberal party came into power. I have this from the railway men themselves and they would not have alluded to it were it not for the statement made concerning my hon. friend from Halifax.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Where is the letter? I don't believe a word of it.

Gen. LAURIE. I think, Sir, that I am as much entitled to be believed in this House as the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). He dares to say that he does not believe a word I say. How dare he do so? What right has he to say that I am telling an untruth? I stated that I have this from the word of mouth of these men, and I claim protection from you, Sir, when he dares to charge me with falsehood.

Mr. BOWELL. He would not do it if you were not lame,

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. member for Shelburne quite misunderstood my observation.

Mr. BOWELL. You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If the Minister of Customs does not keep quiet we will deal with him too. When the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) stated that these men told him they had letters from the Liberal committee threatening them in this way, I said I did not believe they had the letters. I did not doubt the hon. gentleman's statement that they told him this.

Gen. LAURIE. I accept the apology.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman with the enthusiasm which characterises him on all occasions went off, as sportsmen say, at half-cock and he would not listen to me at all. It is just one of those absurd statements; one of those political fables which are told day by day and the hon. gentleman must know himself that it is not true.

Mr. TUPPER. I am not ready to accept the statement made by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), considering that last Session I read from his own paper, the *Morning Chronicle*, the report of a speech made by that gentleman when he spoke as Minister of Militia at the election in which he was beaten by a very handsome majority and in which he threatened from his own lips, and not through the indirect means of an election committee, all Government officers if they dared to vote against him in that election. He said if they dared to do so that they took their offices in their hands, and when I read him from his own speech and gave him the date of the *Morning Chronicle* in which that speech was reported, the hon. gentleman sat down and he did not deny, and has not yet denied the accuracy of the speech from which I quoted. The circumstance referred to by the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) is exactly of the same character as this. I was amused to hear the hon. gentleman pretend that he would not resort to this means, when I have proved (if the hon. gentleman's organ can be relied upon) that he used that threat and he used it at an election for the purpose of securing himself votes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman thinks that I consider it of sufficient importance to reply to all his observations, I might tell him he is quite mistaken. Whatever he may have quoted then, I paid no attention to nor did I agree in it. I never made any threat against any man during any time, who occupied a public position in the Government or out of it. My advice to the railway men always has been to keep out of politics, and I have urged on the Government both Local and Dominion to disfranchise them; and when men occupying a public position have come to me, I have stated: "You occupy an equivocal position, you are not the servants of the Government, you are the servants of the State, and although it is true that the Conservatives may be in power to-day, the Liberals will be in power to-morrow and I advise you to keep out of politics." That is more than the Government would do, because during the last election every official was driven up to the polls, and every engineer and every man on the road who is supposed to have any sympathy with our party was sent on election day away from Halifax to Pictou or other parts of the line. Men went down over the road. Men who were supporters of the Government were given books of railway passes, which they themselves filled up, and these men were carried over the road from one county to another, from Pictou, from Colchester, from Cumberland; and every man in Halifax who was thought to have any Liberal sympathies was sent to Cumberland or to Pictou, and any one thought to have Liberal sympathies in Cumberland or Pictou was sent to Halifax. I saw the order myself; it was brought and shown to me at that time; and when the hon. gentleman attempts to talk to me about the management of that road, which is a sink of political corruption from beginning to end, which accounts for the deficiency of $350,000 a year—because it is run for the party and not for the country—I tell him he had better enquire into the management of the accounts of that road before he undertakes to refer to my action in the House. That road has been run as a political engine, and it will continue so until there is sufficient wholesome public opinion in this country to place the officials of the country beyond the control of either one party or the other. That has been always my contention, although I am sorry to say I have never yet seen it carried into effect; but I think the time will arrive when there will be a more wholesome public opinion in the country, and when the course I recommend will be adopted.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not going to detain the Committee by entering into this personal squabble which the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) is responsible for. It has not been once, but a dozen times, that the hon. gentleman has attempted to drag down the discussions of this House to the level of some Nova Scotia parish politics. He does not seem to be able to rise above them, and his personal animus and hatred of the hon. gentleman on this side who leads him, is such that it very often induces him to descend to a level which outside this House he never descends to. Sir, we are not going to be dragged down to discuss here mere Nova Scotia parish politics. The question was raised whether it was proper for a member of Parliament to be receiving gratuities from the Government from year to year, whether it was right for him to have large interests in public undertakings which are seeking, through their officers, advances, loans and gifts from the Government of the day, and whether, holding that position, he could at the same time maintain his independence? That was the question being discussed, and we on this side of the House have held, and hold now, that gentlemen occupying the position of the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Temple), have, and can have, no pretence of independence. That independence has been surrendered. They are perforce followers for the time being of the gentlemen who hold the purse strings. They vote, not as their conscience dictates, not as the electors' interests require them to vote, but as the interests of their own pockets dictate; and that hon. gentleman is in the position—not of all the members on the other side—that charge was not made—but of a certain number on the other side who were compelled to prostitute their position to support the Minister who holds the purse strings for the time being. Parliament has been reduced to a pitiful condition by the Prime Minister of the day; and when he boasted in Quebec two or three years ago that when he left this country to the Grits, he would leave them with a great debt and an empty Treasury, and that if he bribed the people he bribed them with their own money, he might have also made the boast that he would reduce Parliament to a position of dependence on the man who for the time being held the purse strings. It is a pitiful condition for Parliament to stand in. We have the hon. member for York, N.B., standing here to-day defending a proposition to vote $30,000 under a secret promise made to him a year ago, and under which he has been voting in this House for the past two months. What independence could the hon. gentleman have during those two months when he was voting under a promise which he had from the Prime Minister that he was to get $30,000 before this Session ended? I wonder whether other subsidies are voted under promises made by the Prime Minister to the promoters—we will hear. When this discussion was improperly and unjustifiably dragged away from the matter before the House by the junior member for Halifax, we wanted to know as a matter of public interest what amount of bonds had been issued by this company on this

bridge. There is no doubt whatever that Parliament in a short time will own that bridge. We have advanced $300,000, or over 80 per cent. of its cost, and we shall have to pay the bonds in a few years I find, looking at the Act authorising the issue of these bonds for $75,000, that they were to be made a first charge and preferential claim on the undertaking. That provision clashes to some extent with the Act under which we made the loan, and it is hard now to tell whether the bonds or the loan take the preference: but I have no moral doubt in my own mind, whatever the legal position may be, that this country, which has advanced the $300,000 and which is now making a present of $30,000 to the hon. member for York, will have to take up those $75,000 of bonds too. Therefore it is of the highest importance, before we pass out of Committee, that the Prime Minister should tell the House—and if he does not know, the gentleman assisting him should tell us—what amount of bonds this company has issued on this bridge? I think that is a fair question to ask, and we are entitled to have the information before we pass this vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was not aware that there were any first mortgage bonds on this bridge.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are no bonds issued.

Mr. TEMPLE. There were no such bonds issued as the hon. gentleman asks for at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have they power to issue them under their mortgage?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have got the first mortgage, and can foreclose in case of default.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Did I understand the hon. member for York to say that there were no bonds issued by that company?

Mr. TEMPLE. I have given you my answer.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. gentlemen has given me an answer. Of course he has a perfect right to refuse to answer anything; but he must remember that he stands here in the position of a suppliant, asking the members of this House on both sides to vote him $30,000, and it is not becoming on his part to refuse to answer a pertinent question on the important subject before us. I have been informed by a gentleman who said he was correct, that bonds have been issued by that company on that bridge, and are now outstanding; and if that is the truth the House has a right to know it. Hon. gentlemen sitting beside the hon. member for York are as much interested as we are in this matter. The country will have eventually to take those bonds up beyond all reasonable doubt. I will read the first section of the Act regarding the issue of these bonds. After giving authority to the directors to issue them, it says:

"Such bonds shall be taken and considered to be the first and preferential claim and charge upon the undertaking, and the tolls and property of the company, real and personal, then existing and at any time thereafter acquired, save and except as hereinafter provided for in this section; and each holder of the said bonds shall be held and deemed to be a mortgagee or encumbrancer upon the said securities *pro rata* with the other bondholders, and shall have priority as such: Provided, that the amount of bonds so issued, sold or pledged, shall not exceed three hundred thousand dollars: Provided also, that no such bonds shall be issued until at least two hundred thousand dollars have been subscribed to the capital stock and ten per centum of the same *bonâ fide* paid thereon."

That is the whole clause, and I think the House has a right to be informed whether any bonds have been issued, and what the amount of the bonds is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know and I do not care, because the Government have the first mortgage and can foreclose that mortgage and take possession of that property in case of default.

Mr. McMULLEN. There must be a change in the statutes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is nothing in the statutes on the subject of the loan by the Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is this to be considered. The First Minister has already stated that the $300,000 are the first mortgage, and he also stated the total cost was $375,000, of which $300,000 were advanced by ourselves. The hon. gentleman knows well that he may refuse to answer and that the Committee may pass the resolution, but we cannot allow this to go through the second reading without taking the opinion of the House on it. Does the hon. gentleman ask that we should pass this resolution to-night without this information, which might influence largely the votes of members?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Nothing will influence your vote.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is a gross piece of impertinence for the hon. gentleman to say that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It may be, but it is true.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I tell the hon. gentleman it is false.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have never yet seen the hon. gentleman give one single vote which was not a strict party vote since he has been in Parliament.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I tell the hon. gentleman that his memory is entirely at fault. I voted with him on more than three occasions against my party. I voted five or six times against my party on strict party votes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). You are to blame for doing it.

Mr. TUPPER. Name one.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I voted against my party on the Orange vote. I voted against nine-tenths of the party.

An hon. MEMBER. That was not a party vote.

Mr. COLTER. I think when a vote of this character comes before the House it should be very fully considered and freely criticised. It appears that the Government is under no obligation whatever to vote this money, and that already the Government have invested in that work a very large sum for which the country is not liable to receive any adequate return. While the Government has done this, it appears they have not time to give fair and full consideration to claims pressed against them and to obligations devolving upon them. There has been a good deal said with reference to people being bribed with their own money. There is one thing I had intended to call the attention of the House to before the close of the Session. In the county I represent works operated by the Government have caused a large amount of damage as a whole, and a year ago the Government admitted that the damage caused at York alone amounted to $10,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That has no reference to this item.

Mr. COLTER. I am merely showing that the Government ought to be just before it is generous. I think there is a great difference between the position the hon. gentleman for York, N.B., occupies in this House and the position many other gentleman occupy. Hon. members are sent here to represent the public generally, and it is their duty, when items such as this are brought up, to criticise them and consider them on their merits, apart altogether from party consideration, because it is unfair and improper that a person should be entrusted with the public interest and at the same time advocate his own. Now there have been a large number of votes of this kind, and it is about time they should be put a stop to. The debt of Canada is increasing and the general expenditure of Canada is increasing, and I feel it my duty to express myself most strongly against any vote of this character.

Mr. McMULLEN The question of veracity has been up to-night, and I wish to allude to some statements made in connection with grants already passed, by which the Committee was misled. For instance, there is the statement made in connection with the Oxford and New Glasgow line. The hon. the Minister of Fisheries stated to this House that that road would be forty-five miles shorter than the line on the Intercolonial Railway; and we hear now when that road is completed and surveyed and the line located, that it is not five miles shorter than the old line.

The CHAIRMAN. That matter was pronounced upon this afternoon.

Mr. McMULLEN. I allude to it to show that we should not pass this item without further information, and I say we are entitled to compare the statement with regard to this undertaking with those made in other cases before the Committee. I consider that this Committee was misled by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the item of the Short Line, and yet that hon. gentleman now dares to challenge the veracity of an hon. gentleman on this side. I wish to enter my solemn protest against the expenditure of money in connection with this bridge. Such a proposition bears on its face the impress of a "job." It is a scandalous transaction from beginning to end, and the right hon. the First Minister, in refusing to give the information asked, makes that fact only the more evident. He dare not inform the Committee whether bonds are issued or not. There is an Act under which the bridge is constructed, which provides that bonds may be issued that will take precedence of the Government lien, and put the Government in the position of second mortgagee. I want to know if that is our position before consenting to this grant of $30,000. I want to know how the title stands—whether it is encumbered to the extent of $75,000 as an issue of the first bonds.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You have been told that we have the first mortgage.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are there no bonds issued? If, let us say, $75,000 had been issued either as second mortgages or in any other way by the gentlemen who are concerned in it, it is clear that none of their money has gone into this bridge, and it might therefore very well be that this $30,000 might be appropriated neither to the reduction of the mortgage nor to the payment of the bonds, but might go into the hands of the promoters of the bridge. I do not mean to say that it will be the case, but it is quite possible, and it is not the intention of the Government, I presume, that such a thing as that should occur. I should regard that as making the grant doubly objectionable.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The question has only arisen now, and it never occurred to me that the obligations the hon. gentleman speaks of could be treated in that manner. I can only say now that this $30,000 will not be paid over until the Government perfectly understands the position of affairs.

To the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company, for ten miles of their railway from New Moscow, to a point at or near Harrowsmith, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and not exceeding in the whole $32,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not believe that this House, by declaring that a road is for the general advantage of Canada, can make it such in a legal sense, and, until I see a decision of the Supreme Court or some higher tribunal to that effect, I will not believe it. That rule would allow the Government to take away altogether the exclusive power given to the Provinces, and I do not think that was the intention of the British North America Act. The third sub-section in that Act refers, I think, to the previous clauses, and while I am not raising this question now, because, rightly or wrongly, the House passed upon it in 1883 when I was not here, I say that while allowing these matters to pass without raising an argument now, I do not at all admit that we have the right to grant aid and to give charters to railway corporations which are wholly within the limits of a Province. A road may be declared for the general interest of Canada if, when constructed, it forms part of a general work such as that spoken of in the two previous sub-sections.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not object to the hon. gentleman making a saving protest. That is a most important question, and it is quite right that he should put in his protest now.

Mr. LAURIER. But it does not affect the result.

Committee rose and reported progress.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons additional Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service for the year ending 30th June, 1890, and, in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 27th April, 1889.

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

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12 o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 29th April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FISHING LICENSES.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. FISET) asked, Whether the Government have issued, or intend to issue, licenses for fishing with the net in the River Natashquan? If so, to whom, how many, and to what distance from the mouth of the said river?

Mr. TUPPER. One license has been issued to Mr. Charles Bertrand, of Isle Verte, to a point three miles below Isle à Bois, which would be, it is calculated, in the vicinity of six miles from the mouth of the river.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. FISET) asked, Whether the Government have considered the legal question raised by the hon. Prime Minister of the Province of Quebec, as to the right of the Dominion Government to grant licenses for fishing in the River St. Lawrence, and especially at the mouths of rivers?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They have considered it.

BRIDGE AT GANNON NARROWS.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BARRON) asked, Does the Government intend to grant a sum of money (if so, how much) for the construction of a floating bridge across Gannon Nar-

rows, in the County of Peterborough? Has a deputation from the County of Peterborough waited upon the Government in regard to said undertaking? If so, what reply was made to said deputation? Has the Government been informed that the County Council of Peterborough will grant the sum of $5,000 towards the undertaking, if the Government will bear the balance of the expenditure?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see by the Estimates laid before the House, that there is no appropriation for this sum of money. It is not the intention of the Government to bring down any further Estimates.

SHAWINIGAN DISTRICT—SENATOR.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. LAVERGNE) asked, When will the Government appoint a Senator for Shawinigan district?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is under consideration.

LAKE ST. JOHN MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. COUTURE) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to carry the mails from Chanbord to Roberval by the Lake St. John Railway, as is asked for by numerous petitions?

Mr. HAGGART. That matter is being considered by the Government.

CHANNEL SUBWAY COMPANY'S ACT—NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. ELLIS asked, Has the Act of the Legislature of the Province of New Brunswick passed in the Session of 1888, intituled: "An Act to incorporate the Channel Subway Company," been disallowed? If not, will the Act be allowed to go into operation?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Act has not been disallowed. It is the subject of communications which are not yet concluded between the two Governments.

DUNDAS AND WATERLOO ROAD—SURVEY.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth) asked, Is the Minister of Public Works prepared to bring down to the House the report of the engineer who recently inspected the Dundas and Waterloo Macadamized Road? If so, how soon can he lay it on the Table?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot bring down that particular report, but I shall bring down, probably tomorrow, the report of the Chief Engineer which contains all the material points of that first report.

PAYMENT TO JAMES P. LAKE.

Mr. MACDOWALL asked, Whether a letter was written James P. Lake, stating that he would be paid $270 for a wire rope and use of scow by the Militia in 1885? Has this been paid? If not, why not?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I beg to state in answer to my hon. friend, from information received from my department, that no letter was written to James P. Lake The Award Claims Commission did not award him $270 for a wire rope and use of a scow in 1885. The award was not made at any time, to my knowledge, and was not paid. It is only quite recently that Mr. Lake has had this account certified to by Mr. Secretan.

Mr. MACDOWALL. The letter referred to was written on the 29th February, 1888.

Mr. TROW.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am not aware of any. That is the information I got from my department.

HUDSON'S BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether the attention of the Government has been directed to the question which, on the 4th April, in the English House of Commons, was put by Mr. E. Beckett to the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, respecting the action of the Manitoba Legislature in passing an Act on the 2nd of March, 1889, repudiating the statutory guarantee of interest on the bonds of the Hudson's Bay Railway Company, for 25 years, which was provided for by an Act of the said Legislature in 1886, and the answer of Baron de Worms, in which he stated it was a matter entirely for the Provincial and Dominion Legislatures. Whether, further, the attention of the Government has been drawn to an article in the London *Financial News*, headed: "Manitoban Repudiation," in which the following, among other statements, appears:—"The question put by Mr. Beckett, in the House of Commons last Thursday, to Baron de Worms, as to the repudiation by the Provincial Government of Manitoba of its engagements in connection with the bonds of the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway, raises an issue of considerable importance. In 1886, the Legislature of Manitoba passed an Act guaranteeing for 25 years, interest at 4 per cent. upon an issue of $4,500,000 of bonds of the railway to connect Winnipeg with Port Nelson on Hudson's Bay. Accordingly, a portion of the funds were obtained in England, on the security of bonds, which bear on the face the statutory guarantee of interest. The bonds were issued, the first 40 miles of road were built, when, lo! on the 2nd March last the Government of Manitoba, without a word of warning, repudiated the obligation to pay interest. If Manitoba is to be allowed to obtain money under a Provincial guarantee one day, and having got what she wants, to repudiate the next, then there is not a Provincial guarantee municipal debt in all Canada which can be looked upon other than as a fly-trap. Manitoba is a youthful giant, with a future promise of a very rapid development. Honesty is her best policy; nothing will so surely retard this development, and nothing will check the immigration, both of capital and the capitalist settler so effectually as a policy of financial crookedness. The sooner Manitoba brings her Premier to book, the better for her reputation and for her prosperity." Whether, in the interest of Canadian credit, such official representation on this subject will be made to the Provincial Government of Manitoba as would call for a reconsideration of the matter?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The attention of the Government has been called to that conversation in the English House of Commons, and I dare say that some members of the Government have seen this article in the *Financial News;* I have, for one. So soon as an authentic copy of the Act of the Legislature of Manitoba reaches here, it will be taken into consideration.

WOOD MOUNTAIN AND QU'APPELLE RAILWAY.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee, to-morrow, to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the Governor General in Council to make the grant of land provided for by section 3 of the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 11, being for the line of the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway, of about 240 miles in length, applicable to the line of railway of the said company, as authorised by the Act respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company passed during the present Session of Parliament, upon the like terms and subject to the like conditions as those upon which the grant hereinbefore mentioned was authorised to be made to the said company by the said Act."

Motion agreed to.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE, PROMISSORY NOTES, &c.

On the Order, House again in Committee on Bill (No 5) relating to Bills of Exchange, Cheques and Promissory Notes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. With the assent of my colleagues, and according to the wish expressed by the House that this Bill be not proceeded with, I will take the opportunity of stating now that I hope to re-introduce it at an early stage next Session, and I am sure that the members of this House who urged its postponement until next Session will be disposed then to give it full consideration, notwithstanding the length of the Bill. I move that the Order be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

MILITIA ACT AMENDMENT.

On the Order, second reading of Bill (No. 29) to amend chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Militia and Defence of Canada.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Since I introduced this Bill, I have received from several members of the force and members of the staff some very valuable suggestions, and in consequence of those suggestions, some of which have come in quite lately, I think it might be better to hold over the Bill until next Session. Therefore, I move that the Order be now discharged.

Motion agreed to.

ROCKY MOUNTAINS PARK ACT AMENDMENT.

On the Order, second reading of Bill (No. 141) to amend the Act respecting the Rocky Mountains Park of Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the absence of the Minister of the Interior, I move that the Order be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

JUDICIAL SALARIES.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed with the Order in relation to the Judges' salaries?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have mentioned all those that the Government have at present resolved to discharge.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I mention it because a number of gentlemen returned home, acting on the newspaper report that it was not the intention of the Government to proceed with that measure.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 145) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

OCEAN STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.

Bill (No. 144) relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies was read the second time on a division, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed on a division.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

House again resolved itself into Committee to consider resolution (p. 1572) to authorise the granting of subsidies to certain railway companies, and towards the construction of certain railways therein mentioned.

(In the Committee.)

For a railway from a point near Sicamous, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to a point on Lake Okanagan, 51 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and not exceeding, in the whole, $163,200.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where on earth are these places?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This road is considered to be of very great importance to British Columbia. Besides opening the country through which it will pass, there is a fine agricultural district lying between the mountains, and it is believed to be a very fertile region which only requires the means of transport. There are great mining facilities in the neighborhood, and it is important not only to get the ore out when it is mined but to get machinery in for the purpose of mining it, as perhaps my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will admit, as he has, no doubt, had his attention called to that region, and he knows that one of the great impediments to the development of the mining interests in a country which is so rich in minerals, which is perhaps as rich in that respect as any part of North America, has been the enormous weight of the machinery required, and the impossibility of getting it to the spots where it was most required. This railway of 51 miles in length gives communication with a large water stretch on Lake Okanagan, and, I understand, will be the means of opening up and developing that part of the country. This is the only vote we are asking in the way of railway systems for British Columbia. I will ask my hon. friend from Yale (Mr. Mara), who knows that country intimately, to make a short statement in reference to this railway.

Mr. MARA. The line will run from Sicamous, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to Lake Okanagan, and will be 51 miles long. This will open up the Spallumcheen Valley, and that, with the adjoining valleys, form the best wheat-growing section in the interior of British Columbia. When this line is constructed, we believe that these valleys will be able to supply the whole Victoria market with flour, instead of having to obtain it, as it now does, from Oregon and Washington Territory. Okanagan Lake is 75 miles in length, is navigable all the year round, never freezes, and is only a short distance from the boundary line, and I believe that, at a slight expense, the Okanagan River could be made navigable to the boundary line. With these connecting links, the Canadian Pacific Railway will be able to supply the whole of that northern country. There are about 350,000 acres of good agricultural land in the Spallumcheen and adjoining valleys. The Okanagan Lake will be tributary to 1,750,000 acres of mineral, pastoral and agricultural lands. I do not know of any line which will do more good, not only to the Province but to the whole Dominion, than this, as it will stop the importation of flour from the United States to a great extent.

Mr. LAURIER. Amongst the papers which have been brought down, I cannot find anything in reference to this railway. Is this subsidy granted to a company?

Mr. MARA. There is a company, and the Provincial Government are so alive to the importance of this railway that, out of their slender resources, they have voted $4,000 a mile to that company. The company is formed, and its head offices are in Victoria.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the population of that district?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Sparse.

Mr. MARA. I should say probably a couple of thousand people, but there are large farms there which are raising large quantities of wheat which at present cannot be taken to the market.

Mr. LAURIER. Is there a company formed for this purpose?

Mr. MARA. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. Is it incorporated?

Mr. MARA. It is incorporated.

Mr. LAURIER. They are the applicants for this subsidy?

Mr. MARA. Yes; they are. Captain Larkin, of St. Catharines, who is probably well-known to hon. gentlemen opposite, is one of the company; then there are Mr. Rithet, of Welch, Ritchet & Co.; Mr. E. A. McQuade, of Messrs. P. McQuade & Son, and Dr. Jones. They are all of Victoria, with the exception of Mr. Larkin, who is the only Ontario man in the company.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has this company been incorporated by the British Columbia Legislature, or by this Parliament?

Mr. MARA. By both.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was a special application made by the Board of Trade.

Mr. CHARLTON. When the hon. gentleman speaks of 1,750,000 acres as being tributary to Lake Okanagan, I would like to ask him what portion of that is agricultural land?

Mr. MARA. I would not like to state exactly what part of the 1,750,000 acres are lands fit for agriculture. Of the 350,000 acres which I spoke of, all are agricultural lands, but a large quantity of the 1,750,000 acres are pastoral lands, and there are also some very rich mineral lands in that section. The Rock Creek district will be tributary to this railway and to the steamers that will run on the lake.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would 350,000 acres of that be agricultural land?

Mr. MARA. More than that. That is in the Spallumcheen district.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would that be the same quantity as on the Spallumcheen?

Mr. MARA. Yes, I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What capital does this company possess? It seems to me that, whatever the result may be, the responsibility rests upon the Government, because they should be sure that the parties to whom these grants are given, have subscribed sufficient stock and paid up enough to make the thing a *bonâ fide* undertaking, and it should not be, as we have seen in too many cases in this House, that a charter is granted for a road which will be proceeded with if the bonds are sold and luck favors the company, but not otherwise. The hon. gentleman did not state what capital had been subscribed, or how much had been paid up.

Mr. MARA. I am not quite sure how much stock has been subscribed or paid up, but they must comply with the Railway Act, that, I think, requires 10 per cent. Therefore, 10 per cent. must be paid up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, but it may be a very small amount. The Minister of Railways has, no doubt, informed himself as to the status and solvency of the company.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see in the resolution that we do not ask for a grant to a railway company; we ask for a grant to this road, which will be a great advantage to British Columbia. On the whole, I think this is a better system than to grant a subsidy to a railway company which may be a mere paper company. Here the Government are satisfied that it is for the advantage of that portion of the country, and for the country generally, that this railway should be built. Then, when the money is granted, the Government will see that it is not given to a mere bogus company, but that all the requirements of the Railway Act shall be carried out, and the Government will be satisfied that the company is solvent and able to construct the railway.

Mr. LAURIER. But how is the subsidy to be applied? The hon. gentleman grants a subsidy in general terms to a railway, without giving it to any company.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will look at the railway legislation of the last year or two, he will find that a distinction has been drawn where a company is given a charter, and when there is reasonable expectation that the company, with the aid of the grant, will build the road. When there is a region of country that wants a railway, and, if Parliament is willing to assist, a vote is made for a subsidy. It does not at all follow because this company has got a charter that the Government will promise them individually the subsidy. The Government will see, as they have done in other cases, that the company which gets the grant is, according to all reasonable expectations, able to build the road.

Mr. LAURIER. If they do not get the grant, the Government will keep it.

Sir RICHARD CARWRIGHT. I observe by the statement made by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara), that $4,000 had been set apart by the British Columbia Legislature, as I understood, for this particular company. That is a pretty good guarantee that no other company will be likely to apply, and it makes it all the more important that we should know that this particular company, which it is clear must take it, is a sufficiently solvent company to give a reasonable probability that the work will be carried on. I think we ought to have information of the resources of the company. Some of the names the hon. gentleman gave are good names, and if they are subscribers for a sufficient amount, it will be some guarantee. But I have always felt that where large sums like this, $163,000, are to be granted, the Government ought to take more precaution than a mere guarantee of 10 per cent. on possibly a very small capital stock. There ought to be, as in England, some substantial deposit which could be used to enforce compliance with the obligations that they enter into on their side, as we enter into on ours.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see that every precaution is taken that can reasonably be asked for without preventing a company taking up these kind of things at all. In the first place, they must take the amount of stock required in the General Railway Act, and pay 10 per cent., and when they do commence work, they will only get their proportion of the vote for every 10 miles of road actually built and running. That is the only security that can be taken. As the hon. gentleman has called attention to it, it is an additional security that the Legislature of British Columbia, who, of course, understands the matter better than we do, are satisfied to give a vote of money to this company, which is an additional guarantee of the solvency and ability of that company. But the Government here will require satisfactory evidence that within all reasonable probability the company will build the road.

Mr. MARA. The British Columbia Government, giving a subsidy of $4,000 a mile, is the best guarantee this Government can have that the company will be a *bonâ fide* company, and that the work will be carried on economically. Regarding the amount paid in, I may state that the company have already expended over $15,000 in surveys, which also shows that they are a *bonâ fide* company.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are there any engineering difficulties?

Mr. MARA. There are no engineering difficulties other than heavy rock work along the lake.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the estimated cost per mile?

Mr. MARA. The estimated cost of building and stocking the road, is $25,000 per mile.

To the Cornwallis Valley Railway Company, for one mile of their railway, from the end of the line subsidised by 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, to Kingsport, in the Province of Nova Scotia, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $3,200.

Mr. LAURIER. This is a modest grant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The grant was made for so much a mile between Kingsport and Westport. The Act says that it is in all 13 miles. That has been paid But the subsidy was intended to go from one point to another, and it is found that instead of 13 miles it is 14 miles, and this is merely a grant for one mile additional in order to give a subsidy for the whole line between these two points.

To the Lake Témiscamingue Colonisation and Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway, from Mattawa station on the Canadian Pacific Railway, towards the Long Sault, or from the Long Sault towards the Mattawa station on the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $48,000.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I would enquire from the acting Minister of Railways as to whether this company has ever submitted to the Government a tariff of the charges upon that portion of the line extending from the foot of Long Sault to the foot of Lake Témiscamingue? I may say in reference to this matter, that it has been stated to me that the charges upon that portion of this road are exorbitant. I would also like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that this company was incorporated by an Order in Council, and, so far as I can see, the authority given to the company was to lay out, construct and operate a railway from a point on the Ottawa River from or near Mattawa, at the lower extremity of the rapids known as the Long Sault, to a point at or near the foot of Lake Témiscamingue on the said Ottawa River, that branch line not exceeding 6 miles in length and reaching, as I understand, to Lake Kippewa. So it appears to me that the company have no authority, under this Act of incorporation, to extend the line towards Mattawa at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My attention has not been called to the terms of the Act, but a grant has already been made to the road, and this grant is for the purpose of extending it.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Under the Railway Subsidies Act of 1886, a clause was introduced authorising the Governor in Council to incorporate this railway without the company applying for a special Act of incorporation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the company had no power to extend their line, of course this would be of no value. That point had not been called to my attention until now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The power of the Governor in Council is exhausted?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I presume so. Supposing that is not the case, and that the company have power, I ask the House to vote this aid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the position of the company?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Lake Témiscamingue Colonisation and Railway Company were chartered under authority of 49 Victoria, chapter 10, and is essentially a colonisation road. It has received a subsidy of $3,200 a mile for 18½ miles, and has about 8 miles under traffic, and grading is well advanced on the remaining 10½ miles. The section under traffic has done good service in carrying colonisers into the district, as well as forwarding supplies to lumbermen in that district. The object of the subsidy now asked, is to enable the company to extend the line to the Canadian Pacific Railway, a distance of 15 miles. It is said that since the road has been in operation, more than 200 families have settled in the district. I am satisfied this is a most meritorious road. I am glad to say that in that region of country our French-Canadian brethren and fellow subjects, instead of going to the United States, as hon. gentlemen opposite say they are doing, are going very rapidly into that section of country and settling it. I ask the House with every confidence to vote this aid. Of course, if it is proved that the company had no power to build this road, the vote must stand until they get that power from Parliament. Meanwhile, assuming they have the right, I ask this vote.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). There is another question, as to whether they have submitted a tariff of rates charged on that portion of the road already constructed from the Long Sault to Lake Témiscamingue. It has been alleged that the charges are exorbitant; that, in point of fact, this company, having their connection from Mattawa to Lake Témiscamingue, charge for the 6 miles of their road from the foot of the Long Sault to the foot of Lake Témiscamingue as much as if a lumberman carried his goods from Mattawa by boats and other means to that point.

Mr. BRYSON. I am somewhat familiar with this road. Several communications were forwarded to me with respect to the tariff on it. I believe two years ago there was some difficulty in regard to the tariff from the foot of the Long Sault to the foot of Lake Témiscamingue, 6 miles. It was then alleged by the company that the charge made over that short line was on account of the fact that they were merely running a construction train, that the road was not fully ballasted, and they alleged that so soon as the road was properly completed they would be in a position to give satisfactory rates. I may say that the rate existing from Mattawa to Priest's Bay, near the head of Lake Témiscamingue, a distance of 100 miles, where the French Canadian colony is now established, is 85 cents per 100 lbs., as reasonable a rate as could be expected. The charges by the winter route are $1.35 or $1.40 per 100 lbs. So the present charge over the road is not excessive, as there are five different transfers of freight to be made.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is about four times the regular charge from Chicago to New York.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But it must be remembered that there is an enormous traffic over that road. In reply to the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White), I may say that a tariff has been submitted but not yet approved.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I desire to draw special attention to this point, that persons carrying their own goods by their own vessels from Mattawa to Lake Témiscamingue shoud have the use of the road from the Long Sault to the foot of Lake Témiscamingue at a reasonable rate. I do not dispute the statement of the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Bryson), that the rate from Mattawa to Priest's Bay may be quite reasonable, but if the rate from the Long Sault to the foot of Lake Témiscamingue is unreasonably high it will give the company a monopoly of the carrying trade.

Mr. BRYSON. That was precisely our case. We utilised the water stretches.

Mr. LAURIER. I cannot believe you would "utilise the water stretches."

Mr. BRYSON. We carried our freight by our boats over the water stretches to that railway, and we had it carried over this distance of 6 miles—this was two years ago—without any extravagant charge being made.

Mr. LAURIER. There is the other difficulty which the First Minister has not met. The powers of the company, according to the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White), are now exhausted.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I say their power to construct any further portion of the road seems to be exhausted, because the Order in Council only deals with the road for a certain distance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Power under statute is not exhausted, and if the company have no power to build this additional portion of the line, of course they cannot build it, and there will be no subsidy given them. But assuming they have the power, I ask this aid to be granted.

To the Maskinongé and Nipissing Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, at or near Maskinongé or Louisville, towards the parish of St. Michel-des-Saints, on the River Mattawin, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $48,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This company, the Maskinongé and Nipissing Railway Company, was chartered by 49 Victoria, chapter 79. It is a colonisation scheme, and so great an interest is taken in its early construction that the Quebec Legislature have granted aid for the first 60 miles to the extent of 240,000 acres of land. It is stated that the municipalities have agreed to give a cash subsidy of $20,000 for the first 10 miles. The road is said to pass through a very fine agricultural country, well timbered and abounding in minerals. The line will be 360 miles in length, and the proposed subsidy is for the first 15 miles.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How much is in Quebec and how much in Ontario?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The 15 miles for which we ask aid are in the Province of Quebec.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To all intents and purposes we must consider that if we pass this vote we are pledging ourselves to subsidise all the balance of the road as it is constructed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is exactly what I foresee will be done in all these cases. We are undertaking a liability of which no man can see the end, and I have very little doubt the right hon. gentleman will find it to be quite impossible, on the lines of his present policy, to refuse subsidies to other sections as they are constructed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. As regards any further vote, that is left to the wisdom of Parliament. All we ask is this vote for a subsidy for 15 miles.

To the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company, for 20 miles of their railway, from the city of Kingston towards Smith's Falls, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $64,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not object to it. The Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company was chartered last year, and will run from Kingston to Smith's Falls and thence to Ottawa. The road is an important one, and the residents along the route manifested their interest in it by granting a bonus towards its construction. Already it has been bonused by Kingston, Smith's Falls, and the Townships of Elmsley, Crossley, Leeds, Lansdowne and Barker. The railway will run through a fertile district which it will tend to develop. With the object of aiding this enterprise the subsidy is now asked for the first 20 miles from Kingston.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see on what principle the hon. gentleman will stop granting the balance.

Mr. BAYSON.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A subsidy for 20 miles of the road is substantial assistance. I do not mean at all to say that the Smith's Falls Railway will not come back for further assistance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman ought not to make any rash promises.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not making any pledges one way or the other, but when you see all the municipalities along the line coming forward and voting large sums to the railway, it is reasonable to infer that it is a road of great importance. I think this is an evidence that it is a road that ought to be encouraged.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All that may be; but what I want to find out from the hon. gentleman is this: It seems to me that the Government ought to state to Parliament, in such a case as this when it is morally certain if they make this grant they will have to grant aid again, at any rate to Smith's Falls, to what extent he proposes to subsidise this road, if he is going to subsidise it further, but if he is going to stop here, I for one will not object.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope I shall be able to persuade the House by-and-bye of the necessity of subsidising this line as far as Smith's Falls. If the hon gentleman will look over the subsidies he will see that we have given aid to several of these railways to a certain extent, and of course further grants will depend on the will of Parliament and of the state of the public chest, and also upon the progress which the railways have made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My point was chiefly directed to ascertain the amount of liabilities involved. There are a good many of these railways in which it appears perfectly clear to me that we commit ourselves to an extent, to double or treble the sum that is put down here. It is impossible for the hon. gentleman to stop half way in a case like this, and I am sure he will have to go on.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That may be, but there is no legal or moral obligation on Parliament to do more than they engage to do. It is quite free to Parliament to refuse to vote any more than for these 20 miles. They may say: The first 20 miles are built; you can bond that or you can go to the municipalities; we will grant you no further aid. I hope in this case, as it affects my constituents, that Parliament will be generous if the circumstances of the country will permit.

Mr. PLATT. It seems to me that this is an ingenious way of committing Parliament to subsidise the whole line. I do not know what the line is which the hon. gentleman proposes to subsidise now, but it must be considered to the general advantage of the country from Kingston to Smith's Falls. If only the first 20 miles of the road is built from Kingston, can it be said that this 20 miles alone is to the general advantage of the country. Is it right that we should subsidise 20 miles without knowing that the rest will be completed? We know that an estimate will come down next Session or the Session after, asking us to subsidise the remainder, and if we do not do so the subsidy we have already given will be thrown away. I think this principle is simply committing Parliament to subsidise the whole line, by granting a smaller amount for a few miles.

The South Ontario Pacific Railway Company, for 49½ miles of their railway, from Woodstock to Hamilton, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $158,400.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The South Ontario Pacific is already chartered. It runs from Woodstock to Brantford and Hamilton, and thence to the Niagara River, through a fine agricultural country, and it touches the cities of Brantford and Hamilton, develops an important district and gives

a good, wholesome competition in rates. The present subsidy is for 49½ miles from Woodstock to Hamilton.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that this section of the country is already pretty well grid-ironed with railways, and that this road will be likely to come into competition with other existing railways. Has the hon. gentleman considered that aspect of the question?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite true that there are several railways running through the western peninsula from east to west, and this railway gives, I think, whole some competition. It connects Hamilton with Brantford, and runs to Woodstock and London towards Chatham, and will, I fancy, go through to the western extremity of the Province. The demand for this line is very great, both in the city of Hamilton and the intervening country, and, I think, I can leave it to the explanations given by the hon. members who are connected specially with that part of the country to show the absolute commercial necessity—necessity is not the word, perhaps—but the commercial importance of this railway being constructed.

Mr. PLATT. It is simply a colonisation road.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say this road would run west of Woodstock?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is built west of Woodstock.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is a branch of the Canada Pacific?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, from Woodstock to London, and then from London to Chatham. It is now being constructed to Windsor.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Are we to subsidise from London to Windsor—first to Chatham and then from Chatham to Windsor?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It appears to me that that section of the country is as much entitled to a subsidy as this portion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has been a bonus given from London to Chatham, and the road is being constructed. The road west from that to Windsor is not subsidised.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Am I to understand that when the Canadian Pacific Railway come down here for a subsidy from Chatham to Windsor, that we are virtually pledging ourselves to give them a bonus?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; the Government have too great a fear of my hon. friend's economical objections, to make any proposition of that kind. We only ask for the line from Hamilton to Woodstock.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). If this road is going to open up this extensive trade to the west, it certainly is no more than right, if it goes to Chatham, that it should have a bonus to open up that trade.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would state to my hon friend that the road is nearly finished from Chatham to Windsor, without any subsidy; and unless the hon. gentleman, in his own personal interest, desires that we should vote a subsidy, there is no necessity for it. But that is a mere joke.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). A big joke, too. I think my hon. friend is quite mistaken. I believe the surveys are made and some grading has been done, but I was not aware until now that the road was nearly completed. Even if the contract is let, the road will not be completed until the House meets again, and there will then be an opportunity for the company to come down here and ask the hon. gentleman to grant facilities for this extended trade westward.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). The right of way has been purchased, and trackmen are at work, and there is no intention of asking for a bonus further than that which is now given by the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman say how far this line is from the Grand Trunk Railway?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. For some distance it runs pretty close. Both lines run westward, competing, in fact, for the great western trade. In other portions, they are a considerable distance apart.

Mr. McKAY. This road is intended to run through a part of the country not served at present by the Grand Trunk Railway. Although running parallel to the Grand Trunk it will be some distance from it, several miles in some places, and it will afford railway facilities to a large tract of fully settled country which has never had them. The municipalities which are directly interested have themselves granted large bonuses to railways; and they now ask, for the purpose of utilising the national railways which are in existence, that that part of the country which this railway serves shall have the benefit of those railways. Although the Government are aiding this railway to a small extent, the municipalities interested are prepared to aid it to a very much larger extent. The road is very necessary for the purpose of giving the Niagara Peninsula more direct connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, which the people there feel that they very much need, and for the purpose of securing competition for the towns and cities of that part of the country.

Mr. SHANLY. Before this item passes, I desire to put on record my dissent altogether from subsidies of this kind. I do not think it is the proper way of applying railway aid, in subsidising roads through a country such as that which my right hon. friend has described. The line is, in fact, a competing line with the Great Western Railway, and will come into competition with a line which admirably serves that country; and this, in my view, is a sort of interference with vested rights. My right hon. friend has described the country and the towns through which this line is to pass, as wealthy and prosperous. It is quite true, that section of country may be said, without exaggeration, to be the wealthiest part of the Province of Ontario; and I do think, if the people there really want this wholesale competition which we are told this subsidy is to assure to them, they ought to be able to subsidise roads for themselves, without drawing on the public Treasury. This kind of subsidies, I think, are likely to create a very bad impression on the capitalists abroad who invest their money in good faith in the railways of the country.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Shanly) seems to have got a little new light on the principle of granting subsidies to railways. My hon. friend may not know that a large number of the securities of this road have been sold in England, and have brought the highest price obtained by any securities sold in that market for many years, which shows that the capitalists there regard this as a good property for investment. There is no doubt that the country to be served by this railway is thickly settled with a prosperous agricultural, commercial and manufacturing community. At the same time, when the hon. gentleman comes to recognise that that section has granted municipal aid and large amounts of private money for railway facilities, I do not think it is at all out of place now, when this principle of granting subsidies to

the different sections of the Dominion prevails, that a section which has done so much for itself should receive some Government aid for an important railway like this, to afford competition, and to be a feeder, as it will be, to our national system of railways, and also to connect the system of railways in the Eastern States with the system in the Western States. It is one of the most important railways which has been projected in this country for many years. We can agree with the hon. member for Grenville (Mr Shanly) on the general principle of granting subsidies at all; but if we are to grant them, this is a line which will serve the whole Dominion perhaps more than any other named on this list, or that has received a subsidy since Parliament has been in the habit of granting them.

Mr. McMULLEN. I fully endorse the sentiments of the hon. member for Grenville, that if railways are to be assisted, we should only assist them in sections which do not yet possess railway accommodation. When the Ontario Government began assisting railways by bonuses, the section of country through which a railway ran had first to lay a financial basis equal to $1,000 a mile, and the proposed road was not to compete with an existing line. These are two good sound principles, but here we are voting subsidies for lines running alongside of existing lines. I think it is wrong. Suppose this line, which we are subsidising to compete with the Grand Trunk, should afterwards pool receipts with it; then we will have, I suppose, an application to Parliament in a few years for a subsidy to another independent line, so as to overcome the combination which may possibly exist between the two existing lines. It is a wrong principle. Either the country should take into its hands the right to legislate in the direction of regulating railways as they do in the United States, or else something should be done to prevent combinations that have been formed, because I can easily understand that the pooling arrangement entered into by the railway companies is the cause of the agitation for competing lines. I fully endorse the sentiments of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly), and think it is a pernicious system to go on subsidising lines running right alongside of other lines that are now giving efficient and desirable service to the country.

Motion agreed to.

For a railway from St. Césaire to St. Paul d'Abbottsford, in the Province of Quebec, 5 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $16,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a short line from the terminus of the Montreal and Portland, a subsidised branch of the South-Eastern Railway, to the Champlain division of the same road at Abbottsford, in the County of Rouville, 5 miles in length.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this a branch of an existing railway, or a new railway?

Mr. GIGAULT. The Montreal, Portland and Boston Railway Company, in 1881, obtained a charter, or an amendment to a charter, by which they were empowered to build a branch from Marieville in Rouville County to Abbottsford. A portion of the branch from Marieville to St. Césaire has been built, and there remains to be built the line from St. Césaire to Abbottsford. St. Césaire parish has given $30,000 towards the building of that branch. There is a very costly bridge to be built over the Yamaska River, near St. Césaire, and we hope with this grant the Montreal, Portland and Boston Railway will be able to make a connection with the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Railway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it a branch of a branch?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, it looks like that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. GIGAULT. It is a shorter road from Abbottsford to Montreal. This railway is asked not only by the Rouville people but also by a large portion of Shefford County.

Mr. LAURIER. At Abbottsford have they any connection by railway?

Mr. GIGAULT. There will be connection at Abbottsford; that is, the Montreal, Portland and Boston will connect with the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Railway.

To the Great Eastern Railway Company, for 20 miles of their railway, from the east end of the line subsidised by the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, at St. Grégoire, towards the Chaudière Junction Station, on the Intercolonial Railway, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $64,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Great Eastern Railway Company are incorporated to run from the village of Dundee, in the County of Huntingdon, to the town of Lévis. The object of the road is to give another railway connection between Montreal and the Maritime Provinces. Forty miles from Yamaska to St. Grégoire has been subsidised. The whole distance from Montreal to Lévis is estimated at 146 miles. The road will run through an agricultural country, and the grades are very light, and the bridges few. It is considered this road will be of great public benefit and the cost of transport light. The 23 miles now proposed to be built would bring the length of the subsidised road to 60 miles.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand the line is not completed from Nicolet to St. Grégoire.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not completed, but the work is progressing very well.

Mr. LAURIER. It is not progressing very well. Is the bridge constructed by another company?

Mr. VANASSE The bridge is contracted for by the Great Eastern Company.

To the Drummond County Railway Company, for 4½ miles of their railway, from the end of the line subsidised by the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, to Ball's wharf, on the St. Lawrence River, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $14,400.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Drummond County Railway was chartered by the Quebec Legislature, and 7 miles of it was subsidised at the rate of $3,200 per mile. The work of construction of this section is far advanced, and a portion under traffic. It is important that the road should reach the St. Lawrence, and to do so requires the construction of an additional 4½ miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this road a feeder of the Grand Trunk?

Mr. LAURIER. It will connect the South-Eastern with the St. Lawrence.

To the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company, for 20 miles of their railway, from the end of the line subsidised by the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, at St. Catharines, towards the city of Hamilton, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $64,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This company is assisted by a subsidy from Niagara Falls to St. Catharines. It is proposed to carry on the railway from St. Catharines to Hamilton, and this is to assist the company in building the 20 miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of curiosity, does the hon. gentleman believe that there is a single yard of this railway which is not within 5 miles of some other already constructed and operating railway? This particular portion of the peninsula is absolutely gridironed with railways, and I should think this railway must run within an exceedingly short distance of other roads in actual operation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not a map before me to tell what the distance is from other roads, but the policy was adopted of carrying this railway from Niagara to Hamilton, and it has been finished as far as St. Catharines. It will connect two important points.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Would the hon. gentleman tell us the necessity, or the representations made to him as to the necessity, of a grant to this road? What useful purpose will it serve? While we would be perfectly willing to grant subsidies, we certainly have the right to know that the country is going to be benefited to the extent to which money is granted, and if we are to be asked for a sum of money for the construction of this road, we ought to have some information showing that this section of the country really requires the road, and on construction it will accommodate a section which had not before been accommodated. This information is essential, and I think the Minister has not given us that information, but has merely said they want to get connection with Hamilton. We have already opened a road to Hamilton at a very large figure. We have granted a subsidy to a road from Woodstock to Hamilton; now we are asked to grant one for a road from St. Catharines to Hamilton, and no doubt, later on, we shall be called upon to aid in another connection between Hamilton and the Niagara River. That section of the country is fully supplied with railway accommodation, and I do not see the benefit this road is to produce. If it is a benefit at all, I am afraid it is only to the company. I do not think the country requires another road to be built there, and the First Minister is unable to tell us the distance between this road and the other roads competing for traffic, and we ought to have that information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As I understand the case, it stands in this way. Niagara is the point of contact with American trade, and, looking eastward, there is no other point of contact, in consequence of the width of Lake Ontario, until you get far east. The western peninsula is, therefore, so far as Canadian trade is concerned, coming across *vid* Niagara Falls, confined to one line. The whole people of that country have asked that they should not be confined to one line. I do not mean that it is a local line, but that there should be full access by the whole of the railway systems in western Canada at that point to the American system, because that is the most convenient point for general trade with the United States. For that reason, they all ask that this road should be carried through, so as to prevent a monopoly of the American trade being created there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is too large a subject to discuss now, but I must say that the policy which the hon. gentleman is inaugurating will, and that before any great length of time elapses, have the result of duplicating lines, and thus will pave the way to an amalgamation of these lines into one vast railway system, whether the hon. gentleman intends it or not, or whether the country intends it or not. I very much doubt the wisdom of pushing that result forward faster than is necessary, but this policy seems to be tending in that direction.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). We desire, as I understand, to retain as much as possible of the Canadian trade in our own ports, but does the First Minister declare that it is desirable to have American trade passed through our own territory? Though he has a canal which can convey our freight down to the St. Lawrence, he is desirous to make connection with American ports. He is a loyal Canadian, and says he is desirous to keep as much as possible our own trade in our own country. Is it reasonable, then, that we should be asked to spend money to divert our own trade to American ports? If the hon. gentleman would state that he desires to rush into the arms of the Americans, we can understand his motives, but it is unreasonable to ask us to grant a subsidy for this road, which is not entitled to a subsidy, but will divert the traffic from our own ports to American ports.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman proposes to subsidise a road from Hamilton to St. Catharines. I suppose that it will be located in the immediate neighborhood of the Great Western, and, in that case, it will not open up a section of country which has not railway facilities already. If this were a section of country at a great distance from any railway, there might be some reason in these propositions, but if this is merely to create a competing line, I believe it would be better for Parliament to interfere and fix the rates, to act upon the principle of the Railway Commission in the United States, rather than to assist in building two lines of railway through the same district, neither of which will be able to pay a cent of dividend to the people who have subscribed for the stock. This is a very serious matter. We have to look after the public interests. We may construct railways in order to increase our population and to develop our country, but all railways of this kind may ultimately combine, and we may find that Parliament is governed by these railway corporations. It may be somewhat a heroic course to pursue, but in the public interest I think it would be better to interfere to regulate the rates than to endeavor to create a regulation of rates by competition when there is no real necessity for it. I can understand, where two railways are situated at a considerable distance from each other, but converge to one point, that they may be of service to the country, but, if you are to aid two roads which run within a mile or two of each other, there is no advantage to be gained by the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. In the town in which I live we have the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railways. From that point to Liverpool you have to pay for peas $2 a car more than from a point six miles behind that. Those two companies have come to an understanding that the rates shall be a certain sum to all shippers, and thus the rates are less where there is no competition than they are where there is competition. Very possibly the people to whom we are giving money to build this road anticipate that they will have much less rates to pay than they have now, but, if they are under that impression, they are very much mistaken, unless some change is made in the Railway Act, because I know that, where these two roads meet, competition has been put out of the question by an arrangement as to freight rates; and I was told by a man who is engaged in the shipping trade in my own town that he was under the necessity of going six miles behind the town to buy peas to ship to Liverpool, because he could ship them for less than he could from the point of competition.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it is a very doubtful policy on the part of the Government to engage in the business of aiding to make corporations in this country bankrupt. Very many of these subsidies are essentially for the purpose of injuring roads already existing, and the Government, so far as its influence goes, is using it for the purpose of making bankrupt corporations in this country that deserve the regard and the protection of the Government. Now, it is an absurdity to grant subsidies for parallel lines of road in cases such as the one we have under consideration, where the public does not require the building of the additional road, where it is not in the slightest degree necessary. The only result of creating these lines is shown in the history of railway corporations to lead, as has been pointed out by the member for South Oxford, ultimately to combinations on the part of these lines; and so far from the public being benefited by the construction of rival lines by competition

in rates, the ultimate result invariably is that the public pays for the maintenance of two lines instead of one, and the public is actually damaged by the construction of railway lines where there is no necessity for them. I believe there is nothing in connection with our policy that threatens graver dangers to this country than the system that has been adopted by this Government in regard to railway subsidies. I suppose my right hon. friend has discovered by this time that the demands of localities are insatiable; I suppose he has discovered that in nine cases out of ten where he is called upon to make grants, he is obliged to make them under circumstances that his judgment does not approve, under circumstances where the necessities of the public at large are not concerned, where grants are made for the purpose of securing a riding, for the purpose of placating a supporter, for the purpose of adding to the political strength of the hon. gentleman. It is for this reason that millions upon millions of dollars of this country are being expended, expended in a way that does not advance the public interest, expended in a way that is in effect detrimental to the public interest, as in the case of this vote before us. If this thing is to continue, if this evil is to grow, as it promises to do. I feel thoroughly alarmed for the future of this country. We are already raising about all the money we can raise to meet our expenditures, we are in danger from year to year of having a deficit if there is any derangement of trade; we have a public debt of at least $275,000,000. Every man who has considered the situation of this country knows that our financial position is straitened, that our debt is too large, that our expenditures are too large. Every man knows that these railway subsidies are in the main useless, not calculated to advance the prosperity of the country, not made for the purpose of advancing the prosperity of the country. But the thing has run into this vicious groove, of using them in connection with political affairs, for the purpose of advancing the political interest and of strengthening men in their ridings. I certainly think that the whole system is vicious from begining to end. I do not blame the Government. I say that the Government are incapable of confining themselves to grants within the lines that they should do, with due regard to the interest of the country. They cannot do it. It is impossible for them to confine themselves to grants that can be justified upon any hypothesis of benefit to the country, or of being in accordance with the principles of sound business maxims. They have begun it, and the country is to reap, I am afraid, disaster from the inception and carrying forward of this policy.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Could the First Minister say what amount of work has been accomplished by this subsidy during the last year? They certainly ought to have made a return as to the amount of work performed, and how much of the road has been accepted, and whether the road has been completed in the manner required under the subsidy?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The road from Niagara Falls to St. Catharines is running, and payments have been made on account. The whole of the subsidy has not been paid over, because there are some requirements of the Department of Railways that have not been complied with. Unless the department is fully satisfied, the Government do not pay the full subsidy. They always retain enough to finish any incomplete work, according to the opinion of the engineer of the department. I think in the future that the railway traffic from Niagara Falls into the western peninsula will be very large, and the railway will have to have a double track by-and-bye. Now, I conceive that it is important that, instead of one railway having a double track and a monopoly of all that freight, there should be two railways. The hon. gentleman opposite thinks there may be a combination to raise rates between the two railways. I doubt, even if so, that the combination would produce any different result than a single railway having the monopoly of the trade. If two railways combined to raise the rates, they cannot raise them beyond what is allowed under the Railway Act. If two railways can do so, one railway can do the same thing, and, having the sole monopoly, they are not so obliging, they do not meet the trade as well as the two railways. As to combinations of different railways, that is a matter that, when it becomes a nuisance and a peril to our railway system, the Legislature will have to deal with it. At present we do not hear of anything of that kind occurring in Canada. I am sure the powers of the Legislature are quite sufficient to prevent, and altogether to render impossible, any unwholesome collision between railways to the disadvantage of the general public. The hon. member for Elgin says that it is an interference with the trade of the canal. I do not see how it can be. The trade of the canal runs from east to west, and from west to east, bringing in trade by the Falls of Niagara, and how the railway can interfere with the Welland Canal in the slightest degree, I do not see.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Perhaps the Minister would say how much has been paid on account of bonuses and of construction during the last year. He said the subsidy was paid in proportion as the road was completed. Perhaps he would also give information whether this company had not already offered their road to another company.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. How can I tell that?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see this company has been figuring in the accounts of the late Central Bank, as a debtor who had not paid.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That may be.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; but I do not think that a company who figures as debtor of an institution in difficulties, is very safe to advance public moneys to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They certainly did not get the money out of the bank when it was in difficulty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But they brought the bank into difficulty.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Like other railways, they went to the bank and got money out of this bank.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It strikes me that they were figuring as the defaulters. I happened to have noticed some reference to the matter, and, so far as my recollection goes, the transaction was a perfectly legitimate one. It is true that the bank got into difficulty, but it was in no way attributable to this railway subsidy. It was made apparent before the court, when the bank was being liquidated, that the loan to the railway company was a perfectly good one, secured beyond all question, although it happened not to mature at a time when the bank was in need of money. I think the only possible criticism of the transaction is that the loan was made, perhaps, for a longer period than that for which bank loans are usually made. Usually they are at short dates, and the extended time was probably granted on account of the excellent collateral security.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I desire to obtain information as to the amount paid on account of the subsidy in previous years, and the amount of work yet undone. If the company have not been able to complete the road already undertaken, they cannot be in a position to undertake additional work.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot give that information, but I will furnish it.

Mr. PLATT. I rise, on behalf of those portions of Canada which have not extensive railway facilities, to repu-

diate the argument of the First Minister, that the existence of one railway in a section of country is the strongest possible argument for the construction of another railway.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that.

Mr. PLATT. There are plenty of parts of Canada that would like to enjoy the benefits of a single railway, but the wealthier portions of the country now claim a second railway because they have one already; and if a railway charges exorbitant rates, the only way is to construct another. The First Minister has a plan in view, in case two rival companies unite in charging exorbitant rates, and in that event he will apply to Parliament, and Parliament has power to prevent two such companies charging such rates, but no power to prevent a single company doing so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has.

Mr. PLATT. Except by building another road. If that is the argument of the western portion of Ontario, the eastern portion and other portions of the Dominion may very justly complain. I grant that there is very little object in criticising any one of these items. Taken as a whole the resolutions for granting railway subsidies, the proposal cannot be characterised as other than as a system of log-rolling, one resolution supporting the other all through, the whole being merely the result of the vicious system entered upon years ago. I wish to be understood, although I do not expect to effect anything by criticising any particular item, as declaring that the system is a most obnoxious one, and I trust the warning given by some hon. members on this side of the House, in regard to the effect of this system on the country, will cause the Government to hesitate. If this system is continued, something will have to be done by the people, if not by Parliament or the Government, to check this kind of expenditure. The First Minister said that these were sums out of applications for $21,000,000. We do not know but that the First Minister has commenced the expenditure of $21,000,000 by giving a small sum to each of the various lines, for many of the resolutions are for 10, 15 or 20 miles. We are not told what the entire length of each road will be, but this is merely a first instalment, and Parliament thereby commits itself to subsidise the whole.

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for 20 miles of their railway, from the end of the section of 30 miles from Lake St. John towards Chicoutimi, subsidised by the Act 51 Victoria, chapter 3, towards Chicoutimi, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $64,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is one of those railways which we assist in the construction of a branch line. The Quebec and Lake St. John Railway starts from a point about 4 miles from Quebec, and runs to Lake St. John, a distance of 190 miles. It serves all the country. The object of this subsidy is to enable a branch to be constructed from Chicoutimi to join the main line. Most hon. gentlemen have, no doubt, gone up the Saguenay in the summer, and, if not, I recommend them to do so and see one of the most magnificent scenes on the continent. The River Saguenay is navigable as far as Chicoutimi, and when I visited the place some years ago, I considered that the country was not calculated for settlement. If you visit Chicoutimi now, you find a really handsome town there, picturesquely situated and having a very considerable trade. The fact of there being a town there shows that there is a country to support it, as no town can exist without it. The people have ample communication with the St. Lawrence during the summer, but during the whole of the long lower Canadian winter they have no communication with the rest of Canada, except by going across the snow from Chicoutimi to Quebec. This proposition is to aid the railway connecting Chicoutimi with the Lake St. John Railway and thus the people will have by water and rail in summer two modes of transport, and in winter they will be able to communicate with Quebec and the rest of Canada *vid* Quebec, by building this railway across the country.

Mr. LAURIER. Can the hon. gentleman say how much of the subsidy granted last year has been earned?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think any of it.

Mr. LAURIER. Have they commenced work on the road?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Some work has been done, but they have had very little time on account of the lateness of the season last year.

Mr. SHANLY. Before this item passes I wish to give this subsidy my most unqualified approval. It is exactly the kind of road that ought to be subsidised. I had occasion to go over that line through that country 25 years ago and I went over it again last year, and that country we are, so to speak, adding to our own country by the construction of that road.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear. We are adding to the extent of our own country.

Mr. SHANLY. In view of the fact as I say that we are adding to our own country by the construction of this road any person, however opposed to railway subsidies generally who would see that country as I saw it a quarter of a century ago, and, who would see it as it is now being opened up by this railway will say: "Well done," when we grant a subsidy of this kind.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). If I understood the Minister correctly we have already given a subsidy to thirty miles on which no work has been done yet. Would it not be well to let them finish that portion of the road before we grant a subsidy for another portion?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD It is intended to begin the twenty miles which is to subsidise all this road, from the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway to run towards Chicoutimi. The construction of the portion of the road which was formerly subsidised from the Saguenay to Chicoutimi, can be postponed, because they have a summer traffic on that portion, and this subsidy will enable them to work eastward and then go on towards Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). You want to subsidise both ends of the road, so as to make sure they will get the balance of the subsidy from the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

To the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company, for fifteen miles of their railway, from the Village of Tara to the Town of Owen Sound, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to amend this resolution by inserting after the words "from the village of Tara" the words: "or some point between Tara and Hepburn."

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Will the hon. gentleman explain why he wishes to bind the company down to construct at this particular point?

Mr. SPROULE. My object is the very reverse. By the resolution, as it stands now, it is confined to a certain point, and it is thought that engineering difficulties and other circumstances would make it necessary to allow a little more latitude. This amendment only covers the space of a few miles.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is desirous that the terminus should not be fixed at the village of Tara, but at some place near it, and the village of Hepburn is some 2 miles from it, and he, therefore, proposes this amendment.

Mr. BROWN. This line is of very great importance, and I speak advisedly, as I know the country well. Although it is a short line it is a very important one. I hope that no engineering difficulties will exist to prevent the line from being constructed from Tara, but, as my hon. friend says there may be such, there is no objection to the amendment. I should say that if there are no engineering difficulties, Tara would be the proper point. This line, as I said before, is an extremely important one, as it connects the Grand Trunk Railway system with the town of Owen Sound.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). If the village of Tara has granted a municipal vote or rendered any assistance to the road it would be very unfair to have it run from some other point.

Mr. SPROULE. There have been no municipal bonuses granted, but this amendment will make it a little more probable that a municipal bonus can be got.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this a separate line?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is part of the Grand Trunk Railway system. The parties interested in the port of Owen Sound are most anxious for connection with the Grand Trunk Railway system.

To the Hereford Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway, from Cookshire to a junction with the Quebec Central Railway at Dudswell, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman is aware, and everybody in this county is aware that on this road last fall there occurred very serious trouble because the workmen were not paid their wages. As far as my information goes, up to this day the workmen have not been paid. Is it the intention of the Government to do in this instance as has been done already, to see that the workmen shall be paid whatever may be due to them out of this subsidy?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If we grant a subsidy to a railway, we grant it for the purpose of building the railway, and not for the purpose of paying the debts of the company. The hon. gentleman knows that the Government take every pains to secure the workmen employed on the railway by contractors, and I think that a large sum of money has been already paid to these laboring men, $4,000 or $5,000.

Mr. LAURIER If they have been paid, of course I have nothing more to say; but supposing there are claims still existing, I think it would be only prudent to the country and fair to these men, that the Government should do what was done, if my memory serves me rightly, in connection with the subsidy to the Pontiac Railway three or four years ago, viz., provide that the outstanding claims of the men on the company should be satisfied.

Mr. HALL. The workmen on this line of railway were subjected to a great deal of hardship, and I am aware that an impression has prevailed with the public, and it is now communicated to the House, that the company were in some way responsible for this hardship. I have no interest in the company and no connection with it direct or indirect; but I know enough of the circumstances to be able to contradict that impression entirely. The directors advertised for tenders for the construction of the line. Shirley, Corbett & Co. were the lowest tenderers; but before giving them the contract, the directors made enquiries as to their construction of a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and as to their financial responsibility. As an evidence of their financial responsibility, the company insisted that they should make a deposit of $5,000, which was done. This was to be returned when the percentages which were kept back from the monthly payments amounted to that sum. They were paid from month to month On the 15th September they were paid $25,000 for the work of the month of August, and with that sum the contractors absconded, leaving their workmen unpaid for the whole of the month of August and half of the month of September. The directors afterwards paid these workmen for the half of the month of September and they gave them employment at an increased rate of wages over what they were paying to other men. The case of the Pontiac Railway which the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) has referred to, was a case, I believe, in which the company themselves were in default in the payment of their laborers. The present case is of course not similar, because the company contracted with contractors, the contractors employed their own laborers, and these contractors themselves are in default and not the company. The shareholders have no more right to pay these men than they would have to levy the same amount of contribution on the public, unless an enterprise of this kind is to be carried on sentimental principles instead of business principles. I am sure there is no foundation for the impression which has prevailed.

Mr. LAURIER. There are more ways than one of looking at this matter. I have no fault to find with this company, and from the statement of the hon. gentleman they are not in fault. But we have the fact that certain laborers have given their labor, and this company will have the benefit of it. Apart from the case of the Pontiac Railway, there is another which occurs to my mind, and which is still more in point; it is that of the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, in regard to which the Government undertook, and I believe my hon. friend assented, to pay all the laborers who worked on that railway. I admit that the company are not responsible legally for the arrears of the workmen. They have paid their contractors probably, and so far the company are entirely free from blame. But, on the other hand, we are helping the company with this further subsidy, and they have had the benefit of the work which has been done upon the road by these poor men.

Mr. HALL. And paid for it.

Mr. LAURIER. At the same time they have the benefit of their work, and now that they are asking the country for this assistance, it would be nothing unfair or unjust to say to them: "Very well, we will assist you in the prosecution of your work, but out of that subsidy we will see that the parties who have put their labor on your road shall be recouped for the labor they have given."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If we adopt the principle of a paternal government, whenever a railway is built or subsidised, and, in case the contractors or the sub-contractors, or the sub-sub contractors fail to pay their men, the Government should come forward, and, after paying for the work done, should pay the workmen and these sub-contractors, we should be assuming a burden that would stop all railway building in this country. The hon. gentleman speaks of the New Glasgow road. In the first place, that railway was purchased by the Government, and an extra security was taken for the repayment of the advance to the workmen.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the security?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There was a mortgage given to trustees for the payment of the laborers' claims, and the Government paid the laborers' claims, and availed themselves of this mortgage.

Mr. LAURIER. Who gave that mortgage?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The company.

Mr. LAURIER. I understood that the company could not prosecute the work, and became bankrupt, and that the Government took the mortgage from the company.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The company had a very good property, more than sufficient to pay all those claims.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What property had they?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They had the right of way and the work done.

Mr. MITCHELL. The point that strikes me in this matter is this: If this company had not come to this Parliament and asked for aid, the Government might rightly say we have no right to interfere in the claims between the individuals and the company. But as they have come and asked for aid, the Government have the right to deal with the facts as they find them. A number of workmen have spent their labor on this road and they have not been paid, and I think it is the right, nay, more the duty of Parliament, in granting this aid, to stipulate that these laboring men shall be paid out of this subsidy. As the hon. gentleman has said, we have no right to act as a paternal government if the company do not come and ask for aid. Having come to ask the aid of the Government, the Government should see that the honest laborers who have suffered by not being paid, should be paid by the company before they are given this subsidy, and a condition to that effect should be attached to the subsidy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sory, my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) is not present, but I think he informed me that all these men had been settled with. I am almost positive that they have been settled with some way or other. I disagree with the hon. member for Northumberland. He speaks, as did the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), as if this were a favor granted to this company. The favor is granted to the country through which the railway passes. Now, if we vote this money and if, instead of its being applied in extending and finishing the road, it is applied in paying the debts of the company, the object of the vote would be in a great measure frustrated. This money will be applied in this way. When ten miles are built and not before, and upon the certificate of the Chief Engineer that they have been built, the money is paid for the building of those ten miles. I quite agree that the Government should see as much as possible that all the laborers are paid, and the Government has adopted that policy as much as possible. Of course we have nothing to do with the sub contractors, but in every contract made between the Government and a subsidised railway, provisions are inserted for the purpose of protecting, as much as the Government can, the workmen. All the influence that the Government can use is used to this effect, and we find that in very few cases do questions like that of the Hereford Railway arise. I can promise, on behalf of the Government, that we will do all we can to see, not only with regard to this, but every other railway, that the contractors will pay their workmen, and we will be slow to hand over those subsidies until some satisfactory arrangement is made.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman is evading the question. He regrets very much that the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe is not in his place. Why is he not here? It is his duty to be here.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps the hon. gentleman may know why he is not here.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not know.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is attending to the estate of his relative.

Mr. MITCHELL. His duty to the people is to be here, particularly when he is asking for a vote of money out of the public Treasury. The hon. gentleman is begging the question when he states that the object of Parliament is not to pay for past expenditure, but to advance money for the purpose of building a road to be constructed for the benefit of the people of the locality. What do these gentlemen get charters for and construct roads for? Is it for the benefit of the locality? Is it for their own personal benefit? There are very few patriots among them, and my experience of people connected with railway charters is that they obtain them for the purpose of making money. If the hon. gentleman states that this money should be granted only for the continuation of the road and not to pay past debts, let him look at the votes of past years and he will find that many of them are not for the purpose of constructing roads but for the purpose of paying for roads already constructed. I would ask was the $150,000 granted the International Company for the construction of a road? Many of these subsidies are not given for the benefit of the public but for the purpose of recouping friends of the Administration for services they have already rendered.

Mr. LAURIER. The language used by the right hon. the First Minister admits there is justice in the claims of the laborers, since he says he will do his best to have them paid by seeing, before paying the subsidies, that every justice will be done. The hon. gentleman stated truly that the Government had power and influence over the companies; but there is something which is equally true, and that is, that the railway companies have great power and influence over the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I doubt that.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no doubt of it at all. All the comfort the hon. gentleman has to give the workmen is the assurance that he will do his best for them. But I am afraid the blandishments of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, who unfortunately is not here, used at the proper moment will cause the hon. gentleman to forget his good intentions; and I prefer to his good intentions binding Acts of Parliament, which he cannot forget. Since the Government have established the precedent of taking a mortgage from a company as security that the laborers would not be defrauded of their earnings, I see no reason why a similar course should not be adopted in this instance.

Mr. MULOCK. The right hon. the First Minister says he will take good care to see that these laborers are paid, so far as his influence goes. That is hardly sufficient security, because we have no evidence that this company, which has already received a bonus, and made default to the laborers in the past——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not the company.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that the company is in this position, that labor has been expended on their road that has not been paid for. The right hon. the First Minister says, on the information given him by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, that there is nothing owing to the laborers. Perhaps the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) could give us definite information on that point.

Mr. HALL. My impression is that there is a balance still unpaid. The directors assume that they have no right to use the funds of the shareholders to pay those wages, having already paid the contractors.

Mr. MULOCK. The matter stands in this position, that while the right hon. the First Minister understands, on the information of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, that there is nothing owing either by the contractors or the company to the laborers, the hon. member for Sherbrooke tells us that there is money due the laborers. Whoever owes the money, and assuming for argument that the money is owing by the absconding contractors only, the company and the country have obtained the benefit of the labor which

has been expended. The First Minister says that this is not an issue for this House because the money is voted for the benefit of the locality, and, therefore, we have no right to interfere with it by diverting a portion of the money which is intended for the benefit of the locality. If it is a question between the country and the Government, the country has obtained the benefit of the money expended on the line. It was the duty of the Government to see that these laborers were paid before the last estimate of September was passed. If that had been properly attended to, this complication would not have arisen. Now, the country has obtained the benefit of the labor which has been expended, but the hon. gentleman says this money was given to the company.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have been paid for that labor.

Mr. MULOCK. But the men have not been paid, and the Minister must realise that fact. He knows that in some of the Provinces, at least, the laborer has a lien on the product of his labor until the amount is paid. According to the advanced liberal doctrine in the Province of Ontario, a man cannot be contracted out of the value of his labor, and, when Parliament is coming forward voluntarily to make a present to this company, the Government should make provision to protect the rights of the laborer. What did the Government do two years ago in the case of the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company? There was money owing by sub-contractors for labor performed on the road from some point near Brandon, in a northern direction. The sub-contractors were the nearest persons to the company who were liable, and yet, when this Government was called upon to give a land subsidy to that company, they expressly provided in the Act of Parliament that the amount owing by the sub-contractors to the laborers for labor expended upon the line should be paid by the new company as a condition of the new company getting control of the charter. Is there one rule for the North-West and another for Cookshire; is there no fixed rule, and is this simply left to be decided by the whim of the Government of the day? There are any number of precedents as far as this Government is concerned, and the principle which should be adopted is to make the work responsible until the labor is paid. The original contractor may have paid his sub-contractors, but the laborer has not been paid. I am surprised that the First Minister, who professes to be *au courant* with the times, and to brush away all technicalities in this case, cannot see this matter clearly, and cannot see that justice is done to these workingmen. In view of all the information which has been given by the member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall), I think the Government should make it a condition precedent to the handing over of this money that the labor which has already gone into this enterprise should be paid for, and short of this an injustice will be done.

Mr. WATSON. To my mind, the laborers will have a very poor chance if the question is left to the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) at one end and the laborer at the other. The pressure of the hon. member will be greater than the pressure of the laborer. As to the Great North-West Central Railway, originally the Souris and Rocky Mountain road, this Legislature passed upon that question two years ago without making the claim for labor the first lien on the road. We incorporated a new company, and this House provided that the charges for labor between Melbourne and Rapid City should be a first charge. Afterwards the Government gave them a land grant. The whole cost of the road from Melbourne to Rapid City was about $100,000, and the land grant there was of no value at all. This House should see that the laborers who have done work already should be paid.

Mr. GILLMOR. I think if the laborers are to be paid, it must be for the House to pay them. The Government voted money to the company, they paid the contractors, and these contractors have run away with it. The only way in which I see the laborers are to be paid is to put an additional sum in the Estimates. Why should you take anything out of the pockets of the company who have paid for the labor, because the sub-contractors run away, and the laborers did not get their pay? I sympathise very strongly with the laborers, and I think they ought to be paid, and the Government promises to see, as far as they can, that the laborers shall be paid, but I do not think that our sympathy for the laborers should lead us so far as to take money out of the company. I am willing to vote an additional sum to pay the laborers, but, if I were a member of the company and had paid my obligations, I should think I had done my duty. I do not think I am showing any want of sympathy with the laborers when I say that I see no way for us to pay them unless we make a special grant for that purpose.

Mr. FISHER. When the company made the contracts, and paid the money over to the sub-contractors, they were culpable in not providing for the men who had to do the work. It is well known that the sub-contractors were paid very hastily, indeed, and that there were laborers who had done the work and did not get any money at all. If the railway company had done their duty, they would have held back a certain amount of the money until the contractors had fulfilled their duty, and, as they did not take that precaution, they ought to suffer:

To the Massawippi Junction Railway Company, for fifteen miles of their railway, from Ayer's Flat to Coaticook, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Massawippi Junction Railway was chartered by 51 Victoria to run from Ayer's Flat on the Massawippi Valley Railway to the Atlantic and North-Western Railway in the Townships of Magog and Orford. During the present Session of Parliament an Act has been passed empowering the company to extend its line from Ayer's Flat to Coaticook, a distance of 15 miles, which this subsidy is proposed to cover. By the construction of this line, Coaticook and other business points in the County of Stanstead will be brought 25 miles nearer to Montreal. The distance from Montreal to Portland, Boston and other New England points, *viâ* the Atlantic and North-Western Railway, will also be shortened by the same distance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In what respect does this road benefit the country generally?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It shortens the distance between Montreal and Coaticook, and from there to the United States.

To the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, for twenty miles of their railway, from Westport to Palmer Rapids, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $64,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This has Sault Ste. Marie as an objective point—about how many miles? The hon. gentleman, no doubt, as Minister of Railways, knows how many miles it is to Sault Ste. Marie.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. About 540 miles. The railway has been finished from Brockville to Westport, then from Palmer's Rapids, 20 miles, to the north of Westport, running westward in the direction of Sault Ste. Marie, 55 miles. The Ontario Government subsidised that portion of the line last Session for 55 miles, starting from Palmer's Rapids, $3,000 per mile.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the distance from Palmer's Rapids to the point where this crosses the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This vote is to fill the gap between Westport the terminus of this road, and Palmer's Rapids, where the Ontario Government have taken up the line, going into a country of great value to the Province for its various resources, especially timber.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Especially agriculture.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not say anything about agriculture; at all events, this is to fill up the gap. Then I presume the Ontario Legislature will continue the line, if the country is fit for it, perhaps to Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. DAWSON. As this line is intended to run to Sault Ste. Marie, a place in the constituency which I represent, I may take this opportunity of calling the attention of the Government to another very necessary railway in that district, and that is a railway from some point on the Algoma branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Manitoulin Island. Manitoulin Island has seventeen townships, with a large population. It is completely isolated, but a railway 30 miles in length would connect it with the Canadian Pacific Railway and render it easy of access. At present it is completely shut off during the winter season from all communication with the mainland. Now, I quite approve of such railways as that spoken of by the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Shanly) a few moments ago, because they open up new and valuable regions; and this line would open up a well settled country that at present has no outlet whatever in winter.

Mr. CHARLTON. The building of this line referred to by my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson) would open up and connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway an island containing over a million acres of arable land, and one of the finest portions of the Province of Ontario. I have been over the ground myself, and I can state that the engineering difficulties are of no consequence. A bridge connecting Manitoulin Island with the LaCloche Island across the Little Current, would be about 800 feet in length; for about 200 feet the greatest depth of water is 16 feet, while the balance of the channel is a rocky bottom over which it would be very easy to construct a bridge. After crossing the LaCloche Island a channel of about 600 feet wide is to be crossed in order to reach the mainland. The entire route from Manitoulin Island to a point upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, presents no engineering difficulty whatever. There is certainly no portion of the Dominion of Canada where, if the Government is to persist in building up a system of subsidising railways, money could be expended more judiciously and more in the public interest, than in subsidising a line to the Manitoulin Island.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose to amend this resolution by striking out the words "Westport to" and inserting after the word "from a point at or near Newborough towards." There was a subsidy for building a road of 40 miles to Westport. That has been built, and the company has built five miles further to Newborough.

Mr. MULOCK. It is merely an extension of the present line?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Yes.

Committee rose, and, it being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

To the Thousand Islands Railway Company, for four miles of their railway, from a point near the St. Lawrence River, in Gananoque Village, to Gananoque Junction of the Grand Trunk Railway, and for thirteen miles of their railway, from Gananoque Junction of the Grand Trunk Railway, to a junction with the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $54,400.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is simply a revote of a previous vote. The Gananoque and James' Bay Railway, running over the same ground, was subsidised by 49 Victoria, chapter. 10, for a distance of 17 miles. That railway and the Thousand Islands Railway have been merged into one, and it is now proposed to grant this subsidy of $54,400 to the Thousand Islands Railway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total chartered length of this road?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is chartered to run from Gananoque to James' Bay. All these railway companies are very ambitious, and put their final terminus in the clouds almost, at all events far west. The Thousand Islands Railway has been subsidised by the Ontario Legislature.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What did the Ontario Legislature give to it?

Mr. TAYLOR. The Gananoque, Perth and James Bay Railway Company was chartered to build a line from Gananoque to Perth and James' Bay. They applied for a subsidy, and obtained a subsidy for 17 miles, to connect with the Brockville and Westport road at Delta. The Gananoque, Perth and James' Bay Railway and the Thousand Islands Railway have since become merged into one company, as it was found it would cost $70,000 to enter the village to the water. The two lines, by Act of Parliament last Session, were merged into one, and this resolution is to revote the subsidy of two years ago, granted to the other company.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What did the Ontario Legislature give to this road?

Mr. TAYLOR. Nothing. The First Minister was no doubt confounding this road with the Brockville and Westport road with which this road connects at Delta.

To a railway from Cape Tormente towards Murray Bay, twenty miles, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $64,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This road is to continue the railway running from Montmorency to St. Anne and from St. Anne to Cape Tormente. It was subsidised and has been built, or is building. This subsidy is to carry it on towards Murray Bay from the road ending at Cape Tormente.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. By a previous resolution we are granting $96,000 subsidy to the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company. Is this the same company?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is to continue the road, perhaps not by the same company.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then to whom is this to be granted?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is like many other votes, it is to be given for this road, and I hope we will make satisfactory arrangements with the Montmorency Company who have built so far; but, if we cannot make satisfactory arrangements with them, the subsidy will stand until we can obtain a satisfactory body to build the road.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then there is practically no proposition, and no one at present entering into negotiations for this work, and from whom the Government can obtain security.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I take it that the Montmorency Company are very anxious to build it; but perhaps they may not undertake it in the spirit in which we desire it to be undertaken. It is important that a railway should be carried to Murray Bay, which is now a town of

considerable importance on the north shore of the St. Lawrence. During the summer it has connection with Montreal, Quebec and the west. They have no means to get westward in winter and the railway has been extended as far as Cape Tormente by the Montmorency Company. This will be worked by this company, but if not we want to have that road built, so that if this company will not build it we will get another company.

Mr. MITCHELL. As I understand this grant it is for the same railway which runs from Quebec to Montmorency Falls. The road is now built to Montmorency Falls and the people who built that road are getting the subsidy. The information I have received is that the subsidy which is being granted will cover that portion of the road built and running.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That part from Montmorency Falls to Ste. Anne de Beaupré is built.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am told that this subsidy is intended to cover that portion of the road.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, no portion of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the preceding estimate to cover part of what is built, or is it new work?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We voted in the beginning of these resolutions $96,000 to the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company from the east bank of the St. Charles River to or near Cape Tormente.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Practically we vote $160,000 to the same road.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would be better to put it in one item instead of two. I would ask the hon. gentleman are the company allowed to locate the road where they please? Is it to be built along the bank or close to the shore of the St. Lawrence, or is to be located further into the country? I understand that the advantage to the public depends very much on the location of the road.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no very great depth of country there as the hon. gentleman knows as the mountain range comes perilously near the coast. The object is to give accommodation to all that section of the country, and the line will be settled by the railway company on the most inexpensive route and which will be the most profitable and best calculated to the wants of the people. In all these cases the location between the terminal points, which are stated in the statute, is approved of by the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Have the Government an engineer who inspects all these roads and makes a report before the road is undertaken?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Always.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What population would that road serve from Montmorency to Murray Bay?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Sixteen thousand or 18,000 I suppose, in the first row of parishes. As to the parishes in the rear I cannot say.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I fancy the other parishes are very few and that when the road is built it will be a matter of greatest difficulty to make it pay. We had our experience in the case of the branch from Quebec to River du Loup, which nobody knows better than the Minister of Public Works for many years after its construction was a heavy dead loss to the Grand Trunk Railway, and I am afraid that it has not been much more profitable on our hands. It seems to me that this is more than a questionable expenditure of public money, for 16,000 or 18,000 people.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. But the hon. gentleman must remember that this is opening up this country and that if there are no facilities for reaching Quebec, the centre of that district, the parish will not increase. This road will increase the population and cause the people to open up the land and settle there. It was the same with the Lake St. John district. The people were leaving there until the Lake St. John road was built, but now the population is increasing and the people are coming from all parts to settle there where they have good lands and where they can reach Quebec in 6 or 8 or 10 hours.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman's acquaintance with that country is of course much better than mine, but my impression is that there is a very narrow strip of land between the mountain and the River St. Lawrence which can by any possibility be fit for agriculture. The people there have already very full facility for transport by water, whereas in the case of the St. John district I have always understood that there was a very large area of land capable of being brought under cultivation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. From Cape Tormente for 5 or 6 or 8 miles you are in the mountains, but on this side of the mountains towards little St. François Xavier and Baie St. Paul and other parishes down to Murray Bay, there are three or four parishes in depth, and a much larger area than there is in the mountains. The people of those parishes for six or seven months in the year are perfectly closed up, and they cannot get to the city except with great difficulty.

Mr. LAURIER. Who has asked for this railway?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The people there have asked for communication between the County of Charlevoix and the city of Quebec. When they saw that this railway was being subsidised between Quebec and Cape Tormente, they saw that their aid was coming if they waited three or four years more.

Mr. LAURIER. Is the company organised?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Company, for the first portion of the road.

Mr. LAURIER. Does their charter cover this line of railway?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know, but the title of the company would seem to indicate that they have a charter or that they intend having one, which is the idea we have in granting this subsidy.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I understood the First Minister to state, in reply to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that the Government sent their engineer over the line before its location, and before any bonus was granted. Am I to understand that that was his answer?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On enquiry, I find that the process is this: A subsidy is granted, the termini are fixed; the railway company submits the plan and location. The road may or may not be examined, especially because the department have wide experience all over the country, and they know whether a road is favorably located or not. They frequently object to the location as not being the best. If they do not know, of course they make the necessary enquiries. When the road is once located and any work is done on it, and before any money is paid, the portion completed is examined carefully, and the work is reported upon as being satisfactory and coming up to the standard before any money is paid.

Mr. MITCHELL. From any experience I have had, the way they take is this: They get out a charter; they then look for a subsidy, and if they get the subsidy, they com-

mence building the road where it suits them; and after they have got ten or twenty miles built, or whatever portion is necessary to comply with the conditions of the subsidy, they get the Government to send an engineer to see whether the work is constructed in accordance with the requirements of the Government. Now, Sir, I feel a little interest in this road, for I understand that I have an addition to my party, from the fact that a gentleman from one of these eastern counties, is dissatisfied with the manner in which this grant is made. I was looking around to see if my supporter was in. I do not see him just now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Which one?

Mr. MITCHELL. Do not all speak at once. But speaking seriously, I understand that some objection has been made to this grant because of the manner in which it is to be applied. I do not know the particulars myself sufficiently to enable me to enter into the question succinctly and clearly, and it is evident that hon. gentlemen opposite know about as little about it as I do. I believe the grant will be made, but in the interest of my only follower, I felt it necessary to make some little enquiries about it.

To the Amherstburgh, Lake Shore and Blenheim Railway Company, for twenty miles of their railway, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $64,000.

Mr. HAGGART. This subsidy is given to a company that got a charter from the Local Government, called the Amherstburgh, Lake Shore and Blenheim Railway Company. There are some special advantages in the local charter by which they are allowed to borrow for thirty years, and parts of municipalities can contribute bonuses. It is an extension of a road which is at present in existence, and of which I believe nine miles have been built between Amherstburgh and Blenheim.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This will make about 60 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. The distance from Amherstburgh to Blenheim is about 60 miles.

Mr. BRIEN. This railway is partly in my constituency, and if all the subsidies are of the same merit as this, I can congratulate the Government on their railway policy. My only regret is that the subsidy is not larger, so as to enable the railway to be completed. The people of the Dominion do not realise the great needs of that section of the country. It is a section in which a great quantity of fruit is grown, and it is necessary that the fruit growers should have rapid communication to get their grapes, peaches, and other fruits to market. However, the Government are moving in the right direction, and I hope, if the finances will permit, that in a few years the road will be completed. I may state that towards the construction of this nine miles the hon. Minister speaks of, the township of South Colchester gave a bonus of $20,000, Kingsville gave a bonus of $10,000, and South Gosfield gave a bonus of $15,000, and the road will serve a very useful purpose. The Grand Trunk and Michigan Central pass through that section, but they are through lines and do not serve local purposes. It is hoped by the people of the lake district that that road may yet run through to St. Thomas.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). To what point is the road already built?

Mr. HAGGART. I think from Amherstburgh toward Blenheim.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I understand that this subsidy is granted for the construction of that road running from Amherstburgh east? Is that the case?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Then if the road is constructed, why do you offer a bonus for the portion constructed?

Mr. HAGGART. None of it will be given for the part constructed. That has received a bonus already.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What part is that?

Mr. HAGGART. It is the part of the Erie, Detroit and Essex Road.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This road is intended to run through the Lake Erie townships of Essex and Kent connecting at Blenheim with the Provincial railways. The total length of the road is 61 miles, and it is proposed to amalgamate with the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway which runs from the Detroit River at Windsor, and has been built a short distance along the same route as the Western and Lake Shore road. What is asked for the Amherst and Lake Shore Railway is a subsidy from Amherst to Harrow, 17 miles, and from Cedar Creek to Blenheim 41 miles. That portion of Ontario has long felt the inconvenience arising from want of railway communication, and the municipalities have expressed their willingness to aid in the construction of a road by way of taxation, which is the best evidence of the anxiety of the people of Essex and Kent for the construction of the road.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Are we to understand that they have no railway accommodation in that locality?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If they had, they would not want this road.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The Canada Southern, I understand, runs through there.

2. That so much of the subsidy of $3,200 per mile, which, under the provisions of the Act 49th Victoria, chapter 17, and of any subsequent Act, may be paid to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company in respect of the last thirty miles of their railway, eastward from Metapediac, shall be applicable to the section of the said railway, comprised between the fortieth and the seventieth mile thereof, eastward from Metapediac, instead of to the said first mentioned section of thirty miles, making six thousand four hundred dollars per mile, applicable to the secondly mentioned section of thirty miles; but the foregoing provisions shall be subject to the condition that the said company undertake to complete the thirty miles of their railway from the seventieth to the hundredth mile eastward from Metapediac, within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, to be fixed by Order in Council, and without any further subsidy from the Government of Canada, and that they deposit with the Minister of Railways and Canals, as security to the Crown, that they will well and truly carry out their undertaking, their bonds to the amount of two hundred thousand dollars."

Mr. MITCHELL. What does that mean?

Mr. FOSTER. This road starts from the Intercolonial Railway at Metapediac. For the first 20 miles a subsidy of $300,000 was granted; for the second 20 miles $6,400 per mile, making $128,000. The succeeding section of 60 miles was granted a subsidy of $3,200 per mile, which amounted in all to $192,000. That last section of 60 miles, is divided into two sections of 30 miles each. The first 30 miles is a difficult road to build. This proposes to take the subsidy which was applicable to the second 30 miles of that section and put it on the first 30 miles from the end of the 40 miles down in the direction going east, making for that first 30 miles of this last section $6,400 per mile. But the company bind themselves to build the last 30 miles of the section without a subsidy, so that the amount of money is not increased. Owing to the heavy nature of the first 30 miles of the last section, the subsidy is placed upon that.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is there any danger of their coming for another subsidy for the last 30 miles?

Mr. MITCHELL. Certainly there will.

Mr. LAURIER. The practical result is that the company have undertaken to build 100 miles of railway for a subsidy of $620,000, and now they will build only 70 miles of railway.

Mr. FOSTER. But they undertake to build the whole railway.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is they promise to build the whole, but what assurance have the Government that they will build it?

Mr. FOSTER. They deposit their bonds as security.

Mr. MITCHELL Who are they?

Mr. FOSTER. The railway company.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose, like most of the rest of them, they are allowed to bond the road for some $20,000 or $30,000 a mile, in which case the $200,000 bonds will be exceedingly valuable security.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think this is the first instance within my knowledge or within that of the right hon. gentleman of this way of granting bonuses. I do not think we can point to another instance where the bonus has been doubled up in this way, and the mere personal security of individuals taken for the completion of the balance of the line for which the whole subsidy was given. I do not think it is a healthy system of granting bonuses.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the bond of individuals but the bond of the railway company.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is still worse. If it were the bond of individuals I could quite understand how there might be something in it.

Mr. LAURIER. What reason can there possibly be for thus changing the statute? We agreed to pay the company so much per mile of the railway built. Now, we are asked to withdraw this agreement. What reason can there be for the change?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Simply because these 30 miles are particularly difficult and expensive and beyond the means of the company to build. As there is a vote of $3,200 per mile for 60 miles, what the company asks is to have the whole subsidy put upon these 30 miles of heavy work, the company undertaking and giving security to build the last 30 miles down to the sea coast, which is comparatively easy, without any subsidy.

Mr. LAURIER. Or not build it at all. I ask is that an adequate reason? The road is not more difficult to build now than when the company made the agreement which Parliament sanctioned a few years ago.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These $3,200 per mile were never supposed to be sufficient to build the road. It was simply an aid. $3,200 a mile will not build a railway anywhere in any country. When the company have got to their present terminus, they find that the expense of the railway is so great that, with the aid of $3,200, they have come to the length of their tether, they have no more money, and for the next 30 miles, that amount would be altogether insufficient, and the road must stop. By giving them $6,400 a mile for that distance, they will be able to build the road. If they do not build it, they will not get the money, but if they do build it, they will be within 30 miles of the sea coast, and I have no doubt the remaining 30 miles can be built without any trouble.

Mr. LAURIER. I am quite sure that, after the statement of the First Minister, the House will come to the conclusion that it is very imprudent to undertake to build railways without having sufficient surveys first.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Then the total amount granted to this railway will be $590,000?

Mr. McMULLEN. It is very unfortunate that the First Minister should have broken through his rule in regard to subsidies to railways. This appears to be the first instance in which the amount of subsidy has been doubled.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the first instance.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, it may not be the first, but this will be an encouragement to other parties to build a railway and expend the money they get, and then say: We cannot go on unless you give us more money for the rest of it. The result will be seen when a company gets into financial embarrassments and say they have spent their own money and the money they got from the country and cannot go on unless they get $6,400 a mile. Before the bonus was granted to the road at all the First Minister should have had laid before himself or before the Minister of Railways a survey and a detailed statement of all the work necessary to be done, with some idea of the cost per mile of the road. That should have been placed before the Chief Engineer in order to ascertain the probable success of the scheme, and, then, if the promoters of the road presented a sound financial basis, showing the Government that, with the aid of $3,200 a mile they could complete the road, the Government might be justified in voting that amount, but I contend that the system of giving these amounts as premiums to parties to build lines in this way is a pernicious system.

Mr. DAWSON. As I understand it, this is not granting $3,200 a mile more, but it is shortening the line, and taking a part of that which was granted before and applying it to the other portion of the road.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). How was the first 20 miles provided for?

Mr. FOSTER. The first 40 miles are nearly finished.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). By whom have they been built?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By the Baie des Chaleurs Company. The line is of the length of 100 miles. The first 30 miles were subsidised at the rate of $3,200 a mile. The subsidy of $3,200 a mile for the last 30 miles is added to the first, making the same thing as 60 miles at $3,200 a mile but instead of that the first 30 miles receive $6,400 a mile and the remaining 40 miles $3,200 a mile. The first 40 miles are nearly finished, and the track is laid for nearly 17 miles further.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the first 20 miles have been subsidised to the extent of $15,000 a mile or $300,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; $300,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the road is to get $6,400 a mile?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a most exorbitant subsidy. Whom is the company composed of?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Who is the president?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman behind him might be able to tell. I am informed that Senator Robitaille is the president of the company, and that may explain this extraordinary subsidy. Has this road received any subsidies from municipalities or from the Quebec Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it has received any from the Quebec Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Riopel) could give us some information on the subject? I believe he is a member of the company.

Mr. RIOPEL. I think, so far, the information given by the Government is quite satisfactory and complete, except in one respect. The First Minister has stated that 40 miles of the railway are nearly ready. There are 60 miles nearly completed. By the 15th May, the line will be fully com-

pleted so far as to allow the Governor General's palace car to be landed at a distance of 60 miles on the banks of Grand Cascapedia River.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course, to run His Excellency's palace car to that point, it is cheap for us to pay $600,000.

Mr. RIOPEL. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the subsidies which have been granted to other roads, which are of no more importance, he will find that this subsidy does not exceed any granted to the ordinary roads.

Mr. MITCHELL. Surely that is not correct.

Mr. RIOPEL. The Lake St. John road and other roads have been aided to the same extent. The Gatineau Valley road, which is in the Province of Quebec, has also been aided to the same extent; and, in the Province of Ontario, I might speak of the Gravenhurst and Callander Railway, which has been aided to the extent of $12,000 a mile. The Baie des Chaleurs Railway will give much needed accommodation to the population along its route, which is altogether isolated during the winter, as is well-known. There is a population there now of nearly 50,000, and the fisheries of that coast are increasing in value every year. Agriculture has developed very rapidly indeed, and the receipts of the traffic on the Intercolonial Railway show that there will be a sufficient traffic along the coast to justify the expenditure on this road. The section at the end of the 60 miles is a very expensive one. Large bridges have to be built over the Grand Cascapedia and the Little Cascapedia Rivers. The bridges which have been built and which are to be built over the road, instead of being wooden bridges, as the Government specifications called for, have all been built of solid masonry and steel. The conditions as to construction have been fulfilled, and it is expected that the road will be of very great benefit to the population of that district. I do not see why there should be any objection taken to doubling up this grant, which is only $3,200 for 60 miles.

Mr. DAVIES. Who are the directors of the road?

Mr. RIOPEL. If it is of interest to the hon. member from Prince Edward Island I can give him the names of the directors. The president is the Hon. Senator Robitaille, and the directors are Mr. Robert McGreevy, Mr. E. A. Gervais, Mr. Fosbrooke, Mr. Martin, and Mr. Giroux. One of the directors died lately, and he will be replaced to-morrow at a general meeting of the company.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman one himself?

Mr. RIOPEL. Yes; I am one of them.

Mr. DOYON. Is Mr. Martin the local member?

Mr. RIOPEL. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. According to the argument of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Riopel) he seems to think that $15,000 a mile for the first 20 miles is not an unusual sum. He then justifies getting $6,400 a mile for the next 30 miles, and he thinks it is not an unreasonable thing to ask that we should double up the balance of the subsidy and reduce the amount of construction which has to be done, by one-half. He quotes as an analogy the Lake St. John Road, and the Gatineau Valley Road, all of them in the Province of Quebec. In the other Provinces of the Dominion, except the pet road in the western part of Ontario that we had some fighting over two or three Sessions ago, I believe there is scarcely a road, certainly not in our Province, that I know of, where more than $3,200 is given by the Government.

Mr. RIOPEL. They are being built nearly altogether by the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. None of them that I know of.

Mr. RIOPEL. The Indiantown Branch.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is a branch of the Intercolonial Railway, 18 miles, built by the Government, and the Government own the road, but this road is going to be built out of Government money, and my hon. friend and the other gentlemen who are associated with him, will own the road, and very likely they will come back next year, or the year after, and ask that these 30 miles taken off the length of the road, get an additional subsidy. I think it is an outrageous thing, that ought not to be sanctioned. It is not right to give as an illustration in connection with the subsidising of roads, these three roads in the Province of Quebec, as a standard, and a standard only for that Province. If one Province is to get $15,000 a mile then the other Provinces should get it also. If the Government is to give $6,400 in one Province they should give it in another. They should not allow people who enter into a contract such as this, to come and ask for 30 miles of that road to be taken off, and get the same subsidy, when they originally contracted with the Government that they would build the whole distance.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Perhaps the hon. member will tell us, as one of the directors of this road, how much it has cost per mile to build the first 20 miles.

Mr. RIOPEL. The first 20 miles of road were advertised as a section of the Government branch of the Intercolonial Railway. Tenders were called for. The work to be done was merely the construction, not including the rolling stock, nor the expense of survey, nor the expense of engineering during construction. Three tenders were sent in, of which the lowest was $27,000 per mile. The company, having got a contract for the construction of the road at an uniform rate distributed this money over 20 miles. The company has not yet a thorough account of the cost of every section of the road; that is impossible.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Has there been any bonds issued over this line of road?

Mr. RIOPEL. The company is authorised to issue bonds, and has decided upon an issue of bonds for $20,000 per mile. It was the intention of the company to place these bonds at an early date upon the market. It is well known that during the last 12 months particularly, all provincial enterprises have been placed at a great disadvantage on the money market; I may say it has been almost impossible to dispose of the securities, and the bonds of the company have not been disposed of. It is well known that such security could not fail, inasmuch as there was a Government guarantee of interest for a number of years which will cost something like 40 or 50 per cent. of the proceeds of the sale of the bonds. I quite understand my hon. friend's idea, and if he would just make a calculation he could easily ascertain that when the cost of the road is considered and the amount of the subsidy granted, and the amount of money necessary to pay the contract price, the amount necessary to meet unforeseen expenditures, and to pay for the rolling stock, and to put the road in working order, the expectation of the promoters of making money out of it, is more a matter of fancy than anything else. I think that it is a pretty hard task to find who had made any money, so far.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think we know some of them.

Mr. RIOPEL. Well, I do not. I only hope that I may be one, when we get through.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It appears from the hon. member's statement that the Government built the first 20 miles. Only $15,000 were paid out. The company took that section out of the hands of the Government and built it themselves.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand that when they made an arrangement they issued bonds on this road to the extent of $20,000 a mile, and they could not float those bonds?

Mr. RIOPEL. The company has not floated bonds.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the reason?

Mr. RIOPEL. One of the reasons is this: that it was ascertained last summer that, without the guarantee on the bonds which was intended to be given, the bonds could not be placed upon the market; and as a justification I may state that the Lake St. John Railway bonds have not, so far as I understand, been disposed of, although they appear to have been disposed of.

Mr. LAURIER. The Government are going to release the company from building 30 miles and are going to take the bonds of the company and their guarantee that they will build the road, although the bonds of the company are perfectly worthless and could not be floated and realised upon.

Mr. RIOPEL. I have not said so. The company have not thought proper to place them.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago that those bonds could not be floated, and he cited the example of the Lake St. John Railway Company where the same thing had occurred. He stated also that the bonds could not be floated unless they had the guarantee of the Government, and yet these bonds, which no capitalist will accept, the Government are going to take as security for the contract to be fulfilled.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. One can quite understand that a capitalist in England might say he could not advance the money on those bonds; but all the same they will operate as a charge on the railway. The whole of the railway constructed is liable for these bonds, and the railway and the bonds are both the security of the Government, although if the Government sent them to England no doubt they could raise money on them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Have the shareholders paid up any stock in the road?

Mr. RIOPEL, Certainly we have.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How much?

Mr. RIOPEL. $30,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then we are now advancing $620,000 for the construction of this road, and after the road has been built at that cost, it will be handed over to the company that has altogether only put in $30,000.

Mr. RIOPEL. They are doing for this road what they are doing for other roads, as is well known.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The leader of the Government said that the Government only gave subsidies in aid.

Mr. RIOPEL. So they are. The road itself is the guarantee for the balance.

Mr. MITCHELL. A very poor guarantee.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We are going to give $620,000 when the company itself has invested only $30,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. We want to sift this matter a little further, for it is quite clear there is a nigger in the fence. This is another case similar to the York Bridge, which we discussed the other night. It is another piece of political iniquity. It is clear from the confession of the hon. gentleman that the Government are about to build this road, towards which the stockholders have contributed only $30,000. I should like the hon. gentleman to state how much has been charged for services in connection with securing the charter and the preliminary expenses. The probability is that, when this is deducted, there is not one dollar in the concern so far as the company is concerned. The Government propose to place over $600,000 into a flimsy affair in which the promoters have only put $30,000, and the Government are taking the bonds of a company in which only $30,000 has been invested. I should like to have some more information in regard to this scheme. The hon. gentleman said that when the contract was let, the company had an offer to build the road for $27,000 a mile. We are contributing $15,000 a mile towards the construction even on that basis. I defy the First Minister to point to any railway enterprise to which we have contributed one half the cost. $3,200 per mile is the outside ever contributed to any Ontario road, and no road is constructed for less than $12,000 a mile, which would make the aid equal to about 25 per cent. But in this case we give 50 per cent. and now when the road has reached a point in its financial history when it can go no further, we propose to take as security the bonds issued. This is another rotten arrangement, rotten arrangement No. 2, and it should not be allowed to pass without being further sifted.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I understood the hon. gentleman stated they had an offer to build the road for $27,000 a mile. The Government according to his statement paid $15,000 a mile, and the company put into the undertaking $30,000 all told, which would make $16,000 a mile. The company have issued bonds, and have not floated them. Would the hon. gentleman explain how he made up the difference so as to complete the road in the manner in which it was completed? A considerable amount must have been provided for. If he does not, I have to offer my protest in regard to the manner in which this subject has been treated. A similar proposition has never been submitted to this House. Why the Government should come down with such a proposition is more than I can understand. The hon. gentleman and his associates may be very important in supporting the Government of the day, but certainly, however valuable they may be, we are paying more than the hon. gentleman's services are really worth to the country. The Government are proposing to accept the bonds of this company, when one of the promoters of the road has declared here in his place in the House that the company were unable to float the bonds and unable to realise one dollar on them unless the Government guarantee them, and yet we are asked to accept the bonds of this company. Has any hon. member any idea that the balance of the 30 miles will be completed by the company? I do not think so. It is no secret that the bonds are not worth one dollar without the guarantee of the Government. Their bonds for the completion of this road are not worth a cent. I say the Government should cancel this proposition for the present and wait until they are able to get sufficient information to present a decent proposition to this House. Talk about there being a nigger in the fence or half a dozen of them, but it requires an enormous amount of concealing for the number of niggers in the fence there. I say it is a disgrace to our Parliament to come down with a proposition of this kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Riopel) to explain the statement which he has made. He said that the first 20 miles cost $27,000 a mile; that the Government spent $15,000 a mile upon it and this would leave remaining $12,000 or a total of $240,000. The hon. gentleman says that the company have put of their own money in the 20 miles $30,000 in all. That would leave $210,000 for the mere work of construction to be paid for by some other subsidy or in some other way. It costs about $3,000 a mile or $60,000 in all to rail the road, and it will cost $50,000 for rolling stock. It is quite clear that it will cost $240,000 for the construction part of the work, and the hon. gentleman has only accounted for $30,000 of that. How is the other $210,000 accounted for?

Mr. RIOPEL. I may say that the amount for the construction of the 20 miles is paid and the cost of the construction of all the work so far is paid also. There is no indebtedness as to the construction of the road. There is no outstanding claim, and so far there has been over $1,000,000 expended and paid.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Where did it come from?

Mr. RIOPEL. I hope the hesitation and doubt expressed by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) will disappear. I am asked: "How was it done?" Well, if the money was found to build 60 miles of the road and pay for it, there should be no trouble in getting the balance. My hon. friend wants to know where did the money come from? The money was found.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Where?

Mr. RIOPEL. I do not suppose that a person who is doing business is bound to say what are his transactions. I think all the company is bound to say is that they properly applied their subsidies and that they have carried out the term of their contract so far and that the balance of the work will be done. This is not an additional subsidy; it is only an advance of the subsidy already voted and there is a guarantee that the balance of the work will be done. That is not such an extraordinary proposition as has been represented by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says that a million dollars have been paid and that the company owes nothing. The company have been unable to sell their bonds and the hon. gentleman will not say how the other $210,000 have been paid. He says there was no liability on the road.

Mr. RIOPEL. I did not say there was no liability. It is quite the reverse, for you must expect there will be a liability.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that if the Government and Parliament take the bonds of the company for security for any advance, they have a right to know the value of the security and circumstances of the company.

Mr. RIOPEL. I have stated the circumstances of the company clearly enough.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the company deposited any bonds for security with those who advanced the money?

Mr. RIOPEL. The company has a contractor and the contractor makes his arrangements, and the company carries out the terms of the contract; and as far as the company is bound to make their payments to the contractor they have been made, and the contractor has made his payments to parties to whom money was due.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. RIOPEL. Authorisation has been given for the issue of the bonds, but they are not out yet.

Mr. McMULLEN. Have the bonds been executed by the company?

Mr. RIOPEL. They are just being engraved.

Mr. McMULLEN. How much of that $30,000 was paid in cash at the time the company was formed?

Mr. RIOPEL. The company has a charter from the Provincial Legislature, and it has carried out the terms of that charter. That will be a sufficient answer for my hon. friend.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have a perfect right to find out the financial condition of the company before we permit this resolution to pass. If the hon. gentleman wants to get through peaceably he will have to state to the Committee how much was paid in cash in order to form that company?

Mr. RIOPEL. The terms of the law have been complied with.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How much have the company received, by way of subsidy, from the Local Government?

Mr. RIOPEL. 10,000 acres of land per mile. The land grant was converted into cash, and $3,500 per mile are payable on construction, and $3,500 when the lands which have been converted into cash will be sold for colonisation purposes.

Mr. LABROSSE. (Translation.) I made no objections when the Government proposed to grant subsidies to railways, because I believe that the policy of subsidising railways is in the interest of the Provinces and of the country in general. But I regret that the subsidy asked for by the Vaudreuil and Prescott Railway Company last year, and again this year, has not been granted. The company has already obtained a subsidy for 30 miles of its road, but there still remains more than 50 miles yet to build. The company and its promoters expected to extend the road as far as Ottawa this year, but as the company has not received the required subsidy, I think that only a portion thereof will be built, namely, the 30 miles already subsidised. I would like to learn from the Government, whether they will be prepared to grant fresh subsidies to this railway next year, if the railway goes on. I perceive, that in the various portions of the Dominion, and especially in the Province of Ontario, subsidies have been granted to counties which are already checkered over with railways. The County of Prescott is the only one in the Province of Ontario which does not possess one mile, nay, not even one furlong, of railway. Under these circumstances, I think that it would be but right that the company of which I have spoken should receive a subsidy—or at least, that the Government should pledge themselves to subsidise it if it continues the building of its road, and makes it complete from Vaudreuil to Ottawa. This would be an immense advantage for the population of the counties which are traversed by this road, where there are already important mills and manufacturing establishments; there are, besides, in the County of Prescott, the Caledonia and Plantagenet Mineral Springs. I trust that the Government will take this subject into consideration, and that they will be willing to grant us the subsidy desired to continue the building of this railway; which will probably have for its effect, the increase of the numbers of the French Canadians in the Province of Ontario, but I think that this will be no detriment to the Dominion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to ask the hon. Minister who is taking charge of this matter, who is the contractor for this line? Perhaps the First Minister would kindly say?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. How can I possibly know who the contractors are on any of these lines which we grant subsidies for?

Mr. CASEY. The member has evidently become dumb; he has lost his tongue; and the Committee can come to no other conclusion from his refusal to answer regular and proper questions than there is something he wishes to conceal; and I think it is not hard, even without the corroborating testimony of the hon. gentleman's sulky silence, to come to that conclusion from the terms of the resolution itself. Here is a company calmly proposing that the subsidy which was to be paid for the last 30 miles of their line, for the purpose of securing that the whole line should be built before this subsidy is paid, should be given, not to the last 30 miles, but to the 30 miles before that, thereby giving up the security we had for the construction of the last 30

miles. When a company make such a proposal as will relieve them of the necessity of constructing the last 30 miles they need to show us good reasons for it; and in the course of trying to show such reasons the hon. gentleman has made several startling confessions. He has admitted that this company, who are to receive something over $1,000,000 from this House and the Local House combined, have only risked $30,000 of their own capital in the undertaking. He has refused to tell whether that $30,000 was cash or whether it was notes, or merely checks put in and counted as cash. He has refused to tell us which of the tricks usually resorted to in floating bogus companies has been resorted to—I do not say this is a bogus company—but the hon. gentleman has not made it clear to us that the tricks used in floating bogus companies have not been used in floating this company. He has refused to make it clear that the shareholders have a real financial interest in the undertaking. He has not told us that they are not men of straw, put there because their names could be used to boom the company and to obtain subsidies from Parliaments, Local and Federal. We know that these things have been going on in other cases. We know that members of Parliament have been put on the boards of companies simply for the sake of their political influence, and the hon gentleman, by his silence, leaves us free to imagine what we like in that respect, and we are very apt to take the liberty allowed; whereas by a frank statement of the facts of the case, if they are not too bad altogether to be stated, he would clear away the suspicions from our minds and put the transaction on a business basis. He may take his choice. After asking us for this extraordinary change in the allotment of the subsidy, which gives the company a tremendous advantage, he has confessed to us that the company have already obtained from the Local Government a subsidy of $7,000 in cash for this piece of road, for which he asks this House to give $6,400 a mile, making in all $13,400 a mile in cash, granted for this road which is to become the property of the shareholders who put in $30,000 for the whole 100 miles of road. I certainly cannot but characterise it as a very bare-faced demand under the circumstances. Then the resolution, which I suppose was framed to suit the company, says that if this re-arrangement is made, the company will undertake to finish the other thirty miles within a reasonable time, say four years, without asking any further subsidy from the Dominion Government. The hon. gentleman refuses to show the company's financial standing, so that we may know what their undertaking is worth. No doubt the company will promise anything to get this re-arrangement of their subsidy made; but we want to know what their promise is worth, viz., to put up $200,000 of bonds, which is barely more than their subsidy amounts to. Then, when we try to find out what the bonds of the company are worth, whether any have been issued, and what amount, and what their other liabilities are which might constitute a lien on the property of the company prior to the bonds, the hon. member becomes silent. We can only conclude from his silence that he dare not, in the interest of the company, tell what the facts of the case are, and such being the suspicious nature of the whole transaction and the suspicious silence on the part of the hon. promoter of the Bill, such being the fishy character of the proposal contained in the resolution. I think it is rather hard to ask any member of this House, even though he be a Government supporter, to support an arrangement of this kind, and that a good deal of self-confidence is required in the man who asks it. I should not have had occasion to say all this if the hon. gentleman had made a full and frank statement of the affairs of the company, as he was invited to do by several of my colleagues. I should not have had the same opinion of the railway if he had made that full and frank confession, but he must take that as due to the suspicion which his silence has thrown around the whole affair.

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. RIOPEL. I wish to say just one word after these remarks. I think I have the right, after the very open explanation I have given the House, to say I have answered all the questions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. RIOPEL. I do not certainly think that the remarks just made are applicable.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think that the hon. gentleman was as frank with the Committee as he might have been. He replied to the hon. member for Bothwell that no money had been raised on the bonds of the company. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) pertinently enquired where the money came from, and the hon. gentleman was silent. When I asked the question, he said the subsidy received from the Local Government was a land subsidy. The statement was true, but it did not contain the whole truth. The hon. gentleman kept back the fact that the land subsidy, which was originally given, was afterwards commuted for a cash subsidy of $7,000 a mile.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He said that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). So that, as a matter of fact, the way the company stands is this, that they have received a subsidy or will receive a subsidy from the Local Government to the amount of $560,000 in cash and a Dominion subsidy to the amount of $629,000; or a total of $1,189,000. That seems to be more than the road will cost for the 180 miles. What will be the result in the future? The company are going to build the part nearest the Intercolonial Railway out of their subsidies, and when that is built the part nearest to the Bay of Gaspé will remain unbuilt. We have no guarantee that the company will build it, and in a year or two, in all probability, the people of that section will insist upon this Government building it. They will say they have as much right to a Government subsidy for the construction of the road at that end, as the people near the Intercolonial Railway had for the construction of the road there. This road will cost both Governments in the neighboorhood of $1,250,000 and will be the most heavily subsidised road in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is another point in relation to the security offered. In addition to the cash subsidy to which the hon. gentleman who has just spoken referred to, the company are entitled, when 100 miles are built, to issue bonds at the rate of $20,000 a mile, making $2,000,000. Out of that $2,000,000 they propose to put up a security for the building of the last 30 miles, from which we are deducting the subsidy to double it up on the other, these $200,000 of bonds is only one-tenth of the total issue. What will be the value of that one-tenth? That will not sell for five cents on the dollar, so that practically the company is giving no security at all. The company have had a very good arrangement with both the Local and Dominion Governments. They entered into an agreement to construct the road on certain conditions and terms, and have no right to ask us to depart from those terms and double up the subsidy, when only offering such a flimsy guarantee. If they were putting up the whole $2,000,000 bonds as guarantee there would be some sense in it, but to put up one-tenth after receiving so much in cash seems an outrageous proposition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The fact that the company has power to issue bonds to the extent of $20,000 a mile is simply a provision that is in all these railway charters. If the $200,000 bonds are made a first charge on the road, they are valid security and come before any other bonds.

Mr. MITCHELL. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The $200,000 bonds will prevent the sale of the rest in the English market, for the

hon. gentleman knows that to place the bonds they must put the whole of them on the market without any preference. The hon. member for Northumberland knows the country pretty well; he knows its mountainous character extending from Gaspé to the Baie des Chaleurs, and he knows that it is a very expensive road.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He knows that a subsidy of $3,200 per mile would not be sufficient to build that road or anything like it. If it is to be built at all the company must get more.

Mr. MITCHELL. But they are getting $22,000 a mile.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They must get considerably greater aid than a road across a prairie or through the greater part of Canada. The whole of the assistance that Parliament is giving for the road up to the last 30 miles, is less that $9,000 a mile—about $8,600 or $8,800 a mile. That is all this Parliament will give, and that is not very much aid to a road going through that very difficult country. This is not a bogus road, as shown by the fact that 40 miles are very nearly finished, according to the report of the Government engineer, and that 17 miles more than those 40 are graded, so that nearly 57 miles of the road will be completed this season. Well, $8,800 a mile is no very great assistance for that road, if it is to be built at all. It is not a bogus road; it is being pushed through with difficulty, and all the questions that have been put in order to ascertain the financing that has been done to build it so far, I do not think are quite relevant or quite fair. The company have shown their desire to carry out their undertaking by building 40 miles of the whole 100, and they state on getting this bonus they will build the other 30 miles and give security by bond or otherwise for the completion of the whole line. I have no doubt they will give any security on the road that the Government may ask, that they will finish the easy slope down to New Carlisle. The hon. gentleman knows that the road will be quite imperfect if the last 30 miles are not built. By building the last 30 miles to the shore they will have communication with the fisheries of the Baie des Chaleurs and all that country; and under the circumstances there should be no charge brought against my hon. friend that he has not frankly answered all questions that have any relevance to this vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. No; he has not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The House may grant or refuse this vote, but it is reasonable to assist that road to the extent of $8,800 a mile if the House thinks it ought to be built; and the House has already decided in that sense.

Mr. MITCHELL. The First Minister has appealed to me by name as to my knowledge of this road. He has correctly stated that portions of the road are very difficult to build. There is no question of that, but they have got a large subsidy for that. But there are other portions which are not so difficult. I am not prepared to speak as to the comparative quantities, but, when such extraordinary changes are asked for as are demanded here, the Government should have had the quantities in the different sections for which these subsidies are asked and submitted them to the House. In relation to another point referred to by the hon. gentleman, when I said the company were authorised to issue $2,000,000 of bonds, the hon. gentleman said that $200,000 of the bonds they were to issue were to be given to the Government as a first security, and that they could not deal with the rest until after that security. I think I have a little common sense, and I think I can judge of that as well as the right hon. gentleman, and I do not accept his statement as to the relative position of the $200,000 and the balance of the $2,000,000 which they are authorised to issue. I say that the fact that we take $200,000 of bonds as security for the building of the rest of the road simply means that we will rate *pari passu* with the other $1,800,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman says "no." I say, if he put in this resolution a statement that the $200,000 would be the first issue and would rank ahead of the balance, he would be right, but, if he does not, and he has not proposed to do it, our $200,000 will rank with the other $1,800,000, and perhaps it may not be worth the paper it is written on. No doubt it is desirable to get connection with the great fishing depôt of New Carlisle, and to have the shores of the Baie des Chaleurs brought into connection with the rest of the country, but, when it comes to spend such an enormous sum of money, when the country is being taxed so enormously to raise this money, and when there are other portions of the country which are entitled to a fair share of it, I think the amount is altogether out of proportion to the services to be rendered by this road, and, therefore, I think this vote ought not to pass in this way. Hon. gentlemen have asked questions as to the financial status of this company, and their manner of expending their money. I have not asked any such questions, but have confined myself to the legitimate discussion of an important question in which the finances of the country are involved. If the hon. gentleman wishes to do what is right and to give some security to Parliament that the balance of the road shall be completed, he should alter his resolution and make the $200,000 a first charge, allowing the $1,800,000 to rank afterwards, and then we will have some security.

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) urges, as a reason for this change, that $3,200 is not a sufficient subsidy to build this line. No one supposes that it would be, but surely that would be sufficient to guarantee the interest upon a very considerable amount of bonded debt. Whether it is enough or not, it is clear that the company accepted this amount and agreed to be content with $3,200 a mile for the whole road, in the same way as other roads have done. Now they ask to be given a subsidy for the whole road, when they have built only 70 miles of it, and that brings us to the point which my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has alluded to. The promise to build the other 30 miles is worth nothing commercially speaking. It is only a promise, and, when they offer that promise as a part of the bargain, the company should be prepared to show their financial standing. That is where I differ from my hon. friend for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who seemed to doubt the propriety of enquiring into the financial standing of the company.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not say anything of the sort. I only said I had confined myself to the general question.

Mr. CASEY. When a company ask us to take their word that they will do something in the future, we ought to know their financial standing, what is the amount of the paid-up stock, what that stock is composed of, whether it consists of notes of hand of the shareholders, or cheques for which there is no money in the bank, or on what basis it put up this enormous sum of $30,000 which they are willing to risk out of their own pockets in order to start the road. We should also know what other debts the company may have, whether the contractors have been paid, and who the contractors are? The right hon. gentleman says the promoter of the Bill has given sufficient information. He has not told us who the contractors are. We know of cases where promoters of a road have formed themselves into a construction company and let the contract for the construction to themselves. I do not say that is the case here, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Riopel) will not tell us, and it is therefore open to us to imagine that the promoters did form themselves into a construction company and did pay them-

selves out of the former subsidy with a view of getting another subsidy from the Government. Again, as to their financing, the First Minister said we should not enquire about the finances. I think we should for the rersons already given. Then the right hon. gentleman said he had no doubt the company would give any security the Government asked. It would scarcely seem that the hon. gentleman remembered the last clause in this resolution, because it appears that the Government have asked and have received a security of $200,000 bonds which, as my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) said, may not be worth five cents on the dollar when the Government come to enforce the security. But, according to the statement of the First Minister, if the Government had asked more security, they might have got it. It may not be too late for the Government, after this discussion, to reconsider the matter and to ask for efficient security, and I do not think any better plan could be devised than that which has been suggested by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), that the issue of $200,000 of first mortgage bonds, which are to be given to the Government, should take precedence of all other bonds. The responsibility now rests with the First Minister to obtain some real security, and not merely to ask the company to advance $200,000 worth of bogus security, for no other name can be given to it, in regard to a company of which we know nothing. There was one remark made by the First Minister which I was glad to hear. He said the Committee, after hearing the proposal, might accept it or reject it. Now, that can only mean that the right hon. gentleman proposes to leave this question open and not make it a question of want of confidence, because we know that if he makes it a question want of confidence, the Committee is not at liberty to accept or reject it. I hope, however, the right hon. gentleman meant his words in the literal sense, the only sense in which they could mean anything, and will allow his supporters to vote according to their consciences, according to their idea of business in this matter, and if he puts it in that way, I am satisfied what the fate of this resolution will be.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In 1886 when the Minister of Public Works brought in the Bill dealing with this road he said that the Government was satisfied that the road would be built in two years. I find a curious thing in connection with this matter, that of the three tenders for the construction of this road that was mentioned by the hon. member for Boneventure, one was under $300,000, but the man never could be found, and the bank repudiated the check he had furnished the department. I also observe in course of that debate that the names of the principal shareholders were stated as follows:—Hon. Theodore Robitaille, 500 shares, $25,000; Hon. Thomas McGreevy, 1,000 shares, $50,000; Hon. Louis Robitaille, 1,000 shares, $50,000; Robert H. McGreevy, 500 shares, $25,000; L. J. Riopel, 1,000 shares, $50,000; L. A. Robitaille, 980 shares, $49,000, and a few others. That seems to be a family compact.

Mr. MITCHELL. The Hon. Thos. McGreevy withdrew from the arrangement and has had nothing to do with it since.

Mr. McMULLEN. We simply want to know who was the contractor for the work so far as it has gone.

Mr. GILLMOR. I have been frequently surprised at the cost of building railways as represented by railway men in this House. I think it is a very difficult railway indeed that costs over $15,000 per mile. I have not had much experience in railways, but I have some knowledge of about 80 miles of railway that has been built through a most difficult country, and has been running for years, and that only cost $10,000 a mile, although the road had a great many bridges. I do not believe the road in question is going to cost $15,000 a mile—that is my honest opinion,

This company composed of the gentlemen whose names we have heard read, has got $15,000 a mile of subsidy out of the Local and Federal Governments. I do not know any one here who is acquainted with the country, but I am informed that a large part of that road is built on a very easy line, particularly along the shore. It is not built through a mountainous country, and the company undertaking to build a road through these mountains that the Prime Minister speaks of, ought not to undertake it without having some money of their own to put into it. This country cannot afford to build roads at such a cost as that. I care nothing about the securities on roads. The securities of railways are not worth a snap, they are never enforced, and they are never got back. But this is an enormous subsidy to give any railway in this country. I never dreamed that the Government was giving more than $3,200 a mile to aid in building railways, but here we find that the Quebec Government and this Government are giving $15,000 a mile. I am satisfied if the truth were known the road will not cost more than $15,000 a mile. I remember years ago when we undertook to build the road I am speaking of, it was thought by all those who had any experience that it would cost $20,000 a mile. Those times are altogether changed, and it has been ascertained since then that railways can be built very much cheaper. I am satisfied that company will never put a dollar of their own money there.

Mr. CASEY. When my hon. friend who has just sat down spoke of the lower cost of constructing railways in certain districts, he forgot to take into account the contributions to the campaign fund. That is one item that increases the cost of building roads on the Bay des Chaleurs. Another item which probably increased the cost of this road is the great personal and political influence of the four or five gentlemen who compose the company. You cannot expect to build a railway as cheaply with gentlemen like Mr. McGreevy, and Mr. Robitaille, and Mr. Riopel and one or two more, as the sole owners of the road—as that of which my hon. friend has spoken. Such great political influence costs heavily. I am not astonished that so much has been taken. On the other hand, one would be more inclined to wonder at the moderation of those hon. gentlemen who have it in their power to obtain, apparently, whatever they ask for. But I want to make one more appeal to the promoter of this Bill. After the list of the names of shareholders has been read, after his own name has been mentioned in connection with it, it appears he is one of the very few who owned the stock of the road, and who has contributed at the rate of $300 per mile towards its construction. Can he not be shamed into making a business statement of the affairs of the road? Is he willing to let the matter go in the present shape, and with the suspicion that must rest upon himself and the whole transaction while he maintains that silence? So far as it stands, the affair is, on the face of it, merely a political job for the purpose of putting money and influence into the hands of a few prominent supporters of the Government. It is such a palpable job on the face of it, that any explanation the hon. gentleman chooses to make would be of value in reducing the scandalous nature of the transaction—I do not say it could be wiped out altogether. But I am very sorry for him, and am sorry for the Minister who has agreed to this transaction, if, after all this evidence brought forward as to who owns the road, he insists upon maintaining the sulky silence which he has hitherto maintained. We shall be forced to come to the conclusion that I hinted at before, that the affairs of the company that have not come to light are so much worse than those which have come to light that he dare not tell them across the floor of the House.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I would ask the Minister whether a construction company was not formed by C. N. Armstrong, who made a contract to build the road for $14,-

000 a mile, and a certain portion of the bonds, he being a shareholder to the extent of 580 shares?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I think, Mr. Chairman, that it will be as well to speak in French, at least for half an hour, in order to give some information to the hon. gentleman—who will, however, not understand me—respecting Gaspesia, as to permit this trifling discussion on the railway in question to continue. It would appear that all these details which are asked for, have as their object the ruining of the credit of the company of which my hon. friend the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Riopel) is one of the directors. I do not see why the hon. members of the left push so far their animosity against a company and against men who have had sufficient energy to undertake the construction of a railway so difficult to build, across a country which has such need of a railway like this. Gaspesia, in the opinion of those who know it, of those who have studied its history and are acquainted with the resources of this vast territory, Gaspesia, I say, is one of the most important portions of the Province of Quebec. The hon. the leader of the Opposition and his hon. colleagues from this Province of ours, should be as anxious as I am that this vast portion of their native Province should be developed by the building of iron roads, in order that this vast country may become colonised. They ought to be as anxious as I am that the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company, of which the hon. member for Bonaventure is one of the directors, may succeed in carrying out this project so useful to the Province of Quebec in general and to Gaspesia in particular. But, Mr. Chairman, they wish to know who are the promoters of the road; they desire to know whether the company has issued any bonds. This information is given, and the hon. members of the left are even less satisfied than they were before my hon. friend the member for Bonaventure had given all these particulars. I remarked just now that the leader of the third party, the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) after certain remarks made by the hon. the First Minister, that probably the bonds of the company when the Government held them to the amount of $200,000, could not be placed on the English market. I remarked, I say, that the hon. member for Northumberland observed, to the Committee of this House, that the fact that the Government accepted the bonds of the company for the amount of $200,000 as collateral security, would give a value to the bonds and would enable the company to negotiate them and retire them to a large amount. Well the hon. member ought to rest satisfied. If the company can procure the means of negotiating these bonds, and of gaining a profit on them in the English market, this will give them the means of completing the 30 miles which remain to be built, and all the hon. members on the left should remain satisfied with the success foreshadowed by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). I think that the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Riopel) and the Government, instead of wishing to know the capital which the company had at its disposal; of wishing to lay all the affairs of the company open before the public; and exposing perhaps this company, which has a very important project to carry out, to the risk of seeing its credit ruined, ought on the contrary to give their support to so patriotic a scheme. The hon. members would not like in their own cases if they had a project as considerable as the one in question to carry out, to have their business brought before the public.

Mr. LAURIER. For what reason?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) For what reason? Mr. Chairman, the leader of the Opposition is too good a man of business, I am persuaded, not to understand when I have given the explanations which I intend giving to the Committee. It is neither good for a private person nor for a company to lay their affairs before the public, and to keep the world thoroughly acquainted with their private matters; for after all the affairs of a railway company are private affairs; sometimes it may happen, it certainly does happen, that a great number of private persons are ruined on account of their indiscretion in making men acquainted with their affairs, men who ought not to be so trusted. It is stated that the hon. members who have charge of this undertaking wish to make political capital out of it. I see no one in this House more desirous of making political capital at the present time out of this railway, of which my hon. friend is one of the directors, than the hon. members of the Opposition. It seems to me that all the questions which they are putting to the hon. member for Bonaventure respecting the company of which he is one of the directors, are put with a view of making political capital, and that if there was no political capital to make, our hon. friends would be as dumb as oysters. The hon. members are seeking to make out that the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Riopel) has pecuniary interests to protect,—that his political future is bound up with this scheme; and it is in the political interests of these hon. members to make out that the hon. member for Bonaventure is acting with a regard to his personal interest or with the sole view of making himself popular. A moment ago, the hon. the First Minister appealed to the leader of the third party, and the latter frankly admitted that Gaspesia was an immense country and that the railway was a difficult one to make. I will add that it is imperatively necessary that this road be built, for this country is a vast one and fairly settled at the present moment. The hon. members of the left are grievously in the wrong in placing sticks within the spokes of the chariot of the company of which my hon. friend the member for Bonaventure is one of the directors, and in endeavoring to prevent the attainment of the end which this company has in view. Mr. Chairman, I cannot explain the reason of the opposition of the hon. members from the Maritime Provinces made to the subsidy given to the company in question. They appear to object to the considerable sum to which this subsidy amounts to. I must admit that several of the hon. members now before me made no objection to the subsidy granted to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, but I perceive that several others of them wax somewhat violent with respect to a subsidy when granted to the Province of Quebec. It is stated that to no other Province but Quebec are subsidies to such an amount granted. That is possible, Mr. Chairman, but the Government does a little better than that for the Maritime Provinces; they construct all their public works. I do not wish to reproach either the Government or any one else, but I state that the members of the Maritime Provinces are still more favored than we are, because the Government as I have stated, wholly executes their public works. I should like to know what are the public works which have been made, under the present Government, in the Maritime Provinces and even in Ontario, without the assistance of the Government, what are the works which have not been constructed altogether by the Government? In the Province of Ontario, the whole of the Pacific Railway from one extremity to the other has been built by the Government. In the Maritime Provinces the whole of the Intercolonial Railway with its branch lines in all directions has been built by the Government. I do not say that it was not a good policy to build all these branch lines; on the contrary, although a member from another Province, I am content that the Government have considered it proper to develop the numerous resources of these noble Provinces which the hon. members who criticize with so much bitterness the subsidy granted to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, represent in this House. But if the Government show themselves so liberal with regard to the Maritime Provinces who are not always the first to support the policy of the Government, for I see that a considerable number of the

members of the Maritime Provinces oppose the policy of the Government when this policy takes effect in other places than their own—it appears to me that these hon. members who have received for their Provinces, in cash and public investments, more than has been received by any other Province in the Confederation, it seems to me, I say, that these hon. members should not raise their voices so high against the subsidy granted to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. It is useless for me to occupy further time in endeavoring to show the immense resources of Gaspesia. I am certain that the hon. the leader of the Opposition has already moved in the direction of favoring this portion of the country; and that he knows, as I do, that it is a magnificent country from an agricultural point of view, which only asks for railway communication to produce good results. I say, then, that a railway in this region will give comfort to a numerous population. In connection with fisheries and mines, I may add that Gaspesia is a rich country. It is the same in respect to the timber industry. I trust, therefore, that the hon. members from the Maritime Provinces will excuse our listening to all their trifling questions, and that they will say, as we do, that the Gaspesian railway is a useful one, and that of necessity it must be built. I hope that they will think, as I do, that we ought to give a strong helping hand to the hon. member for Bonaventure, and recognise the merit which belongs to him for having taken so active a part in this enterprise.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Notwithstanding the full explanations given by the First Minister and the hon. member for Bonaventure, (Mr. Riopel), there are very few members on this side of the House who consider this a satisfactory transaction. I have waited for some time to see what answer the First Minister would give to the very reasonable proposition of the hon. member for Northumberland, (Mr. Mitchell). I thought the hon. member was going to acquiesce in it, but he intimated that they would make the bonds or some other securities, but he did not say what, the first charge. The proposition of the member for Northumberland would be a certain improvement on the Government arrangement, that if the Government are determined to force this arrangement through the House, although we consider it a very unsatisfactory one, they should take care that under this resolution these bonds should be the first charge on the road. I hope before proceeding further the First Minister will adopt that view.

Mr. McMULLEN. The First Minister is assuming the responsibility of forcing this resolution through Committee without giving the information required. We have asked the name of the contractor, and whether the contract was let by public tender, and that information hon. gentlemen opposite have refused to give. It appears we have two or three political sinks of iniquity. The St. Charles Branch, which was to cost $500,000, but on which $1,600,000 have been spent; then we have this matter, and we had the other night the Fredericton Bridge matter. These are abominable transactions which bear on their face evidence of corruption and bribery. They exist, and they will come to the surface now and then.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman will admit that we have treated these resolutions fairly and generously. But we cannot agree to this proposal, and we must record our protest from the very inception of it.

Resolution agreed to. Yeas, 43; nays, 23.

Resolutions reported and read the second time.

LIGHTSHIPS AND BUOYS ON LAKE ST. LOUIS.

Mr. MITCHELL. Would the right hon. gentleman give an answer to the telegram I placed in his hands?

Mr. DUPONT.

Mr. TUPPER. I have nothing further to say in addition to what I said the other day, and the hon. gentleman surely can understand the matter from the answer I gave him before. There is a three years contract for the placing of the lightships and buoys in Lake St. Louis. The responsibility of doing the work for the time being rests with the contractor. He is bound at the first available opportunity to place the lightships and buoys in position, and I told the hon. gentleman the other day that, as he had not done so, he was asked why he did not do so, and he explained it was in consequence of the danger from ice. The contractor was ordered to place the lightships and buoys in their proper position. It was understood he would do so to-day, Monday. The hon. gentleman has sent a telegram across the House that at noon to-day those lightships were not placed. That may be so, but I take it they are placed before this.

Mr. MITCHELL. I can only say that the leading forwarder of the whole city of Montreal has sent these telegrams and letters to me, complaining that, although navigation has been open for several days, the lightships and buoys have not been placed, and one of his tows went on shore. In regard to the excuse made by the contractor, that he was not able to place them on account of ice, there is no foundation whatever for such a statement.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman's course of procedure is entirely irregular. Out of courtesy I answered his question. I understand that both his newspaper and he himself are very anxious to make a point of attack against the department over which I preside; but the hon. gentleman takes a very poor way of doing it. The hon. gentleman ought to know that these lightships cannot be placed just at the time some forwarder thinks they should be placed. Certain precautions have to be taken, notwithstanding the fact that some shipper may be very anxious that great risks should be run with Government property and lightships and buoys placed in position whether there is danger or no danger.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong——

Mr. TUPPER. I wish to call the hon. gentleman to order. I answered his question.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think I have a right to a personal explanation, as the hon. gentleman has brought a personal charge against me. He says that I want to make some attack against his department. I do not want to do so. I took care to hand the telegram to the Premier, because the impertinence of the hon. gentleman to me the other day led me to adopt that course. I wish to get information for the people and it is right I should get it, and instead of public business standing still because the contractor does not choose to carry out the arrangement at the present time, the department should look after him.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman should content himself with the *Morning Herald*. He has an article every morning on my department.

Mr. MITCHELL. I shall deal with the *Morning Herald* as I think fit, and you may rest assured you will be looked after.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES—CONCURRENCE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the first resolution be concurred in.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E I.) Last night we had a debate on the proposed grant of $30,000 for the Fredericton Bridge. I need not repeat the arguments urged either in favor or against the proposition. On this side of the House we are satisfied it is a vote which no man can justify to his con-

stituents or to his conscience. That being the case, I move in amendment:

That said resolution be not now agreed to, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole to amend the same by striking out the vote to the Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Company for a bridge over the St. John River at Fredericton, N. B., a subsidy not exceeding in the whole $30,000.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Davies (P.E.I.):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Davies,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Doyon,	Paterson (Brant),
Beausoleil,	Edwards,	Platt,
Brien,	Ellis,	Ste. Marie,
Campbell,	Fisher,	Scriver,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Holton,	Somerville,
Casey,	Innes,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	Jones (Halifax),	Trow,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Watson,
Choquette,	Lovitt,	Weldon (St. John), and
Colter,	McMullen,	Wilson (Elgin).—33.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	Mara,
Barnard,	Ferguson(Leeds & Gren),	Montplaisir,
Bergeron,	Foster,	Porter,
Boisvert,	Guillet,	Prior,
Bowell,	Haggart,	Putnam,
Brown,	Hall,	Riopel,
Bryson,	Hickey,	Robillard,
Burns,	Joncas,	Shanly,
Carling,	Jones (Digby),	Skinner,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kenny,	Small,
Chapleau,	Kirkpatrick,	Sproule,
Cimon,	Labelle,	Taylor,
Colby,	Labrosse,	Thompson (Sir John),
Curran,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Tupper,
Daoust,	La Rivière,	Tyrwhitt,
Davin,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace,
Davis,	Macdowall,	Ward,
Dawson,	McCulla,	Weldon (Albert),
Denison,	McDonald (Victoria),	White (Cardwell)
Desaulniers,	McKay,	Wilmot, and
Desjardins,	McNeill,	Wood (West'l'd).—65.
Dewdney,	Madill,	
Dickey,		

Amendment negatived.

On the main motion,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved in amendment:

That the resolution be not now agreed to, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole to provide that the sum of $30,000 to be paid to the Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Company, be applied in reduction of the sum of $300,000 advanced to the said bridge company.

House divided on amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Davies,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Doyon,	Paterson (Brant),
Beausoleil,	Edwards,	Platt,
Brien,	Ellis,	Ste. Marie,
Campbell,	Fisher,	Scriver,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Holton,	Somerville,
Casey,	Innes,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	Jones (Halifax),	Trow,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Watson,
Choquette,	Lovitt,	Weldon (St. John), and
Colter,	McMullen,	Wilson (Elgin).—33.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	Mara,
Barnard,	Ferguson(Leeds&Gren),	Montplaisir,
Bergeron,	Foster,	Porter,
Boisvert,	Guillet,	Prior,
Bowell,	Haggart,	Putnam,
Brown,	Hall,	Riopel,
Bryson,	Hickey,	Robillard,
Carling,	Joncas,	Shanly,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jones (Digby),	Skinner,
Chapleau,	Kenny,	Small,
Cimon,	Kirkpatrick,	Sproule,
Colby,	Labelle,	Taylor,
Curran,	Labrosse,	Thompson (Sir John),
Daoust,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Tupper,
Davin,	La Rivière,	Tyrwhitt,
Davis,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace,
Dawson,	Macdowall,	Ward,
Denison,	McCulla,	Weldon (Albert),
Desaulniers,	McDonald (Victoria),	White (Cardwell),
Desjardins,	McKay,	Wilmot, and
Dewdney,	McNeill,	Wood (Westm'l'd).—65.
Dickey,	Madill,	

Amendment negatived, and resolution concurred in on a division.

On motion to concur in second resolution,

House divided:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Dickey,	Madill,
Barnard,	Dupont,	Mara,
Bergeron,	Ferguson(Leeds&Gren),	Montplaisir,
Boisvert,	Foster,	Porter,
Bowell,	Guillet,	Prior,
Brown,	Haggart,	Putnam,
Bryson,	Hall,	Robillard,
Burns,	Hickey,	Shanly,
Carling,	Joncas,	Skinner,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jones (Digby),	Small,
Chapleau,	Kenny,	Sproule,
Cimon,	Kirkpatrick,	Taylor,
Colby,	Labelle,	Temple,
Curran,	Labrosse,	Thompson (Sir John),
Daoust,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Tupper,
Davin,	La Rivière,	Tyrwhitt,
Davis,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace,
Dawson,	Macdowall,	Ward,
Denison,	McCulla,	Weldon (Albert),
Desaulniers,	McDonald (Victoria),	White (Cardwell),
Desjardins,	McKay,	Wilmot, and
Dewdney,	McNeill,	Wood(Westmorl'd)—66.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Doyon,	Mitchell,
Bain (Wentworth),	Edwards,	Paterson (Brant),
Beausoleil,	Ellis,	Platt,
Brien,	Fisher,	Ste. Marie,
Campbell,	Gillmor,	Scriver,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd)	Holton,	Somerville,
Casey,	Innes,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	Jones (Halifax),	Trow,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Watson,
Choquette,	Lovitt,	Weldon (St. John), and
Colter,	McMullen,	Wilson (Elgin).—35.
Davies,	Mills (Bothwell),	

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I observe that the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Riopel) voted. I do not think that under our rules the hon. gentleman ought to vote. The hon. member has admitted himself to-night that he is a director of the company, and has an interest as a shareholder. He is therefore voting money in which he has a pecuniary interest and is therefore not entitled to vote.

Mr. CASEY. I may call attention to the fact that when Mr. Abbott was a member of this House and solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at the same time, he invariably refused to vote in matters relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think this case is much stronger.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has a right to vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is not a question whether he has a right to vote or not, it is a question of good taste.

Mr. SPEAKER. I should think that the hon. member ought to be asked at first what kind of an interest he has.

Mr. MITCHELL. He has been asked. It was in the Committee and you were not in the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RIOPEL. If I had the right to vote I intended to give it. As the attention of the House has been called I wish to withdraw my vote.

Resolution concurred in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 148) to authorise the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railways therein mentioned.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second times.

BOUNDARIES OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved,—That a humble address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that she may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be submitted to the Parliament of the United Kingdom, declaring and providing the following to be the westerly, northerly and easterly boundaries of the Province of Ontario, that is to say:—Commencing at the point where the International boundary between the United States of America and Canada strikes the western shores of Lake Superior, thence westerly along the said boundary to the north-west angle of the Lake of the Woods; thence along a line drawn due north until it strikes the middle line of the course of the river discharging the waters of the lake called Lake Seul or the Lonely Lake whether above or below its confluence with the stream flowing from the Lake of the Woods towards Lake Winnipeg, and thence proceeding eastward from the point at which the before mentioned line strikes the middle line of the course of the river last aforesaid, along the middle line of the course of the same river (whether called by the name of the English River or, as to the part below the confluence, by the name of the River Winnipeg) up to Lake Seul or Lonely Lake, and thence along the middle line of Lake Seul or Lonely Lake to the head of that lake, and thence by a straight line to the nearest point of the middle line of the waters of Lake St. Joseph, and thence along that middle line until it reaches the foot of the outlet of that lake, and thence along the middle line of the river by which the waters of Lake St. Joseph discharge themselves to the shore of the part of Hudson's Bay commonly known as James' Bay, and thence south-easterly, following upon the said shore to a point where a line drawn due north from the head of Lake Temiscamingue would strike it, and thence due south along the said line to the head of the said lake, and thence through the middle channel of the said lake, into the Ottawa River, and thence descending along the middle of the main channel of the said river to the intersection by the prolongation of the western limit of the Seigneurie of Rigaud, such mid-channel being as indicated on a map of the Ottawa Ship Canal Survey, made by Walter Shanly, C.E., and approved by Order of the Governor General in Council, dated the 21st of July, 1883, and thence southerly, following the said westerly boundary of the Seigneurie of Rigaud to the south-west angle of the said Seigneurie and then southerly along the western boundary of the augmentation of the Township of Newton, to the north-west angle of the Seigneurie of Longueuil, and thence south-easterly along the south-western boundary of said Seigneurie of New Longueuil, to a stone boundary on the north bank of the Lake St. Francis, at the cove west of Pointe au Baudet, such line from the Ottawa River to Lake St. Francis being as indicated on a plan of the line of boundary between Upper and Lower Canada, made in accordance with the Act 23 Victoria, Chapter 21, and approved by Order of the Governor General in Council, dated the 16th of March, 1861.

He said: This boundary carries out the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, to whom was referred the settlement of the boundary between Ontario and Manitoba. Besides establishing that line, the Judicial Committee described a portion of the northerly boundaries of Ontario, although, perhaps that was not a portion of the reference to them—we will not raise that point just now; and if at any time a question should arise as to the northerly boundary, they would uphold the judgment then given. The line follows the waters northward and eastward from the Lake of the Woods to a point which will be touched by a line drawn due north from the confluence of the Ohio and the Mississippi. From that point it continues to follow the same waters and the Albany River, until it falls into James' Bay. This line is in effect the same line as was recommended by the commission consisting of Sir Francis Hincks, Chief Justice Harrison and Judge Wilmot. Then, from the mouth of the Albany River it skirts the shores of James Bay until it arrives at a point drawn due north from the north end of Lake Temiscamingue, and then it follows the boundary between Ontario and Quebec as laid down, first in the Royal Proclamation, and, then, in the Statute of 1860, which was passed by the Parliament of Canada, defining the boundary line between Upper Canada and Lower Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am pleased that the hon. gentleman has made this motion, although I would have been better pleased if he had brought down a Bill simply confirming the Bill already passed by the Legislature of Ontario. As the hon. gentleman knows, by the Act of 1871, the second British North America Act, the power to establish or to alter a boundary was granted, and a reference would have been unnecessary. But as the hon. gentleman has seen proper to adopt that course, I, of course, do not object. The boundary which the hon. gentleman has suggested here is precisely that which was indicated by the Judicial Committee, and which was found by the arbitrators in 1878. The Judicial Committee, of course, had not before them any portion of the boundary east of a due line drawn north from the confluence of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. The hon. gentleman has expressed some doubts as to their right to have proceeded to a decision of even that western portion of the northern boundary: but I suppose he has followed the argument, and he knows how that decision arose. Of course Manitoba claimed as far north as the 54th parallel and as far east as the meridian drawn due north from the confluence of the Ohio and Mississippi. Before the Judicial Committee the Province of Ontario claimed that portion west of the due north line lying south of the Albany River, and the right of the Dominion as against Manitoba to that portion of Manitoba north of the Albany River was never contested before the Judicial Committee. What both the representative of Manitoba and the representative of the Dominion maintained was that this meridian line was the eastern boundary of Manitoba, and being the eastern boundary of Manitoba, so much of Manitoba as lay north of the Albany River remained in Manitoba under that decision. It was never argued before the Judicial Committee that if Manitoba could not claim any portion of the territory south of the Albany River, she would not be entitled to any portion north of that river. That question was not raised, and I do not see how the Judicial Committee could do otherwise than as it did—leave to Manitoba that portion which was uncontested, and assign to Ontario that portion west of this meridian line which they believed belonged to the Province of Ontario. I am pleased that the hon. gentlemen has brought forward this resolution, and I trust this will be the last time we will have to discuss the boundaries of Ontario in the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. DAWSON. This is a very important question, and it is much to be regretted that it has come up at so late a period in the Session. It will have a very serious effect either for good or evil on the destinies of this Dominion. This resolution makes over to Ontario a territory quite as large as that which has hitherto been supposed to form the Province of Ontario, and it must not be supposed that it is a wilderness unfit for settlement or a barren country. On the contrary, Ontario gets by this one of the finest regions on the American continent. It is true that along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway there is a great deal of barren land, but to the north of that, on a lower level, along the waters of the Moose, we have 30,000 square miles of beautiful country, watered by fine rivers, many of them navigable for hundreds of miles and with a climate and soil equal to the average in the best parts of the Dominion. Again, on the waters of the Rainy River there are 30,000 square miles of forest lands which are now of immense value. Of course, Ontario has to be congratulated on acquiring such a vast territory, a territory as large as that which she now possesses, and perhaps I should congratulate those who by their skill and untiring energy and industry succeeded in acquiring that for her; but there I am afraid my congratulations must cease. I am

sure I cannot congratulate them on the manner in which they have accomplished this grand result. There is no doubt that, with a knowledge of the subject superior to what the other side possessed, with an intelligence also superior to that which was brought to bear on the other side, they gained a case which, if fairly considered on its simple merits, they never would have gained. I have always held that Ontario was bounded on the north by the St. Lawrence water-shed, and I believe there is abundant evidence to prove this. It is a great pity that the line from the confluence of the Ohio and the Mississippi running due north was so much persisted in by the Dominion advocates for the western boundary of Ontario. It had a judicial decision in its favor, the decision of the three eminent judges of the Province of Quebec, in the de Reinhardt case, but that decision was not given with a full knowledge of the circumstances. We all know how the Act of 1774, enlarging the boundaries of Quebec, was worded; we all know that the boundary was to pass by a given route by Lake Ontario, thence to the Province line of Pennsylvania, thence to the Ohio River, then along the Ohio west to the banks of the Mississippi, and thence northward to the southern boundary of the territories of the Merchant Adventurers of England trading to Hudson Bay. In the decision in the de Reinhardt case, the judges had only this before them, and they concluded that the line northward meant a line due north, which probably, under the information they had, was as fair a decision as they could have come to. But what was not before them at that time has been unearthed since, and is now well known. At the time the Act was drawn, surely the framers of the Act, surely the British Government, were better able to interpret the Act than we are now. Well, it turns out that after the Act, which was passed in January, 1774, had received the Royal Assent, in August, 1774, there was, on the 17th December, 1774, a commission issued to the Governor General, Sir Guy Carleton, afterwards Lord Dorchester, describing what was meant by northward. The commission then issued described the boundary as extending northward, along the east bank of the Mississippi to the territories of the Merchant Adventurers of Englsnd trading into Hudson Bay. This clearly shows that the watershed of Hudson Bay was, in the view of those who drew that commission, the southern boundary of the Hudson Bay Company's territory. That watershed touches on the head waters of the St. Lawrence, the Mississippi and the Missouri, and, further east on the watershed of the Ottawa, the St. Maurice and the Saguenay and other great rivers falling into the River or Gulf of St. Lawrence, so that there could be no doubt as to what they considered the southern boundary of the Hudson Bay Company's territories. Well, the matter stood in this way, and was under dispute from time to time until, in 1884, it was agreed to carry the case between the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Ontario for decision to the Imperial Privy Council. It was agreed that a joint case should be made up—that a case should be made up by Manitoba stating her views, and a case by Ontario stating her views. It was agreed that such documents should be put in it as were mutually agreed upon. I believe that on the part of the Governments of Manitoba and the Dominion a lawyer of some distinction, Mr. Christopher Robinson, of Toronto, was appointed to look at documents and select such as were to be put in. It is well known that before that period Ontario had a great many works dealing with this question. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), with very praiseworthy industry, had searched for documents in all directions, and had amassed as many as five or six very large volumes. The Dominion had nothing to show except the report made by the Committee which sat upon the question in 1880. This joint case was made out and a joint appendix prepared. Now, what did this joint appendix contain? All the more important documents for the Ontario Government and for the Dominion little or nothing. Even the report of the Committee of 1880 was omitted. Now, this gentleman who was appointed on the part of Manitoba and the Dominion, Mr. Christopher Robinson, yielding, I suppose, to the blandishments of the Attorney General of Ontario, in consenting to have that report left out, took a great deal upon himself. Who sat on that Committee? There were Mr. Robinson, late Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, Mr. Geoffrion, who was Minister of Justice at one time, Mr. DeCosmos, who had been Premier of British Columbia, Mr. Brecken, formerly Attorney General for Prince Edward Island, Mr. Royal, a sound lawyer, now Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, Mr. Trow, of whom I cannot speak too highly, Mr. Mousseau, afterwards a judge of the Superior Court of Quebec, Mr. Caron, now Sir Adolphe Caron, the Minister of Militia, Mr. McDonald, of Cape Breton, now a Senator, Mr. Weldon, of St. John, N. B., Mr. Ouimet, now our worthy Speaker, Mr. Ross, now Minister of Education in Ontario, and my humble self. There were some distinguished lawyers on that Committee, and yet this Mr. Robinson, a Toronto attorney, took upon himself to throw that report aside, and those who prompted him must have known that that report dealt most clearly with those points which their Lordships of the Privy Council were sure to consider most important, and in fact it pointed out the very matters which subsequently in their opinion, as the result proved, were the most important. There were a few extracts put in the back part of the voluminous document which was placed before the Lords of the Privy Council, at the end, where they would attract no notice. In that report were given the opinions of three distinguished judges, Chief Justice Armour, Judge Johnson, of the Superior Court of Quebec, Canada, and Judge Ramsay, of the Court of Queen's Bench in Lower Canada. These men might be supposed to form a proper opinion on the question, and they all said that the watershed of the Hudson Bay, the height of land, was the true boundary on the north, but they differed as to the due north line being the true boundary on the west. The report of the Committee dealt with these and other matters essential to the proper understanding of the case, and, if the reports which are now here of the arguments before the Privy Council are read, it will be seen that the views expressed in that report were not fully laid before their Lordships. The decision of the arbitrators rested upon a revoked commission to a Governor. The commission to Lord Dorchester, issued on the 22nd April, 1786, was the only commission which carried the boundaries to the north of the watershed, but, when the Constitutional Act was passed in 1791, the first words of the succeeding commission revoked that previous commission absolutely. Every matter, article or thing therein contained was revoked. This was not brought to the notice of the Lords of the Privy Council. We had no advocate to call their attention to that, and the whole case depended upon these commissions. Now, as to the arguments brought forward on the other side. I can conceive of nothing more silly on the part of a distinguished man like the Attorney General of Ontario, than his saying: If you do not give us this, we will have less territory than the Province of Quebec; the Province of Quebec has 188,000 square miles, while we have only 100,000 square miles. What an argument! When everyone knows that Ontario is the garden of the Dominion, while much of Quebec is on the sterile region of Labrador, or the country to the north of it! I have known a distinguished philosopher to talk about the Indian lands being on the Arctic watershed; and arguments and statements of that kind were brought forward in order to influence the Lords of the Privy Council. In order to show what the views of the Lords of the Privy Council were, I have read over the arguments

very carefully. When the award was disallowed, as it had to be disallowed because it had not received the assent of the Dominion Parliament, which was one of the conditions to the award, the Attorney General of Ontario put forward a claim to the whole territory up to the Rocky Mountains, which my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had advanced before. That claim went, at all events, to the sources of the Saskatchewan, and, in that claim, he was logical, because, if you admit once that you can cross the watershed of the Hudson Bay and the height of land, there is nothing to stop you until you reach the sources of the Saskatchewan. But, when Mr. Mowat said: You only give us by this award 100,000 square miles, and our claim is to have 962,000 square miles, up to the Rocky Mountains, what answer was made by the Lord Chancellor? He told him at once: Your claim is perfectly absurd. That is here in the proceedings. Then the Attorney General of Ontario said: Your Lordship must be perfectly right; I will not dispute that; we will take the award. Mr. Mowat, with his great knowledge of the case and with the maps before him, succeeded so well in showing the Lords of the Privy Council the right view of the case, and they were getting so much information that I believe if the case had rested there, the Dominion Government would have got what it demanded, and Ontario would not have got more than her just limits.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will remind my hon. friend, if he will permit me, that so far was the Lord Chancellor from saying that the contention of Ontario was absurd, that if it had not been for the doctrine of acquiescence, he would have given her the whole territory to the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. DAWSON. The expression is in the report that we have here. At all events, I do not believe that that was the view they took of it. Our counsel, Christopher Robinson, before the arbitrators, was so confused that when the maps were called for he did not seem to know where to turn his hand for them, and the Lords of the Privy Council had actually to point out things to him on the map. On one occasion, when they called for some maps to show the position, he brought out a map of 1810, to show what the Dominion was claiming, with a line marked down to the Albany. Of course, they must have looked at it with amazement; it must either have been a spurious map or a partisan map of the Hudson's Bay or North-West Fur Companies. If the hon. member for Bothwell was present, he must remember that incident. Now, in the report of the Committee of 1880, there was one matter brought up which was never brought out before, a matter on which the whole question naturally hinged, and that was the position of the Indian territories. In 1803 there was passed an Act of the Imperial Parliament, the Act 43 George III, chapter 138, providing for the maintenance of order in the territories called the Indian territories. Where were its boundaries? You can best ascertain that by looking at the Act and considering the action taken under it. Under that Act there were commissioners appointed who went there, arrests were made in this disputed territory immediately to the north and west of the height of land, and people were taken down and tried in the courts of Canada which had been given jurisdiction to try such cases. Now, that Indian territory was practically defined by Sir John Coape Sherbrooke, Governor General of Canada in 1816. The proclamation which was issued, was studied by the Imperial Government, it was carefully thought over before they sent it out to this country; having been passed by the Imperial Government it was surely of equal authority with the commission of 1786 to Sir Guy Carleton. That commission followed the wording of the Treaty of 1783 between Great Britain and United States after the War of Independence. It described a certain line, and the commission to Lord Dorchester followed that line, but when the Constitutional Act was passed in 1791, that commission was absolutely and completely revoked. Well, this matter of the Indian territories was dealt with in that report of the Committee of 1880, which Mr. Robinson, counsel for the Dominion, took upon himself to leave out of the joint appendix, and left it out, notwithstanding it was at first ordered to be put in. The hon. member for Simcoe made as good a case as he could make with the knowledge he could have had of the matter in the very short time he had had to study it, and his pleading in some cases was very good indeed. He drew the attention of the Lord Chancellor to this fact: "If you confirm this award you double the size of Ontario." Ontario which has now in the Dominion Parliament 92 members. Supposing Ontario continues to fill up as she has been doing, she now has 92 members, and when she shall have 92 members more, and Quebec only 65, what becomes of Confederation? Well, they have gained their case, but it has not been all a victory for Ontario. They have to provide payments for all time for the Indians. It is very properly decided by the Privy Council that the Province getting the land has to provide for the Indian payments. That will compel Ontario to provide for the payments to the Indians in the disputed territory, which are very considerable, and she will also have to provide for the payments under the Robinson Treaties in the territories ceded to the south of the height of land on Lake Superior and Lake Huron. These payments to the Indians are made a lien upon the land, or equivalent to a lien, by these two Robinson Treaties. So Ontario has not got the territory for nothing. Again, by getting this territory she incurs very large and serious responsibility. Here is a vast region lying to the north. Where are the means by which to open up this country to be found? Although at present, financially, Ontario is the first Province of the Dominion, where is she to find all the capital necessary to develop this country, as large as Ontario was when she entered Confederation? Not only does this addition double her size, but it extends her territory to a new and promising region. Belgium and a great portion of France are in the same latitude. Our explorers have shown that when you pass the height of land and get on a lower level on the other side towards the Hudson Bay, there is a beautiful climate, better than a great portion of Quebec, and an enormous extent of the most excellent land. You have there a magnificent country, navigable rivers running hundreds of miles through it, a country which can easily be rendered accessible. And with all this Ontario will now have command of Hudson Bay. As to this great Mediterranean of the North, we do not fully know what its resources may be: we know the region has coal, that the fisheries are inexhaustible, but we do not know what its possibilities may be. No doubt there is wealth there. I am not one to regret anything that Ontario can gain, for that is the Province in which my lot is cast. But by adding this vast region to Ontario, in the course of time you render it evident that Confederation cannot succeed? I say that the representatives of Ontario in the Dominion Parliament are as much the representatives of all the Provinces as they are of any particular Province, and it is their duty to legislate for the Dominion at large, and not seek to aggrandise their own particular Province at the expense of the whole Dominion. Yet, that is what the representatives of Ontario, who have had this case in hand have done. While they have certainly gained a great victory by their industry and capacity, it was no doubt due in a large measure, I am sorry to say, to the apathy and incapacity of some of those opposed to them. If Mr. Robinson is the clever lawyer that they give him credit for being, I cannot avoid saying that in reading over the discussion before the Imperial Privy Council, the idea stamped itself very strongly on my mind that he had succumbed very easily to the Attorney General of Ontario, and

given away the case. I will conclude by giving in as few words as possible the result of the investigation of a Committee on this subject some years ago. It is in these words:

"Referring to the award made by the arbitrators on the 3rd day of August, 1878, a copy of which is appended, your Committee are of opinion that it does not describe the true boundaries of Ontario. It seems to your Committee to be inconsistent with any boundary line ever suggested or proposed subsequent to the Treaty of Utrecht, 1713. It makes the Provincial boundaries run into territory granted by Royal Charter in 1670 to the Merchants' Adventurers of England trading into Hudson Bay, and it cuts through Indian territories which, according to the Act 43rd George III, chapter 138, and 1-2 George IV, chapter 66, form 'no part of the Provinces of Lower Canada or Upper Canada or either of them,' and it carries the boundaries of Ontario within the limits of the former colony of Assiniboia, which was not a part of Upper Canada."

That was the conclusion at which the Committee arrived. However, as the Session is so far advanced, I shall not detain the House much longer; but, to go into detail for a moment, I may say that the decision of the Privy Council made Manitoba extend to the north of Ontario. We have two Acts of this Parliament which show it is impossible that the one Province can lie to the north or the south of the other. They are separated by a meridianal line, and of course that must be taken into consideration, and Manitoba curtailed into her proper limits. In dealing with this matter the description is very imperfect, and in the description, taking it verbatim as given by the Privy Council, it is strictly impartial, and gives the territory equally to both Provinces. It sets out by describing Ontario as being bounded on the west by a line drawn due north from the north-west angle of the Lake of the Woods, and winds up by making the due north line the boundary eastward of Manitoba, and it gives the Provinces a good slice of the United States. Desiring, as I do, to speak of anything that emanates from that august body with the utmost respect, I must say, nevertheless, that their decision, taking it as it is worded, is absurd.

Mr. DESJARDINS. (Translation.) The remarks which I have to make, will not affect the merits of the speech of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson). He has established how greatly the portion of Ontario has been advantaged by the judgment rendered by the Privy Council, by which there has been ceded to it so great an extent of territory. When Confederation was entered upon not one of the Provinces—not even Ontario—expected that the territory of Ontario could become as great as it has become through the decision of the Privy Council. Inasmuch as this judgment has been rendered, and the Federal Government, after coming to an understanding with the Province of Ontario, desire to have the boundaries of this Province definitely fixed, granting to it a territory which doubles its extent, it appears to me that the occasion would be opportune to render justice to the Province of Quebec in this matter. And I think that there will be an uneasy feeling in this Province when it is understood that an immense extent of territory has been granted to Ontario, and that the occasion was not thought opportune to state what will be the northern boundaries of our own Province. I am persuaded that the Province of Quebec will only be satisfied by taking, as the basis of the northern limits of territory, the existing line which has just been determined as settling the northern boundary of Ontario. Seeing that Ontario extends as far as James' Bay, it appears to me that a line which naturally presents itself, that of East Main River, ought to be followed and that the territory extending as far as this river should be recognised as part of the territory of the Province of Quebec. The opportunity at the present moment presents itself of going before the Imperial Parliament and asking for a statutory settlement of boundaries for the Province of Ontario. I inquire when will the opportunity arrive for the Province of Quebec, if she does not do so at the same time with the Province of Ontario,—to reach this settlement of boundaries, which she asks for at the present time? I believe that a declaration made by the Government in this matter would reassure our Province, and we ought to have it before this resolution is passed.

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

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

Mr. LAURIER. Before this resolution passes did I understand the Prime Minister to say that there were some slight variations?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The only variations are these: In the proclamation the language is erroneous in some respects, as for instance, it speaks of the "Seignory of Vaudreuil," where it is meant the "Seignory of Rigaud," and so on. If the hon. gentleman will look at the statute of 1881, when there was a commissioner appointed by the Province of Lower Canada and a commissioner appointed by the Province of Upper Canada—Mr. Kirkpatrick, father of the hon. member for Frontenac, was representative of Upper Canada, and Mr. Quesnel was the representative for Lower Canada—he will see they issued a proclamation then, but the names were not quite right. The line is precisely the same in this resolution as are staked out on the grounds up to Lake Temiscamingue. This description is approved of by Mr. Deville, the Surveyor General, and by Mr. Taché, as being the proper description under the statute.

Mr. LAURIER. I merely ask for information; does the resolution carefully follow the boundary as defined by that commission?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; word for word.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there can be no doubt as to where the boundary is situated that must divide Ontario from Quebec. There were two papers laid before the Imperial Parliament when the King proposed to divide the Province of Quebec into two Provinces. The King retained the right to himself to divide the Provinces but having exceeded his power he had to have recourse to Parliament, and in one of those papers is stated where the line should be located that should divide the Province of Quebec into two Provinces and there is another provision stating what the Province of Ontario should be. The paper dividing the Province says that boundaries shall be continued up the Ottawa River to Lake Témiscamingue and thence north to the southern boundary of the territory granted to the Hudson Bay Company. The second paper defining the eastern boundary of Upper Canada follows exactly the same boundary word for word until, it comes to the head waters of Lake Témiscamingue, and then it says the boundary shall be extended northward to the boundary of Hudson Bay instead of to the boundary of the Territories. These words are again used in the description of Upper Canada. They are included in the proclamation and it is said that all that portion—not of the Province of Quebec—but all that portion of Canada, or of what was known as Canada then, to the utmost limits westward and southward shall be included in the Province of Upper Canada. Now, my hon. friend from Algoma said that our Territories extended westward far beyond what he had a right to claim. I think we claimed before the Privy Council, and they admitted, that the French had dominion as far west as the Rocky Mountains. In what is now called the North-West Territories there were 50 French soldiers and 700 French traders, and a license of the date of 1759 was produced before the Privy Council; but the Committee said, you cannot claim that because you have not continued in the occupation of that territory; and they did not allow us to go farther west than the Assiniboia district; and the Albany River north had been the boundary suggested at one time by the Hudson Bay Company themselves. I have no doubt the boundary of Quebec will extend very much farther north at the eastern extremity, but not so far at the west; and I have no doubt that the Province of Quebec and the Dominion will find it convenient, instead of accepting the legal boundary to establish a conventional boundary on the north. I think there is no difficulty in taking all the papers and saying precisely where that legal boundary must be drawn on the map. Then I think they might employ engineers to lay it down on the ground. But I believe that would be an expensive boundary, and not a satisfactory one to Quebec. If a river boundary could be found, which extended to Hudson Bay, that would give the Province of Quebec access to Hudson Bay. It is no part of my business to give advice to the House on a question not before it, but it seems to me that it would be advantageous if both Governments had an expedition sent out there to ascertain whether a natural boundary could not be had.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That the said resolution be referred to a Select Committee composed of Sir Hector Langevin, Mr. Mills (Bothwell), Mr. Shanly and the mover, to draft an address embodying the same.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, from the Select Committee reported an address to Her Majesty embodying the said resolution, which resolution was agreed to, ordered to be engrossed, and ordered to be communicated to the Senate, with the request that their honors unite with this House in the said address.

SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient that a railway should be constructed, as a Government work, between a point of junction on the New Brunswick Railway, at or near Harvey, in the Province of New Brunswick, and a point of junction with the Intercolonial Railway, at or near Salisbury or Moncton, in the said Province, and that the sum of five hundred thousand dollars be granted towards the construction of the said railway.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Committee will remember that Parliament subsidised a line running in fact from Montreal *vid* Sherbrooke to Mattawamkeag, and from Mattawamkeag to Salisbury to a junction with the Intercolonial Railway. This short line was divided into three portions, and $63,000 were reserved for the construction of this portion from Harvey to Salisbury. The subsidy was granted to the International Railway. This company assigned it to the Atlantic and North-Western, who again leased the line to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The whole line?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; this portion. The Canadian Pacific Railway would have control of the whole line from Sherbrooke to the junction with the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was the part now proposed to be built leased to the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was by the Atlantic and North-Western Railway Company. This railway is a link of the short line from Montreal to Halifax so strongly advocated in 1881 by Mr. Blackmann, of New York, a great railway promoter, who represented to the Government and the shareholders of the company that the construction of such a line would bring together the great Canadian seaports on the Atlantic and Pacific oceans by the shortest direct route, thus securing to the Canadian transcontinental line the most rapid mail and passenger transit between Europe and Asia, and to Canada all the advantages attending the handling and transport of the heavy traffic between the eastern and northern hemispheres. In 1882, Mr. Blackmann and his associates secured by Act 45 Vic., cap. 23, a

charter for this road under the name of the Great American and European Short Line Railway. They sought Government aid, and by the Acts 45 Vic., cap. 14, and 46 Vic., cap. 25, a cash subsidy was granted towards building the eastern section. Up to the end of 1883, the company had accomplished very little towards its construction, being much embarrassed by tightness in the New York money market. Work on the line ceased, and the public mind became somewhat exercised over the delay, and as it was found that no further progress was likely to be made——

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is that the Oxford and Cape Breton line?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. As it was found that no further progress was likely to be made with the construction of this important work unless further Government aid was granted, a cash subsidy of $170,000 per annum for 15 years was given for the construction of a line between Montreal and the harbors of St. John and Halifax, following the route which the report of a competent engineer laid down as the shortest and most practicable. Upon the prorogation of Parliament, the Government issued orders for surveys to be made of several of the most feasible routes, and early in the summer of 1835 a large staff of engineers took the field and explored the country. They made surveys of a number of routes, and we obtained sufficient information to enable the Government to select the shortest route practicable. The result of their surveys was the adoption of a line from Montreal *viâ* Sherbrooke and Mattawamkeag, to Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury. The subsidy available, however, proved to be insufficient to induce capitalists to embark in the enterprise, and during the Session of 1885 it was increased to $250,000 per annum for 20 years. Shortly after Parliament rose, a representative of the International Railway examined the general map of the route and the plans, profiles, and survey of the line subsidised, and having apparently satisfied himself of the feasibility and soundness of the enterprise, the company offered to enter into a contract for its construction and operation under the Act 48-49 Victoria, cap. 58. On the 14th of December, 1885, a formal contract was entered into. The International Railway Company owned about 100 miles of railway running eastward from Lennoxville, which would form a link in the short line. Subsequently, in 1886, the Atlantic and North-Western Company purchased this road, and agreed to construct the balance subject to the consent of the Government to accept them as contractors and to confirm the arrangement. This company seemed to be equally reliable as the other, and the Government confirmed the arrangement, and accepted them as contractors by agreement of the 12th of January, 1887. Having found difficulty in obtaining the capital requisite to proceed with the work under contract, they sought the aid of the Canadian Pacific Railway, who agreed to furnish the money for the construction of the two first sections, that is, from Montreal to Sherbrooke and from the International boundary to Mattawamkeag, on condition that these sections should be leased to them and the amount of the subsidy continuable to this section secured to them. An agreement for a perpetual lease was entered into on the 6th December, 1886, and was confirmed and accepted by the Government by the agreement above referred to on the 12th of January, 1887. This course placed beyond peradventure the construction and operation of two out of the three sections of the line. The financial arrangements being completed, the company proceeded vigorously with the construction of the work, and it is expected the road will be under traffic from Montreal to Harvey early next month. The Atlantic and North-Western Railway Company being called on to proceed with the construction of the third section from Harvey to Salisbury, expressed themselves unable to raise the necessary capital, and the Canadian Pacific Railway was not disposed to embark in an enterprise which they alleged would only be the saving of from 14 to 16 miles in the distance to Halifax. The distance saved in fact will be really 27 miles. Every effort has been made to induce them to undertake the construction of this section of the road with the Government subsidy. That is exactly the position of the case. Parliament agreed to give $63,000 for 20 years for the construction of this portion of the road, under the impression that the Canadian Pacific Railway really were the Atlantic and North-Western. It was stated in Parliament that the Canadian Pacific Railway had undertaken to build the road, and my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works stated in Parliament when the matter was before the House that it was considered that it was perfectly safe and certain the road would be built and the Government would see that it was built. The Government feel that they have pledged themselves to Parliament and the country through which this road passes that the road should be built. As the Atlantic and North-Western Railway Company are unable to build it, and as the Canadian Pacific Railway does not desire to assume the responsibility, the Government have asked Parliament to build that portion of the road from Harvey to Salisbury, or to Moncton, which is on the same line. The road is estimated to cost $16,000 a mile. That has been considered carefully by the Chief Engineer.

Mr. MITCHELL. What is the whole distance?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. One hundred and thirteen miles. The Fredericton Bridge Company, which the hon. gentleman has heard something about, have offered to take the contract to build it for $16,000 a mile, and I know now that another party has offered to build the road for the same sum. As to the solvency of that party, I am not yet informed. I had a letter from an agent of theirs this evening, but I have not laid it before the House, because I do not know anything about the parties who offer to build the road. But this offer is the same in fact as that made by the Frederiction Bridge Company to build it for $16,000 a mile. The Government made a provisional arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who, I do not think, were very willing to undertake it, but they have agreed that, if the road is built from Harvey to Salisbury by the Government, they will operate it, they will run it, they will keep it in good order and repair, and it will become a portion of their short line from Montreal to Moncton, joining there with the Intercolonial Railway. They will have it at a nominal rent for 20 years, and at the end of 20 years they agree to pay $73,000 in perpetuity. That contract is, of course, not operative until it is sanctioned by Parliament. The resolution now before the Committee is simply that it be resolved that the railway be constructed as a Government work, and that Parliament will appropriate $500,000 towards the construction of the railway.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Do I understand this is to go to the Fredericton Bridge?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is the agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway? Is it on the Table?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; I have laid it on the Table.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What privileges does this give to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company?

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD. They run the road.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does it give them running privileges over the Intercolonial road proper?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. From Salisbury to Moncton.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And beyond to Halifax?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have they any privileges beyond?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have the lease from Harvey to Salisbury.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But they get no other privileges on the Intercolonial Railway besides?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is only from Moncton to Halifax. The Government think that the Intercolonial road, running from Halifax to Lévis, is a great public work, and not only that, but it is the basis of the original union between the Maritime Provinces and the old Province of Canada; and the Government think, and I believe Parliament will concur in that opinion, that that road can only be properly kept up, and the bargain with the Maritime Provinces can only be maintained by that road being always kept as a Government work. If that railway were sold or leased to any company in the world, it would be run only with a view to pecuniary and commercial advantages by the company which would purchase it; but the great object in building that line was that the country should have a road belonging to the Government of United Canada, under the control of the Parliament of United Canada, and to be dealt with as Parliament should think proper for the benefit of the United Provinces, so as to carry out in spirit as well as in letter the agreement which was made between the different Provinces, which resulted in the Confederation of 1867.

Mr. MITCHELL. And that road is in no case to be transferred or abandoned?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In no case to be transferred or abandoned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that all that is to be saved by the construction of these 113 miles of railway will at the outside be 14 miles, according to the information I have from gentlemen who know the district, but, on the extreme opinion of the hon. gentleman himself, it will be only 27 miles, and for that, we are to expend about two millions of dollars of the public money, with the result that we will, in all human probability, add enormously to the enormous deficit which now exists on the working of the Intercolonial Railway. That deficit will probably reach $500,000 for the current year. It did reach $363,000 in 1888, not including a vast number of items that should have been charged to that. That property has cost us $47,000,000, and the Government propose to expend $2,000,000 more in making that road still more worthless, still more unproductive, and a still greater burthen on the people of this country. I venture to say that, of all the proposals which have been made in this House for many a long day, this appears to me to be the most irrational, the most absurd, and, politically speaking, the most dishonest. The House was told, when it granted $250,000 a year for 20 years to the Short Line—very improperly as I thought, because, as I then stated, it would injure the Intercolonial road, as it will—that that was the utmost which we were to pay; but instead of that, now we are to be engaged to construct a work, the cost of which the hon. gentleman puts at $2,000,000, though I am informed that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company themselves have estimated it at a very much higher figure. I think they have stated that it would cost from $3,000,000 to $4,000,000. We have had abundant opportunities of judging how utterly worthless the estimates of the Government are in regard to the cost of these roads, and how utterly worthless they are as to the shortening of the distance by these roads. Scarcely twenty-four hours have elapsed since I put on record in this House a statement made by the then Minister of Finance or Minister of Railways, whichever he was at the moment, where he formally declared that 45 miles would be saved in the construction of a strip of some 80 miles of road, and I showed that the Prime Minister had declared that these 45 miles had been reduced to 7. I also proved at the same time, and so did other hon. gentlemen here, that time and again we had been told that the branch to Lévis, would cost $400,000 or $500,000, and yet it had cost a million and a half or more, and we have not seen the end of the expenditure yet. Therefore, for my part, I wholly and entirely decline to accept any of these statements as to shortening the distance, and doubt extremly, when this road comes to be constructed, whether it will not be found that in all probability not one mile will be saved, that we will be duplicating the Intercolonial Railroad to our great loss, to the great injury of the traffic that exists upon it, in that locality, at a cost which, I venture to say, will prove ultimately to be nearer four or five millions than two. That, I take the House to witness, is the opinion we have been obliged to form in consequence of what we have already seen, and the result of the statements formerly made to us. But I protest against this most of all because I say that this road, if built, will be nothing less than a means of destroying what little value remains in a piece of property in which this country, from one end of the Dominion to the other, is interested to the extent of $47,000,000, and I say that a more improper proposal was never laid on the Table of this House.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). With regard to the statement made by the Minister I would like to know whether any surveys have been made since 1885?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. There were no surveys since 1885.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). When the arrangement was entered into for building the Short Line, and when the members for New Brunswick were advocating a short line from Mattawamkeag, and when the members from the Eastern Townships were also advocating it, the Halifax people and the other people of Nova Scotia insisted upon this road being put through, and an arrangement was made that this amount should be appropriated towards building that road. While the arrangement was in force it was repudiated by the Halifax people. When Mr. O'Sullivan brought forward his project for a line to Moncton they insisted that it should be adopted. Yet we are perfectly willing that the original arrangement should be carried out because we know the exact amount which the country has got to bear. But here we are embarking on a totally different arrangement, which is made simply for the purpose of taking traffic away from the Intercolonial Railway. Instead of its being a line connecting the ports of St. John and Halifax, the great sea ports put forward by the Minister of Finance, it is simply a means to draw away all the advantages which were given by this arrangement made by the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is an agreement made for the purpose of drawing away traffic from the City of St. John, and so far as New Brunswick is concerned, we will get no benefit from it. The Minister has said that this road was leased to the Atlantic Railway to build. Now, I have a copy here of the contract entered into by the Government on the 14th December, 1885, with the International Railway Company to build this road, and to build it for the terms and under the agreement then made. Further than that, I find a special specification attached to that contract setting forth the style of the road, and what its construction was to be. Now, we find, that subsequently the International transferred that agreement and contract to the Atlantic and Western Railway, that this company then commenced to build two sections down to Mattawamkeag. The road was finished to Mattawamkeag and the Canadian Pacific Railway than leased it in perpetuity,

not the whole road as put forward by the Prime Minister, but only the sections to Mattawamkeag. An agreement was entered into on the 6th December, 1886, by which they accepted the Atlantic and North-Western and an agreement was then made between the Atlantic and the North-Western and the Canadian Pacific Railway by which a certain amount was to be paid. The subsidy was to be applied towards the interest on the bonds, and after the expiration of the subsidy the Canadian Pacific Railway was to pay a certain amount for the use of that road. The Government provided a subsidy, then, of $63,000, and it was clearly understood at the time between the Atlantic and the North-Western, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government, that the subsidy was to build the road between Harvey and Salisbury and Moncton. What do we find now? We find, when this contract is enforced, the Minister says the Atlantic and the North-Western have not the means to build, and the Canadian Pacific Railway refuse to build it. Practically, it is the Canadian Pacific Railway, which controls the Atlantic and North-Western, who do not wish to undertake that work. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, knowing the matter, having the sole means of information, refuse to build the road for the amount of the $63,000 representing a capital of two million dollars, and we find that the Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Company, getting $300,000 to build their bridge, which has only cost $75,000, come forward and undertake to build this road. We find here the very same contract by which the Government have undertaken now to build this road, subject to the supervision of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I find the same description and specification of the roads as were in the agreement signed by the Atlantic and North-Western. Now, it shows that that road cannot be built. I think the best test that we are embarking upon an enterprise that we know nothing about, that we have no reliable information as to what the road will cost, is the fact that the Atlantic and North-Western decline to build the road according to their express agreement, and when the Canadian Pacific Railway is about to build the road, they, after examining it, also refuse to build it for the amount in that agreement. Let the original agreement be carried out, we are perfectly willing to be bound by it, although, so far as the moral obligation is concerned, this had been repudiated and they had wished the country to adopt another line. With respect to the distance we have had many various statements made. The First Minister stated the difference in distance to be 27 miles, the Canadian Pacific Railway make the difference to be only 14 miles. I take these two figures, although they are not accurate. According to the reports of the engineers the distance is 119½ or 120 as against 142 miles, showing the difference to be only 22 miles. It must be remembered, however, that these are only preliminary surveys and do not show detours that may be made. I should further like to ask if the crossing is to be at Fredericton or below Fredericton, because if the road goes to Fredericton it will make 10 or 12 miles difference, for a deduction from what the Canadian Pacific Railway have stated, namely less than 14 miles. If I read the reports of the engineers who have made the preliminary surveys correctly, I find they attempted to cross the St. John River, 12 miles below Fredericton, where they could obtain a grade and reach the river. We have no surveys with respect to the line towards Fredericton. Again, with respect to the question of cost. It has been pointed out by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that we have had considerable experience of Government works far exceeding the original limits. What guarantee have we that this road is going to cost only $16,000 a mile? There has been one contract in connection with this road which the company have not been able to carry out, and which the Government do not seek to enforce, and what means have we to ascertain that this road can be constructed for even two millions? It is to be built by the Government and they have entered into an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to lease it to them for perpetuity, for 20 years at a nominal rent and then for a certain term at $73,000 a year. This road is to be subject to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Further, it is to be built as short as the physical features of the country will permit. With respect to the proposal to go to Fredericton to take the bridge, which has been the subject of discussion here, there is no certainty that that can be reached, and whether it would require a longer line to reach it. At present the distance from Harvey to St. John is about 32 miles, but if you go to Fredericton that would reduce the length by 10 or 12 miles, and reduce it to the length stated by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and according to the reports of the engineer. To expend even $2,000,000 in order to save 14 miles on a long extent of mileage through a country where there are existing lines, the capability of which has not been tested, is a simple waste of public money and is utterly unnecessary. So far as New Brunswick is concerned, we shall not get any special benefit from this except after the road is built. The portion of country through which the road goes, between Harvey and St. John, has already railways, the Fredericton Branch and the New Brunswick Railway; and with respect to the other side, so far as I can gather from physical features of the country, it will always be very sparsely settled, and although a large coal field is at the head of Grand Lake, it has an outlet by the Central Railway running to Norton in King's County. So far, then, as our Province is concerned, this road is utterly unnecessary. Before this expenditure is undertaken, an oppertunity should be given to have the present railway facilities tested. New Brunswick is fully equipped with railways, and the line from St. John crossing at the Falls joins with the Intercolonial Railway running to Moncton, a road fully capable for many years of carrying all the traffic required from Montreal and the West to Halifax and points east of St. John. That question of capacity should be tested before we embark on this scheme without data as to the expenditure, especially when already we have means provided for carrying the traffic. We are now willing to have the agreement entered into in 1885 carried out. I protest on behalf of the constituency I represent, and which is deeply interested in this question, against the Government making such an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and giving such facilities over the road, and also facilities over the Intercolonial Railway, to induce them to withdraw the traffic entirely from St. John. Give us fair play and a fair chance, and if it is proved we lack in enterprise and energy, let us take the consequences. But let us not be handicapped by the Government, and have the Government set to work to make an arrangement to draw traffic from our city; and instead of this being a line to connect St. John and Halifax, the Government have come in and used this line for the purpose of diverting our legitimate trade and enterprise and business from the city. So far as the building of the road is concerned, let us be put on equal terms. Under this agreement $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 may be expended, because we have the St. Charles branch expenditure before us and also the expenditure on the Pictou branch, which has cost nearly double the amount stated, $300,000. These estimates are most reasonable, and the road is to be given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company without a guarantee, although the Government may start with an expense of half a million they will be obliged to complete the work at an expense of even three and a half million or four million. This contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will simply give them certain rights and privileges connected with this road and also the Intercolonial Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have the right to sell tickets on the Intercolonial

Railway and quote freight rates, and have running powers between Salisbury and Moncton, and in fact control the whole business. All these privileges are granted by the Government to this railway contrary to the arrangement of 1885, and it is done for the purpose of withdrawing business from the existing roads and making the Intercolonial Railway practically useless for through traffic. I presume the Government will have to purchase this bridge because I find the Government undertake to furnish a bridge in perpetuity to the company, and the only thing which the company is obliged to provide is their share of the repairs. That bridge cost $375,000, which will have to be added to the cost of this road. This bridge is in the hands of the Fredericton Bridge Company and we will have to pay freight upon it, so that on the one hand the Government is giving a free bridge to one company and refusing it to another. I consider this most unfair and a most unjust arrangement. I protest against the construction of this line, for I consider that for the present at all events it is utterly unnecessary. I believe that the existing road can give all the facilities required for passenger and freight traffic through from Montreal to Halifax, and that the saving of 14 miles in the journey—or even of 27 miles taking the hon. Minister's own statement—is not a sufficient reason for our undertaking an expenditure of $3,000,000. We have no positive information about this road, no surveys have been made which will show us what the grades are, or what the road will actually cost and how could any company undertake to build that road on the basis of the papers brought down to this House. I believe that these are not *bonâ fide* offers, but that they are wild cat offers for the purpose of inducing the Government to embark into the construction of this road with the belief that the Government will then carry it through to completion. I think we have expended quite enough on all these alleged short lines and the only result of our expenditure is that a large debt has been forever settled on this country, The hon. the First Minister read Mr. Blackburn's statement with regard to this line, but Sir Charles Tupper put forward that gentleman's statement in 1882 in reference to the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, stating that it would be a short line to Louisburg. We do not hear much about Louisburg now, however. The Oxford and New Glasgow Railway was palmed off on the House as a short line which would save 45 miles, and which would be one of the great links of this international highway, but this prediction has been a failure. We find now that the Government have made an agreement with the Canadian Pacic Railway such as I believe cannot be paralleled in the history of railroad building. They propose to embark on a scheme the details of which are unknown to them and for the purpose of destroying the trade over the Government's own line. I submit that the scheme now proposed is one which the Government has not sufficient information about and is one which should not be sanctioned by the House. The survey, as far as I am enabled to understand, does not go to Salisbury, but strikes about 12 miles below at a place called Boundary Creek. Before the House should embark on this expenditure I believe that they should know positively what distance will be saved by the construction of this line and whether it is worth the expenditure proposed in connection with it. We also should know that whenever the Government enter in to a contract with a company that the Government will take from the company sufficient guarantee to build according to the terms of the contract. I believe that the great bulk of the Province of New Brunswick does not want this road. It opens up no country fit for settlement and the only benefit would be the expenditure of money while it is being built, but after being built it will be perfectly useless to the country and more especially to the lower portion of the Province which borders on the Bay of Fundy. I protest against this road for instead of being for the benefit of the whole of the Maritime Provinces it will simply be for the benefit of one small portion of them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice another thing which bears on the remarks of my hon. friend and that is, that it is expressly stated in the contract that the railway to be built shall be fit for fast freight and passenger service. Every one knows that a railway built for fast freight and passenger service must be very much more expensive than an ordinary country railroad, and all this would involve a much larger expenditure than the $16,000 which the hon. gentleman speaks of; and he apparently speaks without having any engineers' report of any sort to go on.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have listened with some little interest to the discussion which has taken place on this motion, and I may say that I heard with pleasure the remarks made by the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government as to what the future of the Intercolonial Railway would be. He very properly represented that road as a road which was not built for the purpose of making money for the Administration. It is part of the original contract under which the Maritime Provinces entered this Confederation. It was a contract forming part of the constitution of this country, that that road was to be built in order to make the Confederation of the British Provinces a fact, as it would not have been if the road had not been built. The hon. gentleman stated, and I was glad to hear him state, that under no consideration could that road be alienated or given away. It is true, some years ago a gentleman who was a prominent member of his own Cabinet had entered into negotiations for the purchase of that road. I took some steps to try to prevent that sale being carried out, and the project was dropped—I will not say on account of the steps I took—and I was very glad it was. Now, Sir, that road was built, and has been run in the interest of this country, as a national road, not a commercial road; and any attempt to close up or hand over to any corporation or any company of any kind that great international work for the purposes of commerce as against the national purpose of its construction, would be in my opinion a violation of the compact which drew the Maritime Provinces into this Dominion. A proposition was made four or five years ago for a short line. That proposition I supported. I felt that if we could, by the adoption of a short line, which would lessen the distance between Halifax and Vancouver, attract foreign travel over our country, which would tend to promote a more advanced and rapid class of steamships, not alone upon the Atlantic, but on the Pacific, it was the duty of every patriotic man in the country to support it, no matter whether or not it benefited the road in which twenty years ago many of us took a deep interest. When it was proposed to get a shorter line to the Maritime Provinces, I was one of those who recorded my vote in favor of that line against many of the gentlemen who sit on this side of the House. I recorded that vote on the basis of a line being completed for the guarantee of $250,000 a year, which the Parliament of Canada agreed to give for its construction. The right hon. gentleman has stated that the International Company undertook to build that line. Well, Sir, we know what the International Company was, and I have no hesitation in saying that in my opinion that company and the interests of those connected with it had a good deal to do with establishing that short line. I believe it was originally established in the interest of that company. But if we could obtain a more rapid transit to a winter port in Canada for the sum of money for which that company proposed to build the line, I for one, though deeply interested in the Intercolonial, was prepared to accept it and to assume the responsibility of voting for it. But the proposition made to us to-day is an entirely different one. The International Company

failed to carry out their engagement; they had not the means to do it; there was no basis for the engagement they entered into at that time. I do not know that I am right in assuming that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's necessities induced them, by one of their subsidiary lines, to consent under pressure from the Government to certain arrangements by which if that subsidiary line built the road—I speak of the Atlantic and North-Western—the Canadian Pacific Railway Company agreed to run it. An estimate was made at that time of the probable cost of the road. I have it on probably the best authority which it is possible to offer to this House, that the estimates for the construction of that road, as regards the two sections built out of the three proposed, exceeded the original estimates of the Government by between $2,000,000 and $3,000,000. The Atlantic and North Western Company took over the obligation of the International Company; but they took it over as little prepared to carry it out, perhaps, as the International Company were. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company stepped in. They were under obligations to the administration of the day. The administration of that day were anxious that this road should be built. I do not know of my own knowledge that any pressure was brought upon the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to induce them to enter into any obligation; but I believe pressure was brought to bear upon them by which they were induced to enter into arrangements to run that road when it was built. But the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, finding that the cost of construction had so greatly exceeded the estimates, naturally felt, as they had endorsed the bonds of the Atlantic and North-Western Company for the construction of two sections of the road, that they would not be justified in going on and endorsing those bonds to any further extent. The Atlantic and North-Western Company failed to complete the portion from Harvey to Salisbury, and as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company felt no interest in the construction of that portion of the road, the matter came to a stand still. When they secured connection with the New Brunswick system at St. John, and thus with Halifax, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company felt—I assume that they felt, for I do not speak for them, but from the records of this House and from what I know as a common sense business man—that they were not justified to going beyond the obligations which they had entered into to run the road when it was built. Then, why is it that we are called on to-night to enter into this new engagement? I will tell the House; A gentleman who has had a good deal to do with the control of affairs in this country, Sir Charles Tupper—I am told, and I believe to be true—gave a pledge to the people of Halifax, on the hustings there, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were bound to build this road, and had entered into a contract to build it. That statement was not true. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), I have no doubt believed what was stated at that time, and I believe I myself have heard him repeat that statement in this House and in the Railway Committee not long ago. The hon. the Minister of Public Works, in the absence through temporary illness of the right hon. the Premier, made the same statement, when the question was put to him in this House, that the Canadian Pacific Railway were bound to build that road. Not one of these statements was true, and because they were not true; and because the hon. the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) was pledged to his people on the statement which he believed to be true and which he made in good faith, and which had largely the effect of giving him a seat in this House, and because of the statement of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, and because of the incorrect statement of the High Commissioner on that occasion, we find that the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government was embarrassed throughout this Session by those misstatements and misrepresentations which led the people to believe that the Canadian Pacific Railway were bound to build the road when they were not. Now, we are asked to change this whole arrangement. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I was in favor while we had the advantage of the construction of the Intercolonial Railway—and I thank nobody for it; it was a matter of bargain under which the Maritime Provinces came into Confederation, and I was pleased to find the right hon. gentleman declare that under no conditions would that railway be transferred out of the hands of the Government for a purely commercial purpose. Still we were in that position, and while I felt inclined to support a measure for the purpose of giving the people on the southern side of the Province the traffic of the shortest line from Montreal and for the purpose of having a winter port in Canada—while I was inclined to do that, and supported the vote of $250,000 a year, the engagement was accepted and entered into by the International, and I am not prepared to say to-day I can support the motion now before the House. What are we asked to-day? The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) says it would shorten the distance at the outside 22 miles. The authorities of the Canadian Pacific Railway have said it would shorten the distance probably 14 miles. I have the authority of those who know that section of the country, and I know something of it myself, for believing it will not shorten the distance two miles. If we cannot shorten that line a sufficient distance to make it an object to spend money for that purpose and of shortening the time in the transit of passengers from Europe to the Pacific Ocean, are we going to enter into an engagement of this kind, which may involve the expense of $3,000,000 or $4,000,000? The right hon. the Premier says it can be done for about $2,000,000. I had figured the matter up, and I believe it will cost the country $3,500,000 to build that road, and with the Fredericton bridge thrown in, which the Government are bound under their agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway to purchase, and which the Canadian Pacific Railway are bound to contribute their share of expense in maintaining, it will involve, if they build a road equal in character, as they are bound to do, to the line the Canadian Pacific Railway built, an expense of at least $4,000,000. And for what? Take the most extreme view in relation to the shortening of the distance, the time gained from Vancouver to Halifax would be simply 20 minutes. Will we be justified in doing that? For my part, I do not believe we will. Suppose a train starts from Montreal on the Short Line and reaches Mattawamkeag, it must have a sleeper for Halifax and a sleeper for St. John. The one goes down from Harvey to Salisbury and thence to Moncton and the other goes down to St. John and thence on to Moncton. The shortening of the time is 20 minutes. Does any man of common sense suppose that a corporation such as the Canadian Pacific Railway would consent to start a train 20 minutes before the St. John arrives and run into Halifax and have the other running in 20 minutes later. Whatever arrangement may be entered into, if this line is built—and I suppose it will, for the Government are all powerful—it will cost $3,500,000 to $4,000,000, and it will be that much money thrown into the sea. It will not be a line that will open up and colonise a portion of the country likely to be settled. It will be no great advantage to the country to have the time shortened twenty minutes between the Atlantic and the Pacific at such an enormous expenditure. The fact is the people of Halifax are jealous of the people of St. John. I am not going to say anything in favor of St. John or against Halifax. The people of Halifax dread that if the traffic from Montreal and the west goes around by way of St. John, some portion will drop off at St. John and will lessen the amount of trade Halifax will receive. But because of that jealousy which exists, are we of the Dominion, outside of these two interests, to vote away millions of dollars which might be usefully disposed of else-

where, simply for the purpose of gratifying the jealousies of these two cities and because of the misstatements of Sir Charles Tupper and the other gentlemen who accepted these misstatements as true. I am a New Brunswicker. It may be that I will be doing a foolish thing from a provincial point of view in voting against the expenditure of $4,000,000 in my own Province, for the road will cost every dollar of it, including the bridge, which the Government are bound to take over. When I look at the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway which is laid on the Table, I find the Government are bound to build a road, equal in character and gradients, and in every particular to the road the Canadian Pacific Railway have built. When the existing road has cost two or three millions more than the estimates, I ask where they will build the road for the sum I have named. The officers of the hon. gentleman may say that it will be built for that amount, but they have made similar statements in other cases, and we are now paying hundreds of thousands of dollars for costs alone in an arbitration which is taking place in reference to the Onderdonk contract on the Canadian Pacific Railway, on an impoverished road, and that is the result of their reports. We may have the same thing to undergo when this road is constructed. We may have another arbitration on a claim that this road is not up to the standard. As a New Brunswicker, no doubt my constituents would like to see three or four millions of dollars spent in the Province. This road will run not very far from the constitutency which I represent; but the question for me is whether, in the interests of my constituents, I should feel it my duty to see this amount of money spent there or whether I should consider it my duty to put my finger down and say I will not see this money squandered against the interests of the country, though my constituents might desire it. That is the course I intend to adopt. I regret that the Government have placed themselves in such a position. I think the leader of the Government should have taken a firm stand, and should have said: It is true that Sir Charles Tupper took this position, and made these statements, which were untrue. He should have said to the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny): It is true that you repeated these untrue statements, and I regret it. He should have said to the Minister of Public Works, who repeated the same statement: You have got into the same false position by repeating what you believed to be true of the statements of Sir Charles Tupper. But there it is; are we going to put the Dominion to a cost of three or four million dollars for the sake of supporting these statements? No; I say that if Sir Charles Tupper—to use a most moderate term—made a mistake, and if the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), believing what he said to be true, repeated that statement, and the Minister of Public Works, in the absence of the Premier, fell into the same error, the First Minister should have said: Our principal duty is to guard the interests of the people, and the representatives of the people, and not to sit by and allow three or four millions of the people's money to be voted away in this manner in consequence of these errors, simply in order to place these gentlemen right before the public and before their constituents. I believe that even if the distance can be shortened by 14, 15, or even 25 or 30 miles—and I say that not more than 20 minutes can be saved in time—we will be recreant to our duties if we consent to vote away three or four million dollars for the purpose of that small advantage.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This is a matter in which I have taken considerable interest, and, now that it is coming to a point which some of us desire to see—though I am aware that some of our friends on this side of the House, and particularly from St. John, do not agree with us in that view—I must address a few words to the House on the subject. In 1885, the sum of $250,000 was granted by Parliament for the construction of this road to Salisbury, and, at that time, after due examination, it was considered a sufficient sum to complete the road to that point. I cannot but regard it as a matter of extreme regret that, owing to the bungling arrangements of the Government, owing to their want of care in utilising the vote which Parliament placed at their disposal, they only secured the construction of the road for a part of the distance, and left the very important portion from Harvey to Salisbury unfinished. That, of course, is the cause of the awkward position in which the matter stands to-day. The action of the Government in not building that originally has placed this Parliament in the position in which it now finds itself, and, of course, that is a very regrettable circumstance when you take the whole matter into account, because it would be a great deal better for the taxpayers of this country if this connection with Salisbury could have been secured, as it should have been, under the original subsidy. But, from want of proper care and supervision, from carelessness or rather from errors on the part of the Government, that was not accomplished, and now they have to ask the House to supplement that vote by the expenditure which is now proposed. Of course, our people looked to the completion of that road with great interest. Whether we are right or wrong in regard to the advantages to be derived from the completion of that road, the people in that part of Nova Scotia from which I come have had it so instilled into their minds by the Government organs and the Government representatives on all occasions that it would be to their advantage to have the Short Line completed, that they have arrived at that conclusion and therefore they have, perhaps unreasonably, determined that *coute que coute*, that contract shall be carried out. Therefore, early in this Session I took the ground that it was the duty of the Government to carry out their pledges to the people of Halifax, and this is the first step they have taken to carry out their promise. I only regret, in the absence of a satisfactory arrangement at the outset, that this proposal will extend the construction over many years. I would rather have seen the Government make a proposal to conclude the construction of this road at the earliest possible day. I hope the First Minister will not be disappointed as to the saving in point of distance which he anticipates. In a conversation with the hon. member for York (Mr. Temple) the other day, he said he would undertake to construct the road and build the bridge for $2,500,000. I think, if the Government could make an arrangement with the Fredericton Bridge Company for $16,000 a mile, they should close the bargain at once. If they are to secure the construction of that bridge by agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, they had better make the arrangement at once with the Fredericton Bridge Company and secure that in the contract. I repeat that no matter what the distance may be—which may be a matter of question until the surveys are finished—I believe it would be in the interest of the country, if there was an offer by respectable and reliable parties to build that road for $16,000 a mile, that they should at once complete the contract and let the work go on. This voting a sum of $500,000 a year and extending the expenses over a good many years, will neither be satisfactory to the people nor advantageous to the country. Now, with regard to the agreement entered into between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway respecting this road, there is one point of their agreement which I am inclined to look upon with regret, that is the portion which gives them the absolute control in perpetuity of the branch from Harvey to Salisbury. I have understood that the Grand Trunk Railway people were about making arrangements to connect their Edmundston road with Fredericton, and that the railway were anxious to secure running powers over that branch and subsequently over the Intercolonial Railway. Now, if the Grand Trunk Railway are in that position, and desire to secure running powers

over the Rivière du Loup Branch, I think it would be of considerable advantage to the country to have the traffic go over that road, and then for the rest of the distance from Temiscouata to go over their own road down to the point where it would intersect this branch that it is proposed to build. I think it would be of great interest to Halifax and that portion of the Maritime Provinces, that they should have running powers over the Intercolonial Railway or the Government road which may be built under this bill to Halifax. The Canadian Pacific Railway will of course, have their running powers, and I think the Grand Trunk Railway should have running powers as well. Then with these two roads and the Intercolonial Railway as well, we might fairly expect that the people of that section of the Dominion would be fairly served. I think it would be much better if the Government had left themselves in a position to give running powers to the Grand Trunk Railway over that portion of the road, and not to have made arrangements to transfer it in perpetuity to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I listened to the remarks of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon), and I understand, perhaps, that there is a little soreness in St. John about this road going past them on the way to Halifax. It is proposed now that it should be so, but I do not think that it will hurt them as much as they imagine. If we can get any advantage out of it, we are entitled to it, and if it is of the advantage to us which has been predicted by sanguine people, the country will be in a measure recuperated for the expenditure. Under these circumstances I am glad to see the Government are carrying out the pledge to build the road, although I repeat that I regret that they put the country to such an expense, which they might have avoided if they had been more careful in disposing of the subsidy which Parliament placed at their disposal four or five years ago for that purpose, and which was considered ample to secure the construction of the whole line. I repeat again, also, that the people of Nova Scotia will look with very jealous care at the progress which has been made with this work. I have heard it spoken of in various quarters that the Government only proposed under this appropriation to make the surveys, but did not propose to enter into any final arrangements until the cost of the road was ascertained and until the surveys were submitted to Parliament. I do not know whether that is their determination or not, but of course the sum at their disposal under this Bill is not very large, and it will not enable them to go on very far, although it is as much as they can expend this summer. But if they can make the contract at the rate mentioned by the First Minister, I would be of the opinion that the Government would save money by making it, and running the risk of building the road under their supervision.

Mr. SKINNER. I think that one of the tests as to whether or not Halifax simply wants to take business away from St. John, would be that, if the proposed line is substantially not any shorter than the New Brunswick and Intercolonial Railway to Halifax, then if they are willing that this arrangement should not be carried out, that, I take it, would be a test of the whole matter. But if they desire this road to be built across the country, whether it shortens the line between Mattawamkeag and Lévis and Halifax or not, then it shows that they want it for the very purpose of diverting the trade that naturally goes to St. John from those points. Now, my colleagues representing St. John know that our people are going through a state of considerable interest and excitement with reference to that point, and persons who understand the history of these matters would not wonder that they are undergoing the influence that is exerted upon them now, considering the matter from their standpoint. It has been, as I remarked on another occasion here, the idea that commerce should be able to get a short line to make up for what we have always considered the mistake of building the Intercolonial Railway where it was built, and not making it more of a commercial road than it is.

Mr. MITCHELL. They made no mistake at all.

Mr. SKINNER. I am speaking from my standpoint. Instead of putting it where they did and giving my hon. friend a branch that would accommodate him and his constituents, all that they required was to develop the matter in harmony with the true interests of the Province. But such was not done, and one reason why it was not done was because Halifax and Nova Scotia interests were pressed so strongly upon the Goverment of the day. Well, the people of St. John tried to do what they could in a reverse direction, that is to say, to get the Intercolonial Railway through the centre of the Province. We did not succeed. During the time this agitation for the short line has been going on, Halifax did not have a real interest in the short line. All the time that the International Company was going forward in the work of promoting their road, it was with a view of going down to the maritime ports of New Brunswick. That was the point, to get the shortest route between the maritime ports and the city of Montreal. Thus the matter developed from year to year, and in 1884 it was proposed to have legislation. Then, of course, Halifax again came to the surface, and she exercised all the influence she could against us. Halifax has always been potent in her influence by having certain representatives who were able apparently, to secure her interests, while we at St. John always seemed to get into the background. But at all events, in 1884, when this matter came forward, when we had legislation upon it in this Parliament, Halifax succeeded in getting the idea introduced into the Act that Salisbury was the objective point on the Intercolonial Railway. During and since that time, I know that it was considered to be a very much shorter line from Harvey to Salisbury than from Harvey to Salisbury by way of the Intercolonial and New Brunswick Railway. That was acquiesced in, and it was admitted to be very much shorter. In fact, it has been all along pressed that it was very much shorter. When surveys were made in 1884-85 it was found that it was not so much shorter as it was expected to be, and I rather think that had something to do with respect to having a contract made between what I shall call for shortness the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government for the building of that portion of this short line west of Mattawamkeag. When it was found that the line from Harvey to Salisbury *vid* Fredericton was not so short as Halifax had anticipated, it was very largely dropped out of sight. Although it was to be built to Salisbury, still to a large extent it came to be overlooked, on the supposition that Halifax would not wish to put the country to a very large expense to build a road across the country if it would not materially shorten the line. So it went on until the Short Line was about being finished. At the close of last year the agitation began as between Fredericton, Moncton and Halifax with a view to getting the Short Line put through to Salisbury. Then it was that the people of St. John found that the line of argument pursued by the persons, who spoke on the question as representing those three cities and put forward their ideas, was inimical to the city of St. John, with the view of keeping the trade away from that city and driving business through legislative enactment and Government power rather than by commercial influences past St. John.

Mr. MITCHELL. It was very selfish.

Mr. SKINNER. All have a right to be selfish, and it is just to be selfish, but there are laws of justice which accompany selfishness as well as everything else. After considerable agitation, the matter was brought down until we are here at this time considering the matter. What do we

find to-day? We have the survey run out in 1884-85, a flying survey, not a survey by which you can locate the road or by which you can ascertain how long the road is going to be, but a survey by which the distances are calculated between two given points, and something is ascertained with regard to the formation of the country. It is also well-known, when you come to locate the road after it has been surveyed in this way, you have to add a considerable percentage to its length. I believe this, and in this I am supported by engineers who have been able to study surveys from a scientific standpoint, that after this road is located, it will not substantially be anything shorter than the distance round by the Intercolonial Railway. From Harvey to Salisbury is exactly 141 miles *viâ* St. John. According to the survey by which this road has been run out, it will be 118 miles to go by the way they say they can go. In addition, there are various difficulties which engineers know about. In order to use the present bridge at Fredericton you would have to come in by a very expensive way, because the hills are very high north of Fredericton and north-west up the river, and the work would be very expensive and difficult. If you do not go into Fredericton but go below it adds very materially to the expense. The citizens of St. John, seeing that the road is now being pressed forward, and that the Halifax and Nova Scotia people are forcing the Government and determined to have their pound of flesh because it has been promised—whether the line was longer or shorter was a matter of no consequence, saying that the road is not being pushed through on commercial reasons in the ordinary sense—are greatly agitated as they see that their commerce and trade are threatened. That is the reason why St. John is up in arms about this matter. It is not less or not more selfish than other cities. All cities and all citizens have a right to be selfish. But St. John should not forever have the keen edge of the sword turned towards her, and whatever is the outcome Halifax reap the benefit. Halifax is standing on the promise made by the Minister of Public Works when he said that the road should be built, but he said it should be built under the subsidy. The Minister never said that the road should be built with the power of the Government to push it through, no matter whether it stood on its own merits or not. I put this argument forward for the purpose of explaining to this House and the country why St. John is up in arms in regard to this matter. I do not intend to enlarge on the question. I say that my constituents protest against this proposal. My constituents desire that this long looked for trade shall not be taken from then especially at the moment when they think they are going to obtain it. We ask that first of all accurate measurements of the route should be obtained, and if it is found that the adoption of this route would only involve the saving of 8 or 10 miles, the Government is not surely going to build it. The Government feel they are pledged with respect to this matter, and that their honor is given, but at all events let them ascertain whether this is going to be a shorter line or not. I do not think it would be the policy of the Government to adopt the line if it is not shorter than the existing route. A longer road than that now claimed to be ascertained will undoubtedly be found necessary if actual surveys are made. I wish it to be remembered that whatever traffic passes over this Short Line, as it is called, will be so much taken off the Intercolonial Railway. I also wish to say that that portion of the Intercolonial Railway that runs between St. John and Moncton is, as I understand, the best paying portion of the Intercolonial Railway, and is capable of doing vastly more business than it does. It is capable for the next half century of doing all the business between Montreal and Halifax that will require to pass over it, and this expenditure on building this proposed line, through a wilderness comparatively speaking, from the time it starts until it ends, and through a country which does not require development, is a waste of money. It is proposed simply because some persons in Nova Scotia say they will have it because it has been promised whether it will be of advantage to the country or not. I say: "Do not do such an injustice to St. John as to divert our national trade, and the trade which belongs to us by right, unless you find—what was understood at the time the promise was made—a really very much shorter road than the one existing now."

Mr. ELLIS. I desire to say a very few words on this matter. The ground has been so well covered by my hon. friend and my colleagues as to make it unnecessary for me to do any more. Every person who has listened to the debate must be satisfied that there is only one side to the argument. The hon. the Premier himself in stating the case presented no argument to the House why the line should be built. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), who might be supposed to have an argument if there were one, failed also to present one. Whatever may have been the original intention, or the original contract, the House is now called upon to deal with what is practically a new matter. The question is now in a new position and I take it that the Government might, before they propose to build this road at the expense of the country, fairly say to the House and to the country: "The road has been built as far as Harvey; the line is built now to St. John and Halifax, there is no evidence whatever as to what the saving in distance by the proposed line will be, there is every reason to believe that there will be no saving, and we can very well wait until a trial is made of the road as it is." Instead of doing that, the Government, as my hon. colleague (Mr. Skinner) has said, has thrown all the weight of its influence and gathered up all its force as it were to put this road through at the expense of the entire country. The First Minister himself is not able to state what the length of the line will be. The trial lines are said to be 113 miles from Harvey to Salisbury, while there have been no perfect surveys. Mr. Vernon Smith who conducted the survey of a portion of the road to Harvey, threw out a trial line, in 1885, from that point as far as Fredericton. He found he could not cross the country by the 21 miles which separate Harvey from Fredericton in an air line, and that he would have to follow one of two river courses. One of these, and the one which he favored, would land him forty miles up the river St. John and above Fredericton, so that you would have forty miles to build, as well as to cross the divide, which is at least 15 miles. Mr. Smith does admit that there is another line—that by Gardiner's Creek—upon which the road can be built, but I think he does not favor it. That is a scheme which would still leave the road 20 miles above Fredericton. Assuming that the distance of the divide is 15 miles, then we would have 35 miles to reach Fredericton. It is quite clear that this is the road intended to be built, and this would make the road 35 miles to Fredericton alone. In order to cross the Nashwaak stream it would be necessary to run a distance up that stream to get a good line to the head of the Grand Lake and then to cross from the Grand Lake to Salisbury. It is, therefore, quite within the probabilities that the road will be as long, if not longer, than the present line. The question then is: Is it worth while for the country to waste this money in building a road in this way? Surely it would be the part of reason and surely it would be what a business man would do to ascertain what the actual distance would be before money is expended on this road. Surely we ought to have surveys made, and if it is necessary to build this road, we should know what the saving is to be. These precautions to gain information have not been taken, and notwithstanding the country is asked to give $500,000 as a commencement for a work which undoubtedly will cost three or four millions. Probably if a vote were asked for

this last amount of money in the first instance, the House would hesitate to grant it, but taking it piecemeal in this way it is considered that it is perhaps easier to vote the expenditure. I need not refer to our past experience with the Oxford road, in Nova Scotia, in the case of which the new line is not any shorter, or at any rate not much shorter than before the country was called upon to enter into the expenditure. Then again, Sir, the greatest objection to this road from the point of view of one who has patriotic feelings is that this money is being wasted to destroy the railway now between St. John and Moncton. As my colleague pointed out this is the best paying part of the Intercolonial Railway to-day, and why should the Government try to injure a work which has cost it so much money to maintain? Why should it endeavor to parallel that road by another road; why should it put all its forces into building a road in opposition to its own railway? There seems to be no reason for this and certainly it cannot be justified in any way. The people decidedly object to the terms which are given to the Intercolonial Railway which is to be a part of this road. The agreement entered into by the Government says:

"The rates and passenger traffic interchanged between the parties shall, in respect of Halifax, Pictou and New Glasgow, be divided on a *pro rata* mileage basis, and in respect of passengers to and from intermediate local points, the Intercolonial Railway shall be entitled to its local rates; provided that should the Government make any concessions in local rates or round trip or excursion rates in favor of any line in competition with the lessees, then the lessees shall be notified thereof, and shall be granted corresponding concessions. The lessees shall have the right to maintain freight and passenger agents at such points on the Intercolonial Railway as they may elect, and to sell tickets and make through rates for passengers and freight either way over the lines of the Intercolonial Railway east of Moncton, to or from points on their own lines of railway."

Now, it seems to be quite unfair on a Government railway, built by the whole people, to give this exclusive right to another railway. That is one of the strong points upon which the people of St. John base their objections. I have a telegram from the Board of Trade of that city which I received to-day; of course it is quite hopeless for the Board of Trade to telegraph in the matter, but they say:

"The council of the board, at a meeting held this afternoon, passed a resolution protesting against the building of the Harvey-Salisbury Railway on the terms lately made with the Canadian Pacific Railway."

There is just one word more I desire to say, and it is this. The people of St. John have for a long time lived in hope that out of this road some good would come. They seemed to have a feeling that the shortening of the distance from St. John to Montreal and other Canadian points by this road would realise hopes which they have entertained for a long time. The city has struggled against a great deal of misfortune in a variety of ways. The railways which have been built, owing to its peculiar position, have not operated in its favor as they have done in favor of other points. We have witnessed year by year a decline in our population rather than an increase. The general policy of the Government has been against us, and year by year, as the assessors have made up their rolls, they have found the assessable population of the city declining. The figures of population of the two cities for last year were less than they were in 1881 or in 1882, and I do not know that there has been any increase in one year over another during that period. You can well understand how hard, how vicious I may say, the people feel every blow like this administered by the Government, for which there is no necessity, and which will result in a destruction of public property, and which will injuriously affect the interests of the whole country.

Mr. KENNY. At this late hour, I will not detain the Committee for more than a moment or two. Hon. gentlemen who were members of the last Parliament will remember that this matter was under consideration in the Sessions of 1884 and 1885, when the resolution providing for $250,000 for twenty years was passed by the Parliament of Canada. The distances, and the merits and demerits of this road, were discussed and decided on that occasion; and when the Government of the country to-day asks Parliament to vote this money, it is simply asking Parliament to redeem the promises made in 1885. My hon. friends who were members of the last Parliament will remember that this whole matter was the subject of negotiation and arrangement among the representatives of the Maritime Provinces. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has said that he was quite willing to commit himself to the expense of $250,000 for twenty years to secure the Short Line. I may say *en passant* that I agree entirely with my hon. friend's view of the mission of the Intercolonial Railway. But if my hon. friend will look at the records of this House, he will find that in February, 1884, he, with a majority of the representatives of the Maritime Provinces, advised the Government of Canada to incur a liability of $300,000 per annum for twenty years to shorten the distance to the Maritime Provinces. I am not finding any fault with my hon. friend for the action he then took. That request to the Government was signed by 28 of the representatives of the Maritime Provinces, and there were four members from those Provinces in the Cabinet, so that out of the 43 representatives which the Maritime Provinces sent to this House, 32 signed this memorial asking the Government of Canada to incur an annual expenditure of $300,000 for twenty years. Under the arrangement now before the House I do not think the expenditure will exceed what the representatives of the Maritime Provinces advised the Government to incur in 1884. Hon. gentlemen will remember that, in 1885, when the legislation was finally enacted providing for the construction of the Short Line, the money then voted was not for the construction of a line simply to Mattawamkeag, but for a line from the south side of the St. Lawrence opposite Montreal to Salisbury and Moncton. Now, it is exceedingly to be regretted that that arrangement was not carried out. If that arrangement had been adhered to, and if the mistakes had not occurred which unfortunately have occurred, we should not be bothered with the consideration of this question to-day; and under the circumstances it is hardly fair for the hon. member for St. John to turn around and say, oh, you must suspend your expense, because you are doing us a very great injury. The injustice to St. John would be done by repudiating the bargain with all the rest of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Carry out the bargain as it is.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. senior member for St. John says this road is of no value at all to New Brunswick. That is a very extraordinary statement for him to make. I can hardly credit the statement that the construction of 113 miles of railway running through the very centre of that Province, and opening up the only coal fields it has, will not benefit the Province. The hon. senior member for St. John tells us that there was an agitation in Moncton and Fredericton in favor of this road. Are they not both very important points in the Province of New Brunswick? Moreover, if the senior member for St. John will refer to the vote he gave in 1885, he will find that he then voted for the construction of this very road from Harvey to Salisbury and Moncton. My hon. friend, in the course of an address which he made to the House on that occasion, said:

"I am not going to enter into a discussion with regard to surveys and matters of that kind. In the last Session, when we had a resolution of the same character and when the hon. member for Quebec East moved that the matter should not be left with the Government but that the subsidy should be voted by Parliament, I felt it to be in the interests of my constituents, and of my Province, as well as of the Maritime Provinces generally, to vote against my hon. friend on that occasion, and now, as the Government has decided the matter, I am prepared to endorse their action in this case."

The action of the Government was to build a railway from Harvey to Fredericton and thence to Moncton, and that is what my hon. friend voted for, and yet he says now that the Government are doing something criminal and a great injustice to St. John, and are depriving St. John of all its natural advantages and drawing the traffic from St. John on unfair terms. My hon. friend must recognise that there are no more opportunities for doing that to-day than there were in 1885, when he voted in favor of the very project he is now opposing. As regards the distances, one hon. gentleman says that it is not going to reduce the distance to Halifax. Everybody knows that St. John is some 270 miles nearer Montreal than Halifax, and therefore if this road is not going to reduce the distance to Halifax, certainly no injustice will be done St. John. I think we ought not to look at this question from such a narrow standpoint. This is a national question, and we ought to look at it in a proper national spirit. We have already voted a large sum of money for ocean service, and it is in the interest of Canada to shorten the distances as much as possible between the different sections of the country. As regards Fredericton, the hon. gentleman knows that to-day at Fredericton there is connection by the Temiscouata road to Rivière du Loup, and the junior member for St. John must recognise that it is of value to the people of Moncton, and the people of the eastern side of New Brunswick and of Nova Scotia, to have as ready access to that road as possible, which affords another means of communication with the west. That it must have some value is proved by the very fact that the Grand Trunk Railway, finding out that this arrangement is to be made, comes down here and claims a share in the advantage of the road. If the route is to be of no advantage I can hardly imagine the Grand Trunk Railway would be an applicant for the same facilities over it as the Canadian Pacific Railway are expected to enjoy. Out of consideration for the Committee I shall say nothing further, except to allude to the reference made by the hon. member for Northumberland to some statements I made in Halifax and in the Railway Committee room. I plead guilty to not being able to tell the hon. gentleman what I said in Halifax, for that has escaped my memory; but if he refers to what occurred in 1887, it is true I had to make reference to it this year. I did contend that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be held to their promise, and in the Railway Committee I contended there was a moral obligation on their part to carry out their bargain. I am quite sure that Sir Charles Tupper, when he made his statement, and the Minister of Public Works when he made the positive statement he did, had a right to suppose the obligation was binding on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Resolution reported.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think perhaps we had better arrange to have two separate sittings to-morrow, as it is objectionable that we should suspend our rules in the case of money Bills, the separate stages of which ought always to be taken at separate sittings.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no suspension of the rules required to read a Bill three times in one sitting.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But there is strong objection to money Bills being read three times in one day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that when this House adjourns it stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. to-day.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2:25 a.m. (Tuesday).

Mr. KENNY.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 30th April, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE—PRINTING OF REPORTS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. On Thursday last, it seemed to be the desire of the House, on the request of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), that the second and third reports of the Public Accounts Committee, together with the evidence and documents laid before the House, should be printed forthwith for the use of members. The hon. member thought those reports could be printed immediately, so that he could use them on the motion he made in the House. It was found that the printers had so much to do that that could not be done, and, therefore, the hon. gentleman used the documents in manuscript form. The question is whether it is now necessary that they should be printed, seeing that the hon. gentleman has attained his object. Therefore, if the House do not object, I will move that that order be rescinded. The reports will be printed in the Journals in any case.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The expense of printing them for distribution would be very little extra, if they are to be printed in the Journals.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The reports and the evidence taken by the shorthand reporters might be printed.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the reason for not printing the exhibits?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The expense. Then, these documents belong to the department, where they are wanted, and while they are in the possession of the House they cannot be returned to the department until the printing is completed. The reports and the evidence will be printed.

Mr. MULOCK. It is proposed simply to amend the formal order by dispensing with the printing of the correspondence, and to leave the order for printing the evidence taken, and also the reports produced by the department?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the second and third reports of the Public Accounts Committee, together with the evidence accompanying them, be printed for the use of members.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister to add to the motion, "including the reports produced by the department."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

IMPORTATION OF SKILLED ARTISANS.

Mr. McKAY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture to a copy of an advertisement which appears in an old country paper. It reads as follows:—

"Wanted—Bricklayers, carpenters, masons, navvies, quarrymen, rock-drillers, etc., for the construction of canal locks, railways, government, public, and other buildings in Canada; also farm laborers, farm pupils, accompanied (if possible) by female relatives, for domestic and other occupations; good wages and steady employment. References required. Apply, Colonial Agency, 2 Billiter street, London, E.C."

The matter has been brought up before the Council of the Trades and Labor Organisation of the city of Hamilton, and my attention was called to it too late to have it brought before the House in the shape of a question. I therefore ask the hon. the Minister of Agriculture if he will reply to the question, as this is the only occasion on which the matter can be brought up before the close of the Session. The Trade and Labor Organisation think that the Government are connected with this advertisement, and I would ask the hon. gentleman whether he will say if that advertisement has been authorised in any way by his department?

Mr. CARLING. (1.) It is not true that the Government either assists or invites any artisans or mechanics to come to this country. (2.) The assistance to agricultural laborers and female domestics formerly afforded ceased absolutely on April 27th, 1888, and has not in any way since, directly or indirectly, been continued. (3.) The Government is not in any way responsible, either directly or indirectly, for the advertisement quoted by the Trades and Labor Council in their report published in the Hamilton *Spectator*, on April 23rd. The Government cannot control advertisements which may be placed in newspapers by private parties, and cannot be in any way responsible for them. The term "Colonial Agency, 2 Billiter street, London," refers to a private enterprise with which the Government has not in any way any connection whatever. (4.) The Government, by its own publications, issued from its own agencies under the direction of the High Commissioner, defines with clearness the classes who should and who should not come to Canada, and respecting farm pupils, as referred to in the advertisement in question, the Government publications dissuade the paying of premiums, and recommend application to Government agents.

REDUCTION OF EXPENDITURE.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Do the Government intend to ask the concurrence of the House in the report of the Joint Committee with reference to reducing the expense of Legislation?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention of the Government is not to ask the concurrence of the House on that report, but to leave it on the Notice Paper, in order that it may be considered at leisure.

SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

Report of Committee of Whole on resolution (p. 1658) providing for the construction of a railway between a point of junction on the New Brunswick Railway at or near Harvey, New Brunswick, and a point of junction with the Intercolonial Railway at or near Salisbury, New Brunswick, or somewhere between Salisbury and Moncton, was read the first time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the said resolution be now read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It is to be regretted that this matter, which is one of great importance, involving a large expenditure of money, should be brought before this House at this last hour of the Session when many members are absent and when necessarily, owing to the anxiety of the members to leave, the discussion must be short. But I feel that in a case of this kind which so greatly affects the interests of the Province of New Brunswick, and of the city and county I have the honor to represent, it is my bounden duty to ask the attention of the House for a few minutes while I discuss the matter. The hon. the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has spoken as if it were a matter of agreement. When the Intercolonial was built on the north shore, it practically was of very little benefit to St. John, as we were obliged to go eastward 100 miles for the purpose of getting on the line to Quebec and Montreal. It was agitated at the time; and, when the Intercolonial Railway was first brought before the Dominion Parliament, shortly after Confederation, a strong effort was made to have that road run by the valley of St. John, the route which is now formed by the Témiscouata Railway and the New Brunswick Railway, and to run in that way to St. John and Halifax. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who was at that time a member of the Government, interested himself in getting a road carried by the north shore instead of by the valley of St. John. I do not blame my hon. friend from Northumberland for that, because he was acting in the interests of those who had sent him here, but I do blame those who had the interests of St. John at that time to defend, for having stood by and made no effort to have the road constructed on a line which would have been the proper one, in justice not only to the Dominion, but to the Province, a line which, if it had been adopted, would not only have saved a large amount of the money which was expended on the north shore route, but would probably have saved the expenditure on other railways which have had to be aided in consequence of that railway being constructed in that direction. After the railway was finished, it was naturally felt that in the western portion of New Brunswick it was of very little benefit. We were geographically situated 300 or 400 miles nearer to Montreal and the western Provinces than Halifax, but by that road we were only about 100 miles nearer. This agitation was continued down to 1884, when the present High Commissioner, who was then Minister of Railways, brought forward a scheme with respect to the Oxford and New Glasgow line, which he contended would form a link in the great international road running from the west to Louisburg, as the nearest and best port for the eastern point of departure for Europe. The members from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia felt a deep interest in that, and in having a shorter communication, and in 1884 a subsidy for that line was placed before Parliament. My hon. friend, the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), seems to think that the members from New Brunswick at that time favored a vote of $300,000 a year for 30 years, to build a line from Montreal by way of Mattawamkeag, as the shortest line to Moncton, and now he says we are going back upon ourselves in opposing the present proposition. What was the proposition then put forward? This is dated the 13th March, 1884:

"We, the undersigned members of the Parliament of Canada from the Maritime Provinces, would urge upon the Government the extreme desirability of taking immediate measures for procuring the extension or connection of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from Montreal to or with the following ports of the Maritime Provinces, to wit: St. Andrews, St. John, Halifax and Louisburg, by the shortest practicable line, and having reason to believe that the appropriation of $300,000 per annum for 20 years to whatever company may have satisfied the Government of their ability to promptly complete the line, will secure the immediate construction of this important work, request that Government be asked to make provision for such a subsidy."

You will see there that the application then made was not for a line from Montreal *vid* Harvey to stop at Moncton, but it was for a short line by the most practicable route to the ports of St. Andrew's, St. John, Halifax and Louisburg. At that time Louisburg was put forward, not only by the then Minister of Railways, now the High Commissioner, but I find that the First Minister then said:

"My hon. friend, in moving the resolution, has stated that we look forward to Louisburg being the great Atlantic port for Canada some day or other, that it is the port nearest to Europe, shortening the distance to Europe, and there are great expectations by those who have considered the question—for instance, certain men such as the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. Stephen, who is very enthusiastic on that point, believe that will be a point of departure eventually for first-class steamers carrying passengers from the Atlantic States as well as from Canada to Europe."

That statement was put forward, and it was with that view, and with the intention of doing justice to all parties, that this memorandum was sent in for the whole line, and not, as put forward by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) for a road only to Moncton. Upon that statement, the subsidy was granted in that year. Sir Charles Tupper brought down a resolution as follows:—

"For the construction of a line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbors of St. John and Halifax by the shortest and best practicable route, a subsidy not exceeding $170,000 per annum for 15 years, or a guarantee of a like sum for a like period as interest on bonds of the company undertaking the work."

That was the resolution brought down in 1884, and the House will observe that it is simply for a line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbors of St. John and Halifax. On that occasion, the report of the Chief Engineer was put in, and I allude to that now because, when I come by-and-bye to deal with the question of cost, that will be very important. Sir Charles Tupper said, that the Chief Engineer had reported as follows:—

"For the construction of the western section, a grant of $140,000 per annum for 15 years be made for a guarantee, or a similar sum as interest on the bonds of the company undertaking the work for 15 years, in aid of the construction of the shortest and best line to be found from Montreal to St. John and Halifax, in accordance with the resolution of last year, appropriating aid to the International Railway."

That was the idea of the Chief Engineer at that time, that a subsidy of $140,000 would be amply sufficient. The motion of Sir Charles Tupper gave $170,000 for 15 years for the short route simply to St. John and Halifax. The next year, in 1885, it appeared that that was not sufficient, and then for the first time the members for Halifax raised the contention that the short line should be brought across the country, and, while endeavoring to get the subsidy, those gentlemen insisted on the line being constructed from Harvey to Moncton. After considerable discussion, that was agreed upon, and $150,000 was granted, being, as hon. gentlemen will see, about $80,000 additional to the amount which was granted in 1884. At that time, it was agreed that the line should be run from Harvey *viâ* Fredericton and Salisbury, to be built by the company. I may say, in passing, that, after this agreement had been entered into, and the subsidy had been proposed, a Mr. O'Sullivan, an engineer, undertook to show a more practicable and a shorter route, and another point he put forward was that this other route would keep the line altogether on Canadian soil, instead of it having to go through the State of Maine. A large public meeting was held in Halifax on June 20th, 1885, at which the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) was present, and telegrams were sent up here urging upon the then representatives of Halifax County to abandon this scheme. I mention this now because the hon. member for Halifax undertakes to say that we are bound under this arrangement. When the Halifax people discovered that there was a shorter route which would bring them within 70 miles of St. John, they were ready at once to repudiate that arrangement, and instructed their representatives to abandon the road. I must say, in justice to those gentlemen, that they did not recognise this arrangement, but stood by the agreement they had made. And so I say in regard to this matter, let that agreement remain, let that road be built under the terms set down, because then we will be put on equal terms, and then it will be left to the energy and enterprise of the people of St. John to take advantage of the facilities afforded. But I point out that this places us at a disadvantage, that the Government have deliberately gone to work and placed that line between Halifax and Moncton so as to give an unfair competition as between the two lines. Now, such was the history of this matter until we find that a contract was made on the 14th of December, 1885, between the International Railway Company and Her Majesty, to

build this line. I may say that at that time the present member for Guysborough (Mr. Kirk) moved that they should commence work simultaneously at both ends. The Hon. Mr. Burpee of New Brunswick, and Mr. Ray, Mr. Vail and Mr. Forbes, members from Nova Scotia, voted for the motion. But it was lost, and the Government refused to enter into an undertaking of that kind. I may mention that in August, 1885, engineers had been sent down to make what is called a preliminary survey of the line between Harvey and Moncton. The report of those engineers, which is dated January 15th, 1886, is on file in the office of the Minister of Railways. The Dominion Government then entered into an arrangement by which they divided the subsidy, by Order in Council dated 14th June, 1886; they gave $71,100 to the first section, $115,500 to the second section, and $63,400 to the section between Harvey and Moncton. At the time they made that provision, the Government considered that that amount was sufficiently ample to induce a company to come in and build the railway. That amount was appropriated, as I said, with all the knowledge of the facts; the Government had fully considered that subsidy and thought it sufficient. When we compare the subsidy of 1884 with the subsidy granted in 1885, we find that the last subsidy was larger than the former by $18,000 The line then was built, and the Atlantic and North-Western Railway proceeded with the contract and finished the first and second sections to Mattawamkeag. Then an agreement was entered into by which the International road was transferred to the Atlantic and North-Western, and the Canadian Pacific Railway leased it in perpetuity, according to agreement made in December, 1886, between the Government of Canada and the Atlantic and North-Western and the Canadian Pacific Railway. In this agreement the Canadian Pacific Railway became no party to any contract to build the road or to lease what is called the third section, but they simply became the lessee of the road in perpetuity. Such is the position of affairs. The Government have a contract with the International Railway Company which, after the whole Atlantic and North-Western was subsidised, remains to day in full force and effect. Therefore the Government have no right to come forward and say that the Atlantic and North-Western are not in a position to build and that the Canadian Pacific Railway will not do it, that the Canadian Pacific Railway are under no obligations to do it. It appears now that the only object the Government can have in coming in and releasing the Atlantic and North-Western from the contract, is simply to redeem a statement made by Sir Charles Tupper to the hon. member for Halifax at the time he was opposing the motion of my hon friend (Mr. Kirk) when he stated that that agreement was entered into by the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Minister of Public Works also made a statement in 1885 of a similar purport. Such, however, does not appear to have been the case. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), it may have been a mistake, because the Atlantic and North-Western was considered to be a sort of adjunct to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Be that as it may, if a mistake has occurred, if now it is known that no such contract was entered into, I say that is no reason why the present Government should now step in and embark upon an enterprise of which they know not the end, and they know not the cost or the advantage. They propose to build a road which is entirely useless and certainly ought to be avoided at the present time, when we are beginning to practice economy. As I have said, the surveys are simply preliminary and do not at all show the expense that the road is likely to cause, nor the difficulties of an engineering character which it will encounter. Any person reading the report will see that there are very serious difficulties both in starting from Harvey and in starting from Salisbury.

Now, I take the road and I take the figures which I find in the report, and I think that a careful perusal of the report will show that the intention was to cross the river at a lower point where the grades will be easier By that survey we find it is 119 miles. We may fairly allow 10 per cent. additional for changes necessary to avoid difficulties, and that will bring the distance up to 121 or 122 miles. The distance by the present road is 141 miles. That makes a difference of between 9 or 10 miles. No person has been able to come forward and say that the difference will be any more. It is true the Minister has said it was 27 miles, but he has not the slightest data upon which to base his assertion. The statement made by Mr. Van Horne gives a difference of 14 miles. The Canadian Pacific Railway, however, with interest secured by the Government on a capital equal to $2,000,000, refused point-blank to build the road, and now the Government come down and undertake it before anything is ascertained as to cost, as to whether it will prove advantageous, without the necessary information relating to surveys, in fact before surveys have been made, and without ascertaining whether existing facilities for carrying freight are not ample. The Government have entered into this agreement to build the road, no matter what the cost may be, and to build it to the satisfaction of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the road to be equal to the Intercolonial Railway between Moncton and Truro, and to be subject to the satisfaction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and if not satisfactory to them the question has to be left to the arbitration of a competent engineer appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. In addition, the Government have undertaken to secure a bridge across the St. John River and lease it to the company at a nominal rate. The Government have embarked on this undertaking without obtaining the slightest reliable information in any shape or form. The Canadian Pacific Railway are given facilities and advantages to compete with the Intercolonial Railway, and they are bound hand and foot to the Canadian Pacific Railway in this matter, and they give that company advantages and facilities over the Intercolonial Railway which other companies are refused, and the effect will be to cause the company to use that line to the detriment of the city of St. John, to which the Government is as much pledged to take the short line there as it is to Halifax or any other port in Nova Scotia. It is stated that a company is ready to build the road, that the Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Company are ready to construct it for $2,000,000. But who form that company, and what stock have they subscribed? It is stated that they expended $375,000 in building the bridge at Fredericton; towards that amount they have received $30,000 as a gift, $295,000 has been advanced by the Government, making $300,000, and that leaves $45,000, and it is rumored that they have not paid that amount. It has been stated that there is another company ready to build the road. It is true that a few days ago a company was incorporated by the Provincial Government to build a railway from Harvey to Moncton. That possibly may be the road indicated. The people are, however, strangers and foreigners in this country, and we do not know anything about their financial position. I protest against the Government embarking in this undertaking, unless with a reliable company, which will give sufficient guarantee that they will complete the road. Here we are without surveys and without statements on which any man can estimate the cost of the road. It is true we have a letter, written on April 8th, by Mr. Collingwood Schreiber. It reads:

"I have the honor to report that upon a careful examination of the plans of the preliminary survey of the proposed line of railway between Harvey and Salisbury, and from general knowledge in regard to the country traversed, and after fully considering the matter, I estimate the approximate cost of constructing a road (equal in every respect to the section of the New Brunswick Railway between Harvey and St. John, and by utilising the Fredericton and St. Mary's Company's bridge over the St. John River) at $16,000 per mile."

But that is not the kind of road it is agreed to construct. The standard of road agreed upon is that of the Intercolonial Railway between Truro and Moncton, and not a section of the New Brunswick Railway. Little reliability can be placed on railway estimates, as members of this House well know. The St. Charles Branch, which extends a distance of only 14 miles, was estimated to cost $350,000, but it has cost $1,300,000. The Pictou Branch, 30 miles in length, was estimated to cost $300,000, but to-day over $500,000 have been expended; and if there is so much difficulty in obtaining a correct estimate for a short road, how much greater is the difficulty with regard to a road 120 miles long. I have no doubt the cost of the road will be from $3,000,000 to $4,000,000. It is true we have the statement of the hon. member for York (Mr. Temple), that he would undertake to build it for $2,000,000. No doubt he would do so, with the prospect of obtaining half a million for the bridge, and he would undertake to land the Government at Cariboo Plain, at the head of Grand Lake, for $2,000,000 at least. If the Government are going to build this road, they should first have a sufficient guarantee from reliable companies or reliable parties that the road will not cost over $2,000,000. If that is not done, let the Government adhere to the original scheme to guarantee $6 ,000, and let those who build the road own it and stand on equal terms with us, but do not let St. John and New Brunswick be handicapped by a contract made in perpetuity for the purpose of diverting the traffic from that portion of the Dominion, and for the purpose of destroying the energies of the people of New Brunswick and of the people of the county which the Minister of Finance represents. I should like to know how the Minister of Finance is going to defend the action of the Government before his constituents in running this line through a part of the country which is not fit for settlement, and in constructing it so that it draws away the traffic from the most fertile part of the Province.

Mr. FOSTER. Come up next summer, then you will see.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think the Minister of Finance will receive from his constituents a reception worthy of the occasion.

Mr. FOSTER. I always do.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think you will find that the people of St. John as well as your own constituents will not thank the Minister of Finance for destroying the legitimate traffic which should run through the most fertile part of that Province. We have been betrayed in St. John time and time again. We were induced into Confederation by the great idea that we were to be the Liverpool of America, but to-day our people have cause to bitterly regret placing faith in those promises. With regard to the Intercolonial Railway, as I said before, my friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) was powerful enough in the Cabinet to carry the line along the shore, admittedly not for the commercial purposes of the road, but for the benefit of his own constituents. I do not blame him for that; I rather honor him for that energy in carrying out that project, but I do blame the men to whom the interests of St. John were then entrusted, and who stood coldly by and allowed those interests to be sacrificed. This line now under discussion is another blow at the city of St. John, and it is the worst of all. If the Government had built that road according to the original arrangement, we were prepared to stand by it, but we cannot compete with it under the conditions now imposed which will handicap us in the race for commerce. We have suffered a good many times in New Brunswick. The hand of Providence

has struck us several times in St. John ; fire and fire again has devastated our city. The last fire there, in proportion to the size of the city, was one of the greatest conflagrations which ever took place in America. We have survived all that, for our people are energetic and willing to work and prosper. Give us fair play in regard to this railway, and we are prepared to compete on friendly or unfriendly terms with Halifax or any other port, but handicap us, and we cannot compete, and I believe our people will resent it. There is a feeling of unrest for a long time with regard to our treatment by this Dominion, and I think this will tend to increase this unrest, and intensify the wish to seek connection with another country. I believe that the position which the Government has nos taken will intensify that feeling of unrest in the Lower Provinces, and before long you will hear of a cry for repeal of the Union or a desire to seek refuge in another country. I move in amendment:

That the said resolution be not now agreed to, but it be resolved, that no action should be taken by this House authorising the construction by the Government of Canada of another line of railway between Harvey and Salisbury or Moncton until a proper survey of the proposed line and reliable estimates of its probable cost are laid before Parliament, and until time has established that the existing line of railway between the points named is not sufficient to meet the demands of passenger and freight traffic."

Mr. ELLIS. I do not propose to say more than one word, and it is just this, that the members who are supporting the Government from the Province of Ontario and from the other Provinces cannot have fairly looked into this matter, or they would not support this proposition at all. All the circumstances of the case have been pointed out, all the circumstances which will arise in the future to the great interests which are involved in this question, so far as it affects the Maritime Provinces, and which are of so serious a character that any man having in his soul and in his heart and in his mind a consideration of the future of this country would hesitate before he would vote to build another railway parallel to the Intercolonial Railway to the Province of New Brunswick for the purposes for which this railway is to be constructed. The whole expenditure of the money is an extravagance; the circumstances are bad; and it is such an evidence of misgovernment which no man who desires to do his duty by the country would support if he fairly examined it.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I wish to say merely one word in reply to the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House. He has said that the members from Ontario and Quebec could not, if they properly understood this measure, vote in favor of it. It appears to me, however, that the gentlemen who are opposing it at the present time have furnished no sufficient reason for the changed attitude which they have assumed towards the construction of this line since 1884 and 1885. Hon. gentlemen, it appears to me, must forget the circumstances upon which the Government and Parliament were first committed to the construction of this line. When first submitted to the House, as the hon. senior member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) stated, the proposition was to construct the shortest and most practicable line between the city of Montreal and seaports of the Maritime Provinces. A discussion arose during the Session of 1884 as to the course the line should take, and an amendment was moved and adopted that the question should be submitted to the decision of competent engineers. During the season following a number of surveys were made, and in the Session of 1885, when those surveys were submitted to Parliament, the Government decided that the line which it is proposed to construct now was the line which would best conform to the conditions of the resolution of 1884, and which under all the circumstances was the best and shortest practicable line. The Minister of Public Works, when introducing the measure, gave the results of the surveys in detail.

He went at great length into the subject to show that this line was the shortest—that, taking the curves and grades into consideration, it was the best line that could be adopted; and the anxiety which hon. gentlemen opposite expressed on that occasion was not that this portion should not be constructed, but that after the line was constructed as far as Mattawamkeag this portion of the line might be abandoned. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Kirk), in speaking on this subject, used this very strong language:

"When the road is built to Mattawamkeag we have connection, but the Short Line is not complete unless it is built to Harvey, Fredericton, and Salisbury. Unless this section is built, the road will be of no earthly use to the Province of Nova Scotia or to the city of Halifax."

That language was used in moving an amendment, which reads as follows:—

"That the report be not now considered, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending the Bill by providing that the work on the sections of the line between Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury shall be begun and prosecuted simultaneously with the portion of the whole line west of the boundary between New Brunswick and Maine."

Hon. gentlemen opposite, I believe, unanimously supported that amendment in the House.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I beg your pardon. I voted against it. You will find my name recorded in *Hansard* on both sides; but in the Journals you will find my name recorded against that resolution.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I certainly find it among the yeas on that occasion.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). And among the nays too. It is a misprint in *Hansard*, where I am recorded among both the yeas and the nays, but in the Journals I am recorded with the nays.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). However it may be with the hon. member for St. John, I think it is a good answer to the remark of the hon. junior member for St. John, that the members from Ontario and Quebec should not support this measure now, to say that they supported on that occasion a resolution as strong in its terms as the one I have read. I believe, too, that there would have been a much larger vote in favor of that resolution had it not been for the very positive assurances given to the House by the Government that they would undertake to see that this portion of the line now under consideration was constructed. Now, Sir, it is incomprehensible to me at least how hon. gentlemen who supported that motion can now advocate the abandonment of this portion upon the ground that the saving of distance is trifling, and that its construction will involve an unnecessary expenditure of money. Hon. gentlemen, too, have stated that they would have been satisfied if the company had built the road under the original arrangement. Now, I claim that the fact of the company failing to carry out their contract does not in any way relieve the Government or Parliament from the responsibility of completing this enterprise. It is true if it were an open road, and aid were given by Parliament towards its construction, and if the company undertaking to build it failed to carry out their arrangement, Parliament might be relieved. But that would be a wholly different case. The road was undertaken, not as a local road, but as a part of a great national work, and the money given was not simply to aid in its construction, but to secure its construction. In 1884, a subsidy of $170,000 a year for 15 years was given. In 1885, it was shown that that was wholly inadequate, and a subsidy of $250,000 a year, for 20 years, was given, which, practically, was double the amount of the first subsidy. The principle acted upon by the Government and Parliament was that this was part of our great national highway, and that it was the duty of Parliament to see that it was constructed, and to vote whatever money was necessary for its construction.

Now, the hon. senior member for St. John has said that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company did not consider this link worth building, that they were not favorable to its construction. It is true, the attitude of that company has somewhat changed towards this section of the line; but that is easily accounted for by the fact that the cost of the line through the State of Maine has been very much in excess of their expectation. If I am not misinformed, that section has cost as much as the estimated cost of the whole line from Montreal to Moncton, and it is not to be wondered at, under these circumstances, that they may desire to be relieved of their contract. But hon. members will notice that the principal opposition to the present measure comes from the hon. gentlemen who represent the city and county of St. John. That opposition is entirely local and sectional in its character. In 1884 and 1885 they supported the construction of this line in its entirety. But now, since that portion has been constructed which gives the section of the Province they represent direct connection with the west, they have changed their attitude and are opposing the construction of the remaining portion of the line. I do not think that the views of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), or the arguments which come from those who are moved by motives of this character, will have very much weight with the independent members of this House. Although the vote for this portion of the line does not receive the unanimous support which it did in 1884 and 1885, it has the same merits which it had then. The conditions have not changed. It was never claimed that the saving of distance would be more than 26 or 27 miles. I believe when the location surveys are made, from all the best information I can get, there will be fully this saving in the distance, and I have every reason to believe the saving will be somewhat increased. I support this proposition on account of its intrinsic merits, because I believe, in the opinion of a great many men well competent to judge, this is an important portion of our great national highway across this continent, and, besides that, there is one consideration above all others, and that is the importance of preserving the honor and the faith of the Government and of this Parliament.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is painfully evident that in these, the dying hours of the Session, this important resolution cannot receive that attention to which it is entitled. I look on this as one of the most indefensible propositions ever presented for the approval of this House. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat has charged that the opposition of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) has been prompted largely by local considerations. I think the retort might be made against him that his support of the Bill is prompted purely from local considerations. But apart from the local considerations which may prompt hon. gentlemen who represent the interests placed at antagonism here, namely, those of St. John, Halifax, and Annapolis, there is a duty incumbent upon the members of this House who are not, from the nature of the case, influenced by local considerations, to decide this question, not upon legal grounds, but in the national interest; and when we ask, as men who have no local interest in this matter, whether there are national interests demanding the expenditure of this $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 for the sake of duplicating the railway, I think there can be but one answer coming from those who are not bound to answer otherwise than in accordance with their party leanings. The proposition which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) seems to me an eminently reasonable one; involved in it there are three or four statements of facts. First, that there is to be a duplicate road. The hon. gentleman talks about our constructing this great national highway from Montreal to the sea, but he knows that we have at present already, or will have in the course of a week or two at the furthest, that national highway completed. He knows there is already a road running from Montreal to St. John and Halifax, and he knows the proposition of the Government is to build over a portion of that line a duplicate road, and the question is whether our national interest requires the expenditure of that large amount to duplicate this portion of the road. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) tenders this proposition, that the length of the line proposed to be constructed is now unknown. There have been no survey, made of this new line. The House was led to believe, from the remarks of the right hon. the First Minister the other day, that surveys of the proposed line have been made and laid on the Table. Such is not the case. It cannot be emphasised too strongly and understood by the country too clearly that we are asked to embark on the construction of a road, the survey of the line of which has not yet been made. It is true that the survey has been made between the points named, but not over the line of the road proposed to be built. The surveys which have been laid on the Table of the House are surveys from Harvey to Moncton, crossing the St. John at Majorville. That is a distance of some 10 or 12 miles further down the river than Fredericton, and the length of the line by way of Majorville, or the difficulties in the way of construction by way of Majorville, or the estimate of the cost of the construction of the road, offers no index of the length or cost of construction by another and totally different route. You must remember, Sir, that the House is asked to come to this conclusion upon data supposed to have been furnished by this preliminary survey by way of Majorville. If the line runs by way of Majorville, a new bridge will have to be constructed over the St. John where the river is much wider. No doubt such a bridge will cost $500,000, but the House is not asked to run a line there. The surveys made by that line, therefore, offer no index of what our expenditure will be over the new line proposed. We are asked to build a line from Harvey to Fredericton. Let us see whether the estimates given the House by the Chief Engineer are such that any credence can be placed in them. In 1881, the cost of subsidising this line from Montreal to the sea was estimated at $170,000 per annum for 15 years. When Sir Charles Tupper came down to the House and asked us to vote this subsidy, he pledged his word that he had made the most careful examination, that he had taken into his confidence those who understood thoroughly the subject, and that he had informed himself to such an extent that he was able to assure the House beyond doubt that this line could be constructed under that subsidy of $170,000 per year for 15 years. Upon this statement the House voted that subsidy, and one short year had hardly gone by when the hon. gentleman came down to the House and acknowledged that he was altogether wrong. He then proposed that the subsidy should be increased by the sum of $80,000, making $250,000, and that the term should be increased from 15 years to 20. The proposition, in other words, meant an addition of $1,600,000 to the capital value of the original subsidy. That proposition was opposed by the vast number of members on this side, who argued that it should not be given until a proper survey had been made and proper estimates submitted to the House based on that survey. What did that proposition of Sir Charles Tupper involve? We were told, in the first place, that a subsidy of the capital value of $1,900,000 would build the road. The next year we were told it would take a subsidy of the capital value of $3,400,000 to build it. That subsidy was voted by the majority of this House, and what was the result? The result was that, in 1886, the Chief Engineer of the Government took that subsidy and divided it into three parts. We need not concern ourselves now with the part he appropriated for the other portions of the line; but we know the part he appropriated for the construction of the line now before the House, the line from Harvey to

Moncton, which part amounted to $63,000 of the $250,000. On the 14th June, 1886, an Order in Council was passed, on the recommendation of the Chief Engineer, appropriating for this section of the road between Harvey and a point on the Intercolonial near Salisbury, $63,400 a mile. Now, what value can be attached to that report of the Chief Engineer and the action that the Government took upon it? At that time the Chief Engineer had before him the preliminary surveys which had been made of this route by way of Majorville. With these surveys in hand, he estimated that $63,000 a year for 20 years, would be sufficient to construct that road, or to pay the interest on a capital value of $700,000. That was the estimate made by the Chief Engineer in 1886, when he had before him the surveys and the estimates of the surveyors. To-day he comes before the House, and has not one solitary bit of information more than he had when he made that estimate, and yet he tells us now that the construction of that road will require nearly three times as much money as he estimated in 1886. We are now told that it will take $16,000 a mile to construct that road, that the distance is 113 miles, and consequently, supposing its length does not exceed that, the expenditure will be, without counting the bridge, $1,808,000. The Chief Engineer pledged his word in his report to the Executive in June, 1886, when he had the surveys before him, that the road could be built for $63,000 a mile. The cost at that time was supposed to be, in all, $700,000. Now the same officer reports that it will cost $1,808,000. If it is built by way of Fredericton, we will have nearly a million more to pay for the bridge, making about two millions and a half, assuming that the estimate is correct. But are there any data for that assumption? Those who are acquainted with Fredericton, and we have had it stated also by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), are aware that, owing to the high land west of Fredericton, it will be impossible to reach that bridge which the Government have bought from the hon. member for York (Mr. Temple) without making a detour of at last 8 or 10 miles. They meet the Naswaak River in that way, and they will have another bridge to construct, which will be nearly as costly to build as this, and that is not estimated at all. It is rumored that the Government are not going to build that bridge. If not, they will have to make a detour of another 12 or 14 miles, and that will make the length of the road from 130 to 140 miles. We have now a road 141 miles in length, and I wish to know why the House should be asked, in the absence of information, to lengthen the line, or without accurate information as to the cost of the line to indulge in a large expenditure to construct what will simply be a line parallel to the present one. I do not speak in the interests of St. John or of Halifax. I speak in the general interests of the country, but it does appear to me that St. John is being sidetracked for some reason or other, and is not being fairly dealt with. I say, speaking from the interests of the Dominion at large, that this vote is indefensible, that, with the information before the House, it is more than indefensible, it is shameful and disgraceful that the House should enter into an unknown expenditure on 130 or 140 miles of railway running parallel to a road they now possess. I have watched to see if hon. gentlemen opposite would advance a single argument in support of this proposition. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) has indulged in some recrimination as to what was suggested three or four years ago, and has asked if the Opposition were not pledged to what took place then. If the Opposition were pledged to anything at that time, it could only be to that expenditure. Now we are entering upon an expenditure which is nearer $7,000,000 than the amount then spoken of, $700,000. I say it is a disgrace to the Government that proposes it, and will be a disgrace to the House that votes it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have been looking over this agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway in relation to this undertaking, and I have again to express my regret that the Government should have confined themselves so entirely to the Canadian Pacific Railway in regard to the running powers they are giving over that branch to Moncton. It must be in the interests of the Maritime Provinces generally that railways which have the means of building or extending their lines should be in a position to use the Government line when they can, but, as far as the Salisbury branch is concerned, it appears that the Government intend to give to the Canadian Pacific Railway the sole running powers. I do not know whether they may consider that they will be exonerated by the clause that provides that, if the Government permit any competition with the lessee, then the lessee shall be granted corresponding concessions. That may be only on the road from Moncton into Halifax, but the principle, if there is any principle in the arrangement at all, would, in my judgment, apply to the whole Government road, and to the undertaking which we are now considering. I look upon it as of the greatest importance that the Government should be able to deal with the Grand Trunk Railway Co. when they have completed their road and are able to make their connection with this branch. The full advantage of this would be obtained if, as doubtless they will, the Grand Trunk should require running powers over the Rivière du Loup branch, which is not now used to its fullest extent, and therefore, if the Government could give running powers to the Grand Trunk over the branch we are now considering, and could also give running powers over the Rivière du Loup branch, it would largely be in the interest, not only of the Maritime Provinces, but of the whole country. This discussion has taken a different range to-day from that which it did yesterday, and hon. gentlemen seem to forget—and particularly the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood)—that we are placed in this position to-day in consequence of the want of proper foresight on the part of the Government That hon. gentleman says, the faith of Parliament is pledged to this undertaking. The faith of Parliament was pledged to an expenditure of $250,000 a year, which it was said was sufficient to construct the line, and, had the Government exercised ordinary business care, and had they made their arrangements on business considerations, there is no doubt the road could have been built without its being necessary for them to come to Parliament to-day and ask for a larger grant. Therefore if the road has not been built under the arrangement proposed to Parliament and by the amount placed at their disposal, the House and the country will understand that it is entirely owing to the want of proper consideration, and owing to the want of business management and prudent arrangements in carrying out the arrangements with the other companies. Then, again, we have here the Atlantic and North-Western Co., who are bound to finish this road at all events. It was stated in Parliament this year, that when their charter was extended they were going to spend a certain sum of money to finish the line at so much per annum, and that announcement was telegraphed to Halifax and to all the Tory papers in the Lower Provinces, as an evidence that the Government were affording the Atlantic and North-Western Co. the means of keeping their charter alive, and that they were going to carry it out. While I am in favor, as I have said before, of having the line completed, I cannot but regret that the country is suffering to such an extent through the incompetency of the Administration, which has placed us in the position we are in to-day. Then, I think that the hon. members from St. John are a little unreasonable in this matter. They have their short line to St. John, which makes a road for them about 280 miles shorter than it was before this line was built. The people of St. John should remem-

ber that by the completion of the line to Mattawamkeag connecting with existing lines, they are placed about 280 miles nearer Montreal than they were before this short line to Mattawamkeag was built; whereas the people of Halifax are only placed 80 miles nearer. Then, again, the people of St. John are placed by this arrangement 359 miles nearer to Montreal than Halifax is by the Intercolonial Railway, and one would think that they would be satisfied with such a large mileage in their favor as 359 miles over the Intercolonial Railway from Halifax to Montreal, or 277 miles from Halifax to Montreal by the way of St. John. I think the people of St. John are at least a little unreasonable, and that they have not dealt with this matter in the light in which I would have expected to see them deal with a public matter of this importance. If there is any advantage in being 277 miles nearer by their own route to Montreal, or 359 miles nearer than they are by the Intercolonial Railway, why, the city of St. John ought to enjoy that advantage, and therefore they are not reasonable in putting it upon the ground on which they have placed it to-day. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner), in the course of his address, put the whole blame on the people of Halifax for having induced the Government to undertake any short line there at all. He seems to think that St. John wants to have the only advantages which this Act might afford by the construction of new lines. Well, I am very glad that St. John has the advantage which they possess under this new arrangement, and I think it should be of very considerable importance to them, and I repeat that I think that my hon. friends are very unreasonable in desiring to obstruct an arrangement to complete the line on to Halifax. It may be that it will not shorten it more than the hon. gentleman mentioned. If it does not shorten it more than the mileage they have mentioned, so much the better for St. John and so much the worse for Halifax. I am not in a position to say how much this Salisbury and Moncton line will shorten the distance. It has been estimated by the Canadian Pacific Railway at about 17 miles; others estimate it at about 30 miles. Well, 17 or 30 miles are of no great importance, I admit, but still while the road will accommodate certain sections of New Brunswick, and will at the same time shorten the distance to that extent, I think on that grounds the undertaking is defensible, although I regret that the action of the Government has placed this country in a position to have to pay for this road twice. We placed at the disposal of the Government a sum to complete it once, but which, by their own mismanagement and want of business ability, they have lost the advantage of. Now, after having failed in that arrangement, they come down to the House and ask for a second appropriation. On that ground, I think, as one of the representatives of this country, it is much to be regretted, although rather than have the road not built, as a representative of Halifax, why, I, of course, support the motion. But I should have been much better pleased had I been able to support the motion on other grounds, and to have seen such arrangements carried out as were reasonably contemplated under the subsidy of $250,000 which was placed at the disposal of the Government three or four years ago.

Mr. COLTER. I do not intend to occupy more than a few moments in discussing this question; I merely wish to put on record my view, and the views of my constituents, and the views of a great many who are now living in the Province of Ontario. I am opposed to all these railway subsidies. I believe that the railway development of this country, particularly in the older sections, has exceeded altogether the progress of the country, and that we have, in many cases, railways competing with others when there is no necessity for such competition. When we have, as in this case, the Government proposing to subsidise a line, the only effect of which is to depreciate the value of the lines or the property of this country, I believe it is time to call a halt. Now, if this line had any special local significance, there might, perhaps, be something alleged in its defence. I admit, there may be something alleged in defence of the money subsidies proposed, but then the subsidies are all of a local character, and have no right to assistance from the general Government. If they are required in consequence of the business exigencies of any section of the country, let the people of that section subsidise them, and let the people of that section pay for them. I believe that when this country constructed the Intercolonial Railway, and constructed the Canadian Pacific Railway, they did all that was necessary in order to meet the national requirements of the people of Canada. But for this Government and this Parliament to be called upon to aid railways such as this, the only effect of which is to build up a portion of the Dominion at the expense of another, then I say we are doing something which I believe to be radically wrong. Then, if we consider the section of the country through which this railway passes: on the west side is the St. John River, where the people have sufficient railway accommodations, and they have railway accommodations by the line from Woodstock. On the east, they have railway accommodation at Fredericton, and they have all the facilities that are necessary to enable them to get their produce to market. And further, in order to get into Fredericton, the line will have to overcome a great difference in the level of the land, because to the west of the city there is a large mountain, and a convenient grade cannot be obtained unless they make a considerable detour. On crossing the St. John River there is the Nashwaak, a considerable stream, and there are low lands on both sides of that river, called intervales, which will require very extensive and very expensive bridging. When we go down further, back of Sheffield, we have a barren section of country, a section which can never supply any local traffic to this road. Sheffield is cut off by low lands lying back of it. It is, therefore, evident that the line has no recommendations whatever on local grounds. When we consider that all this expenditure is to be incurred simply to shorten the route by a distance variously estimated at from 2 to 30 miles, that we incur all this expenditure for that and for no other purpose, simply to save a few minutes, less than one hour, in transit from Halifax to Montreal, and we are entering upon an expenditure, the amount of which is uncertain, and which, therefore, must be taken to be much greater than we have any idea of at the present time, especially judging by the expenditures made on Government railways in the past. When we take into consideration all these circumstances there should be a halt, and I feel it my duty to enter my most solemn protest against any undertaking of this kind.

Mr. MULOCK. I think that before the House assents to this proposition it is entitled to receive more accurate information than has been furnished, and this question should have been submitted at an early stage of the Session when there was a full House. Why is this proposition brought down at this late hour, when more than half the people's representatives have left for their homes? The very fact that it is brought down here at this hour of the Session, when the Ministers think, probably, that the House, wearied of discussion, will submit to the demand rather than prolong the Session, is sufficient to convince any reasonable man that the measure has no merits. If it could stand the light of day and public criticism, why was it not brought down months ago, when it might have received that consideration it ought to have received? What is involved in it? No man can tell. The First Minister will not pledge his reputation as to the outside cost to the country. Are our finances in that position that we

can take a leap in the dark, as is proposed here? Is every other part of the Dominion so well supplied with railways that the time has now arrived when we should duplicate them in the older parts of the country? Is the North-West so well supplied with railway accommodation that they have no longer any need of assistance? Is our Treasury so full and overflowing with money that we can now ask for measures to relieve its bursting condition? Are these the conditions of the country? If not, then I think the Government might well pause before plunging the country into this new and unwise enterprise. I asked a moment ago, what was the amount involved. It not only involves the expenditure of a large sum of money on capital account, but look at the expenditure after completion. The Government openly enter into partnership with the Canadian Pacific Railway and undertake to purchase rolling stock in partnership with that company, and be common carriers with that company in the running of an express line between Montreal and Halifax. That is an enterprise which should be conducted by a railway company itself. It is true we have Government railways as a matter of necessity; but why should the Government go into the railway business when the Canadian Pacific Railway itself would be prepared to run a fast line between Halifax and Montreal without Government interference. Then the Government propose to become rivals to themselves. They enter into partnership with the Canadian Pacific Railway to become competitors with the Intercolonial Railway, a Government railway, and thereby destroy Government property. The Government proposes to invest not less than $2,000,000, but the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have stated to various members within the last few months that this road could not be built for less than $4,000,000, and if that was their estimate, a considerably larger sum will no doubt be expended by the Government. When built it is to be leased to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for 20 years for $1 a year. The hon. member for Hamilton says "Question." He desires evidently to stifle discussion at this moment. But I do not propose to approach this question any sooner than the necessities of the case demand. The hon. gentleman and others may seek to obstruct discussion, but in doing so they are not discharging their duties as members of this House. The hollowness of this concern is established by the fact that for 20 years the Dominion, on an expenditure of $2,000,000, will receive just $1 a year. That is the financial enterprise of the new-born Finance Minister. That is the way he proposes to economise, to restore this country to a healthy financial position, to build up our finances, and to again, I suppose, float a successful loan in old England. Not only for 20 years is this to be handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway, but at the end of 20 years the Government are to receive an annual rental of $73,400. What is the value of the promise of a railway company to the Dominion Government to mature at the end of 20 years? Look at the history of this country, and what do we see? The Grand Trunk Railway borrowed vast sums of money from this country, giving a first mortgage, and that security gradually became valueless and has been wiped out. The Northern Railway borrowed a large sum from the Dominion, first giving a lien upon the property, and as the exigencies of the case justified, political or otherwise, I do not know, so pressure was brought to bear on the Government, presided over by the First Minister, and with those in sympathy with him. The value of the security diminished, until at least the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) compromised the claim for a mere trifle. And so it will be with respect to this arrangement for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to pay $73,400 as rent. In other words, the money we are now expending may be considered as so much money thrown away. There is no use denying

Mr. MULOCK.

the fact and trying to humbug the people, for it is just so much money to enable some of the hon. gentlemen opposite to go back and face their constituents. The First Minister knows perfectly well the position, and he placed the Government in it, not as the result of an accident. He knows, and members on the Government benches know, that there was a deliberate release by the Government of the Canadian Pacific Railway from the obligation to build this branch from Harvey to Salisbury. When Parliament, in 1885, entered into a contract to subsidise the Short Line Railway to the extent of $250,000 a year, for 20 years, that sum of money was given as one sum for the completion of one work, and that one work was to build the line to St. John, and from Harvey, *vid* Salisbury, to Moncton; when it was found by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that the branch from Harvey to Moncton was an unnecessary and an unprofitable work, and was of no use to the company or to the country, they sought to be relieved from it, and the Government lent themselves to the scheme and proposed a division of the subsidy. The subsidy was divided into three parts, two parts being applicable to the construction of the line as far as St. John, and $63,000 a year being applicable to the building of the line from Harvey to Moncton. At that stage of the negotiations the dealings between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government established to my mind conclusively—and I charge that it would be the result of an enquiry on the subject—that it was a deliberate arrangement on the part of the Government at that time to relieve the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other company from the construction of the line from Harvey to Moncton, because they allowed the contract, and all its advantages, to be transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway, leaving the liability to build from Harvey to Moncton to be assumed by a company that had no assets. The circumstances show that the Government at that time had the deliberate policy in view of withholding that information from the people of the east, and representing that the Canadian Pacific Railway was still liable to build the road. Now we are called upon to redeem pledges made by them; and pledges given either in ignorance of the situation, or with the knowledge of the situation. I hold that this House should not be called upon, under these circumstances, and at this late hour in the Session, to commit itself to this wildcat scheme. In view of the condition of the finances of the country, and the reckless manner in which the Government has heretofore plunged the country into enterprises of a non-paying character, in view of the stringency that prevails in the country, in view of the fact that the Minister of Finance is adding millions and millions to our capital account irrespective of this transaction, in view of the fact that our expenditure is greater than ever before, in view of the fact that our population is not increasing as it ought; there is nothing to justify the Government heaping additional burdens on the people unless there is good ground to believe there will be a return to the people. I believe that if the Government be wise or just it will pause in this scheme, and have correct surveys made and a full statement of what the line will cost this country, so that we can proceed deliberately, rather than they should spend millions of money to secure the seats of three or four members. If that is the object of this proposal, why cannot they be secured in the same way that the support of the hon. member for York (Mr. Temple), who owns the bridge at Fredericton, was secured. It would be a much cheaper transaction to the country and it would secure the same faithful subserviency on the part of the members. In that case the whole of the promises were in the future, but in this case the promises are in the past and the Government will have to buy those gentlemen over again, or their successors, when the time comes. The transaction is a disgraceful one and deserves the severe censure of the country if it is persisted in by the Government.

Mr. GILLMOR. I recognise how unwilling the House is, at this stage of the Session, to listen to any lengthened speeches, but the fact that only a few members are here does not alter the case, nor does it alter the vote in respect to numbers, because this Parliament has ceased to be a deliberative body. No one expects to convince members on the Government benches by any argument which they may use on the great questions which are introduced into this Parliament. I will not detain the House long, although I have a perfect right to speak as long as I choose upon this question. This is a very important question, and that members have gone home is no reason why it should not be thoroughly discussed. I am surprised, if there is a good and sufficient reason for this appropriation, that this reason has not been given. I know the ability of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and that when he has a good case no man can advocate that case better. From his locality, from his constituency, from the position he occupies in this Government, from the amount of money he has got to furnish to this road if it is built, I say that he is called upon to give a reason for this expenditure. Speaking of localities, I am as influenced as other men are by local considerations. I voted for the subsidy of $250,000 very reluctantly indeed, but I was influenced to do it from local considerations, and if there was a proposition now to build that short line for the $63,400 annually, I would not vote against it I then thought differently, however, as regards to distances to be saved, because it was variously estimated at that time that this line would be from 40 to 50, or even 60 miles shorter than the existing route. These were the estimates that were current in the air. The hon. member for York (Mr. Temple) told me and he told the House that he would show us how much shorter it was by this proposed line than it is by the line from Harvey to St. John and thence on to Moncton. Why has he not shown this to the House? for the information that we have before us is very indefinite indeed. This proposed line has been described by the Prime Minister as being some 27 miles shorter. I do not wish to exaggerate, but I am pretty well acquainted with the country there, as I have had for many years occasion to drive over from Harvey to Fredericton on the mail road, and I know that you cannot approach anywhere in the vicinity of the city of Fredericton, to connect with the bridge which is erected there. I know that you cannot get across the St. John River at less than 10 or 15 miles above Fredericton, for you have to make a short curve, and come down near Long Spring, and then down to Fredericton on the shore of the St. John River. If you build the road on the survey made to Majorville, you have got to come that distance up to Fredericton, because you have the same physical difficulties to overcome below the city as you have above the city. I venture to predict, that when the surveys of that road are made, that it will not be 27 miles shorter than the existing route, but the chances are that it will not be a mile shorter than the road from St. John. I know that, looking at the map, the route would appear to be a good deal shorter, but you cannot overcome the physical difficulties in the way of making it a shorter route. This question involves a large sum of money, variously estimated at from $2,000,000 to $4,000,000. The information is too indefinite; if the Government have it, they have not communicated it to the House sufficiently to justify this enormous expenditure. I can understand the position of the Government; they were bound to carry out their pledge to build that line, and I voted reluctantly for the subsidy of $250,000. I listened to the speech of the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), and with all due respect to him, I think he had better have held his tongue than to have made the speech he did. He stated that no matter if it would only save 10 or 15 or 20 miles, he wanted it built. What for, if he can reach Halifax by the same distance on other lines already constructed? Why does he want to involve this Dominion in a further expenditure of two or three, or it may be four million dollars, if he can get to Halifax as quickly now? For no other reason than to take the freight past St. John. The hon. gentleman may justify his position to the people of Halifax, but he cannot justify to my mind or to the people of this Dominion, that this money ought to be expended unless in the public interest. Now, very little has been said about the nearest Atlantic Ocean port to Montreal, and that is the port of St. Andrews. The Prime Minister did my county the honor of a visit last year, when he saw one of the finest harbors he ever saw, the port of St. Andrews. I do not know what he has said about the Short Line; but I know what his colleagues, Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Lenoard Tilley, have said about it. Both of them have gone to pastures green now; but they both had their summer residences at St. Andrews for many years, and they used to tell the people there that St. Andrews had the advantage over all the other ports of the Dominion of Canada, and that it must eventually have the terminus; and they asked, Why are you sending to every Parliament a man to oppose a Government that is trying to get this line for the port of St. Andrews? Now, I think the Government would have fulfilled their obligation if they had held these companies to their bargain to build the line, but further than that I do not think there was anything necessary to keep good faith with Halifax and the other Maritime Province ports. This short line has been a fruitful source of discussion for many years. How many ocean ports have been promised the terminus for this great western trade which it was to develop? There are the ports of Louisburg and Whitehaven in Cape Breton. The originator of this undertaking, the man who has created all this trouble, the present High Commissioner, has gone to every one of these ports, and held out the prospect to them one after another. At Louisburg and Whitehaven, he stood with one foot on sea and the other on solid land, and told them that the great trade from China and Japan, the silks, the teas, and the wheat and the corn from the West, would flow down to Louisburg and Whitehaven; and then he comes back to Halifax and tells the people there that Halifax is to be the place. Halifax has enough without this Short Line. You can go there by the Intercolonial Railway, or you can go by the line from Rivière du Loup, or if you are not satisfied to go that way, you can go by Mattawamkeag. But does my hon. friend from Halifax want to spend two or three millions to build an unnecessary work and to tax the people of the country for that amount? There is no argument in favor of it. If anything reasonable and convincing could have been said for it, it would have been said by the gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches, who can speak logically and forcibly enough if they have a good case. Then Sir Charles Tupper would hold his meetings at St. John and tell the people there that it was the great commercial centre of New Brunswick, that it had every facility for the terminus and must have it. But after the Short Line has been opened, instead of allowing the ports of St. John and St. Andrews to compete for this trade, the Government propose to tax the people of this country to an enormous extent to build this useless link. It has come to be the case now that no man can speak of economy or make reference to the taxpayers of this Dominion without being considered childish or imbecile to give a thought to the men who are toiling with all these burdens on their backs.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. GILLMOR. Oh, yes, it hurts you to consider how you are going to justify this measure to your constituents. I am astonished that millions should be voted in this way when our burdens are already very great. No road ought to be

built which the public interests do not demand. We are building ahead of our means altogether. I was reading the other day about a foolish company that undertook to build an enormous hotel at Rockaway, a summer resort in the State of New York. The hotel cost $1,500,000, and it had 999 bedrooms in it, and after it was opened and kept opened for six weeks, it was closed and never opened again. For eight years they had a keeper there, but nobody patronised it, and they got an auctioneer a little while ago and began to sell everything in the hotel. There were 1,500 soup plates, 2,000 dinner plates, and 2,000 or 3,000 knives and forks, a range 20 feet long, and several thousand towels, and they sold everything for little or nothing, as the Intercolonial Railway would be sold now if you could get anyone to buy it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do not say that about the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. GILLMOR. I listened to my hon. friend's speech on this subject, and it was one of the best he ever made; but he will not deny the fact that anyone owning the Intercolonial Railway and losing $250,000 a year on it, would be not only glad to sell it, but would pay people to take it off his hands.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would say to my hon. friend that I believe the Intercolonial Railway can be run to pay all its expenses at least, if not more; but if it is run on political grounds, it cannot.

Mr. GILLMOR. I believe it can be made to pay a great deal better than it does. If the Government will give me the contract of furnishing the oil of the same quality and at the same price, I will give them $2,000 a year for the contract. I know enough about the oil that is used to be able to make that offer. They are tearing this great building there down and selling the fragments. They are rich people in New York, they have got ahead of the population, and we are getting ahead of the population, and are investing millions of dollars a year, all of which must come out of the pockets of those who toil. The money will not come out of the pockets of many of us, for we are not among the toilers; it will not come from Sir Charles Tupper, or Sir Leonard Tilley, or Sir John Macdonald, but from the workingmen of this country. Our exports of fish and lumber and agricultural products are all produced by the toiling masses, whom we are taxing beyond endurance; and I say, as a representative of the people, that we have the right, when any demands of money are made, to know that the public interest really demands the expenditure before we vote it. There is no justification for this expenditure. If the road is 10 or 15 miles shorter, it is only a few minutes saved; and with regard to this arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, I look upon it as one of the most prejudicial that could be made to St. John and St. Andrews, for I believe still that St. Andrews is destined to be a very important place. I do not feel that I am inconsistent in the course I am taking. If I make a bad promise I have always been man enough to keep it, and if I have given a bad vote I am man enough to stick by it. When the policy of subsidising railways was introduced, I believed it was one of the worst we could introduce. I saw in it an engine that could be and would be worked to its fullest extent for political purposes. But it brings its own revenge. The way of the transgressor is hard, and no crime has ever been committed that has not carried with it its own penalty. This money will be thrown away if it is voted. The proper course for us to adopt would be to ascertain first if any considerable distance can be saved, for the only argument that can be urged in favor of this expenditure is the saving of distance between Moncton and Harvey, and that is unknown. In fact the very intimation we have now we had before that subsidy was voted. We knew nothing about it before, and I do hope, for the sake of the people, that before this expenditure is entered into the Government will satisfy themselves that the distance will be shortened enough to justify this line. It will have to be a good deal shorter than it is to justify that expenditure. I have pointed out the facilities which Halifax has now. In regard to Fredericton, why should we consider it at all, as it is well supplied now with railways. There is a railway from Woodstock to Fredericton which will soon be completed. There is on the east side the line running from Rivière du Loup to Fredericton. This bridge would never have been built if it was thought that this line was going to be built. With regard to Moncton, which some hon. gentlemen say ought to be considered, why Moncton has been built up out of the pockets of the people. It is a great railway centre, and anyone who knew Moncton before and knows it now, will know what railways have done for that city. I am sorry to have spoken so long, but I felt that coming from a county with 27,000 people, which has never yet had a cent out of the Dominion Treasury, and I doubt if it ever shall, I say there is now an opportunity to carry out Sir Charles Tupper's promise to build up St. Andrews. There is no certainty in this matter at all. It has been made a football to serve the purposes of the Government, and we are only following the course of the lamentable precedents that the Government have set.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Weldon (St. John):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Ellis,	Platt,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	Préfontaine,
Beausoleil,	Gillmor,	Ste Marie,
Brien,	Holton,	Scriver,
Campbell,	Innes,	Skinner,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Mackenzie,	Somerville,
Casey,	McMullen,	Sutherland,
Charlton,	Mills (Bothwell),	Trow,
Colter,	Mitchell,	Watson,
Davies,	Mulock,	Weldon (St. John),
Doyon,	Paterson (Brant),	Wilson (Elgin).—34.
Edwards,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Montplaisir,
Barnard,	Foster,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Perley,
Boisvert,	Guillet,	Porter,
Bowell,	Haggart,	Prior,
Brown,	Hall,	Putnam,
Bryson,	Hickey,	Riopel,
Burns,	Joncas,	Robillard,
Carling,	Jones (Digby),	Ross,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jones (Halifax),	Small,
Cimon,	Kenny,	Sproule,
Colby,	Labelle,	Taylor,
Curran,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Temple,
Daoust,	La Rivière,	Thompson (Sir John),
Davin,	Laurie,	Tupper,
Davis,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tyrwhitt,
Dawson,	Macdowall,	Wallace,
Denison,	McCulla,	Ward,
Desaulniers,	McDougald (Pictou),	Weldon (Albert),
Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Cardwell),
Dewdney,	McNeill,	Wilmot,
Dickey,	Madill,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dickinson,	Mara,	Wright.—70.
Dupont,		

Amendment negatived.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to offer another amendment, which I hope will receive a better reception than that of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon), though I do not think it deserves any more, inasmuch as I think my hon. friend's amendment should, in the interest of the country, have been carried. However, as the House has now decided that it prefers to construct this road purely in the dark, there is nothing to be said

except this, that the House having decided that it will construct this road from Harvey to Salisbury as a public work, it becomes us to consider what ought to be done in the case of the other lines which no doubt will be desirous, at no distant day, of making use of this public work. It is well known to the House, and particularly to the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Militia, that a road has been constructed from the neighborhood of Quebec, which is known as the Témiscouata road, that by this road the distance from Montreal and Quebec to points in the Maritime Provinces, such as St. John and Halifax, *viâ* Moncton, will be very greatly shortened. By this road the distances from Montreal to Moncton would be as follows:—From Montreal to Rivière du Loup, 288 miles; from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston, 81 miles; from Edmundston to Salisbury, even going round by the River St. John, will not exceed 191 miles; and from Salisbury to Moncton, 33 miles, or a total of 572 miles, as against a distance, even taking the hon. gentleman's own statement, from Montreal to Salisbury and Moncton, of 534 miles. It is, therefore, quite clear that on this road which is now in process of construction we could obtain a line to this identical point which the hon. gentleman desires to reach which, at the outside, would only be some 25 or 30 miles longer than the road which he proposes to construct at such an enormous charge to the public. I desire to call the attention of the House, and the attention of the First Minister, and particularly the attention of the representatives of the Province of Quebec, the Minister of Public Works and his colleague, who ought to be especially interested in promoting the interests of their Province, to the fact that this Témiscouata road goes entirely through Canadian territory. It will bring us, within a very few miles, by as short a route to Moncton as this so-called Short Line Railway, which, as the House knows, passes for a long distance through the State of Maine, through foreign territory. We have had proof within a very short period that the United States are disposed to apply their Inter-State Railway Law very rigorously to Canadian roads. They have already, I am told, or I gather from the reports in the public prints, intimated their intention of interfering with the traffic passing over the Grand Trunk Railway, by reason of its American connections, and I call attention to the fact that the Short Line Railway, as it passes for a considerable portion of its distance through the State of Maine, is absolutely and entirely at the control of the United States Government and subject to their law. That being so, I say that, if the Government, in opposition to our protests, will rush blindly into the construction of this road as a public work, they are bound, in all honor and conscience, to see that roads which are almost as short, which, in point of fact, I believe will be quite as short, and which will pass altogether through Canadian territory, should be allowed to have full running powers over this road which is to be built at the public cost. I propose to test the sense of the House on this question. I say it will be an outrage if you give to a road which goes through American territory, powers which you deny to a road going through Canadian territory alone; and I say further, that the interests of the Province of New Brunswick will be better served by the extension of this Témiscouata line which already goes from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston, and there, as I understand, is in connection with the New Brunswick lines, by enabling that road to go to Moncton. But if the Government are determined to put this road from Harvey to Salisbury or Moncton, then I say, they are bound, in all honor and conscience, to allow full running powers over this road to the Témiscouata railway, which is already constructed for a great portion of the way, and which may be, under certain conditions, a most valuable thing in the interests of all Canada. I repeat, that the Government will be false to their own policy, and will injure very greatly the future interests of this country, if they hand over to a line which goes through the State of Maine, and which will be under the control of the United States, exclusive running powers over this road. Therefore, as I do not wish to detain the House longer at this stage, and as the point I desire to make, is one which I think ought to be perfectly plain to every member of this House, and should commend itself to every member of this House, I shall, without further preface, move:

That this report be not now received, but that it be declared, that inasmuch as the Témiscouata Railroad has already been constructed entirely through Canadian territory, from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston, on the River St. John, and inasmuch as the distance from Montreal to Moncton is thereby capable of being greatly reduced, and cannot, in any event, be more than a few miles in excess of the distance by the so-called Short Line Railway, across the State of Maine, and whereas it is now proposed to construct a line from Harvey to Salisbury, entirely at the public expense, it is expedient that the said Témiscouata Railway should be granted full running powers over the said line from Harvey to Salisbury.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is very unfortunate that the House should be called upon to discuss this question at this late hour. If the First Minister had made up his mind early in the Session to bring this question before the House, I have not the slightest doubt that a more extended discussion would have taken place upon this iniquitous Bill than upon any Bill that has been brought before the House this Session. When you consider the additions that have been built for the Intercolonial Railway, and the promises that have been made from time to time by Sir Charles Tupper, and when we come to consider the enormous amounts of money that the country has got to give to fulfil those promises, it is earnestly to be hoped that should an election come on in the course of a year or two, if that hon. gentleman is in London he will be left there. It is quite apparent to every man in this House, and it is well known throughout the country, that every time an election comes on, and that he goes to the Maritime Provinces, he makes extravagant promises that Parliament has afterwards to carry out, and solely and only in the interest of the followers of the hon. gentleman opposite. Now, Sir, we are quite aware that early in the history of this undertaking, his following in the Province of Nova Scotia were promised the Pictou branch. We know under what circumstances that branch was promised. We know who represents the county. We can look back upon the first election, and we can remember what a small majority the hon. gentleman had. We can remember that the next time he ran for that constituency, he had a largely increased majority, and when he goes back the third time, he is elected by acclamation, solely because the people of this country has spent in the construction of that branch $535,000, and that money has been spent for the purpose of electing that hon. gentleman to Parliament. Then we have still a considerable amount of money to spend before that branch is completed—about a hundred thousand, I fancy, from the information given to Parliament, will be required before the Pictou branch is completed. Then we have the extravagant New Glasgow line. That is another line that is virtually doubling the Intercolonial Railway. The High Commissioner, in order to make sure not only his own seat, but the seat of the member for Colchester (Mr. Archibald) and the seat of the member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), made up his mind that it would be desirable to build another branch and another short line. These short lines are very numerous in the Maritime Provinces. They are all called short lines when they are started, but when we have got them completed they are as long as the old lines. The New Glasgow line was to be 45 miles shorter, and we find when it is finished that it is not 45, that it is not even 5 miles shorter, that it is about as long as the old line. Now, this line we are called upon to build is to be a great many miles shorter. The First Minister stated, I believe, that it is supposed to be 20 or 25 miles

shorter. The probabilities are that if it turns out in the same way that the other short lines have turned out, when it is built, if ever it is built, it may be a mile or a mile and a half shorter, and the country will be called upon to expend three or four millions of money for the purpose of producing a line, not because it is a necessity, not because trade requires it, not because there is a new section of the country, a valuable agricultural section, to be developed, but simply because the High Commissioner, on some occasion, made a promise to the city of Halifax that that particular road would be built, and that the Government were going to carry through the construction of that line; and in order to implement all these promises that he had made when he was on these election tours, the Government are now bringing down to the House a measure, in the dying hours of this Session, to pass through this House, in order to produce a line in fulfilment of the promise that was made by the High Commissioner. Now, I find that the First Minister has got into a dilemma over the construction of this line. In the first place, the city of Halifax sent here a junior member (Mr. Kenny) and a senior member (Mr. Jones). The junior member supports the First Minister, and brings all the influence he can in favor of the Government to help them produce this line, and we find this time that the senior member has gone with him. I am exceedingly sorry. We have, at least in that case, one illustration of the tail wagging the dog.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is the dog?

Mr. McMULLEN. I am sorry to think that my hon. friend who sits in front of me (Mr. Jones) should have deserted his party for the sake of getting a line. I think that we should have evidence of the necessity of this line if we are going to build it at all. Now, I wish to draw the attention of the House to some facts. In the first place, there is no certainty whatever as to what the road is going to cost There has been no survey, no careful investigation made, and no estimate made as to what the road will eventually cost when it is completed. Then, again, there is no certainty as to what the length of the road is going to be. In the third place, there is no evidence before this House to show that this road is a necessity. The Intercolonial Railway is able to do all the work. There is no evidence that that road is overburdened with traffic at the present moment—not the slightest. The only reason, and the sole peg upon which the whole thing hangs, is that Sir Charles Tupper made a promise, and that promise has got to be implemented. Well, Sir, I do most sincerely regret that the followers of the First Minister from the Province of Ontario and from the west, have got to swallow this most abominable and ridiculous contract, for it is nothing else. I cannot tell how it is that the First Minister has made up his mind that they shall follow him from time to time through political mire of this kind. I do not think there is another man in this Dominion that could get a following that would stick by him from time to time through every job such as this. We have heard a statement from the hon. gentleman quoted that he would not give a farthing for a man that would support him only when he was right, but he wants a man that will support him whether he is right or wrong, and he appears to have a great many of them. I do not think he has taken a very just way of getting rid of his kickers on this occasion, because I am satisfied that some were disposed to kick against this job. But in order to get rid of them he has sent his whip to work—and I am sorry to think that our whip has consented—and a great many men that might have recorded their vote against the First Minister have been paired off and paid in full, and he has sent them home. Now, I cannot understand how the First Minister has undertaken to do that. I cannot understand how he has a right to send an order to the accountant of this House, and that a man should receive his money in full and go off home in order to escape voting upon an important question of this kind.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. That man can go to his constituents and say, Well, I happened to be away from the House at the time that question came up, and I did not vote upon it. I fancy that has been the reason why a great many members are not here. But I say this question deserves the serious consideration of all the representatives that are left. It is an unfortunate thing that the First Minister should persist in pressing upon this House a question of this kind. He has enjoyed the confidence of this country for a great many years; he has had an unswerving following of men who have stuck to him through thick and thin, and it does look as if he was going to lead them into the mire up to the neck, and over head, before he leaves them. This is one of the jobs that I consider the most abominable, and the most corrupt, and the most unnecessary that have been brought before this House this Session. I know very well, at least public report has it, that there has been a great deal of dissension among the hon. gentleman's followers in regard to this particular line. I have not the slightest doubt that there have been revolts, but still I suppose he will keep them all right. An election will come on in a year or two, and he wants to get two members from the city of Halifax, and two from the city of St. John. He goes to the St. John's people, and, in a sly way, says to them, Now, you fellows keep quiet, don't say a word. I am going to lead these Halifax fellows to understand that I am going to build this line, but I will not do it. He will go to Halifax and tell them, Now, you support us, and we will produce that line. I am making these fellows from St. John believe that they are going to get the road, but, of course, Halifax will get the start of them. We only tell them this in order to keep them quiet. In that way he tries to get supporters from both cities. He has both members from Halifax now. He has got the junior member supporting the Government and the senior member opposing the Government. It appears to me that down in the east a great many people are disposed just to go in whatever way the tide runs, and they are disposed to support the Government if they think they are going to get anything. It appears that is the case in Halifax; it appears that is the case in St. John. We have seen one man from there who has continually supported the Government, with very few exceptions. In this case he has gone against them. I suppose he was afraid he would get skinned when he went home, and that is the reason he does not go the way he usually goes. I am sorry that in the dying hours of this Session this question should have been brought forward. I have summed up the number of expenditures promised by Sir Charles Tupper one way or the other, and I find there was the Pictou Branch, costing $535,000; the Oxford and New Glasgow, $1,150,000, virtually a duplication of the Intercolonial Railway; the St. Charles Branch, costing about $2,000,000, although first estimated at about $500,000, and I believe all the items are not yet paid. Then there is the proposed road which this Parliament is asked to undertake, which will cost, including the bridge, about $4,000,000. These sums make a total of about $8,450,000 necessary to implement the promises of Sir Charles Tupper during the two last general elections. This is the most iniquitous scheme, and it reflects upon the integrity of the First Minister himself. When we consider the financial position of the country, and that our annual expenditure next year will be up to $40,000,000 for 5,000,000 of people, when we consider that we shall have added $100,000,000 to the public debt during the last 10 years, the people will cry a halt if their repre-

sentatives fail to do so. In the face of the present financial embarrassment of the country, and the embarrassment of the people, the stringent and unsatisfactory condition of business generally, it is an outrage upon the people to ask Parliament to expend $4,000,000 to build a wild-goose road of this kind, a road not wanted, a road built simply for election purposes, and which, when built, will be another monument of the folly and absurdity of constructing lines of this kind, not because they are wanted, but, because for political purposes, it is necessary to bring people into line, and secure political support. I hope the day is not far distant, when the people will open their eyes, and whoever is to rule them, whether Grit or Tory, I hope they will set their foot upon such transactions as this, and show their disapproval and disgust of any party which will submit such a proposal which tends to bring ruin and poverty on the country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Much as it is to be regretted that the country should be committed by the vote given to-day to an expenditure of $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 for the construction of a road which seems to me to be quite unnecessary, still it becomes our duty, now that the House has committed itself to the expenditure of the money, to see that no monopoly is given to any one company of running powers over the road. The interests of Moncton and Halifax and all the intervening country between those two points, demand that the road to be constructed with Government money at the Government's expense, between Moncton and Harvey, shall be a road which ought to be capable of being utilised by all the lines converging towards Harvey. The Témiscouata line is one of these, and it may bring a large quantity of traffic towards Moncton and Halifax. It is a monstrous proposition that, having built this road at the country's expense, we should lease it exclusively to the Canadian Pacific Railway and prevent the Grand Trunk or Témiscouata road from having running powers over it. As an eastern Province man, and in the interests of Halifax, Moncton and the country generally, I shall support the motion of my hon. friend. The fact that the Short Line, so-called, runs partly through a foreign country is another very powerful reason why we should vote in favor of granting running powers to the Témiscouta road. We do not know what effect the inter-state regulations may have upon the traffic in that part of the road running through the State of Maine; those regulations may prove in the long run to be very prejudicial and hinder freight traffic over the road. It is in the general interests of the country that exclusive running powers should not be given to a line running through a foreign state. This line mentioned in the motion, which runs entirely through Canadian territory, should, in all fairness and justice, have equal powers with a line running through the State of Maine. For these reasons I shall support the motion.

Mr. SKINNER. This resolution is directly in the interests of Halifax and against the interests of St. John. If this road is to be built, it will be built for the purpose of taking traffic and business away from St. John, and, in our interest, the fewer companies that obtain running powers over it the better, and I shall, therefore, oppose the resolution. During the recent Session of the Local Legislature in New Brunswick, a company was incorporated with the view of extending the Témiscouata road from Edmundston, the point at which the road debouches into the valley of the St. John, near Fredericton, and passes into the valley of the St. John. Knowing the railway will be sufficiently short to give the Témiscouata Railway, and any other railway that desires to reach deep water, all the advantages they want, it will be in our interest—and I shall vote that way—to do so, in order that they may come to St. John. Passengers can join the Intercolonial Railway to all eastern points that can be reached by any railway now constructed. The proposition is, therefore, to my mind, making worse a bad job, so far as St. John is concerned. When the short line is being pushed forward ostensibly and really for the purpose of preventing traffic reaching deep water or the sea at the most convenient place, surely it is in our interest that other companies should not have running powers over this road.

Mr. MITCHELL. I was a little surprised at the speech of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner), and the ground he took on this question. He discussed it purely on personal grounds as regards St. John. We have heard altogether too much of Halifax and St. John, and we should deal with these questions on public grounds and in the interests of the country. I should like to ask the First Minister a question, and on his answer it will depend whether I shall support or oppose the amendment. I will explain to him before I ask the question what my motives are for asking. I feel, and particularly at this stage of the Session, that we should not unnecessarily embarrass the Government in carrying through a measure. My hon. friend from Norfolk beside me laughs and says "hear, hear." I am honest about this thing. He may be a partisan and support his party whether they are right or wrong, but I do not propose to do that in such an important vote as this. I want to know from the Administration whether or not, under the agreement made with the Canadian Pacific Railway, they are bound to give them the exclusive right on that road, and whether, if this amendment should carry, it would interfere with the Government in carrying out their policy? If this thing was an open question and that there was no arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, I want to say that the Grand Trunk Railway or the Témiscouata Railway have just as much right to running powers over a road built by the Government as the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other company. Inasmuch as the Canadian Pacific Railway have entered into an arrangement with the Government to carry out their policy, which I do not approve of, I believe that no good can be served by passing this amendment, which must embarrass them, if they are in such a position under their contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway that they could not accept the amendment. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman to state if this amendment will interfere with the arrangement he has made with the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the first place I do not see the sense of this amendment as to the Témiscouata road, which cannot touch any portion of the road from Harvey to Salisbury——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh, yes, it will.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it will not. It stops at Edmundston.

Mr. MITCHELL. A local charter in New Brunswick has been granted to the Témiscouata road from Edmundston down in that direction.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That I am not aware of, but I do not see how that can be. It cannot be a hybrid road; it cannot be a provincial railway and a Dominion railway at the same time. It cannot be the same company.

Mr. SKINNER. It is not the same company, but it is in the interests of this company.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That may be. It depends altogether on the meaning attached to the words "running powers." If all railways are to have the same running powers over this country, how is it to be kept up? It must be kept up by the Government, and, therefore, a toll levied on the different railways that go over it. Under no arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, or with any other railway, will there be a prevention of the inter-

change of traffic as is provided under the general Railway Act.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is the point I wished to get at. It is evident, from the arrangement made, that the Government cannot accept this amendment, and allow any number of roads to have running powers over a road they have ceased to have connection with. I feel that to vote for this amendment is to embarrass the Government, and I have too much interest in the Government of this country to embarrass it for the mere sake of embarrassing it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Government ought not bind themselves down to prevent giving running powers to other companies. I regard it in the interest of the Maritime Provinces generally, and that whatever roads may be constructed there, they should have running powers under proper arrangements. With regard to the observations which fell from my hon. friend behind me, as to the lateness of the Session and the number of members absent, I think he made a statement which should call for general investigation. I do not pretend to be sufficiently familiar with the manner in which the payments to members have been made, but there is a law, I believe, under which members can only receive their indemnity. It has been stated that by arrangement with the leader of the Government, members can receive their full pay some days or weeks in advance of the close of the Session, if they get a pair. I do not mean to say they were induced in a proper sense to leave, but if they get their full subsidy they are anxious to return home. I do not think such arrangement should be made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is contrary to law.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It appears to me that the system is very improper, and that it should be put an end to in future.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. The agreement made between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway states that the Canadian Pacific Railway will pay so much a year for the use of the road after 20 years, and they are to keep it in repair and in proper working order. I do not think it would be proper to allow any other railway to use that road without some condition that they should pay their proportion of the maintenance of the road. If the hon member for Oxford would add to his amendment that the running powers should be granted to any other railroad having connection with this line on the same terms as the Canadian Pacific Railway, I think it would meet with the approval of more hon. gentlemen than at present.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no objection to that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. There have been many useless expenditures of public money by this Government, but I think, of all the motions I remember ever coming before the House, there never was one which was more thoroughly bad than the one we are now considering. We have decided to build a road that has been shown to be of no use; a road that there was no need for, and a road that is not going to be of any advantage to the company which will use it, or to the country at large which has to pay for it; a road that no argument can be brought forward for the building of; and, Sir, in order to accomplish that the country is to be involved in a large expenditure of money, which we are told, on the best authority, will amount to at least $4,000,000, and it may be a great deal more. We were told that this was intended as a short line. We do not know whether it is going to be a shorter or a longer line until it is finished. But we are committed to it by the resolution passed in the House to-day; and having decided that the work shall be done, the part of wisdom, the duty we owe to the country, imperatively demands that now that the mischief has been done, we shall carry it out with the least possible damage to the country. Sir, I need not tell this House that the money to be expended in building that road is only a part of the cost which it is going to be to the country. We are running the Intercolonial Railway every year at an increasing loss to the country, and the road we are now deciding to build is just going to further reduce the earnings of the Intercolonial, and entail a further loss to the country. That could be met, and met very easily by giving another company running powers over this line. It would materially reduce the expense of keeping it up, because whatever line is given running powers over the road, must necessarily have to bear the expense of keeping it in order. Some may say that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are bound to keep it up; but they are not going to keep it up at a loss, you may depend on that. They may agree to do it, but it is only a question of time, perhaps of two or three years, when they will come down to this House and declare that they cannot keep it running, and there is no reason why they should keep it in running order when they have another line that will do as well. This road, is in fact, of no use to the country; it does not save time or serve any public interest whatever. It would be the part of wisdom to give running powers to the Témiscouata Railway or any other that asked for the privilege, and thereby reduce the future expenses to the country. There is another consideration. I understand that the Grand Trunk Company virtually own the Témiscouata Railway, that in fact it is being built with their money and in their interest. Now, I submit that if there is any road in the country that is entitled to consideration at the hands of the Parliament of Canada, it is the Grand Trunk Railway. We all know that that road was built at a time before the science of building railroads was brought to its present perfection, and that it cost nearly three times as much as it would cost to-day. It is loaded down with debt, and one enterprise after another like the Rivière du Loup road, was tacked on to it when it sought to get Bills through this House, until the company stagger under their load. Now, I think it is fair for them to ask this House that they who have borne the burden and heat of the day should have running powers over this line. But the Government have been so short sighted that they have made no arrangements to give that or any other railway such running powers. They have agreed to build the road at an enormous cost, and after a few years, they will find that they will have to keep it up; and yet they give another company power to use the dog-in-the-manger policy, and of refusing to another company power to use it while it is of no use to themselves. Then, Sir, you are aware that the road which is going to have the exclusive use of this road runs for a long distance through the United States. It is within the recollection of every hon. gentleman in this House that when we objected to the monopoly in Manitoba, we were accused of wanting to divert the traffic into the United States, when it was only going to pass through a small portion of it and cross again into Canadian territory. But what have the Government done? They have built the Intercolonial Railway at an immense cost to the country, and saddled an annually increasing loss on the country for all time to come; then they have subsidised a road through an alien country to take away the traffic from that road. Now, it has been pointed out that the doctrine of inter-state traffic has been very much agitated in the United States, and we do not know in what year or what month the traffic may be stopped on this very road, and then of what use will it be to us? I regret that we have done a deed to-day which we ought not to have done; but having done it, we ought to be in a position to make the best of the bargain we possibly can.

Mr. CASEY. All the argument on this matter is on one side. Not only are all the reasons on one side, but all the discussion is on one side. The Government feel the weakness of their position to such an extent that they do not attempt to defend the course they are taking. The only defence I have heard was the mistaken statement by the Premier that the railway to which this motion refers would not touch the road which the Government are proposing to build. But since he has been informed that there is a probability of its touching that road in the near future, the last shadow of defence of the Government's refusal to accept this resolution has disappeared. In 1884, when Sir Charles Tupper was asking this House to vote a subsidy for the Short Line road, it was distinctly a part of his argument that it would not be an outlet for one road merely, but an outlet for both the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway. The idea had not entered his head at that time of making a link in that chain the exclusive property of one company. That idea was reserved for the Administration, as at present constituted, to discover. In fact, it is perhaps saying too much to say that they discovered it, or that they had any volition at all in taking this course. It is evidently a waste of time to address them on this subject. It is never worth while to deal with subordinates in a matter of this kind. If we could address our arguments to Mr. Van Horne, or to some other official men connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway, there might be some hope of convincing them that they would lose nothing, and the country would gain a good deal by allowing free use of this road, which is being built at the Government's expense, to different railways. My hon. friends, who have wasted a good deal of time arguing this question, seemed to forget that the gentlemen who sit opposite are merely the political department of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is really the Canadian Pacific Railway which governs. This is a conclusive proof that these hon. gentlemen are mere trustees for that railway of the political power of the country, as other gentlemen may be trustees for their bonds, or land grant. It is waste of time to argue with them as to whether they should obey the orders of their masters or not. They must carry out the behests of the company, and the only advantage to be gained by laying our arguments before the House lies in the hope that they may go before the country, whose electors are the ultimate masters both of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government. There is some chance that they may, if they are fully awakened to the enormity of what is being done, take the reins into their hands and dispose both of master and servant through the elective power which they control. To show how clearly this is a matter arranged by the Canadian Pacific Railway and forced upon the Government, it is only necessary to remember that no notice was given of such a policy as this when the House met, or even when the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill was under discussion. It was quietly arranged in secret between the parties; and after the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill passed, after the Government had refused to insert a proviso in that Bill compelling the Canadian Pacific Railway to carry out what was understood to be their agreement in regard to this road, then, like a thunderbolt out of the blue, the Government brought down this extraordinary policy and proposed to force it through, as no doubt they will, at the end of the Session. But how their supporters, who are not individually controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway—their supporters especially from the Province of Quebec who are interested in the Témiscouata Railway—can refuse to make this modification of the terms of the bargain, I cannot conceive. I cannot conceive at least how, after having giving such a vote, they can go back and explain it to their constituents. The Témiscouata Railway is not only a Canadian road entirely in Canadian territory, but is the only outlet for railways, independent of the Canadian Pacific Railway, towards the east to connect with this short line. How the people of the Province, and especially the district of Quebec, can justify the refusal to give that road running powers over the Queen's highway on rails, I cannot imagine. The hon. gentleman knows the Government have decided to give no reasons. As a Cabinet, they are adopting a course which is being individually followed by the right hon. the First Minister, of resting their heads on their hands and quietly waiting for the end of the discussion. This will work very well in the House, but when hon. gentlemen opposite come to explain to the people of Quebec in the first place, and the people of the Dominion in the second place, they will find this is not such a simple matter as they think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Add the words "on same terms."

Amendment negatived on a division.

Resolution concurred in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 149) to provide for the building and working of a line of railway from Harvey to Salisbury or Moncton, in the Province of New Brunswick.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I beg to move second reading of the Bill.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Government have laid on the Table their arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Will the hon. gentleman explain what these renewals touching the freight traffic implies?

Mr. SHANLY. Is that draft of the contract now before the House for ratification?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. SHANLY. It should certainly be printed and distributed before the House is called on to ratify it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly. At the same time, as we are dealing with this subject, we ought to have a little understanding as to what the Government proposes. I will pass over the contract to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SHANLY. This contract would have to be read line by line in order that a railway man would feel competent to pass an opinion on it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend has shown in the clearest possible way, the extreme impropriety of calling on us to consider this Bill or contract the very day before the Government proposes to prorogue the House. I think we ought to have had that printed. I think this whole discussion ought to have been brought on at least a week ago, and I agree with the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) that the agreement should have been printed and in our hands, to allow us properly to understand it. If a man of his experience in railway matters would require a day or two to consider the document, how long would it take an average member of Parliament to understand it, that is, if the average member of Parliament desired to understand it. I should like to know what that particular clause means.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is simply an empowering Act to enable the Government to build this line, and contains a vote of money to enable the Government to commence the work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that, but here we have a contract, formally entered into by the Right

Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, Minister of Railways, representing the one part, and Mr. Van Horne, representing the other, and that is part of the proposition now before the House. Does the hon. gentleman propose to have this agreement affirmed by the House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Bill says nothing about that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This agreement has been produced and laid on the Table. We find an agreement between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway which largely affects, and ought largely to affect, this very matter which we are considering in Committee. The paragraph to which I refer is as follows:—

"On all freight traffic, except coal and iron, produced on the Intercolonial Railway east of Moncton, carried between points west of the State of Maine and Intercolonial Railway points east of Moncton, either way, the Intercolonial Railway shall be entitled to Halifax divisions of rates, which divisions shall be based on a constructive distance equal to the distance from Moncton to Halifax plus 15 per cent., and on such constructive distance and the actual distance carried by the lessees, the through rate shall be pro-rated; provided that in no case shall the Intercolonial Railway be entitled to a proportion of the through rate exceeding its local tariff rate for the time being for the portion of the line over which such freight shall be carried."

I understand that the only limitation is that, if the rate for the 300 or 400 miles from Halifax to Harvey be found to be not in excess of the charge made for the 113 miles, the Intercolonial Railway must content itself with taking the whole. That appears to be the meaning, but it is wrapped up in so much verbiage that no one who is not a railway man can possibly understand it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When the House is asked to ratify the agreement, that can be explained, but it is not a portion of this measure, and it is just wasting time to discuss it now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think so. The agreement is made. We are to build this road for no purpose except to get the Canadian Pacific Railway to take charge of it, and these are the terms on which they agree to take charge of it. The Government repudiate any idea of running it themselves. They say they propose to lease it, after 20 years, for $70,000 a year, and we find here the terms of this agreement which are part of the bargain.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a provision that that lease is subject to the ratification of Parliament and of the company as well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The company, by their chief officer, have signed it.

Mr. SHANLY. If I understand this matter of ratification, suppose the agreement is not ratified this Session—and I do not see how it can be, if we make the printing of it an indispensable preliminary, as I think it should be—the contract will remain open for discussion next Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. SHANLY. I thought my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) felt rather inclined to force either ratification or rejection.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; I wanted to know something as to the sort of bargain which was being made. Everyone knows that, if steps are taken on the faith of a bargain which has been laid before Parliament, it would be pleaded to us that, if we had objections, they were not taken when the bargain was laid on the Table, and that, therefore, the Government and the company were justified in proceeding on the assumption that no objection would be taken. That is the argument with which we will undoubtedly be met next Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; you will not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; I have seen that time and again. I am well aware of the strategy which is adopted on these occasions, and I think there would be something in the contention if we did not now call attention to it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I cannot see the clause in the agreement which makes it subject to the approval of Parliament or to the approval of the company. I would ask the First Minister what course the Government propose to adopt as to the construction of the road, whether they are going on at once energetically, or, as it has been reported, whether they only intend to survey the line at present?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The intention of the Government is, as soon as they are empowered to do so and have this Bill passed, to have accurate surveys made by competent surveyors, to have location surveys to show the best line between the two points, Harvey and Salisbury or Moncton. We must have that first, and then we will decide on the best and shortest line.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Does the Government propose to build the road or to give it to a contractor?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course the Government will not build it by day's work, but by contract.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Does the Government propose to hand it over to a company or to a contractor to build it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will do what is considered most advisable, but at present, under this Bill, all that we can do is to survey the road and to ask for tenders to build the road or a portion of it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As I understand the agreement and the Bill taken together, this agreement is not operative unless Parliament places the necessary moneys at the disposal of the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But, when the road is built, this agreement may be enforced by the company as a right.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes; as soon as the money is voted, and the road built, the agreement becomes operative.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the money is voted to build the line, that is a lease of the road after it is built. That lease has nothing to do with the building of the road. The hon. gentleman knows that principle is laid down in the case of the contract for carrying the mails between France and England.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I mean to say that this agreement does not require the sanction of Parliament—the agreement between the Government and the company when the road was built. I do not see any provision in the agreement that the sanction of Parliament is necessary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have no power to release Government property without the consent of Parliament.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The statement of the hon. gentleman that they propose to take a complete survey, is what might have been expected. I would ask whether, as soon as the survey is completed, they will then proceed with the construction of the road.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is an after consideration. We cannot do very much with $500,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This agreement is little more than the hon. gentleman stated, a lease from the Government to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Parliament is now actively

engaged in ratifying this agreement in part. This agreement is a consent whereby the Government convenants with the Canadian Pacific Railway that they will construct the road between certain points, of a certain class. The Government have laid that agreement before Parliament, and are now asking Parliament to enable them to carry that out.

Mr. SHANLY. I agree with the hon. member for South Oxford that it is very important that there should be some expression of opinion put on record now as regards this agreement. I have not read the document; I have not had time to read it. I supposed, of course, that if the matter was to come before the House for ratification, it would be placed before us in printed form. I must say that I am greatly surprised, more particularly with the observations that have fallen just now from the hon. member from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who is a legal gentleman. I did not think so much of what the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) said, because I believe he is not a lawyer; but when so high a legal authority as the hon. member for Bothwell takes exception to the contract itself as not providing for ratification, and as being operative without ratification, I think it is a very serious matter. I am opposed to any contract being made without due consideration. I am so much opposed to it that I was prepared just now to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford, had it come to a vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The first clause of the document says that the agreement is made subject to the approval of Parliament.

Mr. SHANLY. That is quite satisfactory.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All that shows that this document ought to have been printed and put in our hands. It is almost impossible for the members, with the multiplicity of affairs on their hands, to read this long document with anything like care. I do not think the House was well treated in that one or two copies only were laid on the Table. Here is a gentleman interested in every way in these matters, the member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) who never saw this document until I sent it across the Table for him. It ought to have been printed and discussed at least a week ago, when the members were all here. The hon. gentleman heard the statement made by a member of this House a few minutes ago, that many days before the Session was over, members had been permitted to go, as he stated—I do not state it, because I do not know—on the authority of the Prime Minister. If that be the case, I think the attention of the House ought to be called to that irregularity. The consequence is that now we are discussing one of the most important questions that have been before Parliament this Session, with a bare moiety of the members here.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to that I would only say that in this instance the practice has been carried out that has existed for years, namely, that a few days before Parliament closes when the members are obliged to go away, they pair on both sides; and, in this case, the accountant was told that, so far as we were concerned, there would be no objection. If the hon. gentleman will look over the accounts in the accountant's office, he will find that that practice has existed for years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not under the circumstances that prevail this year. A declaration was sent round, after it was understood across the floor that the business of the House was practically closed, that at any rate no new business would be brought down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh, yes. That was generally understood to take place only within a couple of days before actual prorogation. Now, I understand in this case it has been weeks, ten days, before we were prepared to prorogue. There is a vast difference between the two cases.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, the two things are quite separate. When the announcement is made like the one I made yesterday, that the House would prorogue on Wednesday, if public business permitted, then the accountant issues to every member a declaration to sign. Morever, if a few days, a week or so, before the House is prorogued, any members are obliged to go away, if they can get pairs, they have always been allowed to do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), ever used his position as leader of the House and leader of the Government to allow that practice to exist during his term of office. If it was done, I think it will be found to have been done without his consent or direction.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). It did exist.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would tell the right hon. gentleman, a statement made to me very recently. I was told that an hon. gentleman, who had business calling him away, went to the accountant and said that he desired to do as others had done, and he was told, forsooth, that he could not be allowed to go unless he obtained a pair, and, as I am informed, the certificate of the First Minister that it was all right.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will tell the hon. gentleman that it is true that members were required to pair. Supposing the other practice had prevailed, and I had with a desire to swell the majority given leave to any of the hon. gentlemen opposite to go without taking pairs with them, what would have been said?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am sure you would not do so.

Mr. LABELLE. I suppose no one doubts that I am a supporter of the Government. I went to Mr. Brewer and asked him to give me my pay so that I might go home as I had business to attend to. Mr. Brewer refused, and said I could not get my pay unless I had paired with someone on the other side of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That was so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is quite evident that the whole of these proceedings have been entirely irregular and contrary to the statute. A practice has grown up that after the Government had announced that no new business would be introduced the accountant paid the members on the certificate of the Speaker.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But this practice of getting a certificate is a new one. We know as a matter of fact that the most important business of the Session has been transacted during the last two days and we have merely a rump Parliament. It is hardly fair to those who remain.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 148) to authorise the granting of subsidies in aid of the contruction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.—(Sir John A Macdonald).

(In the Committee).

On section 3,

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I look upon that as being a very curious kind of provision to introduce into this Act. In

1886, a clause was introduced into the Railway Subsidies Act giving the Governor in Council power to incorporate a certain railway therein named. That seemed to me to be a most extraordinary provision, and if I had been in the House at the time, I would have opposed it. This clause, which was introduced for the first time last year, gives the Governor in Council much more extended powers than even the clause to which I refer in the Act of 1886, in point of fact it gives power to incorporate any of the railway companies mentioned in these resolutions and to confer upon them powers which they do not at present possess. It seems to me that this is a pernicious principle to adopt. I think that all these railway companies seeking more extended powers than those they already possess ought to go through the form of appealing to Parliament in the ordinary way to obtain the amendments to their charter which they desire.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This seems to me a very objectionable clause as it stands. If we have the system of free incorporation of railways, there would be no objection to the Government having this clause, but we have never recognised any such rule here. If this proposal were carried out, Parliament would have no information of what the terms or conditions of a road subsidised by the Government are to be, or what is to be the character of the road, and our General Railway Act makes no provision for the construction of the railway in this respect. I believe that the right to charter these roads should be left in the hands of Parliament.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is not a new clause and the object of it is that, whereas in this case the money is voted, and on the strength of the subsidy parties form themselves into a syndicate to build the road, they can come to the Governor General in Council and get a charter which shall have the effect of a charter granted by Parliament. If some provision of this kind were not made, great delay would occur in the construction of roads, as the parties would have to wait until the next Session of Parliament. This provision was in the previous Bill, and I do not see that any harm is done by it.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). It appears for the first time in the Act of 1887. If we are to adopt the principle that railways must apply to Parliament and must give notice to apply for an Act of incorporation, it seems to me that it is improper that any railway company should be incorporated by Order in Council. If the principle be adopted that the Governor in Council may incorporate a railway company, then I think it should apply to all railway companies. For my own part, I am thoroughly opposed to this principle. Let every railway be incorporated by Order in Council or let none be incorporated by Order in Council. If the railways are enterprises of public importance, as I suppose the Government must be persuaded they are, surely the persons undertaking them can apply to Parliament and have corporate powers conferred upon them by this Parliament. I protest against such powers as this Act assumes for the Governor in Council, unless they are conferred in regard to the incorporation of all railways.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the right hon. gentleman should strike that clause out. If a company is formed they can make surveys while they are waiting to come to this Parliament for incorporation, and they then would be able to give information as to the character of the road and they would make substantial progress in the meantime. This principle is an objectionable one unless the Government is prepard to go so far as they do in those countries where there is free incorporation of railways.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will have that clause struck out.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The discussions that have arisen in the last few moments show the extreme inconvenience of asking us to pass a Bill which has not been printed. There are a good many things in this Bill which do not appear in the resolutions. I cannot call it anything else than a scandalous thing that we should be called upon to pass a Bill of this kind that we have never seen.

Committee rose and reported, and, it being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved third reading of the Bill.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I move:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee, with instructions to amend the second section by providing that the bonds therein named shall be a first lien or charge on the said railway, and shall have priority over all other bonds issued by the said company.

I wish to apply to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company the same principle which the Government have applied to the Fredericton Bridge Company and the Dominion Bridge Company, that the bonds of the Government should be a first lien over the general bonds of the Company.

House divided on amendment:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Doyon,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),
Beausoleil,	Gillmor,	Préfontaine,
Brien,	Holton,	Ste. Marie,
Campbell,	Innes,	Scriver,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Jones (Halifax),	Somerville,
Casey,	Lovitt,	Trow,
Charlton,	McMullen,	Weldon (St. John),
Colter,	Mitchell,	Wilson (Elgin).—27.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Dickinson,	Montplaisir,
Barnard,	Dupont,	Porter,
Boisvert,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Putnam,
Bowell,	Foster,	Ross,
Brown,	Guillet,	Shanly,
Burns,	Haggart,	Skinner,
Carling,	Hall,	Small,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Hickey,	Taylor,
Cimon,	Jones (Digby),	Temple,
Curran,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Tupper,
Daoust,	LaRivière,	Tyrwhitt,
Davis,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace,
Dawson,	Macdowall,	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers,	McCulla,	White (Renfrew),
Dewdney,	Madill,	Wilmot,
Dickey,	Mara,	Wood (Westm'l'd).—48.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) did not vote.

Mr. EDWARDS. I was paired, or otherwise I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. GORDON. I paired with the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland).

Mr. WARD. I was paired with the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards).

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am paired with the hon. member for Albert, N.B. (Mr. Weldon), or if not, I would have voted for the amendment.

Bill read the third time and passed.

MONTREAL FLOOD COMMISSION.

Mr. CURRAN moved, That that part of the Report of the Printing Committee presented to the House this afternoon relating to the Flood Commission be referred back to the said Committee for the purpose of reconsidering their decision with reference to the printing of the same.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That matter was discussed in the Printing Committee, and it was decided, with only one dissenting voice, not to print the report. It was considered a purely local matter pertaining to the city of Montreal, and the fact that the corporation of Montreal was willing to pay $500 for extra copies of the report confirmed the Committee in that opinion.

Mr. CURRAN. A similar motion was carried in the Senate this afternoon. The Commission was not at all a local matter because it concerned all the constituencies around the Island of Montreal and on both shores.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this in order?

Mr. TROW. No matter was more thoroughly discussed than that in the Committee. The Committee have dispersed, and many of its members have left for their homes, so that if referred back to the Committee a quorum could not be got together to consider it. It is a very expensive document; there are plans and surveys connected with it, and the printing of it would cost a great deal.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was the universal opinion of the Committee that the report should not be printed, and unless the House wants to squander $2,000 or $3,000 without any practical value being obtained in exchange they will not pass this motion.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. It is not at all a local matter. It interests eight or ten counties, some of the most important counties of the whole Province. Three men were appointed—one by the Government, one by the Montreal Corporation, and the other by the Harbor Commission of Montreal, and each body bore one-third of the expense. If the Committee had been better informed, they would have been unanimous to print the report instead of unanimously not to print it. I hope the Committee will allow the motion to pass.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it not necessary for the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) to give notice of this motion?

Mr. CURRAN. I ask as a question of privilege to be allowed to present it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The motion is not in order being objected to by hon. members.

MONTREAL HARBOR POLICE.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the Orders on the Day are proceeded with further, I wish to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a matter concerning which I have just received a telegram. I am sure he will give it prompt attention.

"MONTREAL, 30th April, 1889.
"8.15 p.m.

"Several vessels arriving here, and no harbor police sworn in yet. Considerable inconvenience arise."

Mr. TUPPER. So far as my information goes, this time of the year is not the time the harbor police are usually sworn in, and no great damage will occur in consequence of their not being sworn in, as the vessels can arrive and discharge their cargoes and take other cargoes and leave, without the necessity of the police being present. Arrangements are being made in the usual way to have the policemen sworn in, and they will be sworn in in a day or two.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is a most extraordinary statement. Vessels are arriving in port, and the hon. gentleman states this is not the usual time to swear in the police. The police are generally sworn in, and if not they ought to be as soon as navigation opens, as they are wanted from the time the first vessel arrives. To talk about vessels arriving and leaving without the services of the police being necessary is only deluding the House. Their services are required every day after the opening of navigation, and the hon. gentleman ought to know his business better.

Mr. TUPPER. There is no occasion for impertinence of that kind when I answer an hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is occasion to keep the hon. gentleman right.

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider resolution (p. 557) to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts and to provide that the salaries and allowances of such judges shall be as stated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope the Government do not intend to proceed with that. It is a motion which will undoubtedly provoke a great deal of discussion, and will probably delay us a considerable time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The resolutions which are on the paper involve several important changes. In the first place there was a proposal to increase judicial salaries of the Superior Court judges of Canada; in the second place, there was a provision for an additional judge in the Province of Quebec, and in the third place there was a provision for three judges in British Columbia of County Court rank. It is proposed not to proceed during this Session with the first item, but it is proposed to proceed with the resolution as regards the County Court judges of British Columbia, and to make provision for the appointment of an additional judge in the Province of Quebec. The circumstances under which these changes are proposed are these: Several years ago the Legislature of British Columbia passed a statute creating County Courts for the Province, and dividing the Province into judicial districts for County Court purposes. The jurisdiction vested in the court was a large jurisdiction, extending to $1,000 in cases of contract; and heretofore, in consequence of the Federal Government having declined to make provision for the salaries of the County Court judges, the duties have been discharged by the judges of the Supreme Court of that Province. At that time, I believe, an additional judge was appointed to the Supreme Court, and it was supposed that the County Court duties would be adequately discharged by the increased number of the judges of the Supreme Court. Hon. members are aware that since that date, which was some time before I took office, the means of communication in that Province have greatly increased, the population has considerably increased, and the necessity for holding a greater number of recruits in the various parts of the Province has likewise increased. It has therefore been considered desirable, and indeed has been pressed upon the Government for two or three years past by the Provincial Government, to make provision for the County Court judges provided by the Provincial Legislature. I propose, therefore, in addition to the County Court judge whom we have now—there is only one—that there shall be County Court judges appointed for New Westminster, Yale and Nanaimo, and that they shall receive the salaries provided elsewhere for County Court judges I presume it will be unnecessary to urge upon the House, the propriety of the claim of the Provincial Government for

the equipment of these courts, as they have been organised, equipped and in force in other parts of the Dominion for years. I will say a word or two as to the proposal to establish an additional judgeship for the Province of Quebec. Those members of the House who have paid attention for some years past to the legislation of the Province of Quebec in regard to judicial matters are aware that, two or three years ago, provision was made for two additional judges in the district of Montreal, but whilst one of these additional judges was provided for, in the absence of what we thought adequate proof of the necessity for the second judge, we declined at that time to ask Parliament to make the necessary appropriation. I presume it is not important that I should now discuss the necessity which seems to me to devolve upon the Dominion Government, in asking for a vote for the salary of an additional judge, to present to Parliament the case for this enlargement of the judiciary. I think, in view of the constant growth and development of the great city of Montreal, that it will not be thought unreasonable to make provision for this additional judge, and thus remove, as I hope, any grievance which may be felt by the Provincial Government in regard to the judiciary of the Province. Being unable to proceed with the other provisions, in consequence of the general expression of opinion by the House, I propose to ask for the appointment of the additional judge for the Province of Quebec, and for the three County Court judges for the Province of British Columbia.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. I congratulate the Minister of Justice on proposing to appoint an additional judge for the Province of Quebec. Three years ago the Provincial Government thought it necessary to have two additional judges for the district of Montreal. That necessity was pressed on the Government by the Ministers of the Province of Quebec. When the present Government of Quebec came into power, more pressing representations were made to have these judges appointed, and the position of affairs was so bad that, of necessity, the Government of Quebec had to create a new tribunal for the district of Montreal. Although the Government of the Province of Quebec took the trouble to decide that, before the new court went into operation, sufficient time should elapse to allow the Dominion Government to make the necessary appointments, still the Dominion Government allowed the time to pass, and then disallowed the legislation of the Province of Quebec. After that conflict is over, I am glad to find that this Government admit that the district of Montreal requires these two judges, and I hope the new judge will be very shortly appointed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I must guard against my statement being supposed to convey the admission which the hon. gentleman has suggested. I do not by any means admit that the failure on the part of the Government to respond to the desire of the Provincial Government in this matter at all authorised the Local Government to proceed to appoint judges themselves, nor do I admit that the Provincial Government were right at first in their demand that these three judges should be appointed. My proposal is simply that the time has now come when this demand may be complied with, and I may say that we are without any information from the Provincial Government in regard to that matter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am sorry the hon. gentleman has not seen fit in this matter to deal with the anomalous position of affairs which have long prevailed in regard to the judiciary in Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman knows that for some reason for which I never could understand, the position of the judges in Prince Edward Island has not been satisfactory. The salaries of those judges are fixed below the salaries of any other judges in the Dominion. The chief justice of that Province only receives $4,000, and the puisne judges $3,000. That is not as it ought to be, and I was under the full belief that the hon. gentleman, knowing the circumstances of the case, would at least have remedied that anomaly and placed these judges in the same position as the judges of the other Maritime Provinces. The question of increasing the salaries of the judges all around was another and different question altogether; but I do not think there is an hon. member in this House who would justify the continuance of a very much smaller salary to the judges of that Province than is paid to the judges of any other Province of the Dominion. The chief justice of the Province now is a gentleman who has occupied the position for a good many years, and probably, owing to his great age, will not be able to fill the place very much longer; but I do think that the salary attached to his position, and the salary attached to the position of two puisne judges, who also acted as Vice Chancellors, and discharge the duties of the Admiralty Court, should have been put in the same relative position as the salaries of judges in the other Maritime Provinces. There can be no possible reason for branding them, as they are branded, and placed on a level inferior to the other judges. They discharge the same duties; they require the same qualifications. The present judges are men of the very highest learning, who have discharged their duties for many years. The fact is that if one or two of them had not had private salaries of their own, we never could have been able to retain them in the position at all. Two of the judges who have been there for a long time happen to have private salaries. The time is very near now when there must be a change made upon that bench, and I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman must acknowledge the justice to the demand I make. The judges of that Province should not be placed in an inferior and degrading position, as regards the positions they hold, relatively to the judiciary of the rest of the Dominion. I am not raising the larger question at all as to whether the judges of the Maritime Provinces should be placed in the same position as the judges of the larger Provinces. That involves different considerations altogether, and that, I have no doubt, will be discussed when we come to consider the question. But there can be no reason, no justification, for maintaining the judges of that one Province in a position inferior, as regards the pay of judges, to all the other Provinces of the Dominion. The fact of the matter is, the common court judges elsewhere get paid larger sums than are paid to the Chief justice and the judges of Prince Edward Island.

Motion agreed to, and resolution considered in Committee, reported, and concurred in.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 150) to amend the Revised Statutes, chapter 138, repecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second times.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it is unfortunate that this Bill was not brought before the House at an earlier period, so that we might have had an opportunity of observing the Rules of the House in taking the various stages of the Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is another reason which the hon. gentleman might have added. This question of increasing the judges' salaries is a very important one, and had the Bill been introduced at an earlier period, the House would have had an opportunity of passing upon it, and the Government would have been able to judge pretty well what the opinion of the House was. But the Bill being now brought in at the closing hours of the Session, preclude discussion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is true to a great extent, but at the present time I am confining myself to those

matters which seem to involve the least dispute. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill considered in Committee and reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I must congratulate the Government on having changed their opinion since this subject was before the House on a former occasion. It will be remembered by those members who were in the House, and I am sure it will be remembered by the First Minister, that when British Columbia provided for the appointment of a larger number of judges, it was objected to by this side of the House on the ground that as we had to appoint a judge and pay the salary we had a right to consider the propriety of the appointment, but the First Minister maintained that the Province was the sole judge as to the propriety of creating the court and of determining the number of judges that should be appointed to fill the various offices. Now, I notice from the observations that have been addressed to the House by the Minister of Justice that the view we maintained on that occasion, when the constitution of the court in British Columbia was under consideration, has been adopted by the Government. Of course they are following in this respect at a respectable distance, but it is gratifying to see that they are following and have adopted the view we pressed so unsuccessfully on their attention some years ago.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is very gratifying to find that after a lapse of several years hon. gentlemen opposite are able to agree with us.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

COMBINATIONS IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE.

House proceeded to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 11) for the Prevention and Suppression of Combinations formed in restraint of Trade.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. One of the Bills returned from the Senate amended is the Bill for the prevention and suppression of combinations in restraint of trade. The Bill has been amended in several particulars, which, with the permission of the House, I will explain. The first amendment is in line 10 of the Bill and consists of the insertion of the word "unduly" before the words "limit the facilities." Line 16, the word "unduly" is again inserted before the word "limit." The word "unreasonable" is also inserted before the word "enhance." At line 19 the word "unduly" is inserted before the words "prevent or lessen." At page 2, line 7, the following amendment is inserted:

"An appeal shall lie from any conviction under the Act before a judge without the intervention of a jury to the highest court of appeal in criminal matters in the Province where such conviction shall have been made, and the evidence taken on the trial shall form part of the record of appeal, and for that purpose the court before which the case is tried shall take note of the evidence and all legal objections thereto."

On the same page at line 8 the following words are struck out: "shall not apply to the exercise of any handicraft or labor or to the performance of labor, but subject to such exception they shall." Of course we were bound by courtesy, as well as by duty, to consult the hon. gentleman who had charge of the Bill up to the time when it was placed on the Government Orders of this House, and that hon. gentleman is of the opinion that it will be desirable to adopt the Bill even as amended, rather than to jeopardise the passage of it this year. I move that the amendments be concurred in.

Mr. WALLACE (York). Before the amendments are concurred in I wish to say that I think the amendments made to the Bill have not improved it. The words "unduly" and "unreasonably" in the first clause lessen the effect, which is quite unnecessary. At the fifth clause a portion is struck out, and the new clause five is very similar to a clause that was before this House. As we are within one day of the end of the Session, and as this Bill, if it were returned to the Senate, would no doubt be thrown over to another year, I have consented to the amendments made by the Senate, because I consider that still, with these changes made, which weaken its effect somewhat, it is an effective Bill, that it will be a terror to evil doers, and it will show that the Parliament of Canada have put on record their condemnation of the illegal practices we have been legislating against. I, therefore, consent to the Bill being passed as amended by the Senate, and if after the experience of a year it should be proved that further amendments are necessary and that it is desirable to restore the Bill to its original shape, then that should be done.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course I am not going to interfere with the hon. gentleman's Bill. The Government have given their approval to it. The Bill did approve when it left this House for the punishment of acts that were unlawful for it left the law just as it was except that in certain cases it modified the punishment that was attached to this particular offence. It made nothing unlawful that was lawful before, so that in every respect the Bill was absolutely colorless. The hon. gentleman accepts of an amendment by the Senate which modifies and weakens the law as it before stood and the law after it receives the royal sanction will be more favorable to combinations than it was before. The introduction of the word "unduly" makes that difference. I pointed out to the hon. gentleman when his Bill was before this House that the section relating to Trades Union was an unnecessary section because his Bill only dealt with offences that were already unlawful and as combinations amongst trade unions were not unlawful, but were made lawful by statute there was no necessity for that reference to them. The hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) took evidence before the Committee. He says he established that there were combinations injurious to the country and he introduced a Bill to cure that evil. The result of that Bill is that it has altered the law, not in the interests of the consumers, but to protect those combinations from the mischievous effects, according to his view, of the common law as it stood.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand the Minister of Justice to say that he has consulted with the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) and that they both agreed to recommend the adoption of the Senate amendments. We have not had the opportunity of studying the amendments on this side of the House, but so far as I understood the explanation of the Minister of Justice it is that the former limitation of a combination is cut down now, and it may not be only an unlawful limitation in regard to advancing prices but must be unduly so and to increase the price on the purchaser must be deemed an unnecessary increase of price to the purchaser. Therefore this very weak measure as it left our House has become weaker still when in the Senate. In one regard the Senate have made a radical change in the Bill. When the Bill left this House it was pointed out to the Minister of Justice that the last section of the Bill almost repealed the 22nd section of the Trades Union Act. It was open to argument as to whether it did or did not absolutely repeal that section, but now as I understand the Bill as explained by the Minister and as approved of by the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) there is no longer room for doubt and according to the amendment made in the Senate it absolutely repeals the 22nd section of the Trades Union Act. If so the Bill is legislating in the wrong direction. I regret that the promoters of the Bill have given those amendments their sanction. I suppose that they cannot prevent its passing and it would be idle to spend further

time upon it, but so far as I am concerned and in the interest of those who were concerned in the passing of the Trades Union Act which up to the present time does not appear to have acted unjustly, I say that they were already sufficiently legislated for. It appears to me that it should have been provided that nothing in this Bill should affect the Trades Union Act. However, since the Minister of Justice and the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) have approved of the amendments made by the Senate, I can only record my dissent from the Bill.

Mr. WALLACE. I think that the hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying that I approved of these amendments. I distinctly stated to the House that I did not approve of these amendments because I considered that they weakened the Bill, but at this stage of the Session if the Bill were returned to the Senate there is a danger that it would be killed altogether, and the risk of that was so great that I preferred to take the Bill as it stands now, and I believe that even yet it will be an effective measure. If you read the sections of this Act you cannot find one word in it which refers to the operations of the workingmen or their organisations. This Bill refers entirely to trade and commerce, and it does not refer except very indirectly indeed to the workingmen or to legitimate Trades Unions. Therefore the 5th section of this Act saying that "the foregoing provisions of the Act shall be construed as if section 22 of the Trades Union Act had not been enacted" shows that it does not refer to workingmen or workingmen's organisations, and that it cannot affect them in any degree. It will affect only combinations by those engaged in trade and commerce. The fact that the Session has arrived at this late stage compels me to assent to these amendments in preference to asking to have our Bill restored to its original shape, as the result of that might be to kill it altogether for this Session. I believe this Bill will prove very effective just as the Abbott Act proved effective last year, although in many cases not put into operation. Those men who are acting illegally were warned that they were breaking the law and warned to desist, and this Bill will exactly have the same effect on the combinations. I have no doubt that the effect of the Bill will be to prevent combinations and that it will prove beneficial throughout the country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Bill as introduced by the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) professed to legislate in the direction of the report of the Committee of which he was chairman. When that Bill reached the Banking and Commerce Committee, the hon. gentleman withdrew the clauses *in toto*, and substituted other clauses, the only merit of which he expressedly asserted over and over again was that they declared what the common law was. The Senate amendments, so far from declaring what the common law is, introduced an element of doubt and difficulty, and minimised the common law. The common law as it stood provided for the punishment of illegal combinations in restraint of trade. His Bill prevents that. It need not be opposed; it will die from sheer inanition.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I should be sorry if, for the purpose of making a political point against the hon. member for West York, the real effect of this Bill should be misunderstood or misstated by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I think the public would at least derive an erroneous impression of those amendments from what has been said. It is true, to some extent, the Bill as now amended will be less severe against combinations in restraint of trade than was the common law or the statute regarding conspiracies. The common law, however, was exceedingly severe in these cases—so severe that it became an indictable offence to combine in any way in restraint of trade, while the statute on the subject of conspiracies levied a punishment of five years in the penitentiary, a punishment so severe that everybody acquainted with those offences will admit that it was entirely inapplicable to them. While, therefore, to some extent, the Bill as amended by the Senate may be said to mitigate the force and severity of the common law and the statute regarding conspiracies, I think it still serves the purpose of the introducer, as an announcement of the severe penalties which will follow the offence of combining to unduly advance prices or to unreasonably restrict competition in trade and commerce. As regards the effect of the Bill on the 22nd section of the Trades Union Act, it simply renders unlawful those combinations which are formed for the purpose of restraining trade; and as my hon. friend from York has said, inasmuch as the lawful combinations among workingmen are not for that purpose, I think there is little danger of their coming within the operation of the Bill.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the Minister of Justice give his reasons why misdemeanants under this Act should have greater rights than other misdemeanants. The Senate recommend that in their case there should be an appeal on both law and fact—a trial *de novo*, in fact, in the highest court of the Province. If that is the law applicable to every misdemeanant, well and good; but if not, why should there be one law for them and another law for ordinary misdemeanants?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The duty would have been incumbent on me if I had been the promoter of the amendments, but because I have moved concurrence in the amendments, the duty does not devolve on me of defending them. All that can be said with reference to the exceptional procedure is that it only applies to the exceptional mode of trial provided for these cases. In the case of other misdemeanants or persons charged with felony, there must be a trial by a judge and a jury, while the Bill provides for an exceptional kind of trial, by a judge without a jury.

Mr. MULOCK. That is the law in Ontario in regard to misdemeanants.

Mr. CURRAN. Another reason is found in the introduction of the word "unduly." I proposed this amendment to the Bill in its original form, and it is much more necessary now that the Senate has thought proper to insert the words "unduly" and "unreasonably," that we should not have a solitary decision, as to the undue or unreasonable character of an act by a judge in the court of the first instance, but that in matters involving the commerce of the country, we should have the expression of the very highest tribunal, at least in the Province where the offence is alleged to have been committed. With regard to the contention of my hon. friends opposite, that these amendments make the law less severe than it was, I can hardly agree with them, because the Trades Union Act does not apply simply to trades unions of workingmen, but it applies as well to unions of traders and all classes of persons engaged in manufacture and trade. I do not know that this law is very desirable in its present form. A law applicable to the circumstances of our country would be most difficult to enact and frame in such a shape as not to do injury as well as good. But I am under the impression that the provision for an appeal is one highly necessary for the protection not only of those carrying on business, but of those who have to earn their bread as employés of manufacturers and commercial men. It is equally important for the worker as for the employer.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). If I could feel satisfied that this Act would in no way affect the Trades Union Act, I would be more inclined to allow it to pass. The original promoter of the Bill says he does not approve of the amendments made by the Senate; yet from his acceptance of the Bill, it is useless for him to say that he does not approve of it. From what the Minister of Justice stated, I think this Act does cast a cloud on the meaning of the 22nd section of this Trades Union Act. If it does so, it is doing an

injustice to a class of men who have been perhaps unjustly dealt with by the Trades Union Act as it exists at present. If injuries heretofore and hardships have been endured under the existing law, there will be a greater tendency to injustice under this amended Bill. All that I can say is that I raise my protest against the passage of an Act of this kind. If we are disposed to have one law on the Statute-book for the rich and another law for the laboring classes, that should be known to the people. If the promoter of this Bill and the hon. the Minister of Justice desire it to go abroad that a Bill of this kind should be adopted, upon them will be the responsibility. I am satisfied that the trades unions disapprove *in toto* of these amendments and this Bill, but the responsibility is upon those who have charge of it, and who will have to answer for the injustice they are prepared to inflict on the laboring classes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to express my regret that the Senate have seen fit to further reduce the effective clauses of this particular measure. If the Bill originally introduced had been passed without being seriously impaired through influences which I have no doubt were bought to bear upon individual members of the Committee and upon members of this House, it might possibly have been of some use, but it appears now that not only in this House and in the Committee, but also in the Senate, means or influences unknown to the country have been at work to so alter the Bill as to make it almost useless. I regret that the Senate have allowed themselves to be influenced in that direction, if they have been influenced—and I do not know whether they have or not. But there is one thing clear, and that is that the Government must certainly assume the responsibility for the manner in which this Bill has been handled. The hon. the Minister of Justice undertook to carry it through, and no doubt if the Government had chosen to exercise the overpowering influence which they possess in the Senate, this Bill would have come back to us without any change. The Government must either have winked at the amendments in the Senate or quietly acquiesced in them and made no attempt to exercise the influence which they undoubtedly possess over that body. That is a point the House will not lose sight of, and I am sure the country will not lose sight of. I am sorry the word "unduly raised" should have been substituted for "unlawfully," because to take an undue advantage and to take unlawful advantage are two different things. Who is to decide what is an undue raise in the value of an article? Is it the judge? And even if he decides as to the value of an article, there is an appeal from his decision to the higher court. It is quite clear that the Bill in its present shape, surrounded as it is with protection to those who are disposed to combine, will largely be ineffective. Next Session, if it is found that the evils which this measure is intended to prevent, continue to grow, I hope this House will take a more decided step to put an end to these combines. There is nothing will tend to ruin the farming classes and the farming community more than to allow these trade combinations to get a footing in our country, and I am sorry to say that, to a considerable extent, they have obtained a footing. I am exceedingly sorry the Government have permitted this Bill to be so impaired. No doubt my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) was sincere when he introduced the Bill, and I think he made an honest effort to have it adopted. It is to be regretted that he did not succeed better; but next Session we will have an opportunity of introducing a more effective measure, and I earnestly hope that then the Senate, which has on this occasion been unduly influenced, will not again adopt the course they have just taken.

Mr. GUILLETT. I wish also to express my regret that the Senate has interfered with the measure in any respect. It was unanimously passed by this House, and the subject was better understood here than it could be elsewhere, owing to the fact that it was considered by a Special Committee and was prominently before the House this Session and last Session. I wish those hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken had all been as fair as the last speaker towards the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) who has devoted so much time and labor to the promotion of the Bill this Session and to the promotion of the investigation last Session. It is altogether unfair to him to say that he thoroughly accepted this measure as amended, because he declares that he did not approve of the amendments, but accepted them on the principle that a half loaf was better than no bread. I trust that next Session a stronger measure will be introduced. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) ought to receive credit from hon. gentlemen opposite for his course in relation to this matter. With regard to the word "unduly," I believe it is understood by a great many employers to mean "unlawfully," but the change weakens the force of the measure. As regards the statement of the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) that this Bill will not interfere with the operations of the trades unions, I entirely dissent from that opinion, and it is noticeable that hon. members who belong to the legal profession agree with me in this respect.

Amendments concurred in.

BILLS OF LADING.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 92) relating to Bills of Lading. He said: This Bill is almost a transcript of an Imperial Statute passed nearly 35 years ago. The object was to vest in the consignees of goods the rights of action arising under the bill of lading. The theory of the law upon the subject, irrespective of the statute, was that the contract was between the carrier and the consignor, and that, although the goods, by operation of mercantile law, would pass to the consignee by an endorsement of the bill of lading, the consignee had no rights of action under the original contract. The property in the goods passed, but the right of action did not pass. The consequence was that, although the consignee had the right to recover his goods, he had no right of action for damage done or anything of that description. The English statute has been found to be beneficial, and it has been adopted in the Province of Ontario, in the Province of Nova Scotia, and I think in Manitoba, and it is in effect embodied in the Civil Code of the Province of Quebec, though not in express terms. When the statute was passed in Ontario after Confederation, the competency of the Provincial Legislature to pass it was doubted, and it was made a subject of report by the Minister of Justice, who desired that it should be left for a subsequent report. That was delayed in consequence of public business, as is explained in the subsequent report which was presented. The other Provinces have adopted this legislation, and, as it is a matter of trade and commerce, and one which, if in force in any part of Canada, should be in force throughout the Dominion, it has been considered desirable, because of the usefulness of the proposed change, and also because of the doubt as to the validity of the Provincial legislation, to embody it in a statute for the whole Dominion.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This is a very important Bill, and I am sorry it was not brought before the House before this time of the Session. Of course it is following exactly the English statute, and no doubt the change is a very important one as to transferring the contracts under the bill of lading. I think that should be passed. It has worked well in England, and I think the contract should be transferred as well as the property in the goods. The third section opens a wild field of discussion. I thought the English statute went a little further till I found that the

owners of the vessels were not held liable for goods shipped on board, and cases have occurred in Canada where railway receipts have been given by persons fraudulently and the companies were not held liable. The Minister of Justice might consider whether he could not make a provision that, when the master of a vessel or the agent of a railway delivers railway receipts or bills of lading, the company should not to a certain extent be bound by them. Banks and other people advance money on those bills of lading, and, although the railway company may be innocent, the legal principle is that, where two innocent persons suffer, the one who has innocently caused the fraud should bear the burden. That is a matter in regard to which there might be considerable discussion. I would also suggest another very important change, which is also in accordance with the English law, and that is in regard to the position of a master of a vessel where the cargo is in dispute with the consignee or the consignee refuses to pay the freight. The question now is, what will the master of the vessel do with the cargo. In England there is an Act by which he is allowed to warehouse the cargo and put a stop order upon it. There is no such thing here. The question has recently been discussed before the Supreme Court of Canada. I think that would be a very necessary and very important change to make in the law. The difficulty I find is, at this late stage of the Session to discuss this Bill as it ought to be discussed, because I think these points are well worthy of discussion, and, under the circumstances, the Minister might allow the Bill to remain for another Session so that it might be further considered. I quite agree with the objects of the Bill and the scope of it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would prefer to give consideration hereafter to the suggestions which the hon. gentleman has made, and in the meantime to adopt the changes proposed in the Bill, which will remove any doubts as to the validity of the provincial laws.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, considered in committee, and reported.

Mr. McMULLEN I rise to a point of order. I question the propriety of a member of the Committee reporting a Bill to the Deputy Speaker. We have seen this thing too often now. We have a Speaker and a Deputy Speaker, we pay both, and I do not think it is right that this system should be introduced. I do not think it is the course in England, and I do not think it is proper for a member of the Committee to report to the Deputy Speaker.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are pursuing exactly the practice adopted in England.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved third reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—MANITOBA RAILWAYS—JESUIT ESTATES ACT.

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

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker——

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) has the floor.

Mr. ROSS. I think the people of Manitoba generally will be surprised when they peruse the resolutions brought down in aid of railways, to see that there are only 17 miles of railway in that Province aided by these resolutions. Now, there are a number of railways being built in that Province by direct aid of the Local Government. In the western part of our Dominion, in Manitoba especially, and in the North-West Territories as well, you have got to consider that matters are entirely different from what they are in the east. Railways ought to go ahead of settlement, or at least go with it; in the east settlement, of course, is a long way in advance of railways. Now, in certain portions of the Province the settlers reside from 50 to 100 miles away from a railway, and it is impossible for them to take their produce to market and dispose of it to advantage. There is one road in particular to which I would call attention, running south-easterly from Winnipeg to the boundary, through a part of my county, and also through the county of hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière). This railway would be very useful in opening up a tract of country that is partially settled, and which would be still more fully settled if there were railway facilities by which the people could get there. Now, this road would not only give facilities to the people who are settled there, but it would be of great advantage to the people residing in Winnipeg and on the prairies by enabling them to get their tie timber and their fuel at less cost and to greater advantage than they can do now. This railway would also give another outlet to the produce of Manitoba. We have the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Northern Pacific Railway, but we want another line which would give us the shortest route to Duluth. I have no doubt whatever that if a land grant were given this railway it would be put under construction and come into operation in a short time. I would beg to remind the House that the company is not asking for any valuable land in connection with this railway. They are only asking for lands that are at the present time valueless, both for settlement and for sale. No person would go in there and purchase these lands and settle, unless railway facilities are given, and the railway company who have got a charter this present Session, would go right on and construct this road if a grant were given to them, and these very lands to-day valueless would become valuable to the Government. There are three million acres in the south-eastern portion of Manitoba which settlers cannot reach, and less than a million acres is asked for by the company, so that two million acres would be left which would remain in the hands of the Government, and the Government would receive value for them. Some of them could be sold which would yield a revenue to the Government, in the sale of timber dues, and timber limits could be disposed of to advantage. I will close by moving in amendment:

That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved that this House regrets that no proposal for a land subsidy in aid of the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company, has been laid before Parliament.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yesterday, I spoke to the Speaker of this House and received his promise that I should receive recognition upon going into Supply. This afternoon, Sir, I spoke to yourself (the Deputy Speaker) and I was informed by you that the member for Yale (Mr. Mara) had spoken to you. I see that the Speaker is absent, and I see that the hon. gentleman whom you stated had spoken to you to receive recognition, has not risen; and I have to state my belief, Sir, that the motion that I intended to move to-night it was the intention of the Government to burk, and that this course has been taken to do so; and I have to say that both yourself and the Speaker have violated the courtesies of this House in this matter. Now, I wish to state for the information of the House and the information of the country, the character of the motion that I wished to move, and the motion that it is evidently the desire of the Government should not be placed before this House. I intended to move:

"That in view of the doubts which have been expressed by many leading constitutional authorities as to the constitutionality of the Act of the Legislature of Quebec, entitled: 'An Act respecting the Settlement of the Jesuits' Estates,' this House is of opinion that the Government of Canada should without delay obtain the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or other competent courts of jurisdiction, as to the constitutionality of the said Act."

Now, Sir, it is evident to me, it will be evident to the members of this House, it will be evident to the people of Canada, under the circumstances of the case to-night, that the Government do not desire to meet that question, that they desire to burk that question, and to avoid it. I believe that in doing so they have acted very unwisely indeed. The excitement that exists in this country on this subject demands on the part of the Government some such steps as that mentioned in the motion that I intended to move, and I believe the Government are recreant to the duty they owe to this country in refusing to allow such a resolution to be put to the House, in order that the popular agitation might be allayed by the authoritative assurance that the question as to the constitutionality of the Jesuits' Estates Act should be settled by the highest court of competent jurisdiction. I intended, if I had moved that resolution, to offer to withdraw it if the Government would give the assurance to the House that they would comply with the terms of the resolution by submitting the Act to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for their opinion. Why the Government should refuse to do that, why the Government should fear to do that, I am unable to say. I have nothing further to say in regard to this matter than that I hold them responsible, under the circumstances of this case, for having refused this reference to a competent court of jurisdiction in order to get a settlement of this burning question, a question that promises serious results to this country, which has aroused an agitation that ought to be allayed, and an agitation which the Government, by accepting the conditions of this motion, and referring the question of the constitutionality of this Act to the courts, could have allayed. I have nothing further to say except that I have never seen in the course of my parliamentary experience a dodge of this kind resorted to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The dodge is on the part of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not at all, Sir.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The right to speak to the Speaker does not belong to any hon. member, the right belongs to the first hon. member who catches the Speaker's eye. The hon. gentleman had no right to suppose that he had caught the Speaker's eye.

Mr. CHARLTON. I caught the Speaker's back, he was looking over that way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman had no right to suppose that he or anybody else who chooses, when he wants to get in a pet motion, can run first to the Speaker and then to the Deputy Speaker so as to prevent any independent member of Parliament in rising and claiming the right to free audience. It is an absurd statement of the hon. gentleman, it is a great piece of presumption of the hon. gentleman to suppose that because he wishes to speak at a particular time in a particular way that everybody else must stand aside and do him reverence. The hon. gentleman who moved this amendment is quite in his right I will say with respect to that, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman did apply, with another hon. member of this House, to me and the Minister of Railways, to see whether they could not this year get a subsidy for the railway, and he proposed a grant of land for the reason that he gave just now. At the time he addressed it, and for reasons which I need not give now, because the lateness of the application is a sufficient explanation, it was not thought proper that it should be included in the land subsidies that have been laid before the House during the present Session. That is the answer we gave to the motion of my hon. friend, which I hope will not be carried.

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would answer a question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I will not answer any question.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is the hon. gentleman willing to accept——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has no right to put any question to me. He has not taken the right course to do it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to say a word. The hon. gentleman intimated his intention to move a resolution and spoke to me yesterday in regard to it, and I consented to second it. I, with the hon. member, thought it was prudent under the excited condition of the country that the Government should be made aware of the fact that we proposed to present such a resolution. The hon. gentleman took a copy of the resolution over to the First Minister's desk, and put it upon that desk. The First Minister, when he came to his place yesterday, received the copy of that resolution which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) intended to move, and he no doubt read it. That hon. member who thus courteously treated the First Minister with respect to this question has received from him that treatment which the right hon. gentleman always metes out to a political opponent when he has an opportunity. The hon. member for North Norfolk in justice to the Government and with a desire to effect a settlement submitted to them a copy of his resolution.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. McMULLEN. I contend that advantage has been taken, because the First Minister was made aware of the fact that the resolution would be moved.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must remind the hon. gentleman that he must address his remarks to the question before the Chair.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is a question we have a right to discuss at some considerable length, as it is one of vital importance to this country. I consider it my duty to make this statement, and I wind up by saying that I believe a contemptible trick has been practiced on this side of the House.

Mr. SCRIVER. I desire simply to say that while the leader of the Government is technically right in his statement that every member has the right to catch the Speaker's eye first if he can do so, yet I think no one knows better than the right hon. gentleman the practice which has generally prevailed with respect to this matter. An understanding between a certain member and the Speaker is very often made, that the hon. member wishing to move a certain important resolution shall be recognised. Such a practice has prevailed as the First Minister knows very well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Complaints have been made not unfrequently that notice of the desire of an hon. gentleman on this side of the House to move a particular motion on going into Supply has not been given. It appears from the statement made that my hon. friend was particular in giving the notice, as desired and requested in former days, to the First Minister, and it also appears that that has had a result which, of course, as a piece of Parliamentary strategy, is not unfrequently resorted to in order to enable the Government to avoid entering into a discussion on a particular subject.

Amendment negatived on a division, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Royal Military College, Kingston—House for Commandant..... $12,500

Mr. McMULLEN. We desire to have a little discussion on this item. It is singular that, notwithstanding the fact

that we have had militia matters and the Military College discussed, this item is brought down in the dying moments of the Session. It is a most objectionable item. We know who the commandant is, that he is closely related to the High Commissioner, that he drew, during last year, over $4,000 of the money of this country, and he will draw, this year, about that sum in addition to a free house. It may be that a house is required, but, if so, it is strange that it should be erected a mile and a half from the college. Next year, in all probability, we shall have a vote to provide a carriage to take the commandant from his house to the college and back. It is considered proper by hon. gentlemen opposite that the High Commissioner's relations shall be all well paid by the country. I believe Colonel Cameron is a son-in-law of the High Commissioner, and of course he has to be provided for in some way. We have evidently more belted knights than one in Canada, and I believe the most highly decorated one is the High Commissioner, and I suppose that, occupying that position, we should not only look to providing him with a comfortable position in London, but also provide for the members of his family.

Mr. MITCHELL. We have done that pretty much already.

Mr. McMULLEN. We are continuing to do it. I much regret that the First Minister has to take second place now. He used to be the chief belted knight of the Dominion; but, since the High Commissioner has added honors to those which he possessed before he went away, he now appears to be the chief and the highest and the most honored by Her Majesty, and I suppose it is thought proper, under those circumstances, that we should find positions in the Dominion for members of his family. He himself is comfortably located in London. His son occupies a position as Minister of the Crown, and no doubt he occupies it in the interests of the family, of which he is no doubt an able and bright member. He, no doubt, sits at the council board to hear that no word is uttered detrimental to the position occupied by the High Commissioner. He will also be there to see if there is any law costs to be expended that they will be given to Tupper & Graham, and if there is anything out west it will be given to Macdonald & Tupper, and he will also be there to see if there is any good lucrative easy position that can be filled up by any other relative who is not already installed in office that that relative should get it. As to Chipman I do not know what relation he is to the Tuppers; I have not been able to find that out yet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could confine himself a little nearer to the question under discussion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am doing that. I am travelling a little around just to show what this House has been asked to do in the past and what it may be expected to do in the future. In all probability we will have to purchase a horse and carriage for this commandant, for it would never do to have him walk a mile and a half.

An hon. MEMBER. Get a cab.

Mr. McMULLEN. Oh, a cab would not suit the commandant of the Royal Military College. We have enough to pay for the cabs for Ministers at Ottawa, and if we paid cabs for the officials throughout the Dominion, we would have a larger expenditure in the way of contingencies than would be desirable. I say it is a gross piece of barefaced nonsense for us to have to provide for Commandant Cameron because he is a relation of Mr. Tupper. I wonder if we are going to furnish this house for him too.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, that is a good thing. I believe that it is unreasonable and unfair to ask the House to consent to this purchase of a residence, when we might have built one on the grounds at Kingston, and especially is it unreasonable to build one at such a distance from the college. However, I suppose Commandant Cameron's duties will be very light, and he will not be required to go from his house to the college more than twice a week. We will have to keep that house in repairs at considerable expense. I pointed out at the beginning of the Session that we had to pay an enormous sum to the Tupper family to keep them in comfortable easy positions, and this will bring the amount up to a sum of $40,000 a year for the entire family, Chipman included.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We should have some explanations as regards this. I am quite aware that Colonel Hewitt resided at as great a distance as Colonel Cameron resides from the college, but I am aware that it was found an inconvenient practice. I think it would have been better if the Government had built a house on the college grounds where the commandant would be quite convenient to his duties. This house is at a distance of 1¼ miles, or 2,000 yards, as the Minister stated, from the college, and it really seems to me that the precedent is a very bad one. I have been informed that the college is very crowded and that there is not sufficient dormitory accommodation. I do think that, if we can spend this large sum of money, the first thing that ought to be done is to provide sufficient dormitory accommodation for the cadets. This is a matter of health, and I certainly think it is of the first importance as concerning the well-being of the college. My hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) laid out a house for the commandant on the college ground, but Colonel Hewitt, having a large family, preferred going to a house of his own.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I fully agree with the hon. gentleman that if it had been a question of building a house it would have been better to build it on the Royal Military College grounds, but I think it was a matter of economy to purchase the Horsey property at $12,500. It is not really of very great importance that the commandant should be located in the building itself, and I think the present commandant is not any further away from the building than Colonel Hewitt used to be.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But Colonel Hewitt to my own knowledge found it inconvenient.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am not prepared to say whether he found it inconvenient or not. We were paying an allowance of $800 a year to the commandant for house rent. I think it will be found that the purchase is a good one, and the property can be disposed of to advantage at any time that we are prepared to build on the grounds of the Royal Military College, as suggested by the hon. member. But until we did so it was necessary to find accommodation for the commandant, and it was reported to me that it was impossible to find a house to rent at the particular period when the commandant came out. Under the circumstances I think we made the very best bargain that could be made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I fancy that the $800 included an allowance for fuel and light.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It was independent of fuel and light.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am speaking from recollection, and I would recommend the hon. gentleman to look back to the public accounts, by which I think he will find that the allowance to Colonel Hewitt was $800, for lodging, fuel and light; and if that be the case, there is no doubt that the purchase of the house, *plus* fuel and light,

and the repairs which will always be necessary, will add very considerably to the sum of $800. The interest on $12,500 is $500, the fuel and light allowance will amount to about $400, and you may rest assured that repairs will come to $300, so that we shall be paying $1,200 a year instead of $400 as a practical result of this arrangement. But my main point is that having a hundred acres on the college grounds, we ought not to purchase a house, because it is quite clear that you could build a house for the accommodation of the commandant for a much smaller sum than $12,500.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I hardly think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where you have the ground I think you could. The salary of the commandant is $3,200 a year, with an allowance of $800. What Mr. Mackenzie did was to build a house for the commandant on the grounds. That was handed over to the officer second in command, and Colonel Hewitt having a very large family, was allowed as a special convenience to reside at a distance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The situation was this: General Oliver went to England, and General Cameron was appointed in his stead. He had a right to have a house somewhere, and there was no house on the grounds at Barriefield or near the fort. The building originally put up for the commandant is occupied I think by the senior professor. As the hon. gentleman knows, Colonel Hewitt lived in the town, and General Oliver afterwards. When General Cameron was appointed, he could not get a house to rent, and this house was offered for sale. It was valued at I think more than the price we paid for it, and a gentleman whom the hon. gentleman knows very well wanted to get it at that price, and would have paid the money readily. But it was thought well to buy that house, as it was quite clear the price was so moderate that it could be disposed of at any time. The question of putting up a residence on the grounds was discussed in Council at the instance of the Minister of Militia. There are good reasons, I think, on the whole, why the commandant should live there, although the commandants themselves do not agree to that. We had, however, a commandant who was quite competent, a very able man, although he has the misfortune to be a son-in-law of Sir Charles Tupper. Notwithstanding that great drawback, he is a distinguished officer and a most efficient commandant, and there has been a considerable improvement in the discipline of the college since General Cameron took the command. I think, with the growth of the college, there ought some time to be a building put up on the grounds. Whenever it is put up, it is quite certain, with the rapidly increasing value of property in Kingston, that the Government could sell this house, which is a new one and a very good one, without any loss.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would not like to guarantee that by any means.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think that in towns outside of Toronto, except, perhaps, Woodstock, property is increasing in value.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I know it is.

Mr. McMULLEN. In Kingston there may be some, but a house must be a very good one to cost $12,500. I quite agree with the suggestion that if we have a house for the commandant, it should be on the grounds near the college. I believe the Minister of Militia could, with very little difficulty, have secured a house to rent which would have suited the commandant for a short time. There are some very fine houses in Kingston.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are occupied by very fine people.

Mr. McMULLEN. I know there are some that are not occupied in Kingston at this moment, so that I think he could have got a house without much trouble. Then we could have built a house on the grounds and the commandant could have moved into it. The hon. gentleman says we will have no difficulty in selling this house when we wish to get rid of it, but I doubt, taking past experience of the hon. gentleman's administration, whether we would be able to realise this promise any more than the many others he has made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You are an unbelieving Thomas.

Mr. McMULLEN. I know the hon. gentleman is always ready with promises, but I have no doubt that in a few years he will be compelled to dispose of this house at from $2,000 to $4,000 less than we have paid for it. Again it is one mile and a half away from the college. I am sure the commandant will never walk that distance, nor will he ride in a street car; he could not be expected to do that, considering the distinguished connection he belongs to, and we will, in all probability, have to go to the expense of providing horses and carriages to take him from the house to the college. I have been looking over the expenses we have made recently, and I see that this worthy gentleman was away 118 days as an additional private secretary to Sir Charles Tupper when at Washington. Sir Charles Tupper had already a private secretary in Mr. C. C. Chipman, to whom we paid $2,499.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. He was not appointed nor did he act as secretary.

Mr. McMULLEN. The commandant was there for 118 days, for which he received $2,716.60. Whether he was there as sub-secretary or not I do not know. Mr. Chipman was engaged as secretary to Sir Charles Tupper, and I suppose he took the commandant along as a kind of assistant in case something should occur. At any rate we paid a very nice sum for bringing him there. Judging by the items in the Auditor General's account we feasted him at the highest prices and best places, for during that 118 days he drew $2,716. I consider it my duty, and I do it fearlessly, to bring this matter before the House. It is not right that the people should be subjected to taxation in matters of this kind, and to this useless expenditure running up into the millions. We have expended $40,000,000 during the past year finding houses for commandants, giving railway bonuses, and lavishing money in every direction, so that there is not a branch of the Empire of Great Britain to-day which is more heavily taxed than we are, and all because one man has occupied the position of First Minister for twenty years, and, backed up by his followers who do his bidding blindly, we see this extravagance in every direction—Short Line, the Oxford and New Glasgow line, the St. Charles Branch, and all these expenditures that bear on their face evidences of the most abominable corruption.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears from the Public Accounts that probably I was correct in saying that the $800 covered fuel and light. I have the Public Accounts of 1878, and I see there that the rent of the house for the commandant is put down separately at the rate of about $500 a year and the coal furnished is put down at $270 a year, so that I presume I was correct in thinking this $800 covered the light and fuel. If that be the case, the hon. gentleman will see that the arrangement he has now made will not be likely to entail a saving but will probably mean a considerable extra expense. I should like the hon. the Minister to ascertain what the facts are.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I still think I am right.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Public Accounts show that I was right as to what has occurred in the past.

Mr. COCKBURN. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to the rather curious calculation he has made. He thinks that $800 will about cover the amount now as before. The house cost $12,500, which, at 4 per cent. means a rent of $500 a year, and he puts the repairs down at $300, a year or 60 per cent. of the rental. Does the hon. gentleman know of any landlord in this or any country who is prepared to pay 60 per cent of his rental for repairs?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; but I know what it costs to keep a house in good order, and I know that in this house owned by the Government bills to that extent will assuredly be sent in, taking one year with another.

Mr. COCKBURN. You will be astonished to hear that $300 out of $500 is required for repairs. Why, 10 per cent. is the ordinary rate among real estate men allowed for repairs, so that, taking the rent at $500 and adding the repairs we will have a total, annual expense of $550.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong. He is talking of what he knows very little about. I have plenty of houses on my hands, and I say that a house of this character will most assuredly require, to keep it in thorough good order, a considerable sum each year.

Mr. COCKBURN. $300 a year?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; every penny. If the hon. gentleman knew the house, he would understand well that it would be extremely easy to spend quite that sum from year to year to keep it in thorough order, and in a house which is the property of the Government, people are not so particular about incurring expenses as if it were owned by an ordinary landlord and used for ordinary purposes. I have not the slightest doubt, the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) to the contrary notwithstanding, that when we come to take into account the supply of fuel and light and the charges for keeping in repair, the sum I named will one year and another be called for. In a house of this kind we could easily spend $1,000 in a single year and see very little for it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am told it is in very good repair.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In a very short time it will require an expenditure for all kinds of purposes. However, that is a minor point. The essential point is this, that if we are going to buy a house in Kingston at all or to incur a charge for the expenses of a house for a commandant, the money ought to be spent on the college grounds, where the commandant ought to reside.

Mr. COCKBURN. However little the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) may, I think, know of matters of this kind, I can assure him that for 20 years I occupied a house belonging to the Government as a Government official, and during that time the average expenditure in the shape of repairs did not exceed $100 a year, and the house was a great deal larger than that purchased for the commandant.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was that owned by the Dominion Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not much.

Mr. COCKBURN. It was owned by the Ontario Government.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not express my own personal opinion about the property because I know very little except from the reports and representations which were made to me, and from the fact that I had it valued by two of the best men of Kingston, in so far as real estate is concerned, but it was represented to me that the original cost of that property was $20,000. I was told that the house was in very good repair and order, and that there would be very little money required for some time to come to keep it in repair.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Was it bought directly from the proprietor or through a land agent?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Directly through the proprietor. We had the property valued and the title deeds were sent down to my department and referred by me to the Department of Justice for verification. I am not aware of anybody except the original proprietor, in whose hands the property was, writing to me directly and making his conditions as to the sale, and my referring the whole thing to Council.

Mr. MITCHELL. The members of the Committee have been skirmishing around this thing for an hour and a-half. They have talked about Tupperism, and about the Tupper family, and about Sir Charles Tupper and about all the Tuppers, but they have not touched the real gist of the thing. For 10 years I have been struggling to get this excrescence wiped out. This Military College and School of Gunnery and so on—what is it? It is nothing else but one of those excrescences which have been established from a desire to build up in this country institutions to educate the sons of the rich men at the expense of the people. When I was first attacking this institution, I think the expenditure was about $30,000 a year. Now, I find it is close on $70,000 a year. Who are educated in that institution? Are there any sons of poor men?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Who are they? Can the hon. gentleman name one? Are there any sons of ordinary middle class men?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. They may be poor men, but, if so, they are poor men in the superior classes, like my hon. friend the Minister of Militia. When these young men are educated, where do they settle down? Do they settle in this country and develop its great resources? Some may do so, but they are the exception to the rule. We find their fathers figuring to get recommendations for commissions in the British army; we find some of them figuring in the United States as engineers on American railways, but we do not find these young men, who are educated with such high notions, settling in Canada and assisting to develop the resources of this country; and it is for that purpose that the poor people of this country are taxed. I have been for ten years protesting against this, and, while my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has been talking about General Cameron and Sir Charles Tupper and Tupperism generally, I say that is all a drop in the bucket, compared with the question of the continuance of this excrescence. I am not going to deal with the Tupper question at all, but I want to see this excrescence wiped out.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What excrescence?

Mr. MITCHELL. This college.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I thought you might mean the Tupper family.

Mr. MITCHELL. No, you cannot get them wiped out. They are too firmly fixed; but there is an amount of money expended in connection with that Military College which is useless to Canada, and it is constantly increasing, and God knows where it will end. I think we should put a stop to this, and I say to my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that he would do more good if, instead of skirmishing round, he would attack the centre.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not the left centre?

Mr. MITCHELL. If the hon. gentleman who has chosen to interrupt me would devote a little attention to economising the resources of the country, I think that between him and myself we could save a good deal of money, and I advise him to commence by wiping out that institution, and to tell the better classes of this country, who desire to get their sons educated at the public expense, that they must pay for it. It is true that they say they do pay something, but we find from the Auditor General's Report between $60,000 and $70,000 charged for the expenditure on that institution. I do not blame the right hon. gentleman opposite alone for this. When my hon. friend to my right (Sir Richard Cartwright) was Minister of Finance, and the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was Premier, I took the same ground as I do now. They are all prepared to support that institution, and to continue it, as I consider, unfairly and unjustly, as a charge upon the laboring classes of this country.

Mr. MULOCK. What amount does the Minister of Militia intend to deduct from the salary of General Cameron when he supplies him with a house?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not intend to deduct anything.

Mr. MULOCK. There was $800 allowed for a residence. That includes something, does it not?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It includes just what we paid to Colonel Hewitt and Colonel Oliver, and any one else in the same position for rental. I say the rental we paid to Colonel Hewitt we have invested in capitalising the amount. The property which we have purchased for $12,500 cost Dr. Horsey $20,000. I know very little about property in Kingston, but during the visit I paid to that city, I saw this property, and it was one of the very best residences I could see. Whenever it is found convenient for the Government and Parliament to construct a residence on the Royal Military College grounds for the commandant of that college, we can find no difficulty whatever in disposing of this property for the price we paid for it. From information I have received from gentlemen residing in Kingston, I believe it could be disposed of to-morrow without any inconvenience. It was a very good bargain, and I do not think we have increased the expense to the country. Of course the allowance of $800 is cut off.

Mr. MULOCK. That is all I asked about.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does the Minister say the expenses have not increased?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. When this question was up for discussion before, the hon. gentleman was absent.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am here now.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, I am aware of it. When the hon. gentleman is here, every one knows he is here. At that time he happened to be away, and I explained that the expenditure on the Royal Military College had not increased, but that, in keeping the accounts, it was thought better to place the amount of money paid by the cadets, in the shape of what they contribute towards their education in the college, to the credit of the college, instead of letting it go into the books in a different shape as it did in previous years. It was considered that the change which we made indicated to Parliament and to the country the exact amount of money which was being expended. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I followed the good advice which he occasionally gives to Parliament, and I have tried to reduce the expenditure on the Royal Military College, and have increased the amount of money paid by cadets by $100 a year. It has not been insisted upon this year, but every new cadet entering the Royal Military College will have to pay $200 instead of $100 as heretofore. I hope that it will be within the period of time when the present Government will be in power that we can make the Royal Military College a self-supporting institution. I can hardly understand that the hon. gentleman should advocate the abolition of the Royal Military College. The results of the college so far has been very good indeed.

Mr. MITCHELL. We cannot see much good to the country from it.

Sir ADOLPHE P. CARON. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. He says the sons of wealthy men are educated there. Some of the most prominent cadets in that institution are sons of Ontario farmers who have taken a proud position, not only in Canada, but abroad. Mr. Perry, who is now serving in the Mounted Police, and Mr. Mackay, from Montreal, and several others whose names I could mention, are the sons of needy gentlemen, not like the Minister of Militia and that class of people belonging to the upper ten, but of the artisans and farmers who are contributing by days' work to bring up their family respectably; and they found in the Royal Military College a means of giving their sons a position which they never could have obtained otherwise.

Mr. MITCHELL. At the public expense.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that the sum of $800 a year has been allowed to the commandant, as the Minister of Militia says, in lieu of giving him a house.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Will that item of $800 be discontinued after this?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. It appears to me that to purchase a house that costs $20,000, even though you bought it at a discount, for a person who has got an income of but $3,200 a year, is a mistake.

To aid in defraying expenses in connection with the meeting of the American Association for the advancement of science $2,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is a very representative association, the members of which live in the United States and in Canada, and which this year has its meeting in the city of Toronto. A large contribution has been given by the Ontario Government, and it was thought well to give this amount in addition.

Mr. MITCHELL. I object to this item. When this association, or a similar one, visited Montreal three years ago, the people of that city did not come to Parliament and ask them to aid to entertain these people.

Mr. FOSTER. That was the British Science Association.

Mr. MITCHELL. It was the same association, as I understand it, or a similar one. The people did not come to Parliament and ask for aid, and I think it is a wrong thing to take the hard-earned money of the people and divert it to a purpose which was never intended. If one city is entitled to it, another city is; and if Toronto is aided, next year when they come to Montreal or to Quebec, those cities will quote this as a precedent for asking for aid. I should think this wealthy city of Toronto, that boasts so much of its expansion, of its new buildings, and increasing wealth, if they want to entertain an institution of that kind, ought to be able to do so themselves without coming to this Parliament for aid.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am rather astonished to hear the hon. member who is interested in the city of Montreal, and who has a paper there, talk in the way he does of Toronto being willing to accept an offer of this kind. I think if his

memory will carry him back a year or two, he will recollect that a sum of $20,000 was given to the city of Montreal to entertain the British Association of Science. Now, this association is kindred in its character and embraces in its ranks a great many leading men in science both in Canada and in the United States. My only regret is that the Government has given so paltry an amount. It seems to me that if a city of the wealth and standing of Montreal could be granted the sum of $20,000 to entertain an association of a similar character to this, the sum of $2,000, a mere tithe of that amount, is indeed a very paltry sum to give to Toronto. I thought when my hon. friend rose from his seat that he, with his usual love of learning, was going to lay hold of the Government for granting such a paltry sum. I was astonished to find a gentleman given up to literary pursuits, as he is, attempting to throw any discredit on a distinguished association of this kind. As to Montreal being visited by the same association and making a similar demand for aid, my hon. friend may keep his mind and heart content in that matter, because it is not likely that for many years to come any other Canadian city will be honored as Toronto will be honored this year, because it is rather a difficult thing to get a body like the American Scientific Association to hold its meetings in Canada. It will perhaps be 20 years before they come round again. I hope if my hon. friend is here then, representing the third party with the same efficiency that he does now, with the same solid following which he has now, he will be able to help us to vote a similar amount to the city of Montreal.

Mr. MITCHELL. The schoolmaster abroad has undertaken to read me a lesson, and has referred to my literary pursuits. I have never put forward my literary pursuits in this House, and I do not know why the hon. gentleman should refer to it. The hon. gentleman attempts to recall to my recollection the visit of the British Association to Montreal some three years ago when he says a vote was asked from this House for the purpose of entertaining them. I beg to tell the hon. gentleman that he is speaking without the book. The amount of $25,000 that was asked for, was for the purpose of paying the passages of these people to this country, and to carry them over the country. But the city of Montreal never asked for one dollar for the purpose of entertaining them. I would like to ask this schoolmaster abroad just to look up the records, and he will find that my statement is correct. Montreal never asked for a dollar to entertain these people, as the city of Toronto seems to be doing, or perhaps it is their representative who is doing it, to gain *kudos* in St. John's ward when he goes there to get nigger votes. If the hon. gentleman will turn up the *Hansard* he will find that I voted against that very appropriation being given to pay the expenses of the British Association. Why should public money be voted for any such purpose? The people are taxed enough without taxing them to pay the expenses of pleasure seekers travelling through the country. It is true there were in that body very distinguished men. But what benefit has that expenditure been to this country? Have we benefited to the extent of $25,000? I do not think so. Perhaps the hon. gentleman may have made the acquaintance of some of these very distinguished people, and it may be very pleasant for him when he is travelling abroad to figure in the front rank of the hospitable people of Toronto who entertain at the public expense these people as their guests. If it is desired to entertain these visitors let the hon. gentleman put his hand in his own pocket and let the council of Toronto assist, and do not come to this Parliament and ask that the people's money be misappropriated by voting it for the purpose of entertaining the guests of a wealthy city like Toronto. I opposed a similar vote two or three years ago when it came up as a proposal to bring the British Association across the ocean, as, the hon. member has said, to visit Montreal and that Montreal made application, which I say was not the case. Montreal never asked the vote, and never got one dollar of it. I oppose the present vote and I hope it will not pass this Committee.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is this amount to enable these scientists to pursue their scientific investigations, or is it for the purpose of entertaining them? If it is for the latter purpose I think this Parliament has no right to vote the money, and furthermore it is not a proper vote to make. We have conventions constantly meeting in different cities and towns, such as the Knights of Labor, the Master Mechanics, Trade Councils, Locomotive Engineers and Conductors' Associations: all these associations are intended to promote the interests of men who are engaged in the active pursuits in life, but these people never come and ask an appropriation from Parliament to pay their expenses. This is a small piece of business for these scientific men, who are no doubt wealthy men and men able to maintain their position, to come to the Parliament of Canada and ask this vote.

Mr. SCRIVER. They do not ask it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If the city of Toronto asks it, the people should be able to entertain their own guests, and to put their hands in their own pockets. It is absurd to ask the Dominion to pay these expenses, and it may be noted that when the common class meet in convention in Toronto or elsewhere to promote their interest, no Parliamentary appropriations are made. It is only when scientific men, persons high up in the social scale, come here that the nobility of the city of Toronto ask the Dominion Parliament to appropriate $2,000 for the purpose of wining and dining those people in Toronto, whereas, if those people desire to entertain visitors from the United States, they should have the manliness to put their hands in their own pockets and pay the expenses.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman assumes a good deal. He assumes that Toronto has asked for this money for the purpose of enabling those gentlemen to wine these American visitors and all the rest of it. He is mistaken in both assumptions. First, I am not aware that Toronto is asking this vote at all; but I am aware of this fact, that the Canadian Association for the Advancement of Learning, which contains most of the men of scientific learning and literature, in Ontario at all events, have asked the Government to aid them in entertaining, in what way I do not know, these visitors, very likely by giving them excursions to different parts of the country and calling attention to our mineral wealth, and so on. The expenditure of the amount will be left in the hands of that distinguished association. It may be right or wrong to make such votes, but it has been the habit for a good many years. Hon. gentlemen opposite did not object to the vote of $3,000 for the Dairymen's institution.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That is a home institution.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is some sense in that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I take it that the dairymen are richer men that the scientists. Science and wealth seldom go together. Those men who devote themselves to a life of science are not speculators, not men in business, they are generally impecunious, as everybody knows; and no doubt when the scientific men of the United States offer to come here and visit Toronto, one of the chief cities of the Dominion, and meet leading men of science and literature there, it will result in a very useful interchange of knowledge, and these scientific men will become better acquainted with Canadian resources. Besides the grant of $3,000 to the Dairymen's Association we have voted $2,000 towards the Mining Association. It is a spirit of carping which

draws distinctions of this kind. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has stated that he voted against the grant to this association. I am very glad that money was voted, and I think that if the hon. gentleman will look into the various scientific journals in England he will find that Sir Henry Roscoe, the greatest chemist in England, speaks of Canada, and Sir Lionel Playfair and other eminent men speak of this country with knowledge as to its resources, and have a high appreciation of its future. I think that money was very well spent, and I think this money will be equally well spent.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has said a good many things, and stated them in the way he generally does when he wants to carry a very doubtful vote. The hon. gentleman has spoken of Professor Playfair and Professor Roscoe, and as to what they have done in England for Canada. I pay a reasonably fair attention to the public prints, but I do not see that they have very much benefited Canada as yet. No doubt, in some scientific reports they have referred to Canada, and perhaps in a very flattering way, but that is not sufficient justification for granting this amount. The hon. gentleman has made a statement which I think he would not have made on reflection. He said that Toronto did not apply for a vote. It is possible the hon. gentleman may be right, and the impression I have got as to what has been transpiring during the Session may be quite wrong. If I am not misinformed, a committee of the Council of Toronto visited Ottawa, I understood at the time for the purpose of obtaining a contribution from the Parliament of Canada for this purpose.

Mr. COCKBURN. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. member for St. John's Ward says no.

Mr. COCKBURN. I beg pardon, St. John's and St. James.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think the addition of another apostle helps. If so, add St. Peter also. I think my hon. friend the First Minister will recollect that a deputation from the council came down to ask for this aid, and I am told that when they did not find it in the Supplementary Estimates they have been firing telegrams at my right hon. friend, or the representative of the city, asking for the insertion of it in some other estimates. This is an illustration of what was done last night when that Baie des Chaleurs railway job was up. Because it was said that the St. Lake St. John and Gatineau road had got $6,000 a mile it was a sufficient reason to give this road $6,000 also, or in some places $15,000 a mile. The Dairymen's Association is a practical association which does service to an important class in this country, and a vote to an institution of that kind may be justified, but I do not think this vote to the city of Toronto can be justified.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I may tell my hon. friend that in addition to the aldermen who came down from the city of Toronto there were also some tavern keepers who were interested in getting these Americans to go to the city. I happened to recognise one very well developed tavern keeper who came down to get this vote, and no doubt he had his influence with the First Minister. Is this to be expended in furthering scientific pursuits, or is it to be expended for entertaining these people?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I wish not to be inaccurate in my statements. A number of gentlemen came down from Toronto and perhaps among them was a tavern keeper of my hon. friend's acquaintance.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. And your acquaintance too.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no. The statement was made that it was on behalf of the Society for the Advancement of Literature and Science that the vote was asked, to assist in entertaining these scientific gentlemen. Mr. King-Dodds a gentleman well known in the sporting and scientific world was the secretary of that association, and he read an address and he pressed for the vote. There were a number of gentlemen with him and perhaps some of the city councillors, but I do not remember that Mr. Clarke, the mayor, was among them. He was here once this Session, but I do not know if it was then.

Mr. MITCHELL. He fired telegrams down since.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That I do not know anything about. I understand that the money is to be expended in giving excursions to these gentlemen and showing them places of public interest in different parts of the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The right hon. gentleman has said enough. It is quite evident that the Minister of Finance could not refuse anything that Mr. King-Dodds asked.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The fact that Mr. Dodds was one of the deputation would probably indicate that this will be a "horsey" investigation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Natural history will be one of the branches no doubt.

Mr. MULOCK. I like when I can agree with any action of the Government to be able to do so, and in this particular case I am willing to take the responsibility of this vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. You are pandering for political support now.

Mr. MULOCK. No, I am not. I understand that this association will have amongst them persons deeply interested in the mining world, and scientific men who perhaps will make excursions into the interior of the country, and visit some of our great mining industries. When they return home they will no doubt write papers and make known to the enterprising American people some of the undeveloped wealth of the country. If it was desirable to have expended $25,000 on a somewhat similar association previously, I fail to see why a vote of less than one-tenth that amount should not be given here. I regret that there has been any objection to the vote.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to say that I believe that this is a judicious vote, and the members of the Ontario Mining Commission were very anxious that some aid of this kind should be afforded by the Government. We were anxious that this scientific body should have facilities afforded them for examining into our great mining resources, both in Ontario and in other parts of the Dominion. I am aware that these resources are very great indeed, but they are not generally known and it is a matter of great importance that they should be known to the world. We should do everything in our power to have the undeveloped resources of our country more fully placed before the capitalists of the United States. I think the vote is one which will yield large returns, and if the Government never made a worse appropriation than this there would be little room for criticism.

Mr. WATSON. With reference to the vote of $25,000 given some years ago I wish to say that if such a vote came up again in this House I would oppose it, because from my own observations, and from information I received from a person who knew whereof he was speaking, a large number of persons who came here to partake of the hospitality of strangers were nothing more than a lot of dead beats; men who secure their position in the association by paying a fee of a guinea a year for the purpose of having those excursions. While there were some half dozen men among them who should be entertained and who are prominent and

eminent men, yet about three-fourths of the whole crowd that came out here were nothing more nor less than a lot of dead-beats.

Mr. MITCHELL. In reference to what the hon. gentleman has just stated, I may say that I was quite familiar with the talk that occurred at the time those persons visited the country, and I heard remarks similar to those made by the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). I had the curiosity to enquire how that could apply to a body of men who professedly stood so high, and for whom the country was spending $25,000 in entertainment and facilities to travel through the country. I learned that, although there were some leading men among them, the large majority of those in that immense delegation were men who became members of the association by the subscription of one guinea a year, which ensured them the privilege of free travelling over this continent for three or four months. We have had just enough of that kind of boodling business going on. I find my hon. friend on my right, and my hon. friend on my left, who is a Lord High Chancellor or something of that kind in a university, supporting this grant, and I am told that my hon. friend was using his influence with the Government to obtain it. I believe the hon. gentleman who represents St. John's Ward, being a school teacher or something of that kind, and my hon. friend being the Lord High Chancellor of the University, were only influenced by the authorities of the college to endeavor to obtain this vote for the entertainment of those visitors to the country.

Gen. LAURIE. I would like to say a word in reference to the visitors from the British Association. I had the pleasure of meeting a large number of those gentlemen. Some of them were most prominent men, well known in all branches of science in the old country. It is true, a person can become a member of the British Association by subscribing one or two sovereigns; but they were members of the British Association and they had a right to come. When they came, we were exceedingly glad to show them hospitality. But the money of the country was not devoted to carrying those visitors around. It was devoted to paying the expenses of the officers of the association who were expressly selected from scientific institutions—professors and other prominent men. Those were the men on whom that money was spent, and I think very judiciously spent. But our railway companies and others extended hospitality to the visitors as a whole, and I believe that it was well done, and that those who did it would be satisfied to do it again if visitors came here under similar circumstances. Only three years ago I as a Canadian visited England with a large number of friends on the occasion of the Colonial Exhibition. There we received the same attention bestowed on our visitors as when the British Association came here. We were taken through the country; they opened their country houses; gentlemen of the highest standing in Scotland, England and Ireland came as the representatives of various cities—the Duke of Westminster, the Lord Provosts of Edinburgh and Glasgow, the Lord Mayors of Dublin and London—to entertain the visitors to England, simply because they came from Canada and the other colonies. I should be very sorry to have the views which have been expressed go to the public among the proceedings of this House, without somebody standing up to say that when visitors from England come to this country we hope to treat them well, as when we go to other parts of the Empire we receive the same treatment.

Mr. MITCHELL. I want to say one word in reply to the hon. member for Shelburne. I have, no doubt, that what he says is quite true, that quite a number of distinguished men were among the visitors we had on that occasion; everyone who has spoken admits that; but I venture to say that nine-tenths of the people who came over were "guinea pigs" such as I have described, who paid the subscription and became members for the purpose of getting free trips through this country. I had it from some of themselves that such was the case. The hon. and gallant member for Shelburne has referred to the hospitalities he received from the Lord Mayor of Dublin and the Lord Mayor of London and the gentlemen from Scotland and elsewhere. I do not wonder at that, because that gallant gentleman will receive hospitality wherever he goes; his courteous manner and his gallant exterior command that admiration which everybody would like to bestow on a deserving object such as my hon. and gallant friend. But I will give my hon. friend the other side of the shield. I have had conversations with several gentlemen who went to England and exhibited the productions of the industries of this country; and in place of being invited—and they are respectable men, too, some from Toronto and some from Montreal—by the Lord Mayor of Dublin and the Lord Mayor of London and those distinguished men from Scotland in the English country houses, they were a little surprised that some attention was not paid to them even by the High Commissioner. Some of them complained to me that even the High Commissioner did not invite them to dinner. No doubt he has invited my hon. friend and will do so again, because he has stood by him so often. But the hon. gentleman has given no reason to show that the statements made are not sustained by the facts, and that this vote should not be rejected.

Gen. LAURIE. Some hundreds, I may say some thousands of colonists who visited England during the Colonial Exhibition received the courteous treatment I have described. I should be very sorry, after we turned our backs on the country, if we should be referred to as the dead-beats from Canada.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like to know if the Lord Mayor of Dublin and the Lord Mayor of London asked the British Parliament to indemnify them for the expense they were put to for entertaining the gallant gentleman on that occasion. It was well enough for the high people of England to entertain the hon. gentleman if they paid the expense out of their own pockets and did not ask the British people to pay the expense by a vote in Parliament. But the case was different; in this country when the British Association came here, and I fancy, now that the gallant gentleman's attention is called to the matter, that he will see the difference. While admitting that many men accompanied the British Association who occupied high positions in scientific circles, I must say that a large proportion of them were men who joined the association for the purpose of getting travel and free entertainment in this country. I have heard a gentleman in this city say that it was exceedingly difficult to satisfy those men. They were driven out through the country to Chelsea, and at the principal hotel here they were given a grand dinner; but when they got back from the drive, they were almost breaking into the dining room, and wanted to know what kind of a "blawsted" country this was. They wanted to be fed and to be travelled over the country, and I think it is not for the country to pay the expenses of those people who are quite capable of paying their own expenses.

Gen. LAURIE. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong, they were not entertained at the expense of the country. I am a member of the British Association, and I think I would keep if only served one meal a day. But the question is, were those people entertained and driven around at the expense of the country? I say decidedly not. The money voted was simply to pay the actual travelling expenses of certain officers of that association or the "guinea pigs" as the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) calls them. I am one of them myself. They paid their own expenses, and where they received invitations to visit certain localities, those invitations were

conveyed to them of the free will of those people who desired to be visited. I object to the term "dead-beat" being applied to those who were guests coming to Canada, as I object to the term "dead-beat" being applied to us colonists when we visit England.

Mr. GILLMOR. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) was one of the delegates who went to England to bring about Confederation. I was pleased to learn that he was entertained by some of the lords or dukes or noblemen over there and that the whole delegation were invited to take part in the fox hunt. The Prime Minister declined the invitation to mount a fine blood horse to hunt the fox and so did all the rest with the exception of the hon. gentleman, for he was the one man of the delegation who had the courage to put on the buckskin breeches and ride in the chase, and I was very proud of him then.

Mr. WATSON. I was just going to say that, so far as the British Association is concerned, it was composed of just such characters as have been described. It is not what the Government paid that is the chief objection, but a fraud was perpetrated on the general public indirectly through the Government contributing $25,000 to bring those people out. Our people naturally felt that they were a body of men who should be entertained, and in every town they were entertained at the expense of the residents. It was a fraud perpetrated on the residents.

For a line of steamers to ply between the ports of Halifax and St. John, N.B., or either, and the West Indies and South America, or either..... .... $60,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is the sum which Parliament was asked to vote for the establishment of a steam service between either or both of those ports named and the West Indies and South America. We are very diligently gathering information from practical men, merchants, in the various centres of the Dominion, especially those which are interested in the trade with the West India Islands and with South America, with the view of finding out, in the first place, what are the chief lines in which trade can be profitably carried on, and, in the second place, what are the best portions of the widely scattered islands and the very long extended coast of South America with which we can trade. When that information is gathered, and I hope it will be within not a very long time, it is the intention of the Government to go very thoroughly into this matter and to establish a route or two routes which may seem best adapted for the furtherance of profitable trade, and then endeavor to get the best possible service that the amount placed at the disposal of the Government will obtain. Hon. gentlemen well know the expense of carrying on traffic with South America, especially the Argentine Republic. The long distances which intervene make it very costly, and whether or not with the amount that is here to be voted the service can be started and carried on to the Argentine Republic is quite problematic. But it is not impossible that some ports of South America may be taken in in connection with the West India service. However, that will appear more clearly when the information I am gathering has been collected, and then the Government will be responsible for obtaining to get the best service it can with these ports.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What are the ports?

Mr. FOSTER. That remains to be seen. We will try and arrange the route which promises to be most useful for the trade likely to be developed.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Of course anything which tends to the development of trade must be interesting to every Canadian, and being a merchant myself I would look with great satisfaction upon any practical effort to bring about any practical result. I have read carefully the report of the commissioner whom we sent to the Argentine Confederation, and I think hon. members who have read it will come to the same conclusion as I did, that there is not much prospect of any profitable trade in that direction in our staples beyond what is already carried on. Our coal, unfortunately, is not adapted to those long voyages. It is not suited even for the West India market as it will not keep in that climate, because it is soft coal and in the hot weather goes into fry. That same remark applies to the Argentine Confederation. With regard to lumber, that is all carried by sailing vessels, and we are now sending the largest portion of that from the St. Lawrence and ports in the Maritime Provinces. No steamer could carry lumber with profit. With regard to anything else along that coast, I am afraid the Government will find a repetition of the failure experienced in our attempt to open up a trade with Brazil some years ago. The hon. the Finance Minister will remember that a subsidy was granted to a very fine line of steamers to run from Montreal in the summer and Halifax in the winter to Brazil. Two or three steamers were put on the route and after making two or three voyages they had to give it up for want of trade, notwithstanding that they had a fair subsidy. With regard to the West Indian business, I think I have already expressed my opinion on other occasions. I do not think that can be carried on by steamers. The Newfoundland people had a number of steamers and they did on one or two occasions send their fish in that way. But, while they sent to the Mediterranean 10,000 or 20,000 quintals in a cargo, they never sent their steamers to the West Indies. They found that sending fish in such large quantities to the small markets have the effect of reducing the value. Some years ago we had a line of steamers running from Halifax to Jamaica, which where subsidised by the British Government to the extent of £15,000 a year. As long as the subsidy lasted, the steamers ran, but the moment the subsidy was taken away the steamers were withdrawn. They belonged to the Cunard Line. There was no trade betwen those ports except a trade from Halifax in our natural products of fish, which the steamers took out at a very good rate; there was no return cargo from Bermuda or Jamaica, and it was not a paying concern. Those steamers were thrown on the market, and they were bought by a business firm in Halifax at a very small price, and that firm put them on the West India route last fall, and I have understood that they have been applying for a subsidy for their line. One of their steamers they put on the route from Halifax to Havana. For some time, while there were potatoes to ship in the fall, they had a full cargo of potatoes, but directly there were no potatoes to ship they took the steamer off the line, because at that time there were no fish to go, and we had no other natural products to send. That steamer is now chartered by another company, and is running between Newfoundland and Halifax. They found by experience what those of us who are familiar with the trade advised them at the outset, that there was no field for enterprise in that way between those ports, as people would not ship in any large quantities. They have a steamer between Halifax and Jamaica, and they have stated that they also expect to share in this subsidy. I call the attention of the Finance Minister to the fact that this steamer is competing in a trade which is already fully developed by our own sailing vessels from Lockeport and Lunenburg, and Halifax. The total exports to Jamaica amount to from 80,000 to 100,000 quintals of fish a year, besides pickled fish. These vessels take about 2,000 quintals at a time once a month, or about 24,000 quintals a year out of the 100,000 quintals which is the consumption of that island, and they contend, I believe, that they are entitled to a share in this subsidy. This steamer has always had a full cargo from

Halifax at a very full rate. They charge two shillings sterling a quintal, or about $10 a ton, but there is no return cargo. It is simply the fish going in moderate quantities all the time by our sailing vessels, and that is distributed all over the island without causing a decline in prices, as fish going by the steamers which are regularly expected, does cause a decline. The effect of the employment of steamers in that trade has been found by the merchants to keep the prices down, because, no matter how scarce the article may be in the market, the steamer being known to be on the way, and arriving with tolerable certainty, the prices are kept down, but, in regard to the sailing vessels, there is speculation in the market, and the prices are kept up. I think a steamer running in that way would have the effect of lessening the price by two or three shillings a quintal, which reacts on our fishermen, because, of course, merchants will only pay in the market what they see a prospect of securing in the West Indies. There is no return trade whatever, comparatively speaking. I have referred to the newspapers, and have taken the return cargoes of this steamer for the last three voyages. On the 8th February, this steamer, *Alpha*, had 100 bags of coffee, 52 bags of pimento, 191 pieces of lignum vitæ, 10 barrels of sugar, 9 bags of cocoa, 1 bag of cocoanuts, and 74 barrels of fruit. That, in the summer, for a vessel of 1,200 tons, was practically nothing. On 8th March, she brought 134 barrels of fruit and 4 bags of cocoa. 8th On April, she brought 25 barrels of sugar, 7 barrels of ginger, 26 bags of cocoa, 288 barrels of oranges, and 132 bunches of bananas. That will show the hon. Minister that there is no prospect of any business growing up between these ports. The whole business is done one way, and that at a rate at present about double what the Atlantic steamers get for carrying cargoes across the ocean. I hope, therefore, that the Government will hesitate before they will subsidise a steamer under such circumstances. It may be asked why those steamers do not bring return cargoes? It may be answered that they can only go to Kingston, where no sugar is procured. The sugar is procured at the other ports, where steamers cannot go because the water is shallow, and the sugar is loaded in sailing vessels for England, the United States or the Dominion of Canada. There is in this proposal no prospect of any increase in our trade in manufactured goods. The goods which go to the West Indies are largely taken from England, and, if we have to require a duty of 20, 30 or 40 per cent. to keep those goods out of our own markets, I think it is evident that it would be impossible to compete with those manufactures in the West India markets. A short time ago, and I mention this as a illustration, the Cotton Company in Halifax brought some samples to my firm and asked if we would be good enough to send them to our agents in the West Indies and see if they could be introduced. They looked like very fine goods, and they were marked at 5 cents, and had been specially prepared for the West Indian markets. I said: These goods seem very cheap and should be easily sold at a price like that in Jamaica. Shortly aftewards a gentleman in the dry goods business came in and I pointed to these samples and said they seemed to be very cheap. He said they seemed cheap enough to me, but these same goods could be purchased in England for one penny. When I learned that, I said to the Cotton Company: It is useless for you to send your samples to the West Indies, and expect to cope with them under these circumstances. Now, with regard to the West Indies, we have no competitors in our natural product, that is fish, except Newfoundland. The Americans do not compete with us there. Their fish is not cured in a way that enables them to send it to the West Indies, therefore to that extent we have the whole market. No matter what subsidy is granted to steamers, no more fish would go then that goes now. Newfoundland exports a considerable quantity, but we cannot control them in our legislation here. Therefore any subsidy granted to a steamer in that way would not increase our exports in the slightest degree, because those markets take all they require, and sometimes they do not take as much as we would like them to take on account of the quantity we have to go forward. Under these circumstances I hope the Government will be very careful in considering all these points, because I presume there is no desire to interfere with legitimate business unless some object is to be gained, unless it can be made to appear that by a change in the mode of business some great step in advance is to be accomplished, and that our exports are going to be increased. I do not see on what grounds any such expectation can be based, because I pretend to be somewhat familiar with the course of trade with all the West Indian Islands. I know how sensitive markets are, and if a cargo of fish went into those markets by steamer, a cargo of three or four thousand quintals, it would simply result in a sale of a dollar or a dollar and a half a quintal less than if they went in as they go now by way of smaller vessels, with a thousand quintals at a time, and being divided. Another point in which my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer), and Yarmouth (Mr. Lovitt) will corroborate me, is that these fisheries are carried on by a certain class of vessels which are called bankers. They go to the banks and fish all summer up to September or October. They are vessels of 100 or 120 tons, some not quite so large. When they come back from the fishing business they then enter into the carrying business until spring, when they resume fishing operations. Anything like subsidising steamers would have the effect of throwing that class of vessels out of employment. You can see how important that would be from the fact that these schooners from Lunenburg, Lockeport, Yarmouth and Halifax, take out those cargoes during that time and they bring back return cargoes of sugar and molasses from the various ports, or bring back return cargoes of salt that is required for the prosecution of the fisheries during the summer months. One part of the season is made to work in and harmonise with the wants of the other part of the season, and in that way these vessels which are employed during the summer, complete their work by bringing home what they require the coming season. This of course could not be done in any other way. It is the result of the trade which has grown up and which has been developed to its fullest extent, and only requires a large market to enable us to develop that industry still more. All we want is larger markets, and those we cannot get, I am afraid, until the neighboring market is open to us. Under these circumstances I venture to hope that the Government will be very careful in entering into any arrangements with regard to this West India business. I think they should consult with business men who are familiar with the trade to prevent their agreeing to the applications which I know will be made to them. In these days there are people always looking out for subsidies in every branch of trade, people who buy a steamer having little means of their own, and then attempt to get a subsidy from the Government to help them carry on a trade that cannot be made self supporting. Now, with regard to the mails, the steamers to the West Indies are of no advantage to us in that respect. They go once a month from Halifax, and, of course, they carry a mail; but we have a mail two or three times a week *viâ* New York in the same way that the British Government send all their correspondence. The British Government subsidised this line for a time, under the impression that it was necessary to have a steamer to carry their own mail matter, but they have done away with that subsidy, and the English mails now for Bermuda, Jamaica and those places go by the way of New York. There is also, of course, a line from England as well. Therefore, if these routes are good enough for the British Government to forward their correspondence, I think they are quite

sufficient for us; at all events they are more frequent, and more convenient to our trade. All you have to do is to drop a letter into the post office, any time, in Halifax, and you find a steamer from New York to almost any port in the West Indies during the week. These are the conditions in the trade at present. I hope the Minister of Finance will carefully consider the position and not embarrass the trade there, which is in the hands of a good many merchants, unnecessarily embarras it by putting in, at the public expense, steamers to interfere when there is no public advantage to be derived from it. If there was any development that one could look forward to in the lines of their industries, that might be defended; but they take nothing from us, except those articles to which I have referred, and in which, at present, we have no competitors except Newfoundland.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), in a previous discussion, called the attention of the House to the fact that the manufacturers of the country who are endeavoring to create a foreign trade, were not fairly treated by the Customs Department with regard to drawbacks. Now, we have at St. John a gentleman who has made considerable effort to create an export trade in horse nails of a particular kind and fine manufacture, which he is endeavoring to put on the markets of South America and Australia. He says that he is not able to command these markets against foreign competition by reason of the fact that a fair drawback is not allowed. He claims there is a loss of one-third of the material in the manufacture of these horse nails, and he is not allowed a drawback sufficient to cover that. I have his statement here which I will hand to the Finance Minister. I called the attention of the late Finance Minister to the matter, and he promised to look into it, but I am satisfied he never did The statement this gentleman makes is so clear that it seems to me there ought to be a relaxation in the drawback system, and the manufacturers who are now endeavoring to create an export trade should be allowed a fair drawback. At any rate they should be put upon the same footing as the manufacturers of the United States, where a system of drawbacks is much more favorable to the exporter than it is in this country. I know that the people of St. John entertain the hope that trade can be established between the Maritime Provinces and South America. But the effect of the tariff of this country is entirely against the fulfilment of any such hope. Anyone who looks at the trade returns of the country will see that our imports from South America have declined, and there has been no material increase in the exports from this country to South America during the last ten years. One year shows a slight gain, and another year a loss. I have before me the figures for the two years 1873-74, when the total exports from Canada to South America were of the value of $2,498,412, and in the corresponding two years 1883-84 $2,767,430, or an increase of about a quarter of a million dollars in that period. But taking 1884 as against 1874 there is practically no increase. If we look at the imports we fine we imported in 1882 goods to the value of $1,373,617, the duty on which amounted to only a million dollars; while in 1888 the imports were only $876,000, but the duty was greater by $100,000 on the $876,000 than it was on the $1,373,000. So, if the trade is to be increased, the first thing to do is to put the tariff on such a basis that it can be carried on successfully. It seems to me to be contrary to every principle of common sense that we should place heavy duties on goods, and then endeavor to create a trade by taking part of the duty and giving it as subsidies to steamship lines. First, make the tariff practicable by lessening the rate of taxation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot say that I was very much impressed with the accuracy or the extent of the information given by the Finance Minister. He did not appear to have any distinct idea as to where the steamers were to go, or in regard to other points. Neither did I observe whether he was asking the House to give authority to enter into the arrangement for a number of years or for only one year. I object exceedingly, on the information we possess, to the Government entering into an arrangement for a number of years. We have practically no information with respect to this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I purposely stated to the House that the object of this vote was rather to empower the Government to enter into negotiations and make arrangements as to the route, and as to the most favorable routes by which trade can be carried as between our ports and the different ports in the West Indies and South America, and as to how far south it will be possible to go. It is not the intention of the Government to enter into hard and fast contracts for a series of years without coming again to Parliament, but, having this vote, it will give the Government a chance to negotiate and find out what route shall be taken, and the next Session we may come down to the House and ask for power to enter into a contract for 5 or 10 years.

Mr. MULOCK. How did the hon. gentleman arrive at the sum of $60,000 as likely to be required, if he does not know where the vessels are to start from or go to, the route and other matters?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not ask a very extraordinary sum. I asked only a moderate sum on that account, and I stated to the House before that I did not suppose that would give a service to the most distant ports of South America.

Mr. SKINNER. Since this proposed grant has been upon the paper I have been in correspondence with some merchants who are well acquainted with the trade. I find it is the opinion of those with whom I have been brought in contact that if regularity were had in the trade as between maritime ports, such as St. John, and the West Indies, and South America, a large trade could be developed. As a matter of fact, the present is the most propitious time for the commencement of this undertaking we have ever had in the history of Canada. For example, on investigation I find that from Boston and New York during the last year there has been exported to South America over 100,000,000 superficial feet of lumber, all of which has gone from Quebec to Boston or New York.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That could not go by steamer.

Mr. SKINNER. Probably not. I am, however, giving that simply as an argument in order to show that at the present time this subject is one which should receive special consideration. These 100,000,000 feet of lumber would be equal to about 250 ordinary small vessel or schooner loads, that carry about 300,000 superficial feet. That lumber is carried from Canada to the United States. The reason has largely been that Boston and Portland have hitherto been the easiest points to which lumber could be taken, especially by railway. With the construction of the Short Line to Mattawamkeag, there opens the possibility of all this lumber going down to one of our maritime ports. Last year there were received in Canada, at Montreal and the west, over $1,500,000 worth of hides from South America. These were taken to the United States and then brought over to Canada. There is no reason why a great deal of this trade should not be done from Canadian ports. The Government should keep this in view with respect to granting subsidies, that in the past a subsidy has really been granted to the steamer and has been controlled for the time by the owner of the vessel. Whereas, in granting the subsidy it should be done on this understanding that through bills of lading to Toronto, Hamilton and Montreal from places from which the goods are brought and also to places to which goods are taken, should be granted. The difficulty that has been hitherto felt, and it is one which continues to

be felt, is this, that a merchant in Toronto wanting to sell goods abroad or receive goods from abroad gets them landed in Boston or New York, or sends them there, and he enters into this calculation: What is going to be the cost to receive my goods from Boston or New York, or to send them to those cities, and how much less will it be to receive them from the Canadian Maritime Provinces? What throws the business into the United States ports is that they can carry the goods to and from the West Indies cheaper than the Canadian ports can, considering the intermediate railway freights. Therefore any subsidy that may be granted to steamers should cover these particular points and enable persons, in Toronto for instance, to send their goods to a Canadian port as cheaply as to an American port. If that is kept in view, the business will be developed and we will have trade for our Canadian ports summer and winter. I may state also that in granting subsidies it would be better to grant them to a Canadian company, which would be interested in developing the business and being so interested, I am sure a great deal could be done. In proportion as we can have that lumber from Quebec, going from Canadian ports, a great assistance can be given to commerce by this trade. The hon. member for Halifax says that lumber would not be shipped in steamers but it should be remembered that it is not alone what the steamers may do. What we want is a regularity and certainty in the service between Canadian ports so as to accommodate freight and pasenger traffic. The exports which are sent from Canada to the United States ports for shipment to the West Indies is because there is a regular and efficient service from the United States ports. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) says you cannot send your products forward so long as you have a heavy duty upon goods coming into this country, but in answer to that it may be said that the heaviest competitors with England in the markets of South America, are Germany and the highest protected countries in Europe. In reference to the West Indies I have been told by a merchant of St. John, who is as well posted on that matter as the hon. gentleman from Halifax, that a ready and continuous supply of lumber in St. John would materially assists the trade of that port. It must be remembered that if you send fish and other produce as a staple article of your export you may be liable to overstock the market, but the lumber business is not liable to any such circumstances, and therefore if you are trading from a port in which you can supply a cargo of lumber any time it is required, the vessel conducting the business can load up with lumber as far as it may be necessary, and then take the balance of her cargo of other merchandise. I may also tell the hon. gentleman from Nova Scotia that the reason why the ships going to the West Indies from Canada have not return cargoes is because of the heavy competition which we have with the United States. These subsidies do not mean that they are given to develop a business in which the Maritime Provinces are alone interested. They are calculated and intended to get back some of the trade the United States have taken from us. We desire to develop the business through St. John with reference to the western portion of our country. What we ask the subsidies for is not for ourselves alone, but in order that we may enable the merchants and manufacturers and producers of Western Canada to export their produce from our own ports and to bring back what they desire through these same ports. When that is accomplished, we will have our export and import trade carried on by our own people and for the benefit of our own people.

Mr. KENNY. This question of the trade relations with the West Indies have been several times before the Parliament of Canada, and the most recent addition we have had to our information on that question is the address which was delivered by the Hon. John Macdonald, of Toronto, to to the Board of Trade in January last. The hon. Senator at considerable trouble has submitted to the Canadian public an amount of information in reference to the trade requirements of the people of the West Indies which entitles him to the thanks of the people of Canada. He has pointed out that in those West Indies there is a population about the same as in Canada, and requiring many of the articles that we produce and of which we have a surplus. That hon. gentleman has also pointed out that the people of the West Indies are now supplied with all these commodities from the United States, and has also showed us that the reason they are supplied from that market is the fact that they have a better means of communication by steamers than we possess in Canada. I agree with the remark which has just fallen from my friend, the junior member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) that if we had steam communication from Montreal, or St. John, or Halifax, whereby the flour and the grain and the cheese and other articles of which we have a surplus in Ontario, and certain manufactured goods of which we have a surplus in Quebec, whereby these articles could be shipped at as favorable terms from our own ports, we would divert to our own ports that trade. It has been contended that we could supply the West Indies with flour. In the speech to which I have referred, the hon. senator says:

"I am glad that I am able also to disprove a statement which I had to meet in the West Indies, and which I was unable to contradict—that is, as to the character and price of our flour, as to the flour itself being unsuited for a tropical climate, and the price being too high. Both of these objections are dealt with by practical men, and the information comes to me through a letter addressed to the Secretary of the Board of Trade."

Satisfying the hon. gentleman who made this address that we can produce flour quite suitable to those climates, but we must have rapid means of transportation. At present our trade with the West Indies is largely a Nova Scotian trade, and it is conducted by sailing vessels which in their time were very suitable; but when hon. gentlemen consider that at present from the United States there are from fifteen to twenty lines of steamers, some starting from Boston, some from New York, and some from southern ports like Baltimore, hon. gentlemen will see how much greater advantages that country possesses for exporting all the articles the West Indies require than we possess. I regret to say that our West India trade is a diminishing trade, that the number of firms as well as the number of vessels engaged in it are diminishing, and it is contended by those who have studied the question that that is due largely to the fact that we have not equal means of communication to those the Americans enjoy. In 1878 the trade of Nova Scotia with the West Indies amounted to $2,412,361, and it diminished to $1,555,188 in 1887. But this is not a local question, and I do not desire to view it from that point. It is a question in which all Canada is concerned, though Ontario and Quebec perhaps not to the same extent as Nova Scotia. In 1886 the trade between the United States and the West Indies, imports and exports, amounted to $102,000,000, while the trade of Canada with the West Indies amounted to $5,553,892. As a matter of fact we are now sending a considerable quantity of fish to the West Indies by way of the United States, because it is transhipped quickly by steamers, and we all know that fish is a perishable article which must be transhipped speedily to secure such a market. The great object of commerce at the present day is regularity, and that can only be obtained by steam. Now, my hon. colleague has referred to the fact that from 1880 to 1886 there was a steam service from Halifax to Jamaica. In 1886, when the subsidy was withdrawn, as that hon. gentleman has stated, this service ceased. But, Sir, it has been renewed, and the first steamer of the line, I find, sailed on the 17th of September, 1888. Up to the date of my departure from Halifax to attend my sessional duties in February there were only six sailings. I find that those vessels accommodated a large number

of shippers, and there were naturally a number of competitors in the market for the supply of the articles required by the West Indies, and I consider that it would be a very great advantage to our fishermen, if that service were continued. The question was asked by an hon. gentleman opposite as to the disposition the Government intended to make of the $60,000. I think they were right to inform themselves of the different requirements in the West Indies, and sub-divided this subsidy amongst them. Now, Sir, I find that the Collector-General of Jamaica, in his last report, attributes the decrease of the trade with the sister colony of Canada to the direct communication having been done away in 1886 for the lack of a small subsidy. At this late hour of the Session and this early hour of the morning I am not going to detain the Committee by any lengthy remarks. I am simply going to give the opinion that has been expressed by the Chamber of Commerce at Halifax, that it would be in the interest of that community and the trade of that locality and the country, if we had a line of steamers to the West Indies; and to secure this we must at the inception subsidise them.

Gen. LAURIE. Last Session I was told, in touching on the question of the West India trade, that I knew nothing about it, and I therefore decided that I would try and learn something, so I put myself in communication with those who I thought knew most about it, that is, the West India people themselves. I sent out as many as 250 letters to merchants and legislators in the West Indies, and asked their opinion on the whole question raised in the debate in this House last year. I am not going to weary the House by referring to many of the letters I received, but there are one or two to which I think I should refer. Some of these came from governors of the colonies, who are perhaps in the best position to express sound views on the subjects For instance, Sir Wm. Robinson, the Governor of Trinidad, says:

"I have received your letters of the 11th and 21st May, with copies of the reports of debates in your House of Commons, and in reply to your question, I am of opinion, and my Executive Council concur with me, that much mutual advantage would accrue to Canada and to Trinidad if there were more commercial relations established between us."

He sends a number of blue books, and says:

"From these papers you will see what we can supply you with, and what we can take from you, and also what strides the colony has taken during Her Majesty's reign. I have directed a copy of our last blue book to be forwarded to you, and would recommend a careful perusal of that portion of it which refers to the general imports into this island. You can make whatever use you like of this letter and of its enclosures. If you desire any further information, I shall be happy to supply it."

That is the view of the Governor speaking for his Executive Council. The discussion hinges largely on the question as to whether sailing vessels or steamers are best adapted to this trade. The last returns show that whilst the sailing commerce entered increased to 1,462 tons and cleared reduced by 8,553, the steamer entries increased no less than 37,828 tons entered and 26,386 cleared, thus showing that the steamer trade is largely increasing, whilst that by the sailing vessels is largely diminishing. That is a justification, I think, for our taking hold of the steamer trade. I do not propose to read many of these letters, but we have been told by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) that a protected country cannot hope to develop its exports. I will read the views of the first magistrate of the most protected country in the world as to the possibilities of export. President Harrison, in his inaugural address, says:

"The exigencies of commerce demand safe, reliable and rapid means of communication and until these are provided, the development of our trade with the States lying to the south of us is impossible."

If he, ruling and regulating the trade, as he must to some extent, of the most highly protected country in the world, finds that he can develop his exports by urging on the people of the United States the largely subsidised steamers running to the country to the south of them, I think that we, a less protected country, are in a similar position and should follow his advice.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Although it may seem perhaps rather hazardous to offer an opinion against the views of President Harrison and the Governor of Trinidad and my respected colleague as well, still considering that I have had forty years experience of the trade, I think I understand that business perhaps as well as any of these distinguished individuals. My respected colleague refers to the number of steamers trading between the United States and the West Indies. But these steamers are not subsidised. I do not object to any steamer going to the West Indies if she can find any trade that will be remunerative. On the contrary, anything that develops trade by steamer or by sailing vessel I am heartily in favor of, but I object to our being called on to subsidise a line of steamers that will enter into competition to secure a trade which is already developed to its fullest capacity and which competition will entail heavy loss on the people who are now engaged in that trade and who will have to bear a part of the tax for subsidising these steamers. In the United States these steamers are run as a business venture without any subsidy whatever, and that is the proper way. They have an advantage which we have not and never will have, and that is they can come back to the various American ports with cargoes of fruit. I have seen fifteen cargoes of fruit arrive in one week in New York alone, all of which was absorbed directly in their markets and a part of which no doubt came to Canada. But if one cargo of fruit came to Halifax, there would be no market for it, and it would decay on the wharves and would have to be thrown away. My hon. colleague says the West India trade has declined. He is mistaken. The hon. gentleman is not versed in that trade, and cannot be supposed to be familiar with it. In Halifax there are not many firms in the business there, but there is as much fish as ever exported from Nova Scotia and Halifax and more from the other ports of Nova Scotia than ever before. The business has been transferred from Halifax to Lunenburg, where they carry on a large business with the vessels on the bank, and to Lockeport and to Yarmouth. Instead of all the fish being sent as formerly to Halifax, a great part of it is shipped direct from these latter ports, so that while there has been this change in the trade there has been no actual falling off in the export. On the contrary there is more fish than ever exported. We have no competitors at present except the Newfoundlanders whom of course we cannot control. Therefore, it is unnecessary to waste the people's money subsidising steamers to carry fish to the West Indies which are now carried there in sailing vessels. But my hon. colleague said it was necessary these fish should be carried as quickly as possible. Again his judgment is in fault for the fish arrive in much better condition in a sailing vessel after a 15 or 20 days voyage than in one of those steamers, where they are liable to be heated with the furnace and hot coal.

Resolutions reported.

CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Purchase of residence for Commandant of Royal Military College, Kingston..... $12,500.

Mr. McMULLEN moved:

That the vote be not now concurred in, but that it be Resolved, That it appears from statements made in this House by the Minister of Militia, that it is proposed to purchase a residence for the Commandant of the Royal Military College, situated at the opposite extremity of the city of Kingston, at a distance of about one and a half miles from the said college; that if it be necessary to purchase a residence for the said commandant, said residence should be erected in the grounds or immediately

adjacent to the said college; that the said purchase is inexpedient, and is a misappropriation of the public funds.

Amendment negatived on a division.

QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY AND STEAMBOAT COMPANY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider resolution (p. 1572) respecting a contract proposed to be entered into with the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Steamboat Company. He said: It is known that, in 1886, a railway company was chartered from Regina to Long Lake, and so on to the North Saskatchewan, and the usual land grant was made to it. Great efforts were made by the company, and in fact there was a junction of two companies that were interested in that region of the country, and that formed this company as the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Steamboat Company. They succeeded in building from Regina to Long Lake straight north. Then the charter enables them to go on to Prince Albert with a branch to Battleford, or rather to go straight north from Long Lake to a certain point and then make a "Y," one branch going to Prince Albert and the other branch going to Battleford.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it operated for 21 miles?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. It has been running, but it is not operated now. It is a short railway. Although it goes through a fine country, the population cannot support the road. A great effort has been made by those interested in the road to get capital to build it, and they have had very provoking appearances of success, but in some way or other they failed. They, however, have not lost heart, and they have tried every possible means to carry on the road further. Meanwhile the people of Prince Albert on the North Saskatchewan are becoming almost desperate. They threaten to abandon that part of the country, because they have almost no access to the outer world except by the North Saskatchewan, which is a summer route, and their business which formerly was locally valuable to them, has to a certain extent disappeared. The building of the Canadian Pacific Railway has carried off a great deal of their freight. Now, the Government are exceedingly anxious to connect the valuable lines of transport, the Canadian Pacific Railway running from east to west, with the main body of the Saskatchewan, and we have come to an arrangement with this company, if Parliament will sanction it, by which we believe the company will be able to build the road to Saskatoon, a point on the South Saskatchewan, and thence, at or near Saskatoon, to Prince Albert. The distance to Saskatoon is 161 miles. In order to give the company some means of raising money in England an arrangement has been made. The company will get no money until the road is finished to Saskatoon, this is 161 miles from Regina. Upon building to Saskatoon they will receive $50,000 a year for 20 years.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the present value of that, considered as a cash bonus?

Mr. FOSTER. About $700,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The proposition is that after this 161 miles are finished, and not before, we will pay them $70,000 for ten years, and for that they will carry the mails and all materials, men, troops, and everything of that kind, which will be an account kept against this money. If at any time the amount earned by the railway will not meet this advance, then the sum paid it shall be charged against the company, and the Government will hold as security one half of their land to make up any deficiency in the earnings. As regards probable earnings, we can only make an approximate estimate and that estimate is founded upon the expenditure by the Government in the past. The calculation is made from what the Government has already paid. The Indian Department has hitherto paid an average of $22,380 for transport, the Mounted Police, $30,375; Post Office Department, $16,000; Telegraph Service, $3,000; messengers and others, $2,000; a total of $72,755. Of course, when the railway is constructed this very large expense we have hitherto incurred for transport, will be diminished in quantity, but as that quantity diminishes the country will be settling, and the compensation will come from the settlement of the country and the increasing trade on the railway. The moment the railway is built the land will become saleable, and the money will be funded for the purpose of paying any deficiency. After being charged to the earnings the balance will be charged against the land.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The value of the land is already hypothecated to meet that bill of $58,000,000 which the hon. gentleman's colleague promised us on the 1st of January.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then it is proposed with $50,000 to finish the road to Saskatoon; then, whenever the road is finished from Saskatoon to Prince Albert, it shall receive for the same $30,000 more.

Mr. TROW. What is the distance from Saskatoon to Prince Albert?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 85 miles. That is about the same rate. The hon. gentleman will understand that perhaps this is one of the most important roads in the North-West. It brings into communication with the rest of the North-West people who are isolated along the North Saskatchewan. There will be a very considerable trade along the Saskatchewan of goods and passengers coming out of Prince Albert and going by the summer route, by the North Saskatchewan to Edmonton, Fort Pitt, Battleford and so on along that line eastward to Winnipeg. There is little doubt that that country will be greatly sought after on each side of this railway. It is in consequence of the great importance of opening up this country and giving the people of Prince Albert and the North Saskatchewan an outlet, that the Government has proposed a larger grant than usual in the North-West. Hitherto grants in aid have been, with the exception of the Canadian Pacific Railway, altogether in land. In this case, in addition to land, it is proposed after the road is built to give a money grant, and until it is built to Saskatoon there will be no payment of any portion of the $50,000. Unless it is finished from Saskatoon to Prince Albert within two years after it reaches that point, the grant of money will be suspended until it is finished to Prince Albert. Considering the great object in view, that of settling the country and giving a connection to the outer world to Prince Albert and Saskatchewan District, the House should have little difficulty in acceding to the proposition of the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no doubt whatever that this is a very important matter, and I cannot but regret exceedingly that this proposal, which requires and deserves at least considerable discussion, should have been brought down at a time when it is not possible to discuss it rationally or intelligently. Now we are called upon to vote this amount at one o'clock in the morning. It is trifling with the great interests committed to our charge that the Government have withheld a matter of this importance up to this time. I must protest against being called upon to consider this question at one o'clock in the morning without having a reasonable chance of obtaining the information required. Who formed the Qu'Appelle Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company in reality? Are they Canadians or foreigners?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. One of them is the Hon. Senator McInnes, who has taken a warm interest in this question. First his eye was turned to a railway running south to Prince Albert and to South Saskatchewan. Another gentleman is Mr. Pugsley, the manager for the original railway running from Regina to Long Lake. He is a New Brunswicker. Mr. McInnes, though a Scotchman like myself, is considered, as I hope I may be considered, to be a Canadian. He is a man who has been in business for many years, of high character, and anything with which he is connected will certainly be *bonâ fide*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do these gentlemen form the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Company?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know the names of their coadjutors, but these are the two gentlemen with whom the Government have been in communication.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is not Mr. Maynard mixed up with it?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No. He was connected with the first twenty miles, and purchased the land grant. He is not connected with this enterprise.

Mr. TROW. Will the road cross the South Saskatchewan at Saskatoon, and run by a line through St. Laurent to Prince Albert, between the two rivers, or will it go on the south side by Batoche?

Mr. MACDOWALL. It is to go to Saskatoon and cross the South Branch near there, and three or four crossings have already been surveyed by engineers, and it is proposed to take the most advantageous one. The road will then be within 90 miles of Battleford. The road will then be continued between the two rivers in as straight a course as possible to Prince Albert. It is intended afterwards to build from the crossing near Saskatoon to Battleford, so as to give connection with these two leading settlements.

Mr. TROW. There is already a charter granted to the Manitoba and North-Western to go to Prince Albert, which would be more direct than the route now under discussion, because the Saskatchewan runs 80 miles to the north-east, while the other scheme is for a railway from Portage la Prairie to Prince Albert, crossing at the junction of the North and South Saskatchewan.

Mr. MACDOWALL. There are two advantages in assisting this road. The Manitoba and North-Western is a longer road to Prince Albert, namely 270 miles in a straight line. This road will be 180 miles in a straight line as the crow flies. It is, of course, cheaper to build the shorter line.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the approximate cost.

Mr. MACDOWALL. The cost of prairie roads is estimated at from $13,000 to $15,000 per mile. It cost $16,000 a mile to build the Manitoba and South-Western. It has this other advantage: that it will reach the three principal settlements, Prince Albert and Battleford, on the North Saskatchewan, and Saskatoon, on the South Branch, whereas the Manitoba and North-Western would run through an uninhabited country until it reached Prince Albert, Battleford and Saskatoon being left out. Therefore, if it is desired to serve the country, this road is the best to attain that object, and as it is a shorter route it will consequently be cheaper.

Mr. MULOCK. While it is impossible for the House to give an intelligent opinion as to the details of this scheme, I desire to say that I entirely approve of the wise policy of the rapid development of the North-West. I am not able to say whether this particular scheme is one that should be assented to or not, but for some years I have been of the opinion that we might to great advantage expend some of the public money in developing the North-West. With regard to the land grants that are being given to the roads in the North-West, I believe it would be much better if the Government gave cash drawn from the land, because the cash would secure the prompt construction of the road and the lands would at once be available for settlers and traffic would be supplied for the railroads in general. I think that the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) has overstated the cost of building railroads in the prairie section.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I am informed on the best authority that the Manitoba and North-West road cost $16,000 a mile.

Mr. MULOCK. That may be quite correct, and yet my statement quite correct too, because it was more expensive to build roads when railroad building was in its infancy in the North-West than it is to-day. I was about to say that it would be wise for the Government to spend so much per annum towards railway development in the North-West. Suppose we spent one million dollars a year in cash towards developing the North-West Territories with railroad building, even at the high estimate of $18,000 per mile we could get 125 miles of road which would develop a country 50 miles in width and 150 miles in length. If that were done every settler would have a guarantee of a certainty of a road being built somewhere in his vicinity in the North-West and our country would be rapidly filled up. While I cannot say whether this particular line is a wise scheme or not, yet I am in favor of the direction in which the money of the country is to be expended. I am sorry, however, that we cannot have some scheme in which some hon. member of Parliament is not concerned, and I say this with all respect to the gentleman who is promoting this Bill. He may, and he probably is, actuated with a sense for the best interests of the country. I know the hon. senator who has been referred to in connection with this scheme as a public-spirited and a high-minded man, and I will assume that he is moved in this enterprise by the same honorable feelings, but yet it would be far better to have these different grants made to corporations not controlled by legislators. I say this without a single element of partisanship, and I care not whether it refers to a member on one side or the other of the Speaker. I say that I wish we could prevent those painful scenes which constantly take place where references have to be made to the *bonâ fides*, and reflection cast from time to time. I am sure the First Minister knows that this commends itself to his better judgment, although I can see from the expression on his face that he cannot say the point is well taken. I would join cheerfully with the policy of any Government that would be conducted on the lines I have referred to, but I would prefer that the money for the development of the North-West should be expended in such a way that it should be for the development of the country, and not get into the pockets of any one except in a legitimate way. I rejoice to see people making money in a legitimate way, but for the sake of the institution which we are all so proud of, I think that persons directly or indirectly connected with the members of the Legislature shall not be concerned in these enterprises.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I partly agree with the hon. gentleman, although I cannot go with him to the fullest extent to which he required me to go. I may say, however, that the Hon. Mr. McInnes entered into this enterprise and invested his money in it before he was a member of the Senate.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not make any reflection on the hon. senator. I could not do so, and I don't intend to do so in any way.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman said as to the desirability of keeping members of Parliament out of any scheme which is supported by the

country. It is too late in the Session to philosophise about what can be done in future, but I think it is desirable that it should be kept in view. While the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was Premier of this country he run a line, I believe, through Prince Albert, and as a number of settlers were induced to go there, I have always thought it cruel to those men, who invested their capital in that part of the Dominion, that they had no market for the surplus products which they produced by their industry and enterprise. I know nothing about the merits of the scheme now proposed, but they are getting a pretty good subsidy and the Government is getting a return, in the conveyance of mounted police and troops and supplies and mails. I am willing on this occasion to give the Government credit for doing the right thing in the right direction. I do say it is the duty of the Government to give those people a railway who went into the country during the administration of my hon. friend from East York.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that the company, in addition to the money subsidy gets a grant of 6,400 acres a mile.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That of itself will mean, on a line of this length, about 1,250,000 acres at least. Is the hon. gentleman going to allow the other railway companies, whether the Canadian Pacific Railway or some of the others about to be subsidised, in addition to this road, to take possession of lands which will lie along to the right and left of this road, and will be made valuable by its construction?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The land grant will be made on each side of the line as it is built. The land on each side will belong to the railway company, subject, of course, to any prior claims of individuals or corporations I do not think they come materially into collision with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Their line will very soon run north of the railway belt, along the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are bound to accept the lands in their railway belt which are fairly fit for settlement. They are not to be the judges. I fancy they would be very glad to take them if they were only fairly fit for settlement, because their proximity to the railway would more than compensate for the inferiority of the land. As it is not supposed that the land fairly fit for settlement along the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway will amount to 25,000,000, there is a reservation to the north so large that it is quite certain the deficiency will be made up out of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then they could not come down on the Government for the balance along the line of this railway?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, certainly not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I believe that the checkerboard system of dividing the land into blocks of one mile square is held by the general consensus of opinion to have proven very mischievous. Does the hon. gentleman, in granting the land to this company, propose to continue that system, or has he considered the advisability of granting large blocks of say 6,400 acres to the railway, and allowing settlement to go in on another block of 6,400 acres? The late Mr. White, in reply to me on several occasions, expressed his individual opinion that it would be very much better to do away with the system of dividing the land into blocks a mile square, and to grant large blocks to the companies if they would take them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to surveyed lands, the system of alternate sections will be continued. That is the arrangement with the Manitoba and North-Western and with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think the great mistake was in adopting the American system of survey, which was very captivating to the surveyors. I think the system that prevailed in Upper Canada, where the length of the lot far exceeded its breadth, which brought the farmers closer together, was preferable. But the surveys have been gone on with according to the American system, and it is too late, except in unsurveyed portions of the country, to alter that system.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You might give townships alternately.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes; the grant to the Alberta and Athabasca Railway, running from Calgary to Edmonton, was given in townships.

Mr. TROW. I highly approve of these resolutions for the construction of the line from Regina to Saskatoon, and direct to Battleford. That portion is highly approved of to Saskatoon. It passes through a country adapted for successful settlement, from Saskatoon to Prince Albert, a distance of some 80 miles on the north side of the Saskatchewan, between the two rivers, which are only about 20 or 24 miles apart. In the greater part of that angle, Saskatoon or Clark's Crossing to Prince Albert and clear to the junction, it is not over 24 miles apart. Now, there is a line of railway already chartered going through that angle, the Manitoba and North-Western, which I should say would give sufficient accommodation for the 24 miles clear up to Saskatoon. I approve of this system of survey, for it is certainly the best adapted for the country out there, but I think this would be a waste of money because your road from Saskatoon to Prince Albert runs to the north-east, while your line to Battleford is to the north-west. The one is entirely different to the other; and it strikes me the other line of railway would answer all the purposes.

Mr. WATSON. There apparently is a unanimous feeling in the House that the Government are doing right in assisting a line of railway to the Saskatchewan country. In fact it has been evident for the last two or three years that these people either had to have railway communication or get out of the country. While I approve of the Government taking this means of assisting the company, I do not altogether approve of the route they have chosen to assist, and am strongly of opinion that the country would be as fully as well served and served in a much better direction by assisting by a cash bonus or loan either the Manitoba and North-Western or the North-West Central. I entirely agree with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) when he states that railroads cannot successfully be built on land grants. That has been clearly proven in the North-West. It is much better in the interest of the whole Dominion that instead of giving these land grants of 6,400 acres per mile, the Government should pursue the policy they follow with regard to eastern railways of giving a cash bonus subsidy of $3,200 per mile or more. A road would be better built on that than on the 6,400 acres of land, and the cash subsidy would be only 50 cents an acre. I am satisfied the Government, once the railway is constructed, would be able to realise more than that for the land. The distance from Portage, by Regina to Prince Albert, is 529 miles. From Portage by the North-Western route, 200 miles of which is built, to Prince Albert is about 425 miles. That is a shorter route by over 100 miles, and that is opening another road which will be built and will serve the country just as well if not better than the proposed route, because the produce of the country will have to go east to find a market.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A good deal of it will go west to British Columbia.

Mr. WATSON. I think the people of Saskatchewan district look more to the east than the west.

Mr. MACDOWALL. They look anywhere for a market.

Mr. WATSON. They have been looking in vain the last two years and have not seen the market yet. I entirely approve of the assistance the Government is giving, and no doubt they will find that the saving on the freights that would be sent going west or north of the Canadian Pacific Railway to reach that Saskatchewan country will be considerable.

Mr. DAVIN. I have just a few words to say in regard to this matter. As a fact the country around Regina is finding a market west, and of course the country around Saskatoon and Prince Albert would look also to the west, and throws into the shade the argument of my hon. friend for Marquette (Mr. Watson). I may say that the Board of Trade at Regina has surveyed the land from Regina to Saskatoon, and I am therefore in a position to say with authority that the land on each side of that railway going north from Regina to Saskatoon is among the best land in the North-West Territories. I have heard with great pleasure the liberal utterances of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) in the early part of his remarks. I think myself that in the interest of the whole Dominion such views and principles as he enunciated in the management of the North-West would be fruitful of the best consequences for the North-West Territories and the Dominion.

Mr. MULOCK. When does the company draw the first portion of the subsidy?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As soon as the road is finished and running.

Mr. MULOCK. That is where the Government I think is overreaching itself. It would be much better, if you want to ensure the rapid building of the road, to pay out the money in small sections. The distance to Saskatoon is 160 miles from Regina, so that the company have to build 140 miles before they can draw a dollar and will be embarrassed in their financing. Why not pay out so much according as every section of five or ten miles is finished?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I pointed out to the hon. gentleman that this is the proposition of the company itself.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, it is an unwise one.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On the other hand it would be a greater inducement for the company to have the line speedily built so that they may be able to draw their subsidy.

Mr. MULOCK. I quite appreciate the object of the hon. gentleman, but I am satisfied that he is taking the best way to defeat that object. The company, if it takes $16,000 a mile to build the road, will have to find financiers prepared to build 140 miles at that rate. That will be over $2,000,000 besides the rolling stock. The company will have to finance for $3,000,000 before one spade can be put in the ground. It is far more difficult to finance for $3,000,000 than for $300,000, and I think the Minister would be wise to take power to pay money out as sections of five or ten miles are constructed.

Motion agreed to, resolution considered in Committee, reported, and concurred in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 151) respecting a certain agreement therein mentioned with the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second times, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved second reading of Bill (No. 146) to amend the Act respecting the North-West Mounted Police. He said: By the original Police Act, the Commissioner and the Assistant Commissioner had the powers of stipendiary magistrates, but, in the Act of 1886, that was omitted, and this is merely to restore to the Commissioner and Assistant Commissioner the powers they had under the original Act. In order to meet the difficulty in the meantime, commissions were issued to them under the Dominion Police Act, and they have been acting as stipendiary magistrates under that, but it has been thought better to restore the powers to them in their representative capacity. Then, at present every constable of the force is a constable in every Province in Canada, but the officers are not. This will give the officers the power which they have in the North-West in adjacent Provinces. The force is employed very considerably in Manitoba in stopping raiders and cattle stealers and others; and so in British Columbia. In consequence of the representations of the British Columbia Government last year that there was an imminent danger of an Indian war, and on a requisition from that Government, a strong force was sent into British Columbia and remained there nearly a year, but the officers had no control in that Province whatever. This is intended to cure that. Then the second clause has reference to the entry of constables into houses for the seizure and destruction of intoxicating liquors. It was held by Judge Rouleau, though I believe his judgment was not concurred in by the other judges, that the police could not go into a saloon or a place which was known to have liquor for sale, and search it, unless they first saw the liquor. This clause is intended to cure that. I have a letter from the Deputy Minister of Justice stating that, while he cannot understand how such a decision was arrived at under the existing law, it would have the effect of law in the district over which that judge had jurisdiction, and suggesting that it might be necessary to pass a declaratory Act. It is to meet that view that this section has been introduced. The next clause is an amendment of the Act to remove a doubt as to whether a deserter can be arrested after the expiration of the term for which he was engaged to serve. We can well understand that the man who deserts ought to be punished for that desertion even if the term of his service has expired.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you put any limitation, because it is hardly desirable to keep that hanging for ever over the man.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is true. Several cases have occurred where men arrested in eastern Canada have been let off by the justice of the peace. A man is arrested, he deserts and comes down to Ontario or Quebec; he goes before a magistrate and is tried and fined $5. This clause makes the minimum $100. The next clause deals with persons who desert, or who persuade any other to desert, and fixes the penalty. This Act was introduced in the Senate, and has been gone carefully over by the Deputy Minister of Justice. The hon. gentleman will see that the Bill is merely for the improvement of the discipline of the force. I move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the Minister intend to give the powers of a magistrate to certain members of the Mounted Police?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, in Manitoba and British Columbia.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1:55 a. m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 1st May, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SICK MARINERS' FUND.

Mr. TAYLOR (for Sir DONALD SMITH) asked, With respect to the Fund for the relief of sick and distressed Mariners: 1. Does not the Act 31 Victoria, chapter 64, require that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries shall make periodical reports of the receipts and expenditures under the said Act? 2. Was not a summary of these reports for the previous eighteen years given in the Nineteenth Annual Report of that Department, page 34? 3. Did not that summary show the total amount of disbursements as being $752,238.47, and of receipts as being $725,679.84, leaving an apparent deficit of $26,558.63? 4. Did not this item of disbursements, $752,238.47, include: (1.) The hospital care in the Marine Hospital at Quebec of 8,293 persons, who were not sick mariners, for an aggregate of 272,617 days, at an average cost of 86⅔ cents per day, amounting to the sum of $235,541.98; and (2) The sum of $16,500, being subventions from time to time paid to two local hospitals, one in St. Catharines, and the other in Kingston, together aggregating the sum of $252,041.08? 5. Are not these expenditures outside the scope of the Sick Mariners' Act, which provides that "The moneys so received shall * * form a fund, to be called and known as the Sick Mariners' Fund, for the purposes mentioned hereinafter, and no other"? 6. Instead, therefore, of there being, as on 30th June, 1886, a debit balance against the Sick Mariners' Fund of $26,558.63, as shown in the said Nineteenth Annual Report, was there not, in fact, a surplus of $225,482.45 at the credit of the Fund on said date, if the account had been correctly stated? 7. Were not the dues, levied on shipping by the said 31 Victoria, increased by 50 per cent. in 1875, by 38 Victoria, chapter 31, on the erroneous plea that the receipts from the tax were insufficient to meet the expenditures of the department for the care of sick and distressed seamen? 8. What steps do the Ministry propose taking? (1.) To correct the returns made to the House, and to show the foregoing surplus, $252,041.08, at the credit of the Sick Mariners' Fund, as on 30th June, 1886; and (2.) To reduce the tax on shipping, so as to make it no greater than is necessary to meet the expenditure for care of sick mariners, as provided by law?

Mr. TUPPER. 1. Yes. 2. A summary of receipts and disbursements in connection with the service is given on the page referred to. 3. Yes. 4. The cost of persons cared for in the Marine Hospital at Quebec during the eighteen years referred to, is not included in the item of disbursements, and special care is taken to state, in each Annual Report, that the expense of maintaining residents of Quebec and immigrants in the Marine Hospital is not included in the entire expenditure for sick, disabled, shipwrecked and distressed seamen. The disbursements referred to do include the grant made to the hospitals at St. Catharines and Kingston. A typographical error appears to have occurred in the disbursements given for the year 1886, the expenditure for that year, after making a deduction for residents and immigrants in the Marine Hospital, amounting to $40,377.62 instead of $49,343.46, but this has been corrected in the reports for 1887 and 1888. Answers do not appear to be required to the remaining question of Sir Donald Smith as these questions are based on the assumption that the expense of maintaining persons who were not sick mariners in the Marine Hospital at Quebec is included in the item of disbursements as given by him, which is not the case.

THE SIX PAGANS IN JOLIETTE.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. CHARLTON) asked, What are the names of the six Pagans returned for the Parish of Ste. Elizabeth, in the County of Joliette and Province of Quebec, in the Census Returns of 1881, as appears from the original schedule of the enumerator for that parish?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are all over there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They may be christians of a different type from those I see before me.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture will answer that question when he comes in.

SESSIONAL INDEMNITY OF MEMBERS.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I desire to refer to a conversation that took place yesterday with reference to the payment of members. The right hon. gentleman stated that it had been the practice under previous Administrations to pay the members under the same arrangement. I took occasion to interrogate the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) on the subject and he assured me that such an arrangement was never sanctioned by him or carried out during the time he was at the head of the Government. He also expressed the strongest disapproval of the action of the leader of the Government in taking it into his own hands to contravene the law in regard to this matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps my hon. friend who sits behind the hon. gentleman can say something about the practice for years past?

Mr. TROW. Since I have had the honor or otherwise of being chief whip for the Liberal party, I may say that the practice has been similar to what it is to-day. I do not know anything about any writings or anything of that description given during the term of anyone else, but this I do know, that under Mr. Mackenzie's Administration members frequently left a day or two or three days before the end of the Session and received their pay. Sometimes imperative affairs called them away. It would be a hardship to force hon. members, when there is no necessity, to remain here a day or two after the work of the Session is closed up. We are not here as slaves to remain until the last moment once the work is practically closed. If there is no occasion or necessity, I do not see why hon. gentlemen should not be allowed to leave and receive their full pay. I even suppose that some of those who made objections are away to-day. Why should they not have stayed until to-morrow? Those who were most forward in their statements regarding the practice are away to-day.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says it was the practice generally for hon. members to be allowed to leave. That has been always understood. Once the day has been fixed for prorogation, it has not been unusual to grant this privilege, but it is altogether a different thing to allow members to go a fortnight before the House adjourns.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There were only two gentlemen, and they were on the opposite side. They were both members from Prince Edward Island who, as a particular favor, wanted to leave—Mr. Yeo and Mr. McIntyre.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). And Mr. Scarth.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD As a particular favor they asked leave to go, and the accountant, as usual, asked what he should do. An arrangement was made by which two pairs were got, and two gentlemen from this side went away also.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The solicitation came from the other side.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it did not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Scarth) was one of them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The matter is of some importance, and the right hon. the First Minister knows well there are two distinct practices. One has always been allowed and I see no objection to it. That is the one the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow) alluded to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is, that after prorogation is fixed and it is understood there is no other business to be taken up, members may be allowed to consider the last two or three days as *dies non*, so to speak, but the practice to which the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) refers is a totally different practice. That practice, I understand, is this, that members who can obtain pairs take upon themselves to go away a week or ten days before it is clear the Session can be closed, and they sign their declaration and receive full pay. Now, that practice, to the best of my knowledge, did not prevail during Mr. Mackenzie's Administration and my friend's recollection is to the same effect. It was not sanctioned, and if it was done at all, it was done entirely without his knowledge or concurrence, and, I may add, without my knowledge or concurrence, as a member of the Government. It appears to me it is a very objectionable practice. Of course, hon. members, if they have special business, can go away. No one expects them to stay here if they have urgent business elsewhere; but the point is that members who pair should not go to the accountant and receive full pay a week or more before the Session is over. That by whomsoever done, and under whatever circumstances it is done, is a breach of the law.

Mr. TROW. I know of only one instance of that kind and that was that of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Scarth). In the other cases hon. members left only a few days before the close as usual from year to year.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would ask the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) if that is not the practice which has been followed every year by arrangement between the whips, without consulting the Premier or any one else?

Mr. LOVITT. I should like to know if we are to get our pay from the whips. I went to Mr. Brewer to get paid. He asked me if I was paired. I said no. He said, if you are paired you will be paid in full. I decline to be under the control of the whips in that way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has been the custom, I know, when the prorogation was fixed, that hon. gentlemen should be allowed to count the last two days. It might, perhaps, have been better to put it in the statute, but, undoubtedly my hon. friend is quite right, that the accountant has no business to go to the whips, either my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Trow) or the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Taylor). The duty of the accountant is to pay according to law. If we sanction, by resolution of the House, that for the last two days he may consider the Session virtually closed, that is one thing, but no hon. gentleman here should be obliged to have recourse either to the Premier or to the whips for what is legally due to him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Paying members for the last two days is as much against the law as paying them for the last eight days.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is right in saying that there has been a custom tacitly recognised for a long time to count the last two days, but I am informed that the cases here are not quite as they have been stated by the hon. gentleman opposite, because these are cases, I understand, of gentlemen who went away for four or five days, independently of the particular cases referred to.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is very objectionable to allow members to leave even after prorogation is announced, because now we see that the practice is to reserve a vast amount of work for the last few days of the Session, when members are unsettled and on the wing. By having a system of this kind, a direct inducement is given to the Government to reserve, as we know they do, many measures they do not wish to have thoroughly discussed, they having in the meantime given permits to the members to depart. I think, until the House is through with its work, no member should be paid, and if during the last two days we do more work than in the previous two weeks, there is no reason why members should be paid for neglecting the last two days of the Session. It may be that this practice began when the work was done before the last two or three days, and there was practically nothing left, but now that the practice is reversed and a large portion of the important business of the Session is done in the last two or three days, I think we should abandon the practice.

PROROGATION.

Mr. SPEAKER communicated to the House that he had received the following letter from the Governor General's Secretary :—

"GOVERNMENT HOUSE, OTTAWA.

"SIR,—I have the honor to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber to prorogue the Session of the Dominion Parliament on Thursday, the 2nd May, at three o'clock.

"CHARLES COLVILLE,
"Captain,
"*Governor General's Secretary.*

"The Honorable
"The Speaker of the House of Commons."

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 151) respecting a certain agreement therein mentioned with the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

WAYS AND MEANS.

House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1889, the sum of $2,090,177.33 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.—(Mr. Foster.)

Mr. MULOCK. Before the Committee rises, I desire to call attention to a matter which I understood had been brought to the attention of the Government, not only this Session but in previous Sessions. I refer to the application of the millers of Ontario for relief from what they complain is the unjust discrimination in regard to their industry. The millers of Canada represent, I presume, one of the largest manufacturing industries in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. I hardly think that is pertinent to the resolution.

Mr. MULOCK. I believed it would be in order, in the Committee of Ways and Means, for tariff changes to be indicated.

Mr. BOWELL. But there are none indicated.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman will find some other opportunity.

Mr. MULOCK. I was in hopes the Minister would have announced something in regard to this important matter, but I will endeavor to get another opportunity to bring it up.

Motion agreed to.

Resolved, that towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending 30th June, 1890, the sum of $25,643,275.93 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada. —(Mr. Foster.)

Motion agreed to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman propose to renew in this Bill the authority to borrow? Is this the whole Bill he proposes to put through?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Resolutions concurred in.

SUPPLY BILL.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 147) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1889, and the 30th June, 1890, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first, second and third times, and passed.

LAND SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider resolution (p. 1572) to authorise the granting of subsidies of land to certain railway companies.—(Mr. Dewdney.)

(In the Committee).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before we proceed with the discussion I would say this, here we have a tolerable strong illustration of some of the matters to which my hon. friend beside me called attention. We are going to be asked by these resolutions to dispose of something between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 acres of land to various railway companies; that is to say, within 24 hours of prorogation we are going to give away to a few individuals the absolute control and ownership over a territory about one-third as large as the whole cultivated part of Ontario, if I make these estimates correctly, something like 8,000 or 10,000 square miles. We are going to discuss that probably in the course of an hour or two, with about 50 members out of our 215. Now, I am inclined to think that the country will regard that kind of thing with considerable disfavor. It does appear to me that huge grants like this, involving territories nearly as large as a province, equal to a round dozen of our largest constituencies, it does appear to me that in all conscience these matters ought to be discussed at a much earlier period of the Session than this. The principle has gone from bad to worse, but here we are expecting to prorogue within 24 hours, and in that time we are gravely to deliberate and obtain all the information necessary and dispose of about 110,000 square miles. Apart from that, we ought to be put in possession of the information as to the various parties who are applying for these amounts, and we ought to know—and that is a point to which I directed the hon. gentleman's attention yesterday—we ought to know how we stand as regards our land in the North-West. We have granted at various times subsidies which must range up to 40,000,000 or 50,000,000 acres, including our original grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have my doubts, looking at the land that has been taken up and the land that has been stripped, as to what territory is really remaining to us in the fertile belt generally available for settlement. Now, the experience of the United States has proved that the practice of giving away large areas of land to the railway companies, has been productive of great evils. Among other things I might remark that it appears to me we are very much more in need of concentrating settlement in the North-West, and particularly in the Province of Manitoba, than of concentrating settlements at very long distances. I think we have lost a great deal for the want of concentration that has taken place, owing largely to our land policy. Now, I want to know from the hon. gentleman, before we proceed to consider these items in detail, first of all, if he can tell me what is the total quantity of land in the North-West that has been granted in subsidies to the miscellaneous railway companies which at various times we have dowered with grants of land.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We have given subsidies to the different railways to the number of 12, including the Canadian Pacific Railway, amounting to 35,000,000 acres, not including the present grants.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Including the amount that was repurchased from the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; it does not include that. It is only 18,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We now propose to grant 5,000,000.

Mr. DEWDNEY. About 5,000,000. This makes about 40,000,000 in all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman inform me how much Canadian Pacific Railway land has been assigned and accepted by them, and how much remains to be assigned?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I can state nearly from recollection. They have notified the department that they have selected between 7,000,000 and 8,000,000 in the railway belt proper. They have not gone beyond that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then there remains 10,000,000.

Mr. DEWDNEY. About that to be taken up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not suppose that anything like exact accuracy can be expected; but we have now, for a great many years, been making some sort of estimate of the available land in the North-West. Can the Minister give us an idea of the quantity of arable land that, in his opinion, we possess for settlement south of parallel 45? I mean these parallels of latitude between Winnipeg and the Rocky Mountains—can he give us roughly any sort of idea of what amount of land we possess?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have thought over that matter and made a calculation, but as the hon. gentleman sees, I cannot vouch for its accuracy. I estimate that in the fertile belt we have about 300,000,000 acres of agricultural and pasturable land. I would deduct from that 30,000,000 for water and inferior land.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman, of course, includes the whole area of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In the North-West Territories and Manitoba.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, I do not want to bind the Minister to figures. I am only asking to get the benefit of his opinion as a man who has been in the North-West a long time. He calls that pasturable and arable land. Roughly, how much of that does he suppose to be pastural? This is not outside of latitude 55, I suppose.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No. The quantity of pasturable land is very difficult to calculate, for this reason: that what we call our ranche country pasturable, which extends from the Rocky Mountains east, I have always held to be very much more extensive than has been generally supposed. I think the cattle can winter over a very much greater area of country, east of the Rockies than has been supposed. As I explained the other day, in the broken country there is a great area in which there is as good agricultural land as exists in any part of the territory. It would be very difficult to make an estimate as to what that proportion would be, but at least half would be first-class agricultural lands. On the ridges and in the rolling country there is a kind of bunch grass, which ripens as it grows, and is as good fodder in winter as in summer, and that country is much more extensive than cattle raisers generally suppose.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then your opinion is that about 135,000,000 acres of fair agricultural land are what we have to dispose of in the North-West, or what we had to dispose of? That includes Manitoba.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Which is pretty well out of the hands of the Government.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The bulk of it is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the present area of Manitoba?

Mr. DEWDNEY. About 40,000 square miles. My calculation of agricultural land is south of the North Saskatchewan.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What parallel would that be?

Mr. DEWDNEY. About 53.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, south of the 53rd parallel, we have about 135,000,000 acres?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That does not include the Peace River country?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If we deduct from that area Manitoba, it would seem to follow that we have at our disposal 40,000,000 acres, reserving a corresponding quantity for homesteading, which is a part of the hon. gentleman's policy.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is about my calculation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The House will see that this makes the question of even greater gravity than I supposed, because practically when we have given away this land with the other quantities we have to provide for, we have in the district bounded by the 53rd parallel on the north and by the Rocky Mountains on the west, practically disposed of all our available lands, that is to say, the grants to railways and free homesteads would use it all up.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I estimate that we have about 136,000,000 acres available for railway grants and other purposes, out of which, according to the return I have, not including these grants asked for now, there have been 35,000,000 acres disposed of.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman includes Manitoba, which is practically gone, in his 136,000,000 acres of arable land. He would have, according to the statement he has made as to the area of Manitoba, within that parallel, something like 80,000,000 or 90,000,000 acres at the outside, out of which we have to give 40,000,000 to the railway companies and set apart at the lowest estimate 40,000,000 acres for homestead purposes. That would pretty well use up the territory within those limits. Of course there is an extensive territory outside, some of which may be available.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Homesteads include pre-emptions, which are paid for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that well, but the pre-emptions are only about one-fourth of the whole amount. Still, practically speaking, this will about dispose of our available lands within the limits I named, or at all events within the limits named by the Minister of the Interior and parallel 53.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In regard to homesteads, Parliament can of course alter that policy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; but the Government could hardly alter it without very grave consideration. It has been in existence for so many years that we are in a manner pledged to it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We could not do it without a couple of years' notice.

Mr. WATSON. What is the quantity of land earned and transferred under the Railway Subsidies Act to the Manitoba and North-Western, the Manitoba and South Western, the Glenborough Branch and the Hudson Bay Railway?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I did not include the Hudson Bay lands. The Hudson Bay sections are calculated as even-numbered sections. I deducted the school lands, which are 14,000,000 acres. The odd-numbered sections in Manitoba and the North-West which have been disposed of were also deducted. In answer to the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), I may state that the Manitoba and North-Western have earned 535,400 acres; they have earned more for which they will make application, but I forget the exact quantity. The Manitoba South-Western have earned 1,132,384 acres, which quantity has been transferred to them, leaving a balance of 243,000 acres still owing to the company. The Glenborough branch is included in the estimates of the South Western. The Hudson Bay Railway Company have not received any lands.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are they entitled to it?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I fancy not.

Mr. WATSON. Could the hon. gentleman tell me if they have made application? The Local Government of the Province of Manitoba are in rather an awkward position with regard to the Hudson Bay land grant, for they issued to them $256,000 in bonds on the strength of the guarantee. It was understood from the Ministers of the Local Cabinet, who were in Ottawa at the time these negotiations were going on, that the Government had guaranteed to turn over these lands on the land grant. I believe there was some misunderstanding between the Government at Ottawa and the Local Government of the Province of Manitoba with regard to the transfer of these bonds, and on the strength of a telegram from the Provincial Treasurer of the Province of Manitoba to the Premier of the Province of Manitoba he handed over $256,000 worth of provincial bonds to the directors of this Hudson Bay Railway. Afterwards they found that this road was not up to the standard, and at present the Province of Manitoba has no security for the redemption of these bonds, which were issued on the road. Can the hon. gentleman tell me what is really re-

quired of this company to entitle them to the land grants, so that the Province of Manitoba may have some security?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Within the last few days application has been made to me for an extension of the land grant for the first 50 miles; 40 of which, I think, have been nearly completed. I have not had the opportunity of submitting that application to my colleagues, but in consideration of this the company have agreed to finish the 40 miles and extend it another 10 miles.

Mr. WATSON. I hope the Government will understand the position that the Province of Manitoba is placed in and that they may not want to confine themselves to the letter of the law in connection with that 40 miles of road. If it were not that it is so late in the Session I should take up some of the time of the House in letting the House know the position in which the Government here stands. That certainly has not been a creditable transaction between the Dominion Government at Ottawa and the late Government of the Province of Manitoba. It is a matter that should be ventilated, and if it had been earlier in the Session I would have taken an opportunity to do so. I hope that the Province of Manitoba will not be placed in a position that they are not entitled to be placed in on account of that work not being as it should have been, when the Government promised to pass an Order in Council authorising the land grant to be transferred to the company.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think those two grants to the North Western Coal and Navigation Company should be taken together. What amount has that company already received in land grants?

Mr. DEWDNEY. 395,912 acres.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears rather a curious thing that 2,600 acres a mile should be granted for merely altering the gauge of the road, particularly as this company have had very valuable coal privileges granted to them for a nominal sum by the Government.

Mr. DEWDNEY. They purchased their coal lands in the ordinary way, and the total grant of 6,400 acres is the regular grant given to railway companies of that gauge. I do not think that this 2,600 acres will repay them for the extra work which they propose in widening the gauge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are they to be allowed to choose the land or is it to be granted to them in alternate lots on the line of railway?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In alternate lots as near as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Within what limit are they allowed to select this land?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are no specified limits.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand this company might select land a hundred miles from the railway?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is for the Government to say. The further away from the railway the lands are, the less valuable they will be, and the company would naturally desire to get land as near the railway as possible, for the moment the railway is built, the lands become more valuable and the more settlers there are the more traffic will be furnished to the road.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is as may be. If the railway goes through a uniform fertile territory well and good, but suppose it does not, the company might select lands in other districts which would be opened up by railways in some time to come. It appears to me that would be very objectionable indeed.

Mr. WATSON.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly it would.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that some limit should be fixed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman says "perhaps." We may not see his face in this fashion for some months to come, and he might tell us what "perhaps" means.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government would prefer that they should take forty miles from the railway rather than twenty, unless these forty miles bring the land within the range of another railway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman should put that in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that would be unnecessary. The Government will take care to preserve as much land as possible in the public interest. I think the limitation would not be in the interest of the public.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I doubt that. Great pressure is often brought to obtain grants of land at unreasonable distances where the land happens to be good, and I think it would be an advantage both to the Government and the public that some limitation should be fixed. In the United States, the land has to be taken along the line of the railway, good and bad, just as it comes, I think within 20 miles of the railway on either side, and there is a great deal to be said for that system. In our territory, I would not confine the railway companies quite so strictly, but I think a limit ought to be imposed, even though we gave them a little more land.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I quite agree with the hon. member that it is undesirable to give the companies land too far away from the railway, and I have always reported against that policy. If you give them good land far away from the railway, you may be giving it in a district which may in future ask for a railroad of their own, and if the land is appropriated already, it may work disastrously against that district. I have always objected to land being granted far away from the railway unless there was no other to be got. The companies will generally take up the land as near their own railway as possible. The North-West Coal and Navigation Company have taken alternate townships.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The land which has been taken is all close to the railway?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that patented?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman says that the land is granted to a distance of three or five townships on each side of the railway. That is about 20 miles. There is another railway company which has a charter from Calgary to Lethbridge, and I certainly think the distance to which these land grants shall extend on each side of the track ought to be limited, because otherwise they must overlap each other. Unless the Government limited them to a certain range, they will go outside and select the best lands they can possibly secure. I know that the Manitoba and North-Western Company hold lands through the very centre of which the North-West Central runs. That is to my mind very unfair. A company that might get the ear of the Government in preference to another company would be enabled to make the selection right on the line of the other company's road. I do not at all object to the Government giving land grants to colonisation roads for the purpose of opening up new districts for settlement; but I do decidedly object to the Government granting large subsidies to any company for their own benefit

almost entirely, as in the case of this Galt Coal Company. The principal traffic on that railroad is and will be coal; and while I do not object to the Government giving a land grant to aid in developing the coal mines, I contend that they should limit the company to charging a certain rate on the coal. I brought this matter up some time ago, when I showed the House the rates which this company were charging for carrying coal. I contend that any company which is assisted by this Government for the purpose of developing the natural wealth of the country, should not be put in a position to exact the last cent that can be exacted out of the settler for fuel. When this company first received a land grant, I advocated giving them a larger grant, so as to enable them to have a broad gauge railway, which would save the transhipment of the coal. When a company comes here asking for powers simply to build a railway, it is not right that we should pledge them to certain rates; but when the country is practically building the road, as in this case, the House should see that the general public are benefited by the grant. With regard to the price of coal, I happened to state in this House that it was sold at Calgary for $8 per ton. The Calgary *Tribune*, referring to my remarks, says:

"The price paid for coal last year was $7.50 per ton. The price at the beginning of this season was $8 per ton. But we are now paying $8.50 per ton for the poorest quality of coal that has ever been placed on the market."

That is at a distance of only 290 miles from the Lethbridge mines.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Is it Lethbridge coal?

Mr. WATSON. I do not care whether it is or not. When I tell you that this company are allowed to exact from the people $8.50 a ton for their coal, while the same coal is sold in Winnipeg, some 700 miles from the coal mines, for $7 50 per ton, you will see that it is only the competition in the market which regulates the price. This company charge every cent they possibly can. At Regina and Portage la Prairie coal is dearer than it is at Winnipeg, simply because American coal has to be hauled so much farther. Now, when this House is granting substantial assistance to any company they have a right to state on what conditions it is granted. I do not see that it is any particular benefit to the people of Manitoba or the North-West that the Government should assist this Galt Coal Company. This grant is simply to benefit Sir A. T. Galt and his company. If we were to argue in the same way as the hon. members from St. John argued last night with regard to the Short Line Railway, we should strongly oppose this land grant to extend the Galt line to the American boundary, because it will enable the Americans to compete with our own people for this coal, and consequently if Sir A. T. Galt finds a better market for his coal, the chances are that he will devote all his energies to shipping coal to the south. It is not worth while dividing the House on this with the miserable remnant left here of some 50 members, but, considering the importance of this matter, I had hoped, after the discussion we had before, that if this company came to the Government and asked further assistance the Government would make that assistance conditional on the company agreeing not to charge over a certain rate on their coal per ton per mile.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It does appear to me that this is not a case in which we can proceed on the ordinary commercial principles of supply and demand. We are, to all intents and purposes, building this road for this company, and this additional grant is going to be of enormous importance to them. If I am correctly informed, they have for the time being, at any rate, a monopoly of the coal in that region, and this is a case in which the Government could with perfect propriety interfere and say that if the company are to receive this 600,000 acres additional of public lands—it does not matter two straws what doctrines of political economy may intervene because we are violating the laws of political economy every day in this House—they should sell the coal at such a rate as will bring it reasonably within the powers of the North-West people to purchase. There is no doubt whatever they could sell it at such a point as Calgary at a fair profit, as cheaply as in Winnipeg, and the Government ought to see that something of the kind the hon. gentleman suggests will be done.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That will cure itself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Aye, at the expense of the country.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If you look farther, you will see two or three other companies who are applying for land grants in that neighborhood. It is almost a certainty that these roads will be constructed, and will be competing coal mining industries with the Galt Mines, and I think that is more likely to reduce the price of coal than anything else. With regard to the value of the land, the hon. gentleman must recollect that these lands are being sold by the Galt Company at $1 an acre, and are not lands similar to what we are giving in other parts of the Territories to some of the other lines.

Mr. SHANLY. When this question was brought up in the House before, of Parliament fixing a rate upon coal on this road, I had occasion to mention then that the company has no power to fix the railway rates upon coal beyond its point of junction with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I made some enquiries then of the manager of the mine, Mr. Galt, who was in the city at the time, as to the price of coal in Calgary and other points. His reply to me was that they sold no coal in Calgary, and that the only place where they have an agent for the sale of coal is in Winnipeg. The coal is bought by retailers, and the company cannot control its price in Calgary. If the dealer finds himself in a position to exact a large price through the want of competition in Calgary, the company are not responsible. The widening of the gauge seems to me of the most vital importance to the very interest the hon member for Marquette speaks of, as it will enable the company to carry the coal much more cheaply. There is an extra charge now upon the coal from the fact of its having to be transferred from a narrow gauge car to a wide gauge car at Dunmore. The widening of the gauge will undoubtedly be a step towards reducing the price of the article in the market. My hon. friend says that the company will pay for the widening of the gauge with the additional land grant, but the 2,600 acres per mile will not go near paying for that work. This is a country where the very freight upon the rails almost doubles their market price, and the ties are doubled and sometimes trebled in cost by the freight in that part of the country. The widening of the gauge is going to be very costly, and pending the sale of the lands this company has to provide all the money for that purpose. They have hitherto found all the capital necessary, and I do think it would disarm a great deal of the opposition to the land grant in this case if the hon. members who object to it could see the extraordinary town that has grown up around the mines at Lethbridge. There is no other instance in the North-West Territories so forcible of what capital can do as is there presented. An enormous capital has been there expended by this company, every dollar of which has come from abroad; the lands already sold have not diminished that capital burden to the extent of five cents in the dollar.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the freight from Lethbridge to Winnipeg?

Mr. SHANLY. I really could not say. I think I asked Mr. Galt, and he gave me some figures, but I do not remember them. As regards the fixing of the rate from

Lethbridge to Dunmore, that is simply a question for the Canadian Pacific Railway to decide. The railway and the mine is one concern. The company run the coal out to Dunmore, where people purchase it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the freight from Dunmore to Winnipeg?

Mr. SHANLY. I cannot say. That is fixed by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I know this, that the Galt Company is always fighting to get it lowered. They could sell more coal if the Canadian Pacific Railway freight was lower.

Mr. WATSON. The freight on coal is a small fraction better than half a cent per mile. That is the rate of the Galt Coal Company. That company are making, according to reliable figures, over $2 a ton on every ton sold in Winnipeg; and as to their having only one agent, they must have a sort of combine, and this agent must be making tremendous profits. I do not ask that we should compel this company to sell their coal at certain prices at different points, but I ask simply that the Government should place a maximum rate which this company will be allowed to charge on the coal placed in their hands for shipment at Lethbridge. While there is a vast amount of coal there it is of no use to the country, because it cannot be got out. Companies would go in there and operate coal mines and sell them at a much less rate than coal is selling at to-day, if they could be sure of having a fair freight rate from this company. But the company control the whole of the road. It is built for the development of their own mines, and the general public has no benefit at all from it; and, so far as regards the price of coal in Winnipeg to day, it is not reduced on account of the coal mine, but it is simply a question of the cost of bringing in American coal that regulates the price.

Mr. SHANLY. Do you want Parliament to fix the price of coal?

Mr. WATSON. No, but I want Parliament to fix the price of freight on this road that runs from Lethbridge to Dunmore, and the Government ought to do that since they are giving so much assistance to the company.

Mr. SHANLY. The House has settled that question.

Mr. WATSON. The House did not settle it satisfactorily to myself, nor to a great number of hon. members in this House, and I believe that if we had all the members here who were here three or four weeks ago, when the other vote was taken, and knew that the Government were asking further assistance to that company, they would appreciate the reasonableness of our request, and insist on the Government fixing a maximum rate from Lethbridge to Dunmore. But, at this stage of the Session, when the whip on the other side has got all our good voters away, we have very little chance in working this thing. I am told, in fact, that the whip on the other side offered to give two, or even three Conservative voters for one Liberal voter, if he was a good fighter on this side, and a regular voter. We have not enough members here to divide the House on this question, but the utmost we can do is to appeal to the Government, and especially to the Minister of Interior, who lived in that country so long, and who knows the importance of cheap coal, to accede to our request.

Mr. DAVIN. There is no doubt whatever that this line will be of great use to the portion of the North-West through which it runs. It will not be used simply for carrying coal to the south of the line, but for general traffic. The Medicine Hat people and the people who live around there are looking forward to the construction of that road. I must say, however, in regard to what the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) contends for, that I do not know whether the Committee see the point he makes. We had the same point here before. The idea which my hon. friend meant to convey and which he has very clearly expressed, though the Committee, not being familiar with the locality, may not have taken that point, is that, for coal purposes, this road may be used as a private road. There are coal mines other than the Galt mine near Lethbridge, and, if this road, assisted by public grants, as we are assisting it, says to a company established near the Galt Company's mine, We will not give you running powers over our road, but we will fix a rate for you which will handicap you, they will prevent the transportation of coal from those other mines. No doubt that is the point which was in the mind of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson), and in the minds of many in the North West, but that is *quoad* coal only. There is no doubt that the widening of the gauge is advantageous for the general traffic, and, in that respect, I think there can be no line brought before this House which the House ought more properly to assist. I see how hard it is for the Government to do what my hon. friend and myself asked the House to do before, but the House decided against us at that time. Nevertheless, it is worthy of consideration, when this road has had public assistance, in case other mines are developed near Lethbridge, whether they should not have the power of sending their coal over that road at the same rate as that which is charged for the coal from the Galt mine. I can corroborate all that my hon. friend (Mr. Shanly) says in reference to Lethbridge. Anyone who visits Lethbridge will see that this Galt Company has been a great blessing to it, and to the North-West generally. The growth of that town and the population which the Galt Company has brought in, and the general rush forward which that company has given to that territory, must make every North-West man feel grateful to the Galt Company for what it has done. I admit that the argument we have made is open to the objection which has been indicated by my hon. friend, the Minister of the Interior. Of course, we have lots of coal north of the line. We have passed in the Committee subsidies for several lines, and, when these lines shall exploiter the immense amount of coal in that district, it will be a different matter, because it is a mistake to imagine that there will be any scarcity of coal in the North-West. I expect that, in the future, coal will be a drug in the market in the North-West, but that is a long way off, and, in the meantime, we are in the position which has been correctly stated by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), that we are paying more for coal in Regina, in Calgary and at Moose Jaw than they are paying in Winnipeg, and that anomaly strikes the economical conscience of our people. No doubt what he said was stated by Mr. Galt is correct, that he has no direct agent at Regina or Moose Jaw, or the other places, but, when that company had an agent in Regina, and an agent at Moose Jaw, and an agent in Winnipeg, the same thing prevailed which prevails now, that is to say, that we paid more at those points for coal than they paid at Winnipeg, and that is what strikes the settler as being anomalous. It may turn out that the explanation is that the Canadian Pacific Railway gives the long haul at a cheaper rate than the short haul. We see that system prevails in other matters. For instance, we can get a much lower rate from Regina to Montreal than from Regina to Winnipeg. The long haul gets the advantage the whole time, and on all lines of railway on this continent, and any railway man will explain that to you on account of what he calls railway economics, and he will show that it is on what he considers a rational base. I have no fear as to the future, and even the near future, because I believe it is more likely that coal will be a drug in the market in the North-West than that it will be scarce. In the meantime, if the Government can ease us off, we shall be very much obliged. Apart from this question of coal, nothing could be more in accord with the

feeling of the North-West than the proposed aid to this line.

Motion agreed to.

To the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding 6,400 acres for each mile of the company's railway from Cheadle station, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to its terminus at a point in or near Township 29, Range 23, west of the 4th Meridian, a distance of about 55 miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this company incorporated?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who compose the company?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are Joseph Ick Evans, Daniel Macfarlane, Joshua T. Johnson, Henry Percy Withers, and John Bain, all of the city of Toronto.

Sir RICHARD CARTWIGHT. Oh, Ick Evans—a capitalist of that kind?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I only know the first of these, who is now in England, or, as I understand, on his way out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, this is a Toronto company to whom the Government propose to grant some 300,000 acres. What guarantee have they given the Government that they possess means enough to build a railway 55 miles long on the strength of this land grant? We have had a good many companies, some of them hailing from Toronto and some engineered by former members of this House, which did not result very satisfactorily, in which certain gentlemen obtained these grants and obtained charters which they disposed of. If the Government, on their responsibility, are prepared to state that this company have sufficient means, that they have subscribed sufficient capital, and that they have paid up a sufficient amount, there may be something to be said on the merits, but the experiments we have in the past should make us very careful in granting 300,000 or 400,000 acres of land to companies formed in other parts of Canada.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In the course of the summer, a gentleman named Brereton, a representative of English capitalists, and a wealthy man himself, on his return from Alaska, where he had purchased large mining claims—a gentleman whom I knew 20 years ago when he was in California and was in charge of a large irrigation scheme—called on me to make enquiry as to the Red Deer country, and he stated that he was prepared, if the land grant was made to this company, in conjunction with his friends, to supply capital to proceed with that line this spring. Since that I have heard that he was to leave at the end of last month. I fancy he is on the water now, on his way out to commence operations.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We ought to have a map accompanying this, because to those of us who are not like the hon. gentleman, familiar with the country, it is impossible to gather from these names any idea of what is proposed to be done. Has the hon. gentleman got a map of this section traversed by this railway?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have not got it here.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is this Mr. Brereton the same Capt. Brereton that was police magistrate at Rat Portage?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does this go north or south?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It goes north.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this intended to open up the new and difficult district, or is it for colonisation purposes?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The company have had for two or three years a large ranch leased in that neighborhood. They propose to stock it with cattle, and also to develop the coal mines in that neighborhood, which are very extensive and very easily worked.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are these lands supposed to have coal underneath?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, but the company have only surface rights.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the mine been visited?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Brereton examined one on the outside and pronounced it of first-class quality.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are the Government satisfied that this is controlled by men of means?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

To the North-Western Railway Company of Canada, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding 10,000 acres for each mile of the company's railway from Calgary, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, northerly to a point on the North Saskatchewan River, at or near Edmonton, a distance of about 210 miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What about this company? Is it in existence?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There was a charter granted this year to this company, which virtually is the old charter revived. This company is represented by the following gentlemen: Mackworth Backley Praed, John Maurice Lloyd, John Dale, and James Lloyd, of the city of London, England, Charles T. Drummond, of Winnipeg, Hon. George A. Drummond, Senator, and C. C. Colby, M.P. Mr. Drummond, who had been in England, accidently met Mr. Praed, and in talking over the country with Mr. Praed, induced him to visit this country, which he did this winter. He travelled over the whole North-West from Calgary to Edmonton and Fort McLeod, in the months of January and February. He was so enchanted with the country that he made strong representations to his people, and they have taken the matter up, and we believe they will at once commence construction, provided the land grant is given.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here we are proposing to grant over 3,000,000 of acres to the North-Western Railway Company of Canada. They will have, according to the declarations of the hon. gentleman, the right of selecting that, and, I suppose, within a considerable distance of their line of railway. The hon. gentleman said nothing about any limitation that is made there.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think it would be quite possible to make a limitation on that line, because there is nothing to conflict, either on the north or the south. They are most anxious to get their lands as near to the railway as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have the Government decided on the policy of granting the lands in blocks and not in alternate sections?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In alternate townships.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that where you are granting such enormous masses of land it might be *pro bono publico*, that, with reasonable reservations which could easily be defined, these parties who receive lands from us, should be required to sell at a fixed rate. I remember years ago when we abolished the claim of $1 an acre on lands going into the hands of the railway company. I pressed strongly on the Government the policy of doing that. The Government refused to listen to the advice of this side of the House, and the consequence has been, to my positive knowledge, that prohibitory prices were placed on a very large section of south-western Manitoba, and many of those people who desired to settle there, were by that most foolish and ill-judged policy, practically driven out of

Manitoba. Now, it is possible, although the true interest of the company is not that way, that this may result in large quantities of land being held at higher rates than they are capable of being sold at. We have seen, and the people of the United States have seen, that kind of a thing practiced more than once. It appears to me that while you are granting such a huge tract as 3,000,000 acres, it is the duty of the Government to take some precaution that the land will be put on the market at reasonable figures.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think to put a price on the land would thwart the construction of the railway. This company especially is an English company composed of representative men, whose names have been read, and some of whom my hon. friend knows. Mr. Praed the hon. gentleman knows. Mr. Wakeland also is a well-known man, and father of the Governor of the Bank of England. Mr. Ross is well known in Canada as a railway contractor, and is himself a millionaire. These men mean business. They want to get this land, and it is upon this land that they will finance. Any interference in that way would greatly tend to spoil the market for them. They have raised the money and intend to build this road, and are anxious to build it at once. It is of the greatest importance that there should be a railway running north and south on to Edmonton, opening access to the Peace River district lying north of Edmonton, and bringing in that great petroleum district. With that road built, as well as the Qu'Appelle road running to Battleford and Prince Albert, and the North-Western running from Portage la Prairie to Prince Albert the whole country will be pretty well supplied with trunk lines of railway. This line running to Edmonton is one of the most important. It will pass through an agricultural and pastoral country, it will give access to the markets to the people of that country, and it will bring Edmonton and the country to the north of it, which is filled with minerals, especially coal and petroleum, within the reach of settlement. So I think any limitation which would view those lands as source of profit would greatly tend to discourage the people and thwart the object of the grant. If we cannot give them money, let us give them a land grant out of which the parties will be able to build the railway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Suppose you place a limit of $2.50 or $2.00 per acre on the land as a maximum price, that would give $2,500 a mile, which would be amply sufficient to build a road through that country, unless it is very difficult. I have heard all those statements made by the hon. gentleman time and time again, and precisely this line of argument was used by him in opposing the contention of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) and myself with respect to those grants, and in respect to south-western Manitoba. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company acted a dog-in-the-manger policy and stood in its own light. I am speaking of what I know when I say that they drove tens of thousands out of south-western Manitoba from the prohibitory prices at which they placed the lands which they had obtained from the south-western Railway Company with the consent of the Government. I have very great doubt whether these railway companies, or any English company, are to be trusted without reservation with the control of such large territories. We are giving these people half a province, a territory of 5,000 square miles, or equal to a tract 100 miles long by 50 miles broad. I repeat my individual protest against the disposition we are making of these vast areas of land, under the present circumstances This is a proposition which should be carefully considered by the House as well as by the Government. Of course, I cannot say whether it has been carefully considered by the Government or not; judging from past experience, I should rather think it has not, but this House can bestow no consideration on it worthy of the importance of the situation. It may be that this is a very important road. I am inclined to think that part of it is so. We cannot tell, from the information furnished by the Government, what kind of country it will pass through; but we can tell that time and time again the granting of very large tracts of land to these companies and corporations has resulted in a great deal of land being held in mortmain. At first the corporations are willing to dispose of it, but after a time, they are very apt to hold large portions of it for a future rise, and in this way very seriously to retard that which is to the interest of the people of Canada, the rapid settlement of the North-West.

Mr. WATSON. I entirely agree with the remarks of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) as to the advisability of placing a maximum price on the land. If this were something new, and if the Government had had no experience in connection with land grants to railways in the North-West, there might be some excuse for the argument of the First Minister, that it might affect the financial arrangements of the company. I know that in south-western Manitoba a large number of settlers crossed the boundary line because they could not get land here on reasonable terms. The sections were pretty well taken up. The Government conceived that there might not be sufficient land in the odd sections for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and reserved even sections, and the settlers left the district because the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would not sell land at terms which they could afford to pay. I do not care what the rate is, $3 or $4. I hold it is important that the Government should fix a maximum price, so that settlers who go into the country would know the upset price of the land. The road in question under discussion is an important one, and worthy of consideration, but in view of the experience of the Government in the settlement of the North-West, they should guard against any company holding lands at very high figures.

Mr. ROSS. It must be remembered that in regard to fixing a maximum price, one part of the country may be worth $10 an acre while another part not more than a mile distant may not be worth $1, or hardly worth paying the taxes on it. In some sections of the North-West the land is exceedingly valuable, while other sections are worth very little. If there was a maximum price fixed, it would apply to a certain extent to poor lands. The less restriction placed on railway grants or aid given to the North-West, the better. If there is any part of the country that cannot afford to have restrictions imposed, it is the North-West. Railway companies to-day, even railways under discussion, like the Manitoba and North-Western, with very strong men on the directorate, find it almost impossible to raise money in the highest market to proceed with the work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be all true to a certain extent, but it is a matter which requires more attention than the House has given it. This practice has caused untold mischief in the United States, and it is going to have the same effect here. One fact is worth a very considerable quantity of this *a priori* argument. I know very well, as the hon. gentleman has stated, that there is great difference in the value of the land, but a tolerably fair average can be obtained, and it must be remembered that the company will not accept lands which are utterly worthless, at all events they will accept only a small percentage of such. I have seen in southern Manitoba the greatest possible mischief result from allowing a railway company unfettered management of its lands. I am aware that the Canadian Pacific Railway charge $4, $5, and even $6, $7, $8, $9 and $10 per acre for those lands. I know, moreover, that many thousands of persons who desired to settle there were driven out by reason of these prohibitory prices. I

do not know that, under the circumstances, I can do more than protest, but I do protest strongly against giving a company, under the circumstances, power to hold its land grant in mortmain.

Mr. MULOCK. When do these lands become liable to taxation?

Mr. DEWDNEY. As soon as they are granted to the railway company.

Mr. MULOCK. As soon as they are entered or patented?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are patented as soon as earned.

Mr. MULOCK. I call the Minister's attention to one weak spot in this measure. It may be that the company will decline to patent the land as soon as they entitled to it, as they will have no object in doing so unless they have the opportunity to sell them immediately. The contract by the Crown to deed the land is just as good as any patent, but I believe they held in the North-West that, until the land is passed to the purchaser it is not liable to assessment. Unless you put in a clause making the lands liable to assessment as soon as they are earned, the company can escape taxation in respect to the earned lands just so long as they choose to withhold taking a patent. If the lands are made liable to assessment the company will have to sell at reasonable prices to settlers. I do not think the railway company should be allowed to have them vested in the Crown when they are earned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The consequence of that would be that a grant of land to a railway would be a curse instead of a blessing. If the company had to pledge themselves to pay taxes on the lands they would rather not have the land at all.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think that argument is sound. I believe that when the company becomes entitled to those lands they should be in the same position as individuals and be obliged to pay their assessment to the municipality.

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD. But there are no municipalities and no people.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then they will not be taxed.

Mr. MULOCK. When there are settlers there will be municipal organisations, and if those lands are vested in the Crown it will interfere with settlers. I think it is most unfortunate that when a serious remark is made on this side of the House the First Minister should dispose of it in a jocular way. That is no argument.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is very successful, though.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, it is very successful. It is my belief that, in the interests of the country, the better plan will be for the Government to withhold the land and give a proper equivalent in money.

Mr. DEWDNEY. My experience is that when a company becomes entitled to the land it is very anxious to get it.

Mr. WATSON. I think that this exemption from taxation in the Province of Manitoba retards the progress of settlement, and it is a great inconvenience to municipalities. Some of the municipalities depended on the taxation of these lands for their maintenance, but because the patent was not issued the municipality has no power to sell the land, and the result is that a great many municipalities have gone behind on account of figuring on a revenue they were not entitled to. I think the Government should say that these lands as soon as they are earned by the companies should be subject to taxation when they run through a municipality.

To the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding 6,000 acres for each mile of the company's railway from Portage la Prairie to the southern boundary of Lake Manitoba, a distance of about 17 miles."

Mr. WATSON. I am not going to find fault with the Government for giving a land grant to this company. I think it is very important that it should receive all the aid possible from the Government; but I would like to have seen the assistance given in a different manner. Of course, as the Government well know, the object of this company is to open up and develop the timber limits on Lake Winnipegosis, the Red Deer River and some of the tributaries of those waters. I would rather that the Government had given a cash bonus to the company instead of the land grant, and allowed them to apply the money on the construction of either the railway or the canal. The most important portion of this work for opening up and developing the timber limits, is the canal across Meadow Portage. This matter has been considered by the Government for several years. They have had surveys made, and have obtained reports on the construction of that work. If the proposed road is constructed, as I have no doubt it will be, provided the Government give a fair amount of encouragement, it will open up the navigation of Lake Winnipegosis, and make connection with the waters of the Saskatchewan. From the south end of Lake Manitoba to the northern end of Meadow Portage the distance is 120 miles, and Lake Winnipegosis is about 140 miles in length; in all, about 260 miles of navigation would be opened up if this canal were cut across Meadow Portage. The Red Deer River is over 100 miles long. There are something like 200 miles of timber limits under lease on Lake Winnipegosis and on the streams tributary to that lake, which that work would make accessible. I do not know that I can show the importance of this work better than to refer to the report made upon it by the Crown timber agent, which is contained in the report of the Minister of the Interior. Speaking of the district which I have just described, he says:

"I beg to report that representations have frequently been made to me by the holders of timber licenses on the shores of Lake Winnipegosis and streams tributary thereto, of the uselessness of attempting to operate their limits until means are provided by the Government for affording them an outlet for their timber, there being no way at present of bringing it profitably to market. There are two ways by which this difficulty could, in my opinion, be overcome. One is by clearing the rock obstructions from Water-hen River, to make the same navigable; the other, by cutting a log channel across Meadow Portage, a distance of about a mile and three-quarters, to connect Lake Winnipegosis with Lake Manitoba. The last-named plan I believe to be the least difficult as well as the least expensive.

"From information collected during the last four years, I estimate there are about 400,000,000 feet B.M. of merchantable timber in the district mentioned, which, if egress were provided, would become a valuable source of revenue to the Government, as well as to the settlers."

A strong reason why this work should receive the consideration of the Government is, that there is a prospect of an immediate return for the outlay. The timber dues that would be realised from the operation of the timber limits would more than compensate them for a very liberal grant towards the construction of this work, and the country would be opened up for settlement. There is also a stream running from Lake Dauphin into Lake Winnipegosis, some ten miles in length, which I am informed could be navigated by river boats; and, if that be the case, it would afford not only communication with Lake Winnipegosis but also with Lake Dauphin, in the neighborhood of which considerable settlement is springing up. I suppose it is too late in the Session for the Government to make any change, but I have no doubt the promoters of this scheme have brought to their notice the importance of the work. There are some 200 miles of timber limits at present under lease, and I believe as many more will be taken up, from which the Government would derive large revenues, if this work were constructed. When

these timber limits were disposed of by the Government in 1879, those who took them up were given to understand that the Government would see that the Water-hen River was made navigable, so that they could run their logs down. I agree with the engineer that it would be impracticable to make the Water-hen River navigable, and it is not possible to run the logs down, because about half way down from Water-hen Lake to Lake Winnipegosis, it opens out into a lake about three miles in length. The cheapest and best way to accommodate these timber limits would be to construct this short canal across Meadow Portage. The fall is 18½ feet, and the canal would require two locks. I would be glad if the Government would assist this company, some of whom are interested in the timber limits, to construct that canal. I believe it would be a work generally appreciated, and the Government would receive a good return for any outlay in that direction.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider resolution (p. 1628) respecting the grant of land provided for by section 3 of the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 11, for the line of the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway. He said: This is the land grant applied for by the company. I have the land grant which they already have under the old charter, transferred to this new charter; it is for the same distance and the same number of acres, 6,400 per mile, only the direction of the road has been altered.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MITCHELL. I would ask the right hon. gentleman if, at the caucus which was held and of which the *Herald* gave such a correct report, this was one of the grants proposed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The *Herald* was wrong.

Mr. MITCHELL. It was stated this was mooted, and the right hon. gentleman, with that sharpness and astuteness and knowledge of human nature which has always characterised him, thought it desirable to reconsider his decision. This is one of the grants which Mr. Jackson, by the influence he possesses, persuaded the right hon. gentleman to recommend to this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know how the hon. gentleman got all the information he did for the Montreal *Herald*. Some of it is correct, I must admit, but a good deal is wrong. In this regard, it is altogether wrong. The question of land grant subsidies for railways was not a subject of discussion at all.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think the *Herald* said it was, but I have since heard from other sources that it was, and I asked for an explanation because I wished to have the *Herald* report of the caucus thoroughly verified, and the hon. gentleman has verified a good deal of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman will say what other subjects were discussed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no intention of resigning my position to the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I never believed, whatever other Christian virtues the hon. gentleman pos-esses, that resignation is one of them, except when compulsory.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not think the hon. gentleman was so Irish as to talk of compulsory resignation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is the only resignation that the hon. gentleman will ever submit to.

Mr. WATSON. I only regret that hon. members have not the same influence with the Government as Mr. Jackson has outside the House. If they had, they would probably use the same means to obtain a land grant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What means?

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) moved a sort of buncombe resolution in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. ROSS. The hon. gentleman has no right to make such a charge.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He has not.

Mr. WATSON. If I am out of order, of course I will have to take it back.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is true all the same.

Mr. ROSS. I do not make as many bumptious speeches as the hon. gentleman, who is all the time making bumptious speeches.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do you refer to me or the hon. member for Marquette?

Mr. ROSS. The hon. member for Marquette.

Mr. WATSON. I generally try to speak to the point, and if I have made a mistake and the hon. gentleman's resolution was not a buncombe resolution, I take it back; but if I moved a resolution of that description and meant anything by it, I would take the sense of the House upon it. If the same pressure were brought on the Government as gentlemen like Mr. Jackson are enabled to bring, the Winnipeg and South-Eastern Railroad would have a grant of land, and the Government would have been perfectly justified in giving them a grant of land. The road runs through a tract of country which is not open to settlement and will not be until a railway is opened through it.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 152) to authorise the granting of subsidies in land to certain railway companies.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved second reading of the Bill.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this $80,000 of subsidy included in this?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; the Bill was passed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For what distance and during what portion of the year is the Saskatchewan navigable east and west from Prince Albert?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Navigation commences on the Saskatchewan about the 1st June. The lower part of the river in the neighborhood of Cedar Lake remains frozen until June, the upper part is navigable six weeks later to Edmonton, that is as far as business brings the steamers. It is navigable further up the river than that, some 60 or 70 miles. That takes in the whole of the river from Grand Rapids to Edmonton. The south branch is also navigable for a certain class of steamers from the forks of the river to Medicine Hat.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can they run down from Prince Albert the whole way in the present condition of navigation?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; they run from June into October. In November the water is pretty low for the class of steamers that sail on that river.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What depth of water do these boats draw?

Mr. DEWDNEY. From 4 to 5 feet of water. They draw much more than the ordinary steamers which I have seen running on the Fraser River. Those carry almost as much freight, and do not draw over 18 inches of water.

Mr. WATSON. I think some of the boats running on the Assiniboine and on the Saskatchewan do not draw more than 30 inches of water.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

TOWN OF COBOURG—RELIEF.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider resolution (p. 1572) to release the corporation of the town of Cobourg from the payment of the balance due by the said corporation under the Act of the Parliament of Canada, 49 Victoria, chapter 33, under certain conditions mentioned.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. In 1850 the town of Cobourg bought the Port Hope and Rice Lake road for £4,600 currency, and also bought the harbor of Cobourg for £4,000. The interest fell in arrears, and an arrangement was made for the principal and accrued interest, and debentures were issued for a total of $44,798 on the harbor and the Rice Lake road in 1876 or 1877. At that time a proposition was made to construct a harbor of refuge at Cobourg, and the town contributed to the works some $25,000. The harbor was used as a harbor of refuge for vessels on the lakes, far more for that purpose than for the tonnage of Cobourg itself. In 1886 a Bill was introduced and became law by which Cobourg was given credit for the $25,000 which it had contributed to the creation of that harbor of refuge, on the ground that it was a Dominton work. That left an indebtedness of about $20,000 upon which Cobourg was to pay at the rate of 4 per cent., and that was a little less than the amount of the debentures issued on the Port Hope and Rice Lake road. It is proposed to release that indebtedness on the condition, among others, that the town of Cobourg shall give up the levying of tolls upon the Port Hope and Rice Lake road. That will have two effects. It will relieve the town of Cobourg from its obligation, and it will also relieve the town of Port Hope, which has, on its own account, gone to a very large expenditure in harbor improvements, and has this year put in a strong claim for Government aid in reference to its harbor. Instead of granting aid to that harbor directly, the Government came to the conclusion that it would be best to relieve the town of Port Hope of the burden which has been caused by this toll road which leads into that town, and thus leave Port Hope in a better position to maintain its harbor improvements. This road is the last of the old toll roads which belonged to the United Government of Canada, and which, in 1867, were made assets of the Dominion to the extent of $1,500,000. In Upper Canada those roads were wiped out to the extent of about half a million, and in Lower Canada to a larger amount. This will get rid of the last vestige of barbarism, so far as this Government is responsible for the toll roads.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that you are making the thing square between those two towns. I dare say it may be a wise settlement, but I think another argument might have been advanced. The original foundation of Cobourg's financial difficulty amounted in 1880 to the sum of $44,000. The Government have come to the conclusion that Cobourg harbor, being a harbor of refuge, ought to be relieved of the responsibility in respect to that harbor, inasmuch as most of the use of the harbor was for vessels not transacting business at Cobourg. It is clear that $20,000 at least of the debt was used for providing a harbor of refuge, and I think, therefore, that you might have disposed of your whole scheme in that way, by saying that you propose to relieve Cobourg of the whole of this indebtedness, as far as it depended upon the money expended in building a harbor of refuge. Nevertheless, I should think it wise to relieve Cobourg of any embarrassment in respect to the harbor of refuge. We know Cobourg is not as progressive as it had reason to expect it would be when it went into the enterprise; and while it is not wise to encourage municipalities to plunge into enterprises, after they have got into difficulty, I am not disposed to question too closely the means by which we help them out of it.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I concur with the idea expressed by the Finance Minister, that it is desirable to sweep away what he calls that relic of barbarism, the toll question, so far as the town of Cobourg is concerned. I would remind him that in my county the Government, after experiencing for years the difficulties of a toll road, did not scruple to offer that road for sale, and undertook to transfer it to another party about three years ago. I would like to suggest, seeing that the title to that road is in dispute, whether it would not be better to aid us in Wentworth in getting rid of that relic of barbarism, and then present their interest in that road either to the town of Dundas or the county, with the understanding that the bulk of the tolls should be abolished, and give the people the benefit of free highways, and thus close out these toll road difficulties.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. I do not see why the city and island of Montreal should not be treated as generously as the city of Cobourg. The island of Montreal is covered with toll roads. The old Government of Canada advanced about $200,000 to commissioners to build these roads, and keep them in repair, and bonds were issued by the commissioners which are now in the hands of the Government. Those roads have been transferred to the Province of Quebec as an asset, and the Government is keeping about $200,000 worth of bonds and are deducting the interest thereon at the rate of 6 per cent. from the subsidy of the Province of Quebec. If it is just for the Government to come to the relief of Cobourg, it seems to me that the island of Montreal is entitled to equally liberal treatment.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 153) for the relief of the corporation of the town of Cobourg.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second times, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—FLOUR DUTIES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is the last measure to which we will call the attention of the House. After communicating with the Hon. Mr. Abbott, of the Senate, we think that the Speaker had better leave the Chair until 5.30 o'clock this afternoon, when he will again take the Chair in order that the House may consider any business or amended Bills that may come down to us from the Senate.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to renew the remarks that I was about to make before, if it is agreeable.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Go on.

Mr. MULOCK. There are a couple of matters that I desire to refer to briefly, and I hope in the best spirit, desiring that whatever I say will be regarded as having no reference to our respective positions in this House. First of all, with regard to the position of flour. The Minister of Finance has received deputations during the past year on the subject of flour. The millers have endeavored to

point out to the Minister of Finance that their industry is discriminated against, and I need not inform an hon. gentleman of his extensive acquaintance with our industries, as to the extent of that great manufacturing industry. I remarked a short time ago, and I repeat it now, that it is one of the largest industries in Canada. For several years that industry has been greatly depressed, and while I do not venture to express an opinion myself upon it, the cause of the depression is alleged by the millers to be that they are discriminated against by the tariff which imposes a higher duty upon the raw material than upon the manufactured article. I believe they have informed the Minister of Finance that the duty on the raw material necessary to make a barrel of flour amounts to 67½ cents, which the duty upon a barrel of flour imported is 50 cents. That is an unjust discrimination, in the eyes of the millers, and, I believe, their opinion has been brought to the notice of the Minister in various ways. During the Session that is just drawing to a close, a communication was prepared and distributed amongst the members of this House, setting forth the fact of this unjust discrimination, and they showed that during the few years which terminated on the 31st December last, a considerable quantity of flour had been imported which they alleged would not have been imported had the fiscal arrangements under which they suffer been otherwise. Now the Government have adopted a policy of protection which purports to protect all the manufacturers of this country, and if it is to operate as alleged, then it is strange that the Government, possessing the power of relieving these manufacturers, have, for some eight years, neglected to give that aid to this industry that it appears to be entitled to. This has been brought to the attention of the Government year after year, and it is time for the Government to give an authoritative announcement as to whether or not they intend to give some remedy to the millers. Deputations come to Ottawa, Boards of Trade meet and pass resolutions, advice is given, and the Government assure the millers that they have the deep sympathy of the Government and that the Government hope at some period to remedy the evil. But time goes on and the Session draws to a close, and the matter remains as it has remained for the last eight years. It is the duty of the Government to solve this problem; now let them determine. They are the creators of the fiscal policy of to day, which is understood to do justice to all. It is manifest, however, that it is not doing justice to all if the charge made by the millers is correct. Again, with respect to the conditions of the pork trade. The Trade and Navigation Returns show that during the last fiscal year 20,000,000 lbs. of pork were imported, and the features of the tariff present some very curious results, and these results have prevailed since 1878. Different portions of the carcass coming into the country are charged different rates of duty. Mess pork in barrels pays a specific duty of 1 cent a pound; if the same raw material is salted in boxes it is subject to a duty of 2 cents per pound. I believe the explanation is that mess pork is used by the lumbermen and is therefore a part of their raw material, as it is considered necessary to carrying on the lumbering industry. But how does that operate on the farmer? The price of pork at home is depressed necessarily when 20,000,000 lbs. of foreign pork find their way into Canada each year. The truth is that the farmers are operated against in every way under the present tariff, although we were told that their industry would be benefitted. I had intended to refer to other matters in connection with the tariff, but I will not do so at the present time. I desire, however, to bring one matter, which is not of a fiscal character at all, to the attention of the First Minister. On a recent occasion I ventured to express the hope that in dealing with the settlement of the vexed question of the Jesuits' Estates Act it would be dealt with in a way to meet public criticism, by a reference to the highest judicial tribunal open to the people of Canada—I refer to Her Majesty in Council; and now that the Session is drawing to a close, I again venture to call the First Minister's attention to this matter. In all controversies that are likely to divide our people seriously, if the subject of discussion is one that is determinable by the courts of the land, I deem it of extreme importance to the peace of the country, and the promotion of that harmony that should prevail among all classes, that the settlement of such a delicate question should be as far as possible removed from tribunals of a popular character, such as legislative assemblies, and the settlement committed to the hands of those whose decision would be accepted with confidence by all classes of the people. There is, I understand, a very ready and simple means whereby such a question as that to which I refer may be settled to the satisfaction, so far as the law is concerned at all events, of all classes, as to what the law is. Under a statute of William the Fourth, I believe it is open to the Government to ask Her Majesty's Government to take the advice of the law officers of the Crown, or of the Privy Council, upon any matter touching the welfare of Her Majesty's subjects, or touching Her Majesty's prerogative, and under these circumstances it appears to me it is a peculiarly fitting occasion now, when we find able lawyers on the other side of the House, and on this side of the House, expressing opposite opinions as to the validity or otherwise of the Act of the Legislature of Quebec, which has received so much attention—I say it is a fitting occasion on which a settlement of this controversy should be arrived at, so far, at all events, as the law of the question is concerned, by asking the opinion of a tribunal in no way amenable to the public opinion in Canada, and in no way influenced by considerations other than those bearing on the law of the case. Under these circumstances, I hope that the First Minister, having endorsed the suggestion which I made on the occasion to which I referred, as I understood him to do——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What occasion?

Mr. MULOCK. An occasion that occurred about a month ago, when, in discussing a certain question—I do not say the discussion took place in this House, and I believe I could not refer to a discussion that has been disposed of during the present Session—I do not say the discussion took place in this Chamber, but in a discussion on a certain occasion concerning the settlement of the Jesuits' Estates Bill, when some people thought it was wise for Parliament to call upon the Government to disallow that Bill, I ventured to express the opinion then that if there was a choice of tribunals, if the one tribunal was the Governor in Council, and if the other tribunal was the courts of law, I ventured to express the opinion that the wiser course would be to obtain, if possible, the settlement of this question from that tribunal which would give an opinion most satisfactory to the people. In that opinion the First Minister concurred, and that being the case, I have been looking forward with hope and expectation to an announcement from him that he would use his position in order to obtain an opinion from such a tribunal, namely, from the courts. That being the case, I now, before the Session closes, would remind the right hon. gentleman of the attitude taken on the discussion on the question by himself, and by myself, and by other members of the House, and to express the hope that he will on this occasion see his way to obtain such an opinion on that very important point in the discussion as will settle the question of legality, at all events, in regard to the subject under discussion. Not only in dealing with this question, but in all questions that are likely to divide our people, where there is a question of law involved, I think it is extremely important that the people should recognise that whatever the law is in a case must govern. If a principle like this is recognised in

all matters, we will not have this clamour to have a law made on each occasion, but we will find the people ready to ask what is the real law on this question, and when they know what the real law is they will be satisfied. I, therefore, hope that on the present occasion, as well as on other occasions, wherever any public questions arise that are calculated to interfere with the welfare of our people, that this Government, and all Governments, will endeavor, in the way that I suggested, to satisfy the public mind, at all events, upon the constitutional questions involved. I am sure there is no class in Canada that desire anything unconstitutional, and if the constitutionality of a question, such as the one I have in mind, is determined, it will go a long way to enable persons to come to conclusions on other phases of such questions.

Mr. BOWELL. I would call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that, with reference to the tariff on pork, he is in error in his figures by about 8,000,000 lbs.

Mr. MULOCK. Are not $12,000,000 worth of imported pork sufficient to call the attention of the Government to the question?

Mr. BOWELL. That is a question which we will consider.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This discussion is rather irregular, but I may say a few words upon it. Although it is quite true that there is a large quantity of mess pork brought into this country for the special benefit of the lumber trade, yet there is no trade in Canada that affects the farmers as does this lumber trade. The farmers of Canada supply the lumber trade with almost everything they want, except mess pork, and as mess pork is especially in the interest of that trade to furnish the raw material as cheaply as possible, I think the farmers will be satisfied if by the increasing prosperity of the lumber trade, they also have an increased prosperity in supplying most of the articles which the lumbermen and their employees need. With respect to the position of the millers, I would simply say, that although there is a higher duty upon wheat than there is upon flour imported into the country, the hon. gentleman must remember that these duties are fixed by the special consent and in the interests of the millers of the day—the 50 cents a barrel was agreed to by the milling interest, as represented by a gentleman who was afterwards my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Gibbs. The millers were quite satisfied with the arrangement then, but from the alteration of the circumstances of the past year they are, I believe, somewhat dissatisfied. As the area of wheat under cultivation is largely increased in Canada, and especially in the North-West, we trust, under beneficent Providence, that these causes of dissatisfaction will disappear after the next harvest. At all events, as the Government having come to the conclusion, as was intimated early in the Session, that the Government would not ask the House to deal with any changes in the tariff, they did not feel it their duty to propose changes in this respect. We will meet again, as we hope, early in January, or, at all events, as soon as we can in January, rather than on the last day, and we will have the experience and knowledge of another year to assist us in deciding upon this subject. I am glad to find that a member of Parliament so influential and so powerful as the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has at last agreed that there may be exceptions to the doctrine of free trade to which his party so closely adhere. He is severing himself on this point, and, perhaps, I may hope that he will sever himself on others. I can only say that we on this side would be very glad to have him as a most promising convert, and a most influential man to carry his converted views into action.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps you will explain how the millers are protected under your arrangement?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are protected by having 50 cents on every barrel of American flour that comes in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And 67 cents on the wheat that makes it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Canadian miller has also the advantage of being on the spot, in proximity to the Canadian consumer. At the same time, I do not at all mean to say that there is not an anomaly; and after another season's experience, some eight months or so, we shall be better able to put this part of the tariff upon a permanent basis. The hon. gentleman has spoken about the subject of the Jesuits' Estates. I do not agree with him that the moment a constitutional question arises, we are to send it off to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. I believe it is only on a matter of very great doubt and under very peculiar circumstances, that that course should be adopted. I believe the Parliament of Canada are to judge primarily and principally on all matters of constitutional law; and after the overwhelming decision of this House—I think the hon. gentleman was one of the majority—that the measure spoken of was constitutional, I think the Government would be wanting in respect to this House if they did not bow to its decision. As regards the mode of bringing up the question, I do not think it is necessary to discuss it here, because I see in the press that those gentlemen who think that the legislation in the Province of Quebec is unconstitutional, are going to take the proper steps to have it thoroughly decided. They will, I have no doubt, press it, and we will get the decision in that way; and at the same time the Government will not be seen to act decidedly in contravention of the overwhelming opinion of the representatives of the people in Parliament.

Mr. MITCHELL. This interesting discussion has developed two or three very important points. In the first place, the right hon. gentleman has satisfied me, that he is going to bring in a measure next year to readjust what some gentlemen believe to be a discrepancy between the protection given to the millers of 50 cents a barrel on flour, and 67 cents on wheat. The hon. gentleman has stated, that that tariff was made by the representative of the millers, Mr. T. N. Gibbs, a gentleman well informed and capable of giving a fair opinion as to what would be the right ratio between flour and wheat. If the hon. gentleman means to imply that he is going to increase the duty on flour, I will tell him right here, that the people of the Maritime Provinces will not consent to any additional tax on their food, and I hope that, if he is going to make any change, he will reduce the duty on wheat. The hon. gentleman has intimated that he is going to call the House together next Session very early in January. We have heard some rumours that there are going to be six Sessions in the term of this Parliament, and, reading the hon. gentleman's statement between the lines, I think there must be some truth in the rumour. I think there are more than he who will not want to go the people. I feel that way myself, and it is one of those consoling thoughts that is not at all unpleasant. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman will tell us whether that is the case or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would say that now that the attention of the Government has been called to it, we will give it the fullest consideration.

Mr. MITCHELL. With the view of retaining your position in the Cabinet.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to correct my statement as to the quantity of pork imported, in which the Minister of Customs has been kind enough to call my attention to an error. I did not notice that in the middle of the list of breadstuff there was an item of beef, which, if deducted, would leave 13,000,000 lbs. as the quantity imported. I do not wish the Minister to understand that my reference to pork had anything to do with creating embarrassment for the lumbermen. I spoke on behalf of the producers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that when this House adjourns, it do stand adjourned until to-morrow at 11 o'clock, a.m.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 5.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 2nd May, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 11 o'clock, a.m.

PRAYERS.

THE SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I desire to ask the acting leader of the Government if the Government have any explanations to make to the House as to what course they intend to pursue with reference to the Short Line, the Bill in reference to which was defeated last night in the other Chamber. Of course the country will be interested in knowing at as early a date as possible what course the Government intend to adopt in reference to that undertaking.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The matter which the hon. gentleman speaks of occurred, as I understand, only last evening, and I do not think he can expect to receive an answer now. This matter will be, like all other such matters, taken into consideration by the Council as soon as they can do so, and, as the hon. gentleman knows, there has been no time for considering that matter or any other since we met yesterday, and I think he must therefore be content to wait a little longer before receiving an answer.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It seems to be the general understanding that the result was not altogether a matter of surprise to the Government, and, therefore, I thought the hon. gentleman might have been prepared to state their intentions on the matter.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government could not know what the members of the Senate intended to do. Those gentlemen are as free as we are in this House, and they have exercised their own judgment.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). For the first time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Though their decision may not be pleasing to the Government, nevertheless they are an independent portion of Parliament and they have taken their own course, no doubt thinking it was in the interest of the country. In this House we thought otherwise, and we had a large majority of the representatives of the people who thought otherwise. As long as we have the confidence of Parliament, we will go on with our measures as Parliament will allow us to do.

Mr. TROW. I think it is highly commendable and creditable that the Senate have shown a spirit of independence in this matter. It has been frequently stated in the press and in this Chamber that the Senate, not being accountable to the people for their acts, are led by the Government, but it is now evident that they are not. I know that efforts were made and that the leader of the Senate was strongly in favor of the passage of the measure which was passed in this House in reference to the Short Line. I heard his speech, and he certainly did his utmost, and stated that the Government were favorable to that Short Line, and that no influence had been used, not merely on himself but on other members of the Senate, to defeat that measure. He strongly pressed upon them the propriety of carrying it. It is pleasing to know that that body have taken the part they have. It is gratifying to the country and particularly to members who have hitherto thought they were a little vacillating in their course to find them showing that they are thoroughly independent of Government influence, and I think the result may be that we may grant them a longer lease of life in that Chamber.

Mr. SHANLY. I entirely agree with what has fallen from my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Trow). My friends on this side of the House know perfectly well that I was not in favor of the undertaking referred to. I also concur with him in saying that the country may consider it very fortunate that the Senate have assumed a spirit of independence in that matter. I will simply say, as I believe was once said in another place: Thank God we have a House of Lords.

Mr. TROW. I can read human nature pretty well at my time of life, and I know it would be quite out of place now to make any lengthy remarks. But since I entered the Chamber, I have gathered a few things that might be mentioned, but my references to them will, of course, depend on the length of time that will now elapse before we are summoned to the other Chamber by Black Rod. I observe in looking round me that the Opposition ranks are few and far between. No doubt it is highly satisfactory to hon. members that the Session has been brought to a close, for they were all anxious to return home to their domestic affairs. It may not be out of place for me to allude to the conduct of the whips, which was referred to the other day. This Session has been somewhat remarkable in this respect: It was generally believed our legislative duties would be brought to a close about Easter, and failing to close at Easter it was confidently expected that the House would close a few days later. Therefore, the whips had no hesitation to allow members anxious to return home to leave, as they thought only a day or two would pass at the furthest before the House would close. This created a little disturbance. I do not know that the Opposition have lost by the pairing off, for the simple reason that the vote only gave a majority of the House of 20, when, if all had remained, it might have been 40. So that no undue advantage was taken, and in fact the Opposition were in a better position than they would have been otherwise. I must give the Government considerable credit this Session for having brought down, the first week of the Session, the reports of the various departments. Their promptness in this respect exceeds any that we have experienced during my parliamentary career. I must also congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance upon having brought down his estimates and made his Budget Speech so early in the Session, so that instead of our having to wait three or four weeks before getting into harness we set to work immediately and kept incessantly at it during three months. We have done considerable work. A large number of Private Bills and several Public Bills have been passed. For my part I never did believe very much in excessive legislation. I believe we are legislating too much instead of too little. There are many professional men here, each of whom seems to think he is in duty bound to promote a Bill, and such Bills are very often passed in

a very crude state. We have often discussions even at the last stage of the Bill, and amendments of considerable importance introduced. The very last Bill passed, that relating to combines, has been so tortured and twisted in the other House that it is questionable if the promoter (Mr. Wallace) knew his bantling when it came back. The result is that when cases arise in our courts on which these statutes have a bearing, there seems to be no possibility of professional men agreeing as to their interpretation; even the judges of the Supreme Court disagree on material points of interpretation. I think we ought to try to draft our measures in such a way that their meaning would be plain to every man of ordinary judgment and not draft them in tortuous phraseology from which it is often difficult to draw any meaning. I am glad the right hon. the First Minister has enjoyed good health. I believe we are all gratified at seeing him constantly in his place. At all hours he has been assiduous in attending to his duties, and it is wonderful to see, in a gentleman of his age, such an adaptability to hard work, and to the responsibilities, not merely of his own, but of other departments. In the lamented death of that good man, Mr. Pope, who was a personal friend of mine, and who had more intelligence than he sometimes got credit for, the right hon. gentleman lost one of his best supporters. The lamented gentleman was thoroughly versed in his own department, was a good counsellor, and in every respect a great help to the Government. Another Minister, no doubt useful in his way, was also, through illness, compelled to be absent nearly the whole of the Session. Therefore the Prime Minister has been at a great deal of disadvantage in the absence of members of his Cabinet. There are some members of his Cabinet who have worked successfully. I have always mentioned one, since I have known him, as being always at work, in his office or otherwise, as being practical in every respect—I have reference to the Minister of Public Works. He is always ready on any question which has reference to his department to answer in a business-like manner, and it seems to me that it is a great relief to the Minister when he is thoroughly prepared to answer questions in regard to his department. I cannot see why any member of the Government cannot prepare himself to do that. I was surprised at the Minister of the Interior. There is no better Deputy Minister in any of the departments than the Deputy Minister of the Interior. He has not been placed in that position through any political influence, but he rose to that position by merit. He is an exceptionally clear headed official, and I think the Minister of the Interior will be able, by next Session, to place himself in such a position that he can discharge the duties of his department with greater credit to himself next Session than he has this Session. I know that he has no desire to do wrong. I have been acquainted with the Minister of the Interior for many years, and I know that he is desirous of doing right, but there is a want of that knowledge which should be possessed by a Minister to state to the House everything in connection with the questions which have reference to his department. Other Ministers have been called in question from this side of the House, but it is not to be supposed that they must think it severe criticism on the part of the Opposition. We are here for that purpose, and it is not to be expected that their measures and departmental work and expenditure will pass without some criticism. Ministers are held resposible for all that is done, and naturally we cast the blame upon the Administration. We have no other resource, and the Opposition have been—I do not say severe or factious—but extremely careful and cautious in their criticism this Session. I believe there is not an item in the Estimates which has been passed this Session without being criticised, and that more than ever before. We are an expectant party. We expect to occupy your position, and that before long, and you are perfectly aware of that. Whenever you are prepared to send us to the right-about, and ask our constituents to give their verdict as to who shall return here, you will see that we will get your places. I have no doubt that, if we occupied your position, you would criticise our work as severely as the present Opposition have criticised your work during this Session. I know, when we were on that side of the House, we never saw or heard any gentleman who would criticise the work of the Administration more severely or more closely than the present Minister of Customs. I have known him for three hours to criticise items which were brought by that Administration into the House. He was a man who persisted in hanging on with such tenacity that you could not get rid of him or shake him off under any circumstances. Moral suasion or any hospitality you could show him would not interfere with him. I do not see, then, why some of our friends opposite should be annoyed because of the criticism which they have received from members of the Opposition. The Minister of Agriculture, I know, is doing a great work. It is not an inexpensive work, but I consider it a great work. It will take time to develop. It takes some time to grow a tree, though you may grow a turnip in a very short time, and I predict that, in a few years, the work of that institution will show its beneficial influence in the great North-West and in the eastern Provinces of this Dominion. I have great faith in that institution. It is true that, at the outset, you must have somewhat lavish expenditure, because you must have all your buildings erected and your drainage made and all must be necessarily very expensive at the outset, but we expect good results from that. The Minister of Militia has been called in question a good deal this Session. I do not know whether he has not been in fault. I have not examined the clothing, and, if I did, I would know nothing about it. I have often bought articles myself which I found were not as good as they were represented to be. We are all liable to be imposed upon, and the result of this criticism may be that he will be more careful in future in the purchase of these articles, and in purchasing them from reliable firms. I do not know that he has not purchased them from reliable firms in the past, but I hope he will purchase articles which will wear, and will be of service to our volunteers. I am sorry that I do not see the Minister of Finance here. I wish he was here, because I must say that I do not approve of his cheese-paring policy. I am in favor of economy. I have been an economist all my life, but driving this idea of economy to the extreme is an injury instead of a benefit. I understand that the Minister of Finance has made a reduction of some paltry $50 on the salary of some of the most useful officials of this House, an amount which they are entitled to under the Statute. If that is the case, I think it is wrong. I know that the hon. gentleman voted for the expenditure of three or four millions a night or two ago which, to my mind—and I do not think my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) will say anything to the contrary—was a useless and worthless expenditure; and it is one which our friends in the other House have thrown out, showing thereby that they are not the men they have been represented to be, that they are not, like the fifth wheel of a waggon, utterly useless. On the contrary, they have saved millions to the country by their action. If we can save millions of dollars in that way, I think it is our duty to give that House a longer lease of life. I hope the Minister will reconsider the cheese-paring policy he has adopted in regard to these officials. If your officials are good trustworthy servants and understand the responsible positions in which they are placed, they should be sufficiently remunerated. There are Mr. Hartney and Mr. Brewer and several others from whom the Minister has taken certain sums which, properly speaking, they are entitled to, and I hope he will reconsider the matter and allow these gentlemen their just dues. Hon. members

talk of the bad ventilation and of the unhealthy position they are placed in in this Chamber, but their labors are not so onerous as those of the men in the paste room. Those men have to work in a little oven, an unhealthy, miserable hole, incessantly from morning to night. They were allowed last Session $50 extra, but I understand this has not been allowed them this Session. To my mind there are no men worthier of an extra allowance, and I hope the Government will give these men a fair remuneration for their services. As an Opposition we are very fortunate. We number some 84 or 85, and no doubt, if we had the opportunity, we would number probably 140. However, that is in the future. We have unbounded faith in our leader, and he has a most devoted following. We have never had any trouble with our leaders, and are the most fortunate class of people imaginable. We commenced with Mr. Mackenzie, who owes his present ill-health to his excessive labors and strict devotion in the cause of his country. If he had indulged in riding in cabs as some members of this Administration do, he would probably be in better health to-day, and if he had employed an extra clerk at a few hundred dollars that would have aided him materially and perhaps have preserved his health. We have had present here this Session our ex-leader (Mr. Blake), but by the advice of his physician he was not allowed to take any part in the debates. He also owes his ill-health to the severe strain to which his arduous labor submitted him. The Opposition, I must say, have shown very creditable, considerable ability this Session. In the debate on the disallowance of the Jesuit Bill, a question of vital importance, which required men of talent, thorough statesmen, to discuss it, some of the best speeches ever delivered in this House were delivered on both sides. The hon. the Minister of Justice, in the opinion not merely of his own friends, but of others, made a speech that was creditably delivered, and the legal points which he adduced were a credit to himself, and will have a tendency to do good throughout the country. Other speeches on other subjects have also been satisfactory to both sides. I hope that our hon. friends opposite and our own friends will return with renewed vigor and health next Session. We are all friendly after our little discussions are over. The animosity which outsiders think exist between members on different sides, I am happy to say, does not exist. I know something of feelings of the Opposition and the sentiments expressed on our side of the Chamber, and I can only say that no feeling of unfriendliness is felt by members of the Opposition against any member on the Ministerial benches. With regard to yourself, Mr. Speaker, I cannot conclude without giving expression to the respect and the appreciation hon. members have on this side of your uniform courtesy towards them. Your hospitality, your courtesy, and your knowledge of the duties of your position, have made you a general favorite with our people. As to the Deputy Speaker, everbody knows him, and we like to see him always around the House. We did expect he would be called to a higher position before next Session, but it is rumored that another hon. gentleman would be called to that place. I hope the right hon. First Minister will change his tactics and give our Deputy Speaker the position he is entitled to.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Davin, Davin.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker——

PROROGATION.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

Mr. SPEAKER:

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

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

Mr. TROW.

IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act to incorporate the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters.

An Act to incorporate the Union Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Revised Statutes, chapter 77, respecting the safety of ships.

An Act for the relief of George MacDonald Bagwell.

An Act for the relief of William Henry Middleton.

An Act for the relief of Arthur Wand.

An Act for the relief of William Gordon Lowry.

An Act further to amend the several Acts relating to the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto.

An Act to amend "The Summary Trials Act."

An Act respecting the harbor of Belleville, in the Province of Ontario.

An Act to amend the Revised Statute respecting interest.

An Act to amend the "Fisheries Act," chapter 95 of the Revised Statutes.

An Act to provide against frauds in the supplying of milk to cheese, butter and condensed milk manufactories.

An Act respecting a loan therein mentioned to certain Mennonite immigrants.

An Act respecting Expropriation of Lands.

An Act to amend "The Post Office Act," chapter 35 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

An Act to authorise the granting of pensions to members of the North-West Mounted Police Force.

An Act to incorporate the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the North-Western Junction and Lake of the Woods Railway Company.

An Act to amend "The Summary Convictions Act," chapter 178 of the Revised Statutes, and the Act amending the same.

An Act further to amend "The Inland Revenue Act," chapter 34 of the Revised Statutes.

An Act further to amend "The General Inspection Act," chapter 99 of the Revised Saatutes.

An Act to extend the provisions of the Extradition Act.

An Act to amend "The Copyright Act," chapter 62 of the Revised Statutes.

An Act to amend "The Cullers' Act," chapter 103 of the Revised Statutes.

An Act further to amend "The Customs Act," chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes.

An Act further to amend the Revised Statutes, chapter 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise.

An Act further to amend "The Dominion Lands Act."

An Act for the prevention and suppression of Combinations formed in restraint of Trade.

An Act relating to Bills of Lading.

An Act to amend the Revised Statutes respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force.

An Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.

An Act to amend the Revised Statutes, chapter 138, respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.

An Act respecting a certain agreement therein mentioned with the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.

An Act to authorise the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

An Act to authorise the granting of subsidies in land to certain railway companies.

An Act for the relief of the Corporation of the Town of Cobourg.

Then the Honorable the SPEAKER of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General as follows:—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

The Commons of Canada have voted the Supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency the following Bill:

"An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1889, and the 30th June, 1890, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service," to which Bill I humbly request Your Excellency's assent.

To this Bill the Royal Assent was signified in the following words:—

In Her Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks Her Loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the Third Session of the Sixth Parliament of the Dominion with the following

SPEECH :

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

In relieving you of the arduous labors which the present Session of Parliament has imposed on you, I rejoice that I am able to congratulate you on the number of important and useful measures which have resulted from your deliberations.

I have reason to hope that the authority which you have conferred on my Government will enable them to conclude an arrangement for effective steam communication with Europe and with Asia, whereby the trade and commerce of Canada will be widely extended and the traffic passing over her lines of communication greatly developed.

You have again made liberal provision for extending the railway facilities of the Dominion and for increasing their efficiency.

The Act relating to the Electoral Franchise will, I believe, be found an important improvement, tending to economy and certainty in the administration of that branch of the law.

The measure by which the system of Speedy Trials for criminals has been extended to the Maritime Provinces is likely to prove a valuable addition to our Criminal Procedure.

It is gratifying to know that your address referring to the boundaries of Ontario, will lead to the early settlement of the principal question which has remained unsettled to the present time between that Province and the Dominion, in a manner entirely satisfactory to all concerned.

The amendment of the laws relating to Copyright, will it is hoped, remove some of the embarrassments under which the printers and publishers of Canada have labored for some years past, without doing injustice to authors in this or other countries.

You have provided for greater efficiency and economy in the Postal Service, for giving greater facilities for the settlement of our lands in the North-West Territories, and for increasing the safeguards of life and property on our ships.

Many of the other measures although of a minor character will be found of great usefulness in conducting the affairs of administration.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

You have liberally provided for the various requirements of the public service.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

In taking leave of you I congratulate you on the indications of prosperity which appear in all parts of Canada, and on the increasing revenue which promises amply to meet the appropriations for the year.

I sincerely hope that in the season which is now opening the labors of our people may be blessed by Divine Providence, and that when it shall be my duty to summon you again, I shall be able to renew the congratulations which I have already expressed on the marked welfare and progress of the Dominion.

THE SPEAKER of the Senate then said :

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate, and Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

It is His Excellency the Governor General's will and pleasure, that this Parliament be prorogued until Tuesday, the eleventh day of June next, to be here held, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until Tuesday, the eleventh day of June next.

The Parliament of the Dominion of Canada was then prorogued to the 11th day of June next.

INDEX.

THIRD SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT, 1889.

Abbreviations of well-known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remarks or debate; Acts. Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C. P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; Hse. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I. C. R., Intercolonial; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N. B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N. S., Nova Scotia; O. C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P. E. I., Prince Edward Island; P. O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Que., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer., Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y. N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italic and parentheses are those of the movers.

Amyot, Mr. G., *Bellechasse.*

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com. and in Com., 778 (i).

Civil Service, Assessment of Salaries authorisation B. 18 (Mr. *Ellis*) on M. for 2° (objection) 366 (i).

Controverted Elections Act Amt. (Ques.) 224 (i).

Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 127 (i).

Corrupt Practices in Municipal Affairs B. 71 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 503 (i).

Debates, Official, delay in Printing French Edition (remarks) 654 (i), 945 (ii).

Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. (B. 70, 1°*) 298 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 6 m. h., 1121 (ii).

Judges' Salaries, in Com. of Sup, 208 (i).

Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1437 (ii).

Pilots, average Amounts received (Ques.) 1146 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com., 1134 (ii).

Privilege (Ques. of) Steamship Subsidies, 1534 (ii).

Rebellion in N. W. T., 9th Battalion (documents read) 234 (i).

——— Official Cor. (M. for copies) 304-317; wthdn., 322 (i).

Amyot, Mr. G.—*Continued.*

Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S. on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 633 (i).

Stein, Leonce, employment by Govt. (remarks) 1533.

SUPPLY:

Immigration (Agents) 948, 954 (ii).

Justice (Supreme Court Reps., Printing, &c.) 205 (i).

Ocean and River Service (Masters and Mates Certificates) 974 (ii).

Railways—Capital: Cape Breton (construction) 1070 (ii).

Victoria Bridge, Cost of maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 1081 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J., *South Middlesex.*

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) in Com., 237 (i).

C.P.R. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 1063 (ii).

Farmers, Frauds upon, on M. (Mr. *Brown*) for Sp. Com., 16 (i).

Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 40 (i).

Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 954 (ii).

——— Pamphlets, in Com. of Sup., 274(i).

Intoxicating Liquors in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1347 (ii).

Lowry, W. G., Relief B. 119 (Mr. *Small*) 1160 (ii).

Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 504.

Armstrong, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) on Amt to M. to conc. in Res., 1682 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (Agents) 954 (ii).
Indian Affairs (Man. and N.W.T.) 1596 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper and Binding) 274 (i).

Bain, Mr. T., *North Wentworth.*
Cobourg Town Relief B. 153 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 1721 (ii).
Dundas and Waterloo Macadamised Road (M. for Cor., &c.) 34 (i).
——— Survey (Ques.) 1628 (ii).
Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 44 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1024 (ii).
Intoxicating Liquors in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1348 (ii).
New Edinburgh and Gatineau Ferry, rents and arrearages (Ques.) 348 (i).
Stein, Leonce, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 1533 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Welland) 1516 (ii).
Civil Government (Postmaster General) 69 (i).
Immigration (Agents) 947, 949, 952, 956 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Experimental Farms (Buildings, &c.) 974 (ii).

Baird, Mr. G. F., *Queen's, N. B.*
Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1033 (ii).

Barnard, Mr. F. S, *Cariboo.*
Mining Machinery in B.C., and Free List (Ques.) 1265.
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1583 (ii).

Barron, Mr. J. A., *North Victoria, Ont.*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) in Com., 235 (i).
Can. Temp. Act, distribution of Fines (Ques.) 1533 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on M. that Com. rise, 362 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1006; in Com., 1012, 1021 (ii).
Gannon Narrows Floating Bridge (Ques.) 1627 (ii).
Horse Island, Georgian Bay, Sale (Ques.) 590 (i).
Indian Reserves, Sale of Pine Timber (Ques.) 20, 30.
Jesuits' Estates Act (Ques.) 79 (i).
——— on M. to adjn., 436 (i).
——— papers respecting (remarks) 524, 526 (i).
——— on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 828 (ii).
——— Test of Legality (Ques.) 1327 (ii).
La Cloche Island, Provincial Claims (Ques.) 1081 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup., 1244 (ii).

Barron, Mr. J. A.—*Continued.*
Ry. Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 364 (i).
Saw Logs, Export Duty (Amt.) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1484; neg. (Y. 62, N. 91) 1494; (Amt.) 1584; neg. (Y. 54; N. 90) 1594 (ii).
Scugog River (Ques.) 1533 (ii).
Stein, Leonce, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 1533 (ii).
Sultana Island, Lake of the Woods, Sale (Ques.) 426 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Trent River Nav.) 1207 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Trent) 1495 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, printing) 272 (i).
Militia (Armories, care of Arms, &c.) 793; (Drill Sheds, &c.) 495; (Permanent Forces, &c.) 797 (i).
Mounted Police, 1213 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff: Roads, Bridges, &c.) 1216 (ii).
Pensions (Mrs. Gowanlock) 792 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Kingston Graving Dock) 802. *Income:* Buildings (Ont.) 806 (i), 1521 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 20, 655, 676 (i), 872 (ii).

Beausoleil, Mr. C., *Berthier.*
Cobourg Town Relief B. 153 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 1721 (ii).
Fishing Regulations in Berthier (M. for copies) 743 (i).
Judges' (Provincial) Salaries B. 150 (Mr. *Thompson*) M. for Com. on Res., 1688 (ii).
Montreal Flood Commission, printing Rep. (remarks) 1687 (ii).
Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1682 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1617 (ii).
St. Barthelemy Post Office (Ques.) 591 (i).
St. Lawrence River Overflow, prevention (Ques.) 591.

Béchard, Mr. F., *Iberville.*
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 117 (i).
Debates, Official, delay in printing French Edition (remarks) 944 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 263 (i).
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 628 (i).

Bell, Mr. J. W., *Addington.*
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co. and Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 90, 1°*) 369 (i).

Bergéron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*
Beauharnois Canal, opening of Navigation (telegram read) 1285 (ii).
——— Rep. of Engineer Crawford, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 304 (i).
Budget Speech, French Edition (Ques.) 171 (i).
St. Louis River Improvements (Ques.) 34 (i).
Subsidies to Rys., on M. to conc. in Res., 1535 (ii).

Bergin, Mr. D., *Cornwall and Stormont.*
Cornwall Canal, prop. Location in 1834, Reps., &c., of Engineers (M. for copies) 595, 677 (i).
Recent Break (M. for Cor., &c.*) 303 (i).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on M. that Com. rise, 361 (i).
Prescott County Ry. Co's. incorp. Act Amt. B. 33 (Mr. *Edwards*) 2° objected to, 239 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 264 (i).
Winnipeg and North Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 82, 1°*) 346 (i).

Bernier, Mr. M. E., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Criminal Laws, distribution to Justices of the Peace (Ques.) 171 (i)
Hereford Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, Laborers' Wages and conveyance of Volunteers, (Ques.) 1017 (ii).
Lake St. Louis, construction of Piers (Ques.) 80 (i).
Longueuil Wharves, completion (Ques.) 80 (i).

Blake, Hon. E., *West Durham.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Repairs, Furniture, &c.) 917. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 925 (ii).

Boisvert, Mr. F., *Nicolet.*
Great Eastern Ry. Subsidy, on M. for Pets., Reps., &c., 21 (i).

Borden, Mr. F. W., *King's, N.S.*
Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s (M. for Cor., &c.) 529, 539 (i).

Bourassa, Mr. F., *St. John's, Que.*
Belle Vallée Post Office, change of Location (M. for Cor., &c.*) 943 (ii).

Bowell, Hon. M., *North Hastings.*
Aird, W. B., jun., Names of Sureties (Ans.) 1017 (ii).
American Fishing Vessels, authority to Enter and Clear (Ans.) 348 (i).
Bannerman, Wm., Customs sub-collector at Calgary, defalcations (Ans.) 677 (i).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry. Subsidy and G.T.R., on M. for Cor., 87 (i).
——— Drill Shed, construction, on M. for Cor., 700 (i).
——— Harbor B. 116 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1042.
Bridgewater, Seizure, Claims for compensation (Ans.) 1423 (ii).
C. P. R., Interest due on $15,000,000 Bonds (Ans.) 348.
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 134 (i).
Customs Act Amt. (prop. Res.) 469; in Com. on Res., 763 (i); (B. 117) 2° m., 1138; in Com., 1140; M. to recom., 1330 (ii).
——— Appraisers (Ques.) appointment (Ans.) 370 (i).
——— Seizures, on Res. (Mr. *Holton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1290 (ii).
Debates, Official (M. for Sp. Com.) 3 (i).

Bowell, Hon. M.—*Continued.*
Electoral Lists, Expenditure on preparation, &c. (Ans.) 30, 33 (i).
Exports to Great Britain *viâ* U. S. (Ans.) 428 (i).
——— to Australia, Manufactures (Ans.) 1423 (ii).
Fish, Foreign, change in Bonding System (Ans.) 224 (i)
Fish Imported in Bond for Export, on M. for Cor., 1089 (ii).
Flour and Pork Duties, on adjnmt. (remarks) 1723 (ii).
Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 686, 692 (i).
Fruits and Seeds Imported from U.S. (Ans.) 224 (i).
Gowan and Boswell, Judges, in Com of Sup., 1362 (ii).
Grosse, John A., employment by Govt. (Ans.) 171 (i).
Imports and Exports (Ans.) 1363 (ii).
I. C. R., French Language on (Ans.) 29 (i).
Jukes, Dr., in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).
Labor Commissioners' Rep. (presented) 1285 (ii).
Liquor Permits in N.W.T., on M. for copies, 556 (i).
Lumber Shipments from N. B. to U. S. (Ans.) 935 (ii).
Milk Adulteration, prevention of Fraud B. 16 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 260 (i).
——— (M.) to trnstr. to Govt. Orders, 1397 (ii).
Oils, Imports into Man. (Ans.) 1533 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com., 1137 (ii).
Preventive Officers in P. E. I. (Ans.) 15 (i).
Printing and Stationery, deptl. Rep. (presented) 346.
——— Bureau, in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).
——— Committee (M. to add names) 346 (i).
Public Accounts Com., meeting (Ans.) 222 (i).
——— (remarks) 500 (i).
——— Printing of Evidence (remarks) 1367 (ii).
Ross, Josiah, Seizure of Property by Customs Dept. (Ans.) 428 (i).
Saw Logs, Importation, on M. for Ret., 33 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Judges Gowan and Boswell, refund) 1362 (ii).
Civil Government (Customs) 152, 155 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Trent) 1495. Culling Timber, 1362 (ii).
Customs (Detective Service) 1221; (Salaries, &c.) 1217; (Miscellaneous) 1461 (ii).
Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1078 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper and Binding) 273 (i); (Returning Officers) 1362 (ii); (Voters' Lists, printing) 271 (i).
Miscellaneous (Jukes, Dr.) 1571; (Printing Bureau) 1571 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1453 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1519 (ii).
West Bay, N.S., Custom House Officer (Ans.) 427 (i).
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on presentation of Rep. of Sel. Com., 384; in Com., 608, 614; on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to M. for 3°, 761 (i).
Wrecking, &c., in Can. Waters B. 7 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) on M. to adjn. deb., 259 (i).
Trade and Navigation Tables (presented) 3 (i).
Vincent, Joseph E., and Customs Dept., on M. for Cor., 935 (ii).
Voters' Lists, printing, distribution, &c. (Ans.) 15 (i).

Bowman, Mr. I. E., *North Waterloo.*
Berlin and Can. Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 58, 1°*) 269 (i).
Mennonite Immigrants Loan B. 138 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com. on Res., 1268 (ii).
Ont. Mutual Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 42, 1°*) 194 (i).
Return *re* Fire Insurance Co's (Enquiry) 323 (i).

Boyle, Mr. A., *Monck.*
Business of the House, on adjnmt. (remarks) 762 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1144 (ii).
Fruits and Seeds imported from U. S. (Ques.) 224 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Welland) 1515 (ii).
Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud (B. 6, 1°*) 13 (i); on 2°, 1100 (ii).

Brien, Mr. J., *South Essex.*
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 125 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1014, 1129 (ii).
Immigrants, Arrivals from 1867 to 1889, number, &c., (M. for Ret.*) 304 (i).
Pauper Immigration (children) in Com. of Sup., 964 (ii).
Stephenson, Rufus, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 223 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1643 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1077 (ii).
Immigration (Agents) 963 (ii).

Brown, Mr. A., *Hamilton.*
Bagwell, Geo. McDonald, Relief (B. 123, 1°*) 871 (ii).
Ballot Box, Waddell's Patent (M. for Sel. Com.) 24 (i).
Boiler Inspection and Insurance Co. of Can. Act Amt. (B. 25, 1°*) 47 (i).
Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to ref. to Com. on Banking, &c., 1115 (ii).
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 119 (i).
Cruelty to Animals prevention (B. 3, 1°) 13; 2° m., 240; on M. that Com. rise, 360; (M.) to restore to Order Paper, 367; agreed to (Y. 96; N. 92) 368; M. for Com., 607 (i).
Fraudulent Practices Com. (M. for Sp. Com.) 16; (M.) reducing quorum, 222 (i).
Fire Arms, Improper use (B. 148, 1°*) 1221 (ii).
Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. for 2°, 1102 (ii).

Bryson, Mr. J., *Pontiac.*
Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Girouard*) on M. for 2°, 170 (i).
Pontiac and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 51, 7°*) 222 (i).

Bryson, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1631 (ii).
Union Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 79 (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 854 (ii).

Burdett, Mr. S. B., *East Hastings.*
Belleville and North Hastings Ry. Subsidy and G.T.R. (M. for Cor.) 85 (i).
Belleville Harbor B. 116 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1042 (ii).
Deaf and Dumb Institute, Belleville, in Com of Sup., 70 (i).
Drill Shed at Belleville, Govt. Aid (Ques.) 80 (i).
——— construction (M. for Ret.) 699 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1026, 1126 (ii).
Milk Adulteration, prevention of Fraud (B. 16, 1°*) 30; 2° m., 259 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com., 1137 (ii).
Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenue, &c. (M. for Ret.) 225 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Postmaster General) 69 (i).

Burns, Mr. K. F., *Gloucester.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 6 m. h., 1121 (ii).
Fish Imported in Bond for Export, on M. for Cor., 1086.

Cameron, Mr. H., *Inverness.*
Cape Breton Ry., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flynn*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
Dredge *Cape Breton*, compensation to Captain and Laborers for Losses (Ques.) 427 (i).
Dredge lost in Northumberland Straits (Ques.) 469 (i).
L'Ardoise Breakwater, on M. for copies of Surveys, &c., 698 (i).
McDonald and Dowling's Gulches, Pile-driving (Ques.) 677 (i).
Simms & Slater, Sureties' Deposits (Ques.) 677 (i).
SUPPLY:
Indians (P.E.I.) 1173 (ii).
West Bay, N.S., Custom House Officer (Ques.) 427 (i).

Campbell, Mr. A., *Kent, Ont.*
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 779 (i).
Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 1444 (ii).
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 116 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1007; in Com., 1013, 1020, 1128 (ii).
Freight Rates, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1068 (ii).
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1407 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. A.—*Continued.*
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 585.
Stephenson, Rufus, in Com. of Sup., 1254 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: (Indian and Colonial Exhibition) 1513 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands, 1253 (ii).
Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1078 (ii).
Indians (Industrial Schools) 1178; (Man. and N.W.T.) 1176 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms) 1361 (ii).
Militia (Armories, &c.) 794; (Drill Sheds, &c) 795 (i).
Miscellaneous (St. Catharines Milling Co., Costs) 1456 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 220 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont) 806 (i). Experimental Farm (Buildings, &c.) 972. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 928, 1531 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (St. John, accommodation) 1068 (ii).
Wrecking, &c., in Can. Waters B. 7 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 256 (i).

Cargill, Mr. H., *Bruce.*
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 132 (i).

Carling, Hon. John, *London.*
Agriculture, deptl. Rep. (presented) 138 (i).
Artisans, Importation, attention called to Advertisement (remarks) 1668 (ii).
Concurrence, 1598 (ii).
Experimental Farm, expenditure (Ans.) 428, 535 (i).
Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 947, 1320 (ii).
——— Pamphlets, in Com. of Sup., 275 (i).
Manuscripts respecting Canada, copying (Ans.) 1363.
Mennonite Immigrants Loan (prop. Res.) 1146; in Com., 1267; (B. 138) in Com., 1399 (ii).
Population of Dom. by Provinces (Ans.) 170 (i).
Seed Wheat, payment by Settlers (Ans.) 590 (i).
Stein, Leonce, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 1534 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Census and Statistics) 298 (i), conc., 1598 (ii); (Colonial and Indian Exhibition) 1512; (Dairy Interests) 1513 (ii); (Experimental Farms) 289 (i); (Fruit-growing Interest) 1513 (ii); (Health Statistics) 287 (i); (*Patent Record*) conc., 1598 (ii).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 71 (i).
Immigration (Agents) 947, 1320, 1498 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 274 (i).
Quarantine (Public Health) 932; (St. John and Halifax) 931 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. S.) 1518; Experimental Farm (Buildings, &c.) 971; Roads and Bridges (Ottawa River and City) 1450 (ii).
Webster, W. A., Sums paid for Services (Ans.) 303 (i).
——— employment by Govt. (Ans.) 979 (ii).

Caron, Hon. Sir A. P., K.C.M.G., *Quebec County.*
Bedson, S. L., appointment in Militia Force (Ans.) 1328 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1509 (ii).
Bonsecours Market Hall and Volunteers (Ans.) 19 (i).
Cartridge Manufacture, in Com. of Sup., 1353 (ii).
Cavalry School, Toronto (Ans.) 302 (i).
Concurrence, 1599 (ii).

Caron, Hon. Sir A. P.—*Continued.*
Hereford Ry. Co.'s Claim for conveyance of Volunteers (Ans.) 1017 (ii).
Lake, James P., payment for Wire Rope (Ans.) 1628 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. (B. 29, 1°) 105 (i); wthdn., 1629 (ii).
Militia Clothing, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1553 (ii).
Military College, Commandant's House (Ans.) 34 (i), 1534 (ii).
Militia and Defence, deptl. Rep. (presented) 13 (i).
Militia Regulations, &c., French Edition (Ans.) 171 (i).
National Defence Com. (Ans.) 1423 (ii).
Permanent Forces, expenditure for Repairs on Works (Ans.) 171 (i).
Pub. Accts. Com., meeting (remarks) 501 (i).
Papers from Militia Dept. (remarks) 470 (i).
Rebellion in N. W. T., Cor. respecting 9th Battalion, on M. for copies, 317 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Prs. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1637 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Contingencies) 157; (Militia and Defence) 55 (i).
Militia (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 793 (i), 1353 (ii); (Armories, care of Arms, &c.) 793 (i); (Drill Pay) conc., 1599 (ii); (Drill Sheds, &c) 795 (i); (Military College) 1357 (ii); (Permanent Forces, &c.) 796; (Rifled Ordnance) 794 (i).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 1509 (ii).
Pensions (Compensation in lieu of Land) 788; (Fenian Raid) 788; (Veterans of 1812) 788 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B. C.) 1528; (Ont.) 1520, 1694 (ii).
Territorial Accounts (Rebellion in N.W.T.) 1461 (ii).
Tête du Pont Barracks, Sale (Ans.) 427 (i).
Toronto School of Infantry, Bread supply, Tenders (Ans.) 1082 (ii).
Valiquette, Sergt., Pension to Family, in Com. of Sup., 788 (i).
Volunteers' (9th Battalion) discipline (Ans.) 1327 (ii).

Carpenter, Mr. F. W., *South Wentworth*
Ont. Loan and Debenture Co.'s. Consolidation B. 48 (Mr. *Moncrieff*) 2° m., 299 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J., K.C.M.G., *South Oxford.*
Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1580.
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 194 (i).
Boundaries of Ont., on prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1329 (ii).
Brown, Capt., Pension to Family, in Com. of Sup., 791.
Budget Speech (Ques.) 79 (i).
BUDGET, THE (reply) 456; (prop. Res.) Unrestricted Reciprocity with U. S., 468 (i).
Buildings, Public, erected 1867–1889 (M. for Ret.*) 303.
Business of the House (remarks) 269 (i).
Chipman, C. C., in Com. of Sup., 138, 142, 145, 196, 199 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J.—*Continued.*
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 670; in Com. on Res., 673; (Amt.) to recom., neg. (Y. 68; N. 113) 763 (i).
——— Assessment of Salaries authorisation B. 18 (Mr. *Ellis*) on Mr. Speaker's Ruling, 367 (i).
Commercial Treaties, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 105, 168 (i).
Commercial Treaties with Foreign States (prop. Res.) 172; neg. (Y. 66; N. 94) 193 (i).
Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditures (M. for Ret.*) 24 (i)
Concurrence, 1597, 1601, 1607, 1614 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1140.
Contingencies, deptl., in Com. of Sup., 159, 166 (i).
Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1240, 1251 (ii).
——— (Amt.) to M. to conc. in Res. rep. from Com. of Sup. 1607; neg. (Y. 39, N. 71) 1510 (ii).
Estimates, The (remarks) 30 (i).
Experimental Farm, expenditure (Ques.) 423, 525 (i).
Exports of Manufactures to Australia (Ques.) 1423 (ii).
Exports and Imports (M. for Ret.*) 24 (i).
——— (Ques) 1363 (ii).
Fisheries and Trade Relations with U. S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 419 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 987 (ii).
Freight Rates, I.C.R, in Com. of Sup., 1070 (ii).
Freight Transit through Canada, on Order Res for Sel. Com. being called (remarks) 591 (i).
Govt. Business on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to take in Wednesdays, 654 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. (remarks) 979 (ii).
Indian Treaties, Surrender of Lands (Ques.) 841 (ii).
I.C.R., Capital Account, expenditure (Ques.) 676 (i).
Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 950, 1319 (ii).
Jesuits' Estates Act, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 908 (ii).
——— on Res. (Mr. *Ross*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1693 (ii).
Judges' (Provincial) Salaries B. 150 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1687 (ii).
Legislative Economy, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) for Joint Com., 782 (i).
Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, amounts received on account (M. for Ret.) 30 (i).
——— (Ques.) 944 (ii).
——— (remarks) 945, 1044 (ii).
——— (prop. Res) in Amt. to Com of Sup, 1147; neg. (Y. 74, N. 117) 1169 (ii).
——— paragraph in Prospectus *re* Sinking Fund (Ques.) 1328 (ii).
Manufacturers' Insurance Co.'s Stockholders, on M. for copies of Cor., 592 (i).
Members' Sessional Indemnity (remarks) 1711 (ii).
Military College, Commandant's Residence (remarks) 1534 (ii).
Milk Adulteration, prevention of Fraud B. 16 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 259 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J.—*Continued.*
Ministerial Changes, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 27 (i).
Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1709 (ii).
——— Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res, 769 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1°, 1263 (ii).
Ocean Steamship Subsidies (B.C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1373, 1376, 1384 (ii).
——— (B.C. and China, &c.) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to Res., 1387; in Com., 1388 (ii).
——— (Can. and United Kingdom) on Res., 1329; in Com., 1389, 1394 (ii).
Oxford and New Glasgow Ry. (Amt.) to M. to conc. in Res. rep. from Com. of Sup., 1603; neg. (Y. 39, N. 70) 1604 (ii).
Pope, Mr. (Dep. Com. of Patents) in Com. of Sup., 74.
Population of Dom. by Provinces (Ques.) 170 (i).
Printing Bureau, expend. for Plant, &c. (Ques.) 428 (i).
Public Accounts Com, meeting (Ques.) 222 (remarks) 500 (i).
——— Papers from Militia Dept. (remarks) 470 (i).
——— Printing of Evidence (remarks) 1366 (ii).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Ry. and Steamboat Co.'s B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1706 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 1284.
Rys. and Canals (Amt.) to M. to conc. in Res. rep. from Com. of Sup., 1601; neg. (Y. 40, N. 73) 1603 (ii).
Rideau Hall Expenses, in Com of Sup., 913 (ii).
Saw Logs, Export Duty, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1483.
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1492, 1593 (ii).
Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) in Com. on Res., 1660 (ii).
——— on M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) 1678; on conc. in B., 1683 (ii).
Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 152 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., and B., 1720 (ii).
——— (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1616, 1630; on M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 33, N. 65) 1653 (ii).
Supply:
Administration of Justice (Judges Gowan and Boswell, refund) 1362 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Census and Statistics) 298 (i), conc., 1598 (ii); (Experimental Farms) 289, 295 (i); (Health Statistics) conc., 1598 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Cornwall) 1205; (Lachine) 1205; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1202; (Tay) 1211; (Trent Riv. Nav.) 1210; (Welland) 1207; (Williamsburg) 1205. *Income* (Lachine) 1514; (Rideau) 1211; (Welland) 1516 (ii).
Charges of Management (Brokerage and Commission) 204; (Country Savings Banks) 203; (Dom. Loan reduced) 204 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 71; Civil Service Examiners) 203; (Contingencies) 159, 166, 168; (Customs) 152, 155 (i); (Departments generally) 1503 (ii); (High Commissioner's Office) 151, 196 (i); (Contingencies) 1503, 1597; (Indian Affairs) 1502 (ii); (Inland Revenue) 66; (Interior) 65; (Marine) 138, 142; (Mounted Police) 62, 153; (Postmaster General) 69 (i); (Privy Council) 1502 (ii); (Railways and Canals) 151 (i), 1506 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 1227. Canals (Repairs, &c.) 1211; (Trent Canal) 1495. Culling Timber, 1362. Dom. Lands, 1240, 1251, 1607. Excise, 1223, 1225. Post Office, 1236, 1596. Public Works (Slides and Booms) 1229 (ii).

Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1077 (ii).

Geological Survey, 1079 (ii).

Immigration (Agents) 950, 961, 1319 (ii).

Indians (B. C.) 1178; (Schools) 1176, 1177; (Man. and N.W.T.) 1173, 1595 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 270, (i); (Franchise Act) 1511 (ii); (Library of Parlt.) 272; (Printing, Paper and Binding) 273 (i); (Returning Officers) 1362 (ii); (Voters' Lists, printing) 271 (i). Senate (salaries &c.) conc., 1597 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms) 975, 1361 (ii).

Mail Subsidies (Halifax, &c., and West Indies, &c.) 1703 (ii); (Magdalen Islands) 1261, 1450; (Payment to Mr. King) 1451.

Militia (Armories, care of Arms, &c.) 794; (Ammunition, &c.) 793 (i); (Drill Pay) conc., 1599 (ii); (Drill Sheds, &c.) 795 (i); (Military College) 1357 (ii); (Permanent Forces, &c.) 796; (Rifled Ordnance) 794 (i).

Miscellaneous (American Association) 1699; (Commercial Agencies) 1180; (Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c.) 1179, 1362; (Govt. of N.W.T) 1179; (Labor Commission) 1497, conc., 1614; (Lands, C. P. R. Belt) 1570; (Litigation) 1460; (Printing Bureau) 1571; (St. Catharines Milling Co , Costs) 1456; (St. Lawrence River Survey) 1461 (ii).

Mounted Police, 1212, 1451, 1497 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers) 974 (ii).

Pensions (Compensation in lieu of Land) 788; (Fenian Raid) 788; (Veterans of 1812) 788 (i).

Penitentiaries (Kingston) 1509, conc., 1615 (ii); (Man.) 216 (i), 1507, conc., 1597 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Buildings (Additional, Ottawa) 799 (i). Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) conc., 1599; (Que.) 1517 (ii) Buildings (N. S.) 805; (N. W. T.) 807 (i), 1527 (ii); (Ont) 806 (i), 1521, 1694 (ii); (Que.) 806 (i), 1362. Repairs, Furniture, &c., 913. Experimental Farm (Buildings, &c.) 972. Harbors and Rivers (Man.) 931; (N. B.) 925, 1447 (ii); (N.S.) 807 (i), 912; (Ont.) 1448. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa City and River) 1449; conc., 1615. Telegraph Lines (N.W.T.) 1233 (ii).

Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (construction) 1047. I. C. R. (Rolling Stock) conc., 1614. Cape Breton (construction) 1069. Oxford and New Glasgow (construction) 1073 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (Meteorological Service) 976 (ii).

Superannuation: Railways (W. Wallace) 1597 (ii).

Superintendence of Insurance (Expenses) 1361 (ii).

Unprovided Items, 1494 (ii).

Tariff, proposed Changes (Ques.) 1221 (ii).

Ventilation of Chamber, in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).

Western Counties Ry. B. 127 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1043 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E., *West Elgin.*

Customs Buildings, cities and towns of less than 20,000 (M. for Ret.*) 303 (i).

Cab-hire, &c., in Com. of Sup., 162, 166 (ii).

Canal Works, Tenders for (M. for Ret.) 593 (i).

Chipman, C. C., in Com. of Sup., 198 (i).

Concurrence, 1598 (ii).

Convict Labor, in Com. of Sup., 212 (ii).

Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 112 (i).

Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 245 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—*Continued.*

Fabre, Mr., in Com. of Sup., 1323 (ii).

Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 39 (i).

Fisheries and Trade Relations with U.S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 402 (i).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1127 (ii).

Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 691 (i).

Freight Transit through Can., on prop. M. (Mr. *Ives*) for Sel. Com., 88 (i).

——— on Order, Res. (Mr. *Ives*) for Sel. Com. being called, 591 (i).

Legal Fees and Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 53 (i).

Legislative Economy, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) for Joint Com., 783 (i).

Manufacturers' Insurance Co.'s Stockholders, on M. for copies of Cor., 592 (i).

Mititia Clothing, in Com. of Sup., 1353 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1131; in Com. on B., 1133 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 261 (i).

Queen's College (Kingston) Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 300, 607 (i).

St. Catharines Milling Co's. Legal Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 53 (i).

Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1683 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1647; in Com. on B., 1686 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Patent Record) conc., 1598 (ii).

Civil Government (Contingencies) 162, 164, 166, 168; (High Commissioner's Office) 196; (Interior) 58; (Justice) 53; (Militia and Defence) 55 (i).

Immigration (Agents) 1323 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Contingencies) conc., 1598 (ii); (Printing, Paper and Binding) 273 (i).

Militia (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1353; (Drill Pay) conc., 1598 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Kingston) 212 (i).

Public Works—Capital: Buildings (N.B) conc., 1599. *Income:* Buildings (Repairs, Furniture, &c.) conc., 1599. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 928 (ii).

Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1104 (ii).

Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) to M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 255; on M. for 3°, 760 (i).

Wrecking, &c., in Can. Waters B. 7 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 256 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. P. B., *L'Islet.*

Fishing Licenses, in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 84 (i).

——— River Matane (Ques.) 171 (i).

——— Rights in Matane River (M. for Cor.) 938 (ii).

Lebourdais Bros., Cor. *re* Trial (Ques.) 16 (i).

Ont. Loan and Debenture Consolidation B. 48 (Mr. *Moncreiff*) on M. for 2°, 300 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. P. B.—*Continued.*
Queen's College (Kingston) Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 301 (i).
St. Roch des Aulnets Wharf (M. for Cor.) 529 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J., *North Norfolk.*
Bannerman, Wm., late postmaster at Calgary, defalcations (Ques.) 677 (i).
Bass Fishing Permits, Lake Erie (Ques.) 1081 (ii).
Boundary between Alaska and Canada (Ques.) 426 (i).
Commercial Union with U. S., telegram *re* Hitt's Res. (read) 384 (i).
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 122 (i).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on M. for 2°, 245 (i).
Cullers' Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1363 (ii).
Customs Seizures, in Com. of Sup., 67 (i).
Debates, Official, delay in Printing (remarks) 944 (ii).
Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84, on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to trnsfr. to Govt. Orders, 1395 (ii).
Franchise Act, amount extended for all services (M. for Ret.*) 303 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 981; in Com., 1127; on M. for 3°, 1278; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 59, N. 88) 1279 (ii).
Free List Extension (Seeds and Grains) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 685 (i).
Fruit Baskets and Boxes, amount of Duty collected (M. for Ret.*) 304 (i).
Interest and Sinking Fund, amounts charged against (Ques.) 1363 (ii).
Jesuits' Estates Act on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 883 (ii).
——— on Res. (Mr. *Ross*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1692 (ii).
Legislative Assembly in N.W.T., Memorials, on M. for copies, 371 (i).
Map of Canada in Chamber (request) 469 (i).
Maritime Court Law (Ont.) Act Amt. (B. 3², 1°*) 169 (i).
Orange Order incorp., Legislation (Ques.) 1082 (ii).
Pagans in Joliette County (Ques.) 1710 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res. and B., 1133 (ii).
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 479 (i).
Saw Logs, Exportation and Duty collected (M. for Ret.*) 33 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1480, 1584 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1493 (ii).
Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com, 1034 (ii).
Sittings of the House (prop. Res.) not to sit after 12 o'clock, Order read, 432; Res., 526 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1630, 1635 (ii).

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Customs) 67; (Militia and Defence) 55; (Postmaster General) 68 (i).
Indians (Oka Indians, removal) 1172 (ii).
Miscellaneous (American Association) 1699 (ii).
Timber and Lumber Inspection Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 665 (i).
Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1103 (ii).
Ventilation of Chamber, in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on presentation of Rep. of Sel. Com., 384; in Com., 608, 619; on M. for 3°, 755; (Amt.) 757; neg. (Y. 56, N. 108) 761 (i).
Wrecking, &c., in Can. Waters B. 7 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 257 (i).

Chisholm, Mr. D., *New Westminster.*
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 127 (i).
SUPPLY:
Immigration, 951 (ii).
Militia (Permanent Forces, &c.) 799 (i).

Choquette, Mr. P. A., *Montmagny.*
Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., (Amt.) 933 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Expenditure on preparation, &c. (Ques.) 30, 33 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1026 (ii).
I.C.R., French Language on (Ques.) 29 (i).
——— Macdonald, A. R., Superintendent, Pet. of Employés (Ques.) 248 (i).
——— Receipts and Expenditures from opening to date (Ques.) 427 (i).
Post Office Inspector, Three Rivers division (Ques.) 1181 (ii).
Quebec and Lévis Ferry provision (B. 12, 1°*) 29 (i).
Tenders, Translation of Forms (remarks) 1535 (ii)
U.S., Invitation to Members to visit (Ques.) 34 (i).

Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R., *Toronto Centre.*
Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to ref. to Com. on Banking, &c., 1116 (ii).
London and Can. Loan and Interest Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 77, 1°*) 322 (i).
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 701 (i).
SUPPLY:
Miscellaneous (American Association) 1697 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1696 (ii).
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 253 (i).

Colby, Mr. C. C., *Stanstead.*
Alberta and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. *Davis*) on Sen. Amts., 1056 (ii).
Jesuits' Estates Act, Disallowance, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 836 (ii).
Massawippi Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 37, 1°*) 138; 2° m., 239 (i).

Colter, Mr. C. W., *Haldimand.*
Cayuga Post Office, Cost to date (Ques.) 303 (i).
Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 1445; in Com., 1446 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 98; on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1000; in Com., 1008, 1020, 1025, 1127 (ii).
Grand River Bridge at York Village, construction (Ques.) 171 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.*) 304 (i).
Indian Lands (Sales, &c.) Grand River, Cayuga (M. for Ret.*) 304 (i).
Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1168 (ii).
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S, on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. 563 (i).
Ross, Josiah, Seizure of Property by Customs Dept. (Ques.) 428 (i).
Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1489 (ii).
Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1675 (ii).
Six Nation Indians, Sale of Lands (Ques.) 428 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1626 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Salaries, &c.) 1220 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Roads and Bridges, 970 (ii).
Tree Peddlers, &c, prevention of Fraud B. 6. (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 6. m. h., neg. on a div., 1102 (ii).
Webster, W. A., Sums paid for services (Ques.) 303.
——— (M. for Ret.*) 303 (i).

Cook, Mr. H. H., *East Simcoe.*
Belleville and North Hastings Ry. Subsidy and G. T. R, on M. for Cor., 87 (i).
Business of the House (remarks) 270 (i).
Chipman, C. C., in Com. of Sup., 200 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 670 (1).
Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 106, 1°) 557 (i).
Cruiser, Govt. Steamer, Engineer's Certificate (Ques.) 739 (i).
Dom. notes, Printing, in Com. of Sup., 204 (i).
Engineers (Stationary) Examination and Licensing (B. 8, 1°*) 17 (i); 2° m., 1107 (ii).
Govt. Business, on M. to take in Monday (remarks) *re* Home Rule for Ireland, 1182 (ii).
Gowan, Hon. J. R, Senator, Pension (Ques.) 676 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland (prop. Res.) 304 (i).
Judges' Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 206, 209 (i).
Personal Explanation, paragraph in Toronto *World re* Elevator's Bill, 842 (ii).
Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 226 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. (B. 9, 1°) 17; 2° m., 362 (i); M. for Com., 1099 (ii).
Sawdust in Ottawa River (Ques.) 223 (i).

Cook, Mr. H. H.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Vice-Admiralty Court) 206 (i).
Charges of Management (Printing Dom Notes) 204 (i).
Civil Government (Contingencies) 159; (High Commissioner's Office) 200; (Marine) 145; (Militia and Defence) 57; (Public Works) 150 (i).
Timber and Lumber Inspection Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 663 (i).
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters, B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 613 (i).

Corby, Mr. H., *West Hastings.*
Bay of Quinté Bridge Co.'s. (B. 75, 1°*) 322 (i).
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. (Mr. *Fisher*) to prop. Res., 112 (i),

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N. B.*
Cigars, reduction of License Fees (Ans.) 171 (i).
Cullers Act Amt. M. for Com. on Res., 1363; in Com., 1365; (B. 142) 1°*, 1366 (ii).
Hide and Leather Inspector, Montreal, on M. for Papers, &c., 23 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. (prop. Res.) in Com., 1221; (B. 139, 1°) 1269; in Com., 1397 (ii).
Inland Revenue, deptl. Rep. (presented) 3 (i).
——— (correction) 17 (i).
Inspection Act Amt. (B. 137, 1°) 1263; in Com., 1398.
New Edinburgh and Gatineau Ferry, rents and arrearages (Ans.) 348 (i).
O'Connor, D., Fees and Legal Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 1229 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Flynn*) informer Le Caron and Secret Service Fund, 323 (i).
Quesnel, Jules, complaints against (Ans.) 1145 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Inland Revenue) 66 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 1227. Excise, 1223. Minor Revenues, 1229. Public Works (Slides and Booms) 1229. Weights and Measures, 1226 (ii).
Timber and Lumber Inspection Act Amt. (B. 113) prop. Res., 469; in Com., 661, (i).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. (B. 27, 1°) 79; 2° m., 195 (i).

Couture, Mr. P., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
Chicoutimi and Saguenay Counties, expenditure of Subsidy (Ques.) 427 (i).
Lake St. John, Buoys and Lights (Ques) 1146 (ii).
——— Hydrographic Survey (Ques.) 1146 (ii).
——— Mail Service (Ques.) 1628 (ii).
——— Wharves, Construction (Ques.) 1181(ii).
Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ques.) 979 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies, Lake St. John (Ques.) 427 (i).
——— Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Ques.) 1181 (ii).
Saguenay River, Buoys and Lights (Ques.) 1146 (ii).
——— Tenders (Ques) 1422 (ii).
St. Alphonse Wharf, Repairs (Ques.) 1181, 1363 (ii).
Ste. Anne de Chicoutimi Wharf, construction (Ques.) 525 (i).
St. Lawrence Telegraph Service (Ques.) 1363 (ii).

Curran, Mr. J. J., *Montreal Centre.*

Bonsecours Market Hall and Volunteers (Ques.) 19 (i).
Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to ref. to Com. on Banking, &c., 1116; on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) for 3° (Amt.) 1468; on Sen. Amts., 1690 (ii).
Customs Act Amt B. 117 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1139.
Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1475 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 991; in Com, 1008, 1022 (ii).
Hide and Leather Inspector, Montreal, Papers, &c. (M. for copies) 23 (i).
Lachine Canal, new Bridge (Ques.) 20 (i).
Montreal Flood Commission, printing Rep. (M.) 1687.
—— Harbor Police (Ques.) 1423; (remarks) 1573.
Personal Explanation *re* Judges' Salaries, 1498 (ii).
St. Gabriel Levee and Ry. Co.'s (B. 45, 1°*) 194 (i).
St. Helen's Island Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 36, 1°*) 138 (i).
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 612 (i).

Daly, Mr. T. M., *Selkirk.*

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) in Com., 238 (i).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 780 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1001; in Com., 1012 (ii).
Great North-West Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 89, 1°*) 369 (i).
Lac Seul Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 52, 1°*) 222 (i).
Legislative Assembly in N.W.T., Memorials, on M. for copies, 376 (i).
Northern Pacific and Man. Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 77, 1°*) 322 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com., 1135 (ii).
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 580.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 292 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands, 1258 (ii).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 1177 (ii).

Davies, Mr. L. H., *Queen's, P. E. I.*

Bagwell, Geo. McDonald, Relief B. 123 (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) in Com., 1234 (ii).
Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1577 (ii).
Bounties to Fishermen, distribution, in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
Cab-hire, &c., in Com. of Sup., 165 (i).
C. P. R. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 1063, 1097 (ii).
Civil Service, Assessment of Salaries authorisation B. 18 (Mr. *Ellis*) on objection to 2°, 367 (i).
Combinations in Trade B 11 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 1439; on Sen. Amts., 1690 (ii).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*

Commercial Treaties with Foreign States, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 187 (i).
Concurrence, 1598, 1604, 1607 (ii).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 101 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1400; in Com., 1401; on M. to recom., 1465 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on M. that Com. rise, 362 (i).
Cullers Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1366 (ii).
Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1249 (ii).
Dredge *Prince Edward*, Repairs, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 31 (i),
Estreated Recognisances Act Amt. (B. 97, 1°) 384 (i).
Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84, on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to trnsfr. to Govt. Orders, 1395; on M. for 2°, 1470; in Com., 1474 (ii).
Expropriation of Lands B. 131 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1267 (ii).
Fisheries and Trade Relations with U. S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 404 (i).
Fisheries and *Modus Vivendi* (Ques.) 30 (i).
Fish Imported in Bond for Export, on M. for Cor., 1091 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1043, 1127; on M. for 3° (Amt.) neg. (Y. 55, N. 88) 1280 (ii).
Freight Rates, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1064 (ii).
Good Friday, adjnmt. (remarks) 1285 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 139 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1397 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 132 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1130 (ii).
Intoxicating Liquors in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1345 (ii).
Judges' (Provincial) Salaries B. 150 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1688 (ii).
Judges' Salaries, Legislation (Ques.) 1629 (ii).
Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1157 (ii).
Lowry, W. G., Relief B. 119 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 995; on M. for Com., 1265 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 656 (i).
Mennonite Immigrants Loan B. 133 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1399 (ii).
Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1274 (ii).
Mounted Police, punishment of Constables, &c. (M. for Ret.) 429 (i).
Mount Stewart Pier, in Com. of Sup., 921 (ii).
New London Breakwater, Survey (Ques.) 468 (i).
Ocean Steamship Subsidies (B. C. and China, &c.) in Com. on Res., 1387; on conc., 1426; (Amt.) 1428.
—— (B. C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1377, 1384; on Amt. (Gen. *Laurie*) to conc. in Res., 1425 (ii).
Piers and Wharves in P. E. I., in Com. of Sup., 148 (i), 919 (ii).
Protection of Fishermen (remarks) 1575 (ii).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*

Public Accts. Com., meeting (remarks) 501 (i).

Queen's College (Kingston) Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 606 (i).

Rys., on M. to conc. in Res. rep. from Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 1604 (ii).

Rideau Hall Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 914 (ii).

Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S, on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 705 (i).

Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1030; in Com., 1032 (ii).

Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) B. 149 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1673, 1681; in Com., on B. 1685 (ii).

Speedy Trials of Indictable Offences B. 17 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 195 (i).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1618; on M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) 1652; neg. (Y. 33; N. 65) 1653 (ii).

Supplies, Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Health Statistics) conc., 1598; (Indian and Colonial Exhibition) 1512 (ii).

Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 1205 (ii).

Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners) 203; (Contingencies) 165; (High Commissioner's Office) 202; (Justice, Penitentiaries Branch) 54; (Marine) 138, 143 (i); (Printing and Stationery) 1503; (Privy Council) 1502 (ii); (Public Works) 148; (Railways and Canals) 151 (i); 1504 (ii); (Secretary of State) 57 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food 1227. Dom. Lands, 1249, 1254. Excise (Preventive Service) 1224. Minor Revenues, 1229. Post Offices (Salaries, &c.) 1239. Public Works (Esquimalt and Lévis Graving Docks) 1232. Slides and Booms, 1230. Railways (I. C. R.) 1496 (ii).

Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1075; conc, 1607 (ii).

Indians (P.E.I.) 1173 (ii).

Justice (Supreme and Vice-Admiralty Courts) 205 (i).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Magdalen Islands) 1450 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c.) 1179; (Govt. of N.W.T.) 1179; (St. Catharines Milling Co., Costs) 1456 (ii).

Mounted Police, 1452 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 1528; (Repairs, Furniture, &c.) 913. Dredging, 1600. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 926; (P. E.I.) 919, 1529; (Que.) 928 (ii).

Railways—Capital: Cape Breton (construction) 1069. I. C. R. (City front of St John) 1068; (Repair Sheds at Richmond) 1064. Oxford and New Glasgow (construction) 1074 (ii).

Unprovided Items, 1495 (ii).

Ventilation of Chamber, in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 195 (i).

Winding-up Act Amt. B. 93 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 660 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F., *Assiniboia.*

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) on M. for 3°, 284 (i).

Beer (4 per cent.) Imported into N. W. T. (Ques.) 525 (i).

Bills relating to N.W.T. (Ques.) 1147 (ii).

Canteen at Regina Barracks (Ques.) 1032 (ii).

Concurrence, 1609 (ii).

Copyright Act Amt. B. 101 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. to recom., 1465 (ii).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Continued.*

Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 130 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (Ques.) 34, 762 (i).

——— B. 145 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1537 (ii).

Fishing Licenses, in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 83 (i).

Fish Propagation in N.W.T. (Ques.) 740 (i).

Hudson's Bay Ry. and Man. repudiation (Ques.) 1628.

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 139 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1398 (ii).

Inspection Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1399 (ii).

Interest Act Amt. B. 132 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1130 (ii).

Intoxicating Liquors in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1343 (ii).

Judges' Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

Jukes, Dr., in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).

Land Board, Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 60 (i).

Legislative Assembly of N. W. T., Memorials (M. for copies) 348 (i).

Legislative Economy, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) for Joint Com., 785 (i).

Liquor Permits in N. W. T., on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 553 (i).

Mounted Police Desertions (M. for Ret.*) 303 (i).

——— Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on Ques. of Order, 1270; on Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1272 (ii).

N. W. T. Act Amt. (Ques.) 105 (i).

——— B. 136 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1°, 1262 (ii).

Personal Explanation, 1574 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1130; in Com. on B., 1135 (ii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Ry. and Steamboat Co.'s B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1709 (ii).

Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 152 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1716 (ii).

Supplies, Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 292 (i).

Civil Government (Interior) 60 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands, 1253; conc., 1609 (ii).

Geological Survey, 1080 (ii).

Immigration (Agents) 953, 1323 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 280.

Miscellaneous (Govt of N. W. T.) 1179; (Jukes, Dr.) 1571 (ii).

Mounted Police, 1452 (ii).

Town Sites in N. W. T., Receipts from Sales (M. for Ret.*) 29 (i).

Tracey, A. R., Seizure of Goods at Medicine Hat (Ques.) 1016 (ii).

Davis, Mr. D. W., *Alberta.*

Alberta and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s (B. 49, 1°*) 222 (i); on Sen. Amts., 1056; 3° m., 754 (i).

Legislative Assembly in N. W. T., Memorials, on M. for copies, 380 (i).

Davis, Mr. D. W.—*Continued.*
Calgary, Alberta and Montana Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 41, 1°*) 194 (i).
North-Western Junction Ry. and Lake of the Woods Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 73, 1°*) 322 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. (B. 31, 1°*) 138 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, Binding) 280.

Dawson, Mr. S J, *Algoma.*
Assiniboia, Edmonton and Unjiga Ry. Co.'s incorp (B. 19, 1°*) 47 (i).
Boundaries of Ont., on M. for Com. on Res., 1654 (ii).
Fishing Licenses in Inland Waters (M. for Ret.) 82 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1008, 1020, 1128 (ii).
Indian Annuities, Arrears, on M. for Cor., 937 (ii).
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1419 (ii).
Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1588 (ii).
Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1030; in Com., 1039 (ii).
Speedy Trials of Indictable Offences B. 17 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 472 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1641 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 1203 (ii).
Indians (Schools) 1170; (Treaty Annuities) 1171 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1448 (ii).
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 613 (i).

Denison, Mr. F. C., C.M.G., *West Toronto.*
Baptist Convention of Ont. and Que. (B. 30, 1°*) 138.
Cartridge Manufacture, in Com. of Sup., 1355 (ii).
Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1477 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1005 (ii).
Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 40, 1°*) 194 (i).
Militia Clothing, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1569 (ii).
Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s (B 86) M. for Com., 754 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Judges Gowan and Boswell, refund) 1362 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 1596 (ii).
Immigration (Agents) 951, 1322 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1355 (ii); (Permanent Forces, &c.) 796 (i).
Telegraph Lines, acquisition by Govt. (M. for Sel. Com.) 80 (i).

Desaulniers, Mr. F. S. L., *St. Maurice.*
Carbonneau, Joseph, payment for Services (Ques.) 1328 (ii).

Desjardins, Mr. A., *Hochelaga.*
Boundaries of Ont., on M. for Com. on Res., 1657 (ii).
Debates, Official, delay in printing French Edition, 654 (i), 944, 1462 (ii).
——— 1st Rep. of Com. (M. to conc.) 247 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com. (M. to conc.) 871, 933 (ii).

Dessaint, Mr. A., *Kamouraska.*
Militia Regulations, &c., French Edition (Ques.) 171.
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Wharf, Repairs (Ques.) 1265.
Témiscouata Ry. Co., Pet. for incorp., &c. (M. for Ret.*) 943 (ii).
——— Shareholders, shares held, amount paid, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 24 (i).
——— Subsidy, amount paid (Ques.) 676 (i).

De St. Georges, Mr. J. E. A., *Portneuf.*
Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ques.) 979 (ii).

Dewdney, Hon. E., *East Assiniboia.*
Ballot in N.W.T., Legislation respecting (Ans.) 525.
Beer (4 per cent.) Imported into N.W.T. (Ans.) 525.
Bills relating to N.W.T. (Ans.) 1147 (ii).
Breslayor Half-breeds, compensation for Losses (Ans.) 347 (i), 1082 (ii).
Boundary between Alaska and Can. (Ans.) 426 (i).
Caughnawaga Indians, Election of Councillors (Ans.) 427 (i).
——— Survey of Reserve (Ans.) 468 (i).
Concurrence, 1607 (ii).
Deschenes, Ludger Miville, amounts paid for Surveys in N.W.T. (Ans.) 1327 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. (Ans.) 34, 762 (i).
——— (B. 145, 1°*) 1462; 2° m. and in Com., 1537 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1241 (ii).
Gas (natural) in Western Ont., Mr. Coste's Rep. (Ans.) 463 (i).
Grazing Leases cancelled in Alberta (Ans.) 935 (ii).
Homestead Inspectors in Man. and N. W. T. (remarks) 22, 29 (i).
Indian Affairs, deptl. Rep. (presented) 29 (i).
Indian Agent at Caughnawaga, Salary (Ans.) 1265 (ii).
——— Annuities, Arrears, on M. for Cor., 937 (ii).
——— Reserves, Sale of Pine Timber (Ans.) 20, 30 (i).
——— Treaties, Surrender of Lands (Ans.) 841 (ii).
Interior Dept., Clerks employed (Ans.) 1228 (ii).
——— deptl. Rep (presented) 346 (i).
Intoxicating Liquors in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1347 (ii).
La Cloche Island, Lake Huron, Sale (Ans.) 428 (i).
——— Provincial Claims (Ans.) 1081 (ii).
Land Commissioner's Office, Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup, 63 (i).
Lands, Conveyance to Govt. of B. C. (B. 128, 1°) 911; in Com., 1042 (ii).
Legislative Assembly in N.W.T., Memorials, on M. for copies, 382 (i).
Liquor Licenses Rocky Mountains Park (Ans.) 249 (i).
Liquor Permits in N. W. T., on M. for copies of Cor., 553 (i).

Dewdney, Hon. E.—*Continued.*
Mining Laws, B. C., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1542 (ii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. (B. 136, 1°) 1262; wthdn., 1498 (ii).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Ry. and Steamboat Co.'s B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1707 (ii).
Rocky Mountains Park Act Amt. (B. 141, 1°*) 1363.
Rosseau River Indian Reserve, Location (Ans.) 347 (i).
St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Co.'s Costs, &c. (Ans.) 1146 (ii).
St. Lawrence River, Sale of Islands (Ans.) 34 (i).
Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1489 (ii).
Scrip (Land) Outstanding (Ans.) 347, 525 (i).
Settlers' (Old) Claims in Man. (Ans.) 1533 (ii).
Six Nation Indians, Sale of Lands (Ans.) 428 (i).
Stephenson, Rufus, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 423 (i).
Subsidies (land) to Rys. (B. 152) in Com. on Res., 1712; in Com. on B., 1720 (ii).
Sultana Islands, Lake of the Woods, Sale (Ans.) 426.
Supplies, Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Indian Affairs) 1502 (ii); (Interior) 58, 63 (i), 1502 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands, 1240, 1253; conc., 1607 (ii).
Geological Survey, 1079 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 1179; (Dingman, A., services) 1172, 1451; (Man. and N. W. T.) 1173, 1595; (Oka Indians, removal) 1171; (P. E. I.) 1173; (Que., relief of Distress) 1169; (Schools) 1170, 1177 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff: Roads, Bridges, &c.) 1180, 1215; (Govt. of N.W.T.) 1179; (Half-breeds, relief) 1461; (Inspector, Registrars, &c., N.W.T.) 1180; (Jukes, Dr., services) 1571; (Lands, C. P. R. Belt) 1570 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1452 (ii).
Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co. (prop. Res.) 1628 (ii).

Dickey, Mr. A. R., *Cumberland.*
Concurrence, 1605 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 104, 1°) 524 (i).
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 730 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1618 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 296 (i).
Railways—Capital (I.C.R.) conc., 1605 (ii).

Dickinson, Mr. G. L., *Carleton, Ont.*
Benevolent Societies (B. 94, 1°*) 370 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *Free Press re* Land Grants, 1600 (ii).

Doyon, Mr. C., *Laprairie.*
Caughnawaga Indians, Election of Councillors (Ques.) 427 (i).
——— Survey of Reserve (Ques.) 468 (i).
——— (Ques. of Priv.) 501 (i).
Employés, Federal and Provincial Govts., dual Offices (Ques.) 525 (i).
Indian Agent at Caughnawaga, Salary (Ques.) 1265 (ii).
Laprairie Village, protection against Ice (Ques.) 427 (i).
Mormon Settlement in N.W.T. (Ques.) 980 (ii).

Dupont, Mr. F., *Bagot.*
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1280 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1651 (ii).

Edgar, Mr. J. D., *West Ontario.*
Alberta Ry and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) in Com., 235 (i).
Assets and Debenture Co. of Canada (B. 22, 1°*) 47 (i).
Ballot in N. W. T., Legislation respecting (Ques.) 525.
Beef Supplies, Indian Agencies, N. W. T., Tenders (M. for copies *) 942 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 775 (i).
Bridgewater, Seizure (M. for Ret.) 752 (i).
C. P. R. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 1056 1094 (ii).
——— Interest due on $15,000,000 Bonds (Ques.) 348.
——— Rys. crossing in Man., Validity of Act (Ques.) 20 (i).
Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 1438; in Com., 1446; on Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) to M. for 3°, 1468 (ii).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 101 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 1463; on M. to recom., 1467 (ii).
Corrupt Practices in Municipal Affairs B. 71 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 502 (i).
Fisheries and Trade Relations with U.S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 342 (i).
Fishing Licenses in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 83 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 980; in Com., 1008, 1019, 1128 (ii).
Free List Extension, Combinations (B. 56, 1°) 248 (i).
Grazing Leases cancelled in Alberta (Ques.) 935 (ii).
House of Commons Act Amt. B. 108 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 786 (i).
Kootenay and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s B. 15 (Mr. *Mara*) in Com., 238 (i).
Legislative Economy, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) for Joint Com., 782 (i).
Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1159 (ii).
Logan, Wm., Mail Contractor at Pickering Village, Sureties (Ques.) 677 (i).
Lowry, G. W., Relief B. 119 (Mr. *Small*) remarks, 1160 (ii).
Public Matters (enquiries) further provision B. 72 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 504 (i).
Quebec Conference, 1887, Res. (M. for copies) 29 (i).
Savary, Charles, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 427 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1235 (ii).
Voters' Lists, distribution, &c. (Ques.) 15 (i).
Winding-up Act Amt. B. 98 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 660 (i).
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 255; in Com., 613 (i).

Edwards, Mr. W. C., *Russell.*

Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 247 (i).
Cullers Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 668 (i).
Mining Machinery, Free Entry into B.C. (M. for O. C.*) 942 (ii).
Prescott Co. Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 33, 1°*) 138; 2°m., 239 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 266 (i).
Sawdust, &c., in Ottawa River, Reps. of Engineer (Ques.) 370 (i).
Wright, E. P., claim for refund on Mining Machinery (M. for Cor.*) 94 2(ii).

Eisenhauer, Mr. J. D., *Lunenburg.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com., 674 (i).
Fisheries in Lunenburg County (M. for Cor.) 940 (ii).
Fish, Foreign, change in Bonding System (Ques.) 224 (i).
Fish Imported in Bond for Export, on M. for Cor., 1086 (ii).
——— (personal explanation) 1099 (ii).
Fishing Regulations in Berthier, on M. for Cor., 749 (i).
Lunenburg Harbor, Survey, &c. (M. for Cor.) 749 (i).
Post Office, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 591 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 656 (i).
Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 231 (i).
Sawdust in Canadian Rivers, Fines for violation of Law (Ques.) 591 (i).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Salaries, &c) 1075 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lights, Fog-whistles, &c.) 975.
Public Works — Income: Buildings (N. S.) 804 (i), 1518. Dredging (N. S., P. E. I. and N. B.) 968 (ii).

Ellis, Mr. J. V., *St. John, N. B.*

Channel Subway Co.'s Act, disallowance (Ques.) 1628.
Civil Service, Assessment of Salaries authorisation (B. 18, 1°) 33; 2° m., 366 (i).
Concurrence, 1615 (ii).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 101 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1401 (ii).
Drawbacks on Goods for Export, Claims (M. for Ret.*) 943 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1046 (ii).
Freight Rates, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1067 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 656 (i).
Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 772 (i).
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1408 (ii).
St. John River Bridge at Fredericton, Cost (Ques.) 526 (i).

Ellis, Mr. G. V.—*Continued.*

Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1040 (ii).
Short Line Ry., St. Andrews, &c., *vid* Mattawamkeag, &c., on M. for Ret., 546 (i).
——— (Harvey to Salisbury) in Com. on Res., 1666; on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1672.
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1620 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Postmaster General) 69 (i); (P. O. and Finance Depts., contingencies) 1504; (Rys. and Canals) conc., 1615 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Minor Revenues, 1495. Public Works (Slides and Booms) 1231. Weights and Measures, 1226 (ii).
Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1076 (ii).
Mail Subsidies (Halifax, &c. and West Indies, &c.) 1703; (St. John and Basin of Minas) 1262 (ii).
Marine Hospitals (Que., N.S., N.B., P.E.I. and B C.) 977 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff: Roads, Bridges, &c.) 1216 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (River and Water Police) 975 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 214 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.) 805 (i). Dredging (N.S., P.E.I., and N.B.) 968. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 925, 1530; (Que.) 927. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa City and River) 1449 (ii).
Quarantine (St. John) 931 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R (Repair Sheds at Richmond) 1067; (St. John, accommodation) 1068 (ii).

Ferguson, Mr. C. F., *Leeds and Grenville.*

Pauper Immigration (children) in Com of Sup., 965 (ii).

Ferguson, Mr. J., *Welland.*

Customs Seizures, in Com. of Sup., 68 (i).
Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 43 (i).
Gas (natural) in Western Ont., Mr. Coste's Rep. (Ques.) 468 (i).
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 35, 1°*) 138 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1131 (ii).
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 557.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Customs) 68 (i).
Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1105 (ii).
Ventilation of Chamber, in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 3°, 757 (i).

Fiset, Mr. J. B. R., *Rimouski.*

Esquimaux Point Telegraph Line (Ques.) 935 (ii).
Fishing Licenses on the Natashquan (Ques.) 1533, 1627 (ii).
Fishing Rights in Matane River, on M. for Cor., 939 (ii).
I. C. R., Noel Fortin, Accident to (M. for Rep.) 303; (M. for Ret.*) 304 (i).
Matane River Fishing Privileges (Ques.) 469 (i).
Rimouski Wharf Repairs, Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 392 (i).

Fisher, Mr. S. R., *Brome.*

Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to ref. to Com. on Banking, &c., 1116 (ii).

Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 111; (Amt.) 112; neg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 137 (i).

Farley, Gunner, Claim for Loss of Horse (M. for Ret.) 433 (i).

Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 42 (i).

Intoxicating Liquors in N.W.T. (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1431; neg. (Y. 53, N. 100) 1351 (ii).

La Cloche Island, Lake Huron, Sale (Ques.) 428 (i).

Liquor Permits in N. W. T., on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 551 (i)

Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on Ques. of Order, 1271 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to prop. Res., 89; on Amt. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 268 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Dairy Interests) 1513 (ii).

Immigration (Agents) 958, 1326 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Experimental Farm (Buildings, &c) 972 (ii).

Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud, B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1105 (ii).

Flynn, Mr. E. P., *Richmond, N.S.*

Cape Breton Ry., Contracts for Stations, &c. (Ques.) 1327, 1574 (ii).

——— (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup, 1182; Concurrence, 1607 (ii).

Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. (Mr. *Fisher*) to prop. Res., 112; (Amt. to Amt.) 112; neg. (Y. 70, N. 112) 156 (i).

Fish Imported in Bond for Export, on M. for Cor., 1087 (ii).

Good Friday, adjnmt. (remarks) 1285 (ii).

Grand Narrows Bridge, Cape Breton, Papers respecting (remarks) 1266 (ii).

L'Ardoise Breakwater, Surveys, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 698 (i).

Privilege (Ques. of) Informer Le Caron, 93, 97 (i).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1616 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Marine) 145 (i)

Fisheries (Salaries) conc., 1607 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B. and N.S.) 805 (i). Harbors and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 1448. Roads and Bridges, conc., 1615 (ii).

Railways—Capital: Cape Breton (construction) 1071 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E., *King's, N.B.*

Atlantic Mail Service (Ans.) 225 (i).

Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 13 (i).

BUDGET, THE (Annual Statement) 436 (i).

——— French Edition (Ans.) 172 (i).

Budget Speeches, Cost, on M. for Ret., 20 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*

C.P.R. Co.'s Sale of $15,000,000 Mortgage Bonds (Ans.) 1363 (ii).

——— Extension to Que., Amount paid and to whom (Ans.) 248 (i).

Chignecto Ship Ry. Prospectus (Ans.) 1423 (ii).

Chipman, C. C., in Com of Sup., 196, 200 (i).

Cobourg Town Relief B. 153 (prop. Res.) 1572; in Com., 1721 (ii).

Commercial Treaties with Foreign States, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 179 (i).

Concurrence, 1603, 1615 (ii).

ESTIMATES, THE (presented) 30 (i).

——— Suppl. for year 1889 (presented) 1018.

——— (Ans.) 1397 (ii).

——— for year 1890 (presented) 1467 (ii).

——— additional for 1890 (presented) 1627 (ii).

Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 45 (i).

Fisheries and Trade Relations with U.S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 337 (i).

Flour Duties, Increase (Ans.) 1145 (ii).

Inland Rev. Act Amt. (prop. Res.) 1221 (ii).

Insurance Returns (presented) 1573 (ii)

Interest and Sinking Fund, Amounts charged against (Ans.) 1363 (ii).

Lard Aulteration, Imports from U.S. (Ans.) 763 (i).

Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, Amount received on account, on M. for Ret., 30 (i).

——— (Ans.) 944 (ii).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 946 (ii).

——— (Stmnt.) 1044 (ii).

——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1153 (ii).

——— paragraph in Prospectus *re* Sinking Fund (Ans.) 1328 (ii).

Mail Service with England (remarks) 1571 (ii).

Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 30 (i), 1018, 1467, 1627.

Mortgage on Properties, Kingston (prop. Res.) 1573 (ii).

Mining Machinery in B.C. and Free List (Ans.) 1265.

Ocean Steamship Subsidies (remarks) 1283 (ii).

——— (B. C. and Australia) M. for Com. on Res., 1368 (ii).

——— (B. C. and China, &c.) M. for Com. on Res., 1386; in Com., 1387; M. to conc., 1426 (ii).

——— (Can. and United Kingdon) in Com., 1389, 1421 (ii).

Pacific Mail Subsidy (Ans.) 34 (i).

Pork Duties, Increase (Ans.) 1146 (ii).

Public Accounts (presented) 2 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 115) on 2°, 1283 (ii).

Rys. and Canals, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. to conc. in Res. rep. from Com. of Sup., 1603 (ii).

St. John River Bridge at Fredericton, Cost (Ans.) 526.

Saw Logs, Export Duty (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1483 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1643 (ii).

Subsidy to P. E. I. (Ans.) 15 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
Subway, Straits of Northumberland (Ans.) 16 (i).
SUPPLY (prop. Res. for Com) 13 (i); in Com.:
Canals—Capital (Cornwall) 1205; (Lachine) 1295; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1202; (Tay) 1211; (Welland) 1207; (Williamsburg) 1206. *Income* (Rideau) 1211 (ii).
Charges of Management (Brokerage and Commission) 204; (Country Savings Banks) 203; (Dom. Loan reduced) 204; (Printing Dom. Notes) 205 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 71; (Auditor Genl.'s Office) 66; (Civil Service Examiners) 203; (Customs) 67; (Contingencies) 160, 163, 167 (i); (Departments generally) 1503 (ii); (Finance and Treasury Board) 66; (Fisheries) 148; (Gov. Genl.'s Sec 's Office) 49; (High Commissioner's Office) 196 (i), contingencies, 1503, 1597 (ii); (Indian Affairs) 65; (Inland Revenue) 66; (Interior) 58; (Justice) 49; (Marine) 138 (i), 1502 (ii); (Militia and Defence) 54; (Mounted Police) 62; (Printing and Stationery) 57 (i), 1503 (ii); (Privy Council Office) 49; (Postmaster General) 68 (i); (P. O. and Finance Depts., contingencies) 1503 (ii); (Public Works) 148; (Railways and Canals) 151 (i), 1504 (ii); (Secretary of State) 57 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Repairs, &c.) 1212; (Trent) 1495. Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1238. Public Works (Slides and Booms) 1230. Railways (I.C.R.) 1496. Weights and Measures, 1496 (ii).
Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1077 (ii).
Immigration (Agents) 1323, 1498 (ii).
Indian Affairs (Man. and N.W.T.) 1595 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Franchise Act) 1512; conc., 1615 (ii); (Library of Parlt.) 272 (i); (Returning Officers) 1511 (ii); (Printing, Paper and Binding) 272; (Voters' Lists, printing) 271. Senate (Salaries and Contingencies) 207 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and West Indies, &c.) 1701; (Magdalen Islands) 1261, 1450; (New Westminster and Victoria) 1533; (Payment to Mr. King) 1451; (P.E.I and Mainland) 1261; (St. John and Basin of Minas) 1262 (ii).
Miscellaneous (American Association) 1697; (Commercial Agencies) 1180; (Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c.) 1180; (Jukes, Dr., services) 1571; (Labor Commission) 1497; (Le Dictionnaire Généalogique des Familles Françaises) 1453; ("Parliamentary Companion") 1453; (Printing Bureau) 1571; (St. Lawrence River Survey) 1461 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1451, 1497 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1530; conc., 1615 (ii).
Railways—Capital: C.P.R. (construction) 1047; I.C.R. 1498, 1597; (Moncton, accommodation) 1049; (St. John, accommodation) 1068; (Repair Sheds at Richmond) 1067 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (Meteorological Service) 976 (ii).
Unprovided Items, 1494 (ii).
Supply B. 147 (1°*, 2°* and 3°*) 1712 (ii).
Tariff, proposed Changes (Ans.) 1221, 1266 (ii).
Trade Commissioner to South America (Ans.) 30 (i).
Ways and Means (prop. Res. for Com.) 13 (i).

Freeman, Mr. J. N., *Queen's, N.S.*
Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 537 (i).
Fish Imported in Bond for Export, on M. for Cor., 1092 (ii).
Intoxicating Liquors, in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1346 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 262 (i).
Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1037 (ii).

Gauthier, Mr. J., *L'Assomption.*
Great Northern Ry., Engineers' Rep. (Ques.) 370 (i).

Gigault, Mr. G. A., *Rouville.*
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 114 (i).
Richelieu River, Survey and Soundings (Ques.) 22, 29.
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 631 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1634 (ii).

Gillmor, Mr. A. H., *Charlotte.*
Cullers Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 662 (i), 1366 (ii).
Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 692 (i).
Ocean Steamship Subsidies (B.C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1382 (ii).
——— (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1403 (ii).
Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1034 (ii).
Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1677 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1650 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Excise (Officers in Distilleries, &c.) 1225 (ii).
Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1077 (ii).
Miscellaneous (American Association) 1701 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 215 (i).
Public Works—Income: Experimental Farm (Buildings, &c.) 972. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 924, 1447 (ii).

Girouard, Mr. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 778 (i).
Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s incorp (B. 23 1°) 47; Order for 2° read., 424 (i).

Gordon, Mr. D. W., *Vancouver Island.*
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies, &c. (New Westminster and Victoria) 1532 (ii).

Guay, Mr. P. M., *Lévis.*
Aird, W. B., Jr., Names of Sureties (Ques.) 1017 (ii).
Grover, J. M., Postmaster of Morden, Man., dismissal (M. for Pets, &c.*) 942 (ii).
I. C. R., Dining Rooms at Stations, Tenders (Ques.) 428 (i).
Lévis Post Office, Pets., &c., for building (M. for copies) 433 (i).

Guillet, Mr. G., *West Northumberland.*
Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 57, 1°*) 269 (i).
Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 1114; on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) for Com., 1446; on Sen. Amts., 1691 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Brigade Majors, &c., Salaries) 793 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*

Baltic, P.E.I., Post Office, establishment (Ans.) 1423.
Bannerman, Wm., late Postmaster at Calgary, defalcations (Ans.) 677 (i).
Brussels Mail Service (Ans.) 249 (i).
Carbonneau, Joseph, payment for services (Ans.) 1328.
Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 100, 1°) 523; (prop. Res.) 621; 2° m., 669; in Com. on Res., 672; on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to recom., 763 (i).
Chester, Que., complaint against Postmaster (Ans.) 468 (i).
Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 34 (i).
Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 685 (i).
Joliette Mail Service, Contract (Ans.) 763 (i).
Lake St. John Mail Service (Ans.) 1628 (ii).
Little Dover Post Office and Canso Mail Service (Ans.) 590 (i).
Logan, Wm., Mail Contractor at Pickering Village, Sureties (Ans.) 677 (i).
Longueuil Postal Service (Ans.) 80 (i).
Lourdes and Somerset Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 752 (i).
Money Order Offices, Que. (Ans.) 468 (i).
Murray Harbor South and Montague Mail Service (Ans.) 468 (i).
Oyster Ponds' Postmaster, Appointment (Ans.) 591.
Postage Rates, Reduction (Ans.) 34, 80 (i).
Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 17 (i).
Post Office Act Amt (B. 93, 1°) 369; (prop. Res.) 469 (i); in Com., 1130; in Com. on B., 1133; on Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1282 (ii).
Post Office Inspector, Three River division (Ans.) 1181.
Post Offices in Montcalm County (Ans.) 1082 (ii).
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 720 (i).
Registered Letters, compensation for Loss (Ans.) 525.
St. Barthelemy Post Office (Ans.) 591 (i).
Ste. Beatrix Post Office, Location (Ans.) 590 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1643 (ii).
Supplies, Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Contingencies) 156, 159; (Postmaster General) 68 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 1235, 1461, 1596 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Griffin, Mr., gratuity) 1454 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1452 (ii).
Three Rivers Postmaster and Newspaper Postage (Ans.) 749 (i).

Hall, Mr. R. N., *Sherbrooke.*

Atlantic and North-Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 65, 1°*) 269; in Com., 754 (i).
Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 38 (i).
Independent Order of Foresters incorp. B. 74 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 755 (i); on Sen. Amts., 1233 (ii).
Pope, late Hon. J. H. (remarks) 1018 (ii).

Hall, Mr. R. N.—*Continued.*

St. Lawrence and Atlantic Junction Ry. Co.'s (B 64. 1°*) 269 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1638 (ii).

Hesson, Mr. S. R., *North Perth.*

Ballot Box Com. (M. to add names) 105 (i).
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 123 (i).
Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 691.
Mennonite Immigrants Loan B. 138 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for 1°, 1268 (ii).
Militia Clothing, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1566 (ii)
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B.C. and Australia) (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 1382 (i).
Pauper Immigration (children) in Com. of Sup., 965 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1132; in Com. on B., 1136 (ii).
Post Offices Built since 1878, &c., on M. for Ret., 229 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 294 (i).
Immigration (Agents) 965 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff: Roads, Bridges, &c.) 1216 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (N. B.) 1447 (ii).
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 620 (i).

Hickey, Mr. C. E., *Dundas.*

Militia Clothing, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1567 (ii).
Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 43, 1°*) 194 (i); (M. to refund Fees) 1145 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1528 (ii).

Holton, Mr. E., *Chateauguay.*

Bridgewater, Seizure, Claims for compensation (Ques.) 1423 (ii).
Can. Congregational Foreign Missionary Society's incorp. (B. 44, 1°*) 194 (i).
Customs Seizures (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1285; neg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 1314 (ii).
Liquor Licenses, Rocky Mountains Park (Ques.) 249.
National Defence Com. (Ques.) 1423 (ii).

Hudspeth, Mr. A., *South Victoria, Ont.*

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1012 (ii).
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 717 (i)

Innes, Mr. J., *South Wellington.*

Chaplains in Public Institutions, Names, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 24 (i).

Innes, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Corrupt Practices Trials, Counsel's Instructions (Ques.) 427 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1521 (ii).
Tête du Pont Barracks, Sale (Ques.) 427 (i).

Ives, Mr. W. B., *Richmond and Wolfe.*
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 670 (i).
Cullers Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 665 (i).
Engineers (stationary) Examination and Licensing B. 8 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 1109 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1129 (ii).
Freight Transit through Can. (prop. M. for Sel. Com.) 87 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 132 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1130 (ii).

Jamieson, Mr, J., *North Lanark.*
Can. Temp. Act, working of (M. for Ret) 541 (i).
Independent Order of Foresters incorp. (B. 74, 1°*) 322; in Com., 754 (i); on Sen. Amts., 1233 (ii).
Intoxicating Liquors in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1350 (ii).
Liquor Permits in N.W.T. (M. for Cor., &c.) 550 (i).
Lowry, W. G., Relief B. 119 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 993; on M. for Com., 1264 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors (prop. Res.) 88; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) 260; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 266 (i).

Joncas, Mr., L. Z., *Gaspé.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 2ª, 1°) 79 (i).

Jones, Mr. H. L., *Digby*
Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 536 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1528 (ii).

Jones, Hon. A. G., *Halifax.*
Ammunition manufactured at Quebec (remarks) 1222.
Annapolis and Liverpool Ry. Survey (M. for Ret.*) 943 (ii).
Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co's., on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 532 (i).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 775 (i).
C. P. R. Co. and B. 68 (remarks) 701 (i).
——— Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 1058 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 672 (i).
Clarke, Judge, Superannuation, in Com. of Sup., 1218.
Copyright Act Amt. B. 101 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1467 (ii).
Concurrence, 1599, 1606 (ii).

Jones, Hon. A. G.—*Continued.*
Cullers Act Amt. B 142 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 662, 665 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 764 (i); in Com. on B., 1141; on M. to recom., 1330 (ii).
Debates, Official, on Amt. (Mr. *Choquette*) to M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 934 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1046 (ii).
Fisheries and Trade Relations with U. S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com of Sup., 390 (i).
Fishermen, Safety (B. 133, 1°*) 1180 (ii).
Fishery Bounty, Claims made and rejected in P. E. I., on M. for Ret., 435 (i).
Fish Imported in Bond for Export, on M. for Cor., 1084.
Fishing Regulations in Berthier, on M. for copies of Cor., 748 (i).
Good Friday, adjnmt., on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1330 (ii).
Halifax Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 801 (i).
International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, division (M. for Ret.*) 943 (ii).
L'Ardoise Breakwater, on M. for copies of Surveys, &c., 695 (i).
Mail Service with England (remarks) 1574 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 656 (i).
Members' Sessional Indemnity (remarks) 1710 (ii).
Militia Clothing, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1560 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1352 (ii).
Modus Vivendi (remarks) 811 (i).
Montreal Harbor Commissioners' B. 103 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 775 (i).
Montreal Harbor Police (remarks) 1574 (ii).
Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 774 (i); on M. for 2° (Amt.) 1270; neg. (Y. 66, N. 108) 1277 (ii).
Ocean Mail Contract with Allan Line (Ques.) 1397 (ii).
Ocean Steamship Subsidies (B. C. and Australia) on Res., 1329; in Com. on Res., 1375 (ii).
——— (B. C. and China, &c.) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) and in Com. on Res., 1387 (ii).
——— (Can. and United Kingdom) on Res., 1329; in Com., 1390, 1393, 1415, 1434 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 1°, 369 (i); in Com. on Res., 1130; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1281 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 263 (i).
Protection of Fishermen (remarks) 1575 (ii).
Rideau Hall Expenses, in Com. of Sup, 914 (ii).
Rolling Stock, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1049 (ii).
Schreiber, Mr., Salary, in Com. of Sup., 1504 (ii).
Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1032; in Com., 1037 (ii).
Short Line Ry., St. Andrews, &c., *vid* Mattawamkeag, &c., on M. for Ret., 547 (i).

Jones, Hon. A. G.—*Continued.*

Short Line Ry. (personal explanation) 740 (i).

——— Amount paid International Ry. Co. or C.P.R. (Ques.) 769 (ii).

——— (Harvey to Salisbury) B. 149 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1664; on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1674, 1682; in Com. on B., 1684.

——— on defeat of B. in Sen. (remarks) 1724 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1501, 1616, 1617 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (Judges Gowan and Boswell, refund) 1362 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 296 (i).

Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 1303 (ii).

Civil Government (Railways and Canals) 1504 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 1238. Customs (Detective Service) 1221; (Salaries, &c) 1217 Excise, 1224; (Preventive Service) 1235. Post Office (Salaries, &c) 1235, 1461. Public Works (Lévis and Esquimalt Graving Docks) 1232; (Slides and Booms) 1231. Telegraph Lines (P. E. I. and Mainland) 1233. Railways (I.C.R.) 1074, 1496. Weights and Measures, 1496 (ii).

Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1074 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Committees, extra Sess. Clerks, &c.) 271 (i); (Franchise Act) 1511 (ii).

Mail Subsidies, &c., (Halifax, &c., and West Indies, &c.) 1702; (Magdalen Islands) 1261 (ii).

Marine Hospitals (Marine and Immigrant, Que.) 976 (ii).

Militia (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 793 (i), (1352); (Armories, care of Arms, &c.) 791 (i); (Military College) 1358 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Banff: Roads, Bridges, &c.) 1215; (Griffin, Mr., gratuity) 1454; (Labor Commission) 1197 (ii).

Mounted Police, 1453 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (River and Water Police) 975; (Wrecks and Shipping Disasters) 974 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Halifax) 1319; (Man.) 1508 (ii).

Pensions (Compensation in lieu of Land) 798 (i).

Public Works—Capital: Buildings (additional, Ottawa) 799. Harbors and Rivers (Cape Tormentine) 802; (Kingston Graving Dock) 801; (Ont.) conc., 1599. *Income:* Buildings (N.S.) 1519; (Ont.) 1521; (Repairs, Furniture, &c.) 914. Dredging (N.S., P.E.I. and N.B.) 968. Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 807 (i); 912, 1528; (P.E.I.) 1530; (Que.) 1531. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa City and River) 1450, 1532. Telegraph Lines, 1532.

Quarantine (Halifax) 931 (ii).

Railways—Capital: Cape Breton (construction) 1070. C. P. R. (construction) 1048. I.C.R. (Halifax, accommodation) 1048; (St. John, accommodation) 1069; (Rolling Stock) 1049; (I.C.R.) conc., 1606. Oxford and New Glasgow (construction) 1073 (ii).

Valiquette, Sergt., Pension to Family, in Com. of Sup., 788 (i).

Ventilation of Chamber, in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).

Western Counties Ry. B. 127 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 871; on M. for 2°, 1043 (ii).

Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 608, 614 (i).

Kenny, Mr. T. E., *Halifax.*

Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s B., on M. for copies of Cor., &c. 534 (i).

Fisheries and Trade Relations with U. S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 395 (i).

Fish Imported in Bond for Export, on M. for Cor., 1087 (ii).

Militia Clothing, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1564 (ii).

Kenny, Mr. T. E.—*Continued.*

Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1391, 1394, 1413 (ii).

Rolling Stock, I. C. R., in Com. of Sup, 1052 (ii).

Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1036 (ii).

Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) in Com. on Res., 1667 (ii).

——— St. Andrews, &c., *vid* Mattawamkeag, &c. (M. for Ret.) 541 (i).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1618 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues (Salaries, &c.) 1217 (ii).

Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1075 (ii).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and West Indies, &c.) 1704; (Magdalen Islands) 1450 (ii).

Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Rolling Stock) 1052; (St. John, accommodation) 1069 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Kingston Graving Dock) 802 (i).

Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 608, 610 (i).

Kirk, Mr. J. A., *Guysborough.*

Cape Breton Ry. Employés (Ques.) 762 (i).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flynn*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1194 (ii).

Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 136 (i).

Cullers Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 664 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1045; on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 6 m. h., 1120 (ii).

Fishing Regulations in Berthier, on M. for copies of Cor., 749 (i).

Freight Rates, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1070 (ii).

Intoxicating Liquors in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1346 (ii).

L'Ardoise Breakwater, on M. for copies of Surveys, &c., 697 (i).

Liquor Permits in N.W.T., on M for Cor., 553 (i).

Little Dover Post Office and Canso Mail Service (Ques.) 590 (i).

Lobster Factories in P.E.I., number, &c, on M. for Ret., 31 (i).

Lowry, W. G., Relief B. 119 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 995 (ii).

Lunenburg Harbor Surveys, on M. for copies of Cor., 751 (i).

Oyster Ponds' Postmaster, Appointment (Ques.) 591 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 263 (i).

Short Line Ry., Oxford to New Glasgow, total length, (Ques.) 529 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 297 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1237 (ii).

Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1075 (ii).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Digby and Annapolis) 1532 (ii).

Penitentiaries (B.C.) 222; (Kingston) 215 (i).

Kirk, Mr. J. A.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY – *Continued*
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S) 805 (i), 1519. Dredging (N.S., P.E.I. and N.B.) 969. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 925; (N.S.) 807 (i), 912, 1528 (ii).
Railways—Capital: Cape Breton (construction) 1070; Oxford and New Glasgow (construction) 1073 (ii).

Kirkpatrick, Hon. G. A., *Frontenac.*
Can. General Trusts Co's. incorp. (B. 34, 1°*) 138 (i).
C.P.R. and Steam Vessels (B. 60, 1°*) 269 (i).
——— Co's (B. 68, 1°*) 269 (i); M. for Com., 855; in Com., 1058, 1094 (ii).
Can. Super-phosphate Co.'s incorp. (B. 81, 1°*) 322 (i).
Dom. Mineral Co.'s incorp. (B. 80, 1°*) 322 (i).
Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 690 (i).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to take in Wednesday, 654 (i).
——— on M. to take in Monday, 1182 (ii).
House of Commons Act Amt. B. 108 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 786 (i)i.
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s (B. 69, 1°*) 269.
Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 47, 1°*) 194 (i).
Legislative Economy, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) for Joint Com., 784 (i).
——— Rep. of Joint Com. (Ques.) 1669 (ii).
Militia Clothing, in Com. of Sup., 1353 (ii).
Public Accts. Com., Printing of Evidence (remarks) 1367 (ii).
Queen's College (Kington) Act Amt. (B. 46, 1°*) 194; 2° m., 300, 602 (i); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts. 855 (ii).
Rock Lake Dam, damages caused through, Engineer's Reps, &c. (M. for copies) 936 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 793 (i), 1353 (ii); (Armories, care of Arms, &c.) 794; (Brigade Majors, &c., Salaries) 792; (Drill Sheds, &c.) 795; (Permanent Forces, &c.) 796 (i).
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters (B. 2, 1°*) 13; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 255; agreed to, 256; 2° m., 250; Rep, of Sel. Com. (presented) 384; in Com., 607, 618; on 3°, 759 (i).

Labelle, Mr. J. B., *Richelieu.*
Fishing Regulations in Berthier, on M. for copies of Cor., 746 (i).
Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) in Com. on B, 1685 (ii).
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 253; in Com., 611; on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to M. for 3°, 761 (i).

Labrosse, Mr. S., *Prescott.*
Hawkesbury Lumber Co.'s incorp. (B. 20, 1°*) 47 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1647 (ii).

Landerkin, Mr. G., *South Grey.*
Budget Speeches, Cost (M. for Ret.) 20 (i).
C. P. R. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 1096 (ii).
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty (prop. Res.) 92, 105; reg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 137 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 998 (ii).
Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 691 (i).
Leduc, Charles, of Hull, employment by Govt (Ques.) 171 (i).
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1420 (ii).
Ottawa, new deptl. Building, Tenders for Painting (Ques.) 1266 (ii).
Pope, Mr. (Dep. Com. of Patents) in Com. of Sup., 76.
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 1°, 370 (i); in Com., 1136 (ii).
Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1493 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Trent River Nav.) 1211 (ii).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 76 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Salaries, &c.) 1221. Post Office (Salaries, &c) 1237 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 270 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1522 (ii).

Landry, Mr. P. A., *Kent, N.B.*
Edmundston and Florenceville Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 88, 1°*) 369 (i).
Interest Act Amt. (B. 10, 1°) 19 (i).
P. E. I. and Continental Ry. and Ferry Co.'s incorp. (B. 96, 1°) 384 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 265 (i).
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 566.
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 925 (ii).

Langelier, Mr. C., *Montmorency.*
Bar of Quebec, Disallowance of Act (M. for O. C., &c.*) 303 (i).
Beach Lots in Quebec, (M. for O. C., Cor. &c.*) 303 (i).
Boundaries of Ont. and Que., Cor. between Local Govts. (M. for copies*) 303 (i).
Cavalry School, Toronto (Ques.) 302 (i).
Customs Appraisers (Que.) appointments (Ques.) 370.
Disallowance of Quebec Acts, O. C., &c. (M. for copies*) 303 (i).
Indians, Huron Tribe of Lorette (M. for Cor.*) 33 (i).
Lévis Post Office, Pets., &c., for building, on M. for copies, 433 (i).
Magistrates, Disallowance of Act, (M. for O. C., Cor., &c.*) 303 (i).
Pilotage Dues, change of Tariff (M. for Cor.*) 942 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1531 (ii).
Vincent, Joseph E., and Customs Dept. (M. for Cor.) 935 (ii).

Langelier, Mr. F., *Quebec Centre.*

Atlantic Mail Service (Ques.) 224 (i).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 778 (i).
C. P. R. Extension to Que., Amount paid and to whom (Ques.) 248 (i).
Commercial Laws of Dom., Codification (Ques.) 194 (i).
Cullers Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1364; in Com., 1365; in Com. on B., 1536 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 767 (i).
——— Collector, Three Rivers, Duty on Foreign Catalogues (Ques.) 740 (i).
Debates, Official, delay in printing French Edition (remarks) 944, 1462 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 997; in Com., 1008 (ii).
Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 948 (ii).
Judges' Salaries, in Com. of Sup, 206 (i).
Massawippi Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2°, 239 (i).
North Shore Ry., Transfer (M. for O. C., Cor., &c.*) 943 (ii).
Ordnance Lands, Que., Extension of Streets (M. for Pets., Cor., &c.*) 943 (ii).
Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Girouard*) on Order for 2°, 425 (i).
Postmaster at Three Rivers, newspaper Postage (Ques.) 740 (i).
Salmon Rivers in Que., Leases, &c. (Ques.) 224 (i).
Speedy Trials of Indictable Offiencs B. 17 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 195 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Inland Revenue) 66; (Militia and Defence) 57; (Postmaster General) 69 (i).
Immigration (Agents) 948 (ii).
Justice (Vice-Admiralty Court) 206 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1517 (ii).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L., K.C.M.G., *Three Rivers.*

Adjnmt. of House, Notices on Order Paper (remarks) 699 (i).
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) objected to, 283 (i).
Annunciation Day, adjnmt. (M.) 782 (i).
Arichat, West, Breakwater, compensation for Expropriation (Ans.) 841 (ii).
Ash Wednesday, adjnmt. (M.) 436 (i).
Behring's Sea Seizures, paragraph in *Empire* (remarks) 287 (i).
Boundaries of Ont., on M. for Com. on Res., 1657 (ii).
C. P. R., Sale of $15,000,000, Bonds (Ans.) 841 (ii).
Cape Breton Ry., Employés (Ans.) 762 (i).
Cascumpeque Harbor, dismissal of Blasting Foreman (Ans.) 348 (i).
Caughnawaga Indian Reserve, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Doyon*) 502 (i).
Cayuga Post Office, Cost to date (Ans.) 303 (i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—*Continued.*

Chicoutimi and Saguenay Counties, expenditure of Subsidy (Ans.) 427 (i).
China Point Piers, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 621 (i).
Concurrence, 1597 (ii).
Criminal Laws, distribution to Justices of the Peace (Ans.) 171 (i.)
Debates, Official, delay in printing (remarks) 944 (ii).
Dredge *Cape Breton*, compensation to Captain and Laborers for Losses (Ans.) 427 (i).
——— lost in Northumberland Straits (Ans.) 469 (i).
——— *Prince Edward*, payment to Captain (Ans.) 30.
——— Repairs, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 31; (Ans.) 302 (i).
Drill Shed at Belleville, Govt. Aid (Ans.) 80 (i).
Dundas and Waterloo Macadamised Road, on M. for Cor., 37 (i).
——— Survey (Ans.) 1628 (ii).
Employés, Federal and Provincial Govts., dual Offices (Ans.) 525 (i).
Esquimaux Point Telegraph Line (Ans.) 935 (ii).
Experimental Farm (Ottawa) Cost (Ans.) 225 (i).
Fishing Licenses on the Natashquan (Ans.) 1533 (ii).
Fifteen Point, P.E.I., Breakwater, Survey (Ans.) 1423.
Fortifications at Esquimalt, Col. O'Brien's Rep (Ans.) 1146 (ii).
French Canadians, Repatriation (Ans.) 677 (i).
Govt. Business (M.) to take in Thursday, 423 (i).
——— Wednesday, 653 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. (remarks) 762 (i), 979 (ii).
Grand Narrows Bridge, C. B., papers respecting (Ans.) 1266 (ii).
Grand River Bridge at York, construction (Ans.) 171.
Great Eastern Ry. Subsidy, on M. for Pets., &c., 21 (i).
Great Northern Ry., Engineer's Rep. (Ans.) 370 (i).
Hickey Wharf, Repairs (Ans.) 621 (i).
Jesuits' Estates Act, Papers respecting (Ans.) 526 (i).
Labor Commission, Legislation (Ans.) 1422 (ii).
Lachine Canal, new Bridge (Ans.) 20 (i).
Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (Mr. *Macdowall*) on Sen. Amts., 1160 (ii).
Lake St. John, Hydrographic Survey (Ans.) 1146 (ii).
——— Wharves, Construction (Ans.) 1181 (ii).
Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ans.) 979 (ii).
Laprairie Village, protection against Ice (Ans.) 427.
L'Ardoise Breakwater, on M. for copies of Surveys, &c., 694 (i).
Leduc, Charles, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 171 (i).
Legislative Economy, Joint Com. (M.) 782 (i).
——— Rep. of Joint Com., 1669 (ii).
Lévis Post Office, Pets., &c., on M. for copies, 433 (i).
Library of Parliament (M. for Sel. Com.) 17 (i),
Longueuil Wharves, completion (Ans.) 80 (i).
Lunenburg Harbor, Surveys, &c., on M. for copies of Cor., 750 (i).
——— Post Office, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 591 (i).
Man. and South Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr. *La Rivière*) on Sen. Amts., 1159 (ii).
Map of Canada in Chamber (remarks) 469 (i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—*Continued.*
Miminegash Breakwater, Damages (Ans.) 1423 (ii).
——— Repairs (Ans.) 1146 (ii).
Mormon Settlement in N. W. T (Ans) 980 (ii).
Mount Stewart Wharf, P. E. I., Construction (Ans.) 171 (i).
Naufrage Harbor, P. E. I., Engineer's Rep., on M. for copy, 33 (i).
New London Breakwater, Survey (Ans.) 468 (i).
——— Repairs (Ans.) 621 (i).
Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Girouard*) on M. for 2°, 169; on Order for 2°, 426 (i).
Ottawa new deptl. Building, Tenders for Painting (Ans.) 1266 (ii).
Piers and Breakwaters, P. E. I., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1222 (ii).
Pinette and Wood Island Harbor, Surveys (Ans.) 621 (i).
Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 233 (i).
Printing Bureau, expenditure for Plant, &c. (Ans.) 428 (i).
——— Cost of Building, Plant, &c. (Ans.) 1363 (ii).
Private Bills, Reps. from Com. (Ms.) to extend time, 516 (i), 841 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Flynn*) *re* Informer Le Caron 97 (i).
Public Accts. Com., Printing of Evidence (remarks) 1367, 1668 (ii).
Public Works Rep. (presented) 2 (i).
Red River Postal Service (Ans.) 1533 (ii).
Richelieu River, Survey and Soundings (Ans.) 22, 29 (i).
Rideau Hall Expenses, in Com. of Sup, 913 (ii).
St. Alphonse Wharf, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1181, 1363 (ii).
Ste. Anne de Chicoutimi Wharf, Construction (Ans.) 525 (ii).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Wharf, Repairs (Ans.) 1265.
St. Clair Rapids, Dredging at Point Edward (Ans.) 591.
St. Lawrence River Overflow, prevention (Ans.) 591.
——— Telegraph Service (Ans.) 1363 (ii).
St. Louis Lake, Construction of Piers (Ans.) 80 (i).
St. Louis River Improvements (Ans.) 34 (i).
St. Roch des Aulnets Wharf, on M. for Cor., 529 (i).
Savary, Charles, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 427 (i).
Sawdust, &c., in Ottawa River, Engineer's Rep. (Ans.) 370 (i).
Secretary of State's Rep. (presented) 33 (i).
Select Standing Committees (Rep. presented) 17 (i).
Short Line Ry., defeat of B. in Sen. (remarks) 1724 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 143 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res, 1618 (ii).
Summerside, P. E. I., Harbor and Breakwater, Survey (Ans.) 303 (i), 1423 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Public Works) 148 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Trent) 1495. Public Works (Esquimalt and Lévis Graving Docks) 1232. Telegraph Lines (N.W.T.) 1233; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 1232 (ii).
Legislation: Senate (Salaries, &c.) conc., 1597 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c.) 1362; Jugements du Conseil Souverain) 1453 (ii).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (additional, Ottawa) 799 (i); (N.B.) conc., 1599 (ii). Harbors and Rivers (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 802; (Kingston Graving Dock) 801 (i); (Ont.) conc., 1599 (ii); (Port Arthur Harbor, &c.) 801 (i); (Que) 1516 (ii). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 1528 (ii); (N.B.) 806; (N.S.) 804; (N.W.T.) 807 (i), 1527 (ii); (Ont.) 806 (i), 1519 (ii); (Que.) 806 (i); (Repairs, Furniture, &c.) 913. Dredging (Lake Man.) 970; (N.S, P.E.I. and N.B.) 968. Harbors and Rivers (B C.) 966; (Mar. Provs. generally) 1448; (N. B.) 924, 1447, 1530 (ii); (N. S.) 807 (i), 912, 1447, 1528; (Ont) 928, 1448, 1531; (P.E.I.) 921; (Que.) 927, 1531. Roads and Bridges, 971, 1532; conc., 1615; (Ottawa City and River) 1449. Slides and Booms, 970. Telegraph Lines, 971, 1532 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, acquisition by Govt. on M. (Mr. *Denison*) for Sel. Com., 81 (i).
Tignish Breakwater, Repairs (Ans.) 1146 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1222 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 655 (i).
Union Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) on Amt. (Mr. *Bryson*) to M. for 3°, 855; on Sen. Amts., 1233 (ii).
Ventillation of Chamber, in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).
West Point, P.E.I., Wharf, Repairs (Ans.) 1498 (i).
Yarmouth County, N.S., Public Works (Ans.) 34 (i).

La Rivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher.*
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 998 (ii).
Judges' Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 210 (i).
Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (Mr. *Macdowall*) on Sen. Amts., 1160 (ii).
Man. and South-Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 61, 1°*) 269 (i).
Oils, Imports into Man. (Ques.) 1533 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Dickinson*) *re* Land Grants, 1600 (ii).
Red River Postal Service (Ques.) 1533 (ii.)
Rosseau River, Indian Reserve, Location (Ques.) 347 (i).
Seed Wheat, payment by Settlers (Ques.) 590 (i).
Settlers' (Old) Claims in Man. (Ques.) 1533 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (Agents) 955, 1323 (ii).
Todd's Parliamentary Govt., distribution to Members, 1600 (ii).

Laurie, Gen. J. W., *Shelburne.*
Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s, on M for Cor., &c., 536 (i).
Arichat, West, Breakwater, compensation for Expropriation (Ques.) 811 (ii).
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 107 (i).
——— on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) 116 (i).
Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 638 (i).
Fish Imported in Bond for Export (M. for Cor.) 1082.
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 655, 657 (i).
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Australia and B. C.) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to conc. in Res., 1426 (ii).

Laurie, Gen. J. W.—*Continued.*
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res, 1412 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1617 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Miscellaneous (American Association) 1700 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W., *East Quebec.*
Address, on the, 7 (i).
Annunciation Day, on M. for adjnmt., 782 (i).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M for Com., 777; in Com., 779, 788.
Boundaries of Ont., on prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1329 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. on Res., 1657 (ii).
——— Memorial from Mr. Mercier (remarks) 1363.
C.P.R Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 1061, 1096 (ii).
Cape Breton Ry. (remarks) 1574 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 669 (i).
Commercial Treaties (remarks) on M. to adjn. House, 105 (i).
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 136 (i).
Cullers Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1364; in Com., 1365; in Com. on B., 1536 (ii).
Debates, Official, delay in printing French Edition, 655 (i), 944 (ii).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 871 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Choquette*) on M. to conc., 934 (ii).
Estimates, Suppl. (Ques.) 1397 (ii).
Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84, on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to trnsfr. to Govt. Orders, 1395; on M. for 2°, 1468 (ii).
Fisheries and Trade Relations with U.S. (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 323; neg. (Y. 65, N. 108) 423 (i).
Fisheries in Lunenburg County, on M. for Cor., 941.
Fishing Regulations in Berthier, on M. for Cor., 748 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 930; (Amt.) 985; neg. (Y, 75, N. 105) 1008; in Com., 1011 (ii).
Freight Transit through Can., on prop. M. (Mr. *Ives*) for Sel. Com., 88 (i).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to take in Wednesday, 653 (i).
——— (remarks) on adjnmt., 762 (i).
——— on M. to take in Monday, 1181 (ii).
Homestead Inspectors, Man. and N.W.T., on M. for Reps., &c., 22 (i).
House of Commons Act Amt., B. 108 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 785 (i)
Inspection Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 1°, 1263 (ii).
I. C. R., Summer Freight Rates (remarks) 1330, 1535.
Intoxicating Liquors in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1340 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued*
Jesuits' Estates Act, papers respecting (remarks) 526.
——— Mr. O'Brien's Res. (Ques.) 675, 740 (i).
——— on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 897 (ii).
King's Co, P.E.I., Representation, on prop Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) challenging Seat, 169 (i).
Land Commissioner's Office, Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 59 (i).
Legal Fees and Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 49 (i).
Legislative Economy, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) for Joint Com., 782 (i).
Liquor Permits in N. W. T., on M. for Cor., 553 (i).
Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1164 (ii).
Lunenburg Harbor, Surveys, &c., on M. for Cor., 751 (i).
Military College, Commandant's Residence (remarks) 1534 (ii).
Mining in Ry. Belt, B.C. (remarks) 980 (ii).
Ministerial Changes, on explanation (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 24 (i).
Mounted Police Pensions B., on Ques. of Order, 1270.
——— B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1276 (ii)
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1°, 1262 (ii).
Ocean Steamship Subsidies (remarks) 1283 (ii).
——— (B.C. and Australia) on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 1328; on M. for Com. on Res., 1372; in Com., 1377, 1381; on conc. (Amt) 1425; neg. (Y. 55, N. 77) 1426 (ii).
——— (B. C. and China, &c) on M for Com. on Res. (Amt.) 1386; neg. on a div., 1387; on M. to conc. in Res., 1430 (ii).
——— (Can. and United Kingdom) B. 144, on M. for Com. on Res. (Amt.) 1389; in Com, 1422, 1437 (ii).
Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Girouard*) on M. for 2°, 170 (i).
Pope, late Hon. J. H. (remarks) 943, 1018 (ii).
Queen's College (Kingston) B. 46 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 302 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 1283.
Rebellion in N.W.T., Cor. respecting 9th Battalion, on M. for copies, 320 (i).
Returns in hands of Members (remarks) 1573 (ii).
Ross, Hon. William, dismissal, O. C., Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 24 (i).
Select Standing Committee (M. to add names) 169 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 120 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 911 (ii).
Short Line Ry., handing in documents to Reporters objected to, 546 (i).
——— on personal explanation (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 741 (i).
Sittings of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) not to sit after 12 o'clock, 528 (i).
Subsidies (money) to B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on 1st Res., 1499; on conc., 1535; in Com. on 2nd Res., 1621, 1629, 1638 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
Summary Trials Act Amt. B. 121 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 912 (ii).
SUPPLY, on M. for Com. (remarks) 48:
Charges of Management, 48 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 79; (Interior) 59; (Justice) 49; (Militia and Defence) 55 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Public Works (Slides and Booms) 1230.
Immigration (Agents) 962 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Griffin, Mr., gratuity) 1454 (ii).
Pensions (Compensation in lieu of Land) 790 (i).
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 1315 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Dredging (N. S., P. E. I. and N. B.) 969. Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1518; (Mar. Provs. generally) 1448; (N.B.) 926 (ii); (Que.) 727 (i). Slides and Booms, 970. Telegraph Lines, 971 (ii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts, in Com. of Sup., 50 (i).
Tariff Changes (Ques.) 1266 (ii).
Tenders, Translation of Forms (remarks) 1535 (ii).
Timber and Lumber Inspection Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 661, 668 (i).
Tolls and Dues (Collection) Act Amt. B. 122 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 912 (ii).
Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1105 (ii).

Lavergne, Mr. J., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
Chester, Que., complaints against Postmaster (Ques.) 468 (i).
Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1475 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1006 (ii).
Money Order Offices, Que. (Ques.) 468 (i).
Quesnel, Jules, complaints against (Ques.) 1145 (ii).
Senator for Shawinigan District (Ques.) 1628 (ii).

Lépine, Mr. A. T., *East Montreal.*
Address, The (seconded) 6 (i).
Cigars, reduction of License Fees (Ques.) 171 (i).
Hospital Dues on Ships, collection (Ques.) 302 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.*) 303 (i).

Lister, Mr. J. F., *West Lambton.*
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 779 (i).
Cab-hire and Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 164. (i).
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 115 (i).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 245; on M. to restore to Order Paper, 368 (i).
Customs Seizures, on Res. (Mr. *Holton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1313 (ii).
C. P. R. Co.'s B. 63 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 1063.
Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1250 (ii).
Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1475 (ii).
Fishing Licenses in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 84 (i).

Lister, Mr. J. F.—*Continued.*
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1008, 1020, 1129 (ii).
Horse Island, Georgian Bay, Sale (Ques.) 590 (i).
Lowry, W. G., Relief B. 119 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 994 (ii).
Manufacturers' Insurance Co.'s Stockholders (M. for Cor.) 591 (i).
——— Return respecting (Ques.) 1017 (ii).
Middleton, W. H., Relief B. 125 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 1093 (ii).
Militia Clothing, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1565 (ii).
Ont. Loan and Debenture Co.'s Consolidation B. 48 (Mr. *Moncrieff*) on M. for 2°, 299 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1131 (ii).
Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 227 (i).
Public Accts. Com., Printing of Evidence (remarks) 1367 (ii).
St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Co.'s Costs, &c., (Ques.) 1146.
St. Clair Rapids, Dredging at Point Edward (Ques.) 591 (i).
Savary, Charles, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 427 (i).
Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) to M. for Com. of Sup. 1490 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Contingencies) 164; (Militia and Defence) 56 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands, 1250, 1254. Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1240 (ii).
Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1076 (ii).
Indians (Dingman, A., services) 1179; (Relief of Distress, Que.) 1169; (Schools) 1170 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouses, &c.) 1450 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1525. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1448. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa City and River) 1449 (ii).
Railways—Capital: Cape Breton (construction) 1072 (ii).
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 255, 256 (i).

Lovitt, Mr. J., *Yarmouth.*
Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 538 (i).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 779 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 656 (i).
Members' Sessional Indemnity (remarks) 1711 (ii).
Port Maitland Breakwater, in Com. of Sup., 150 (i).
Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1032; in Com., 1040 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Marine) 147; (Public Works) 150 (i).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 911 (i), 1528 (ii).
Yarmouth County Public Works (Ques.) 34 (i).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A, G.C.B., *Kingston.*
Address, on the, 11 (i).
Albert Ry. Co., Balance of Grant (Ans.) 348 (i).
Beauharnois Canal, opening of Navigation (remarks) 1285 (ii).
Behring's Sea Fisheries, Proclamation of American Govt. (remarks) 811 (ii).
——— Proclamation of U.S. Govt. (Ans.) 971 (ii).
——— Seizures, on M. for Com. of Sup, 1579 (ii).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry. Subsidy and G.T.R., on M. for Cor., 86 (i).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 775 (i).
Boundaries of Ont. (prop. Res.) 1329, 1423; M. for Com., 1654, 1657 (ii).
——— Telegram from Mr. Mowatt (remarks) 1363 (ii).
Business of the House (remarks) 269 (i), 1721 (ii).
C. P. R. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for Com., 855; in Com., 1061, 1096 (ii).
——— Co. and B. 68 (remarks) 701 (i).
——— Maps, Land and Money Subsidies (Ans.) 935.
Canal Works, Tenders, on M. for Ret, 594 (i).
Canteen at Regina Barracks (Ans.) 1082 (ii).
Cape Breton Ry., Contracts for Stations, &c. (Ans.) 1327 (ii).
——— payment of Laborers (Ans.) 871 (ii).
——— (remarks) 1574 (ii).
Chambly-Longueuil Canal, Construction (Ans.) 80 (i).
Cheese Exports to Eng. (Ans.) 1181 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 670; in Com. on Res, 674 (i).
——— Assessment of Salaries, authorisation B. 18 (Mr. *Ellis*) on objection to 2°, 367 (i).
Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to ref. to Com. on Banking, &c., 1116 (ii).
Commercial Treaties, on M. to adjn., 105, 169 (i).
Concurrence, 1614 (ii).
Customs Collector, Three Rivers, Duty on Foreign Catalogues (Ans.) 740 (i).
Debates, Official, Com. (M.) to substitute Mr. Prior's name for Mr. Baker's, 269 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Choquette*) to M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 934 (ii).
Deptl. Re-organisation Repeal B. 110 (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) on M. for 1°, 590 (i).
Derby Branch Ry., Extension (Ans.) 872 (ii).
——— Subsidy (Ans.) 854 (ii).
Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84, on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to trnsfr. to Govt. Orders, 1395 (ii).
Fisheries and Trades Relations with U.S, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 329 (i).
Flour and Pork Duties (remarks) on adjnmt., 1723 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 985; in Com., 1008, 1128 (ii).
Free List Extension (Combinations) B. 56 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 1°, 248 (i).
Freight Transit through Can., on prop. M. (Mr. *Ives*) for Sel. Com., 88 (i).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—*Continued.*
Freight Transit through Can., on Order for Sel. Com. being called, 591 (i).
Gannon Narrows Floating Bridge (Ans.) 1628 (ii).
Good Friday, adjnmt. (remarks) 1285; (M.) 1339 (ii).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to take in Thursday, 424 (i).
——— (M.) to take in Monday 1181 (ii).
——— Saturday 1534 (ii).
G.T.R., Pets. from Shareholders *re* Subsidies to Rys. (Ans.) 1081 (ii).
Hereford Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, Laborers' Wages (Ans.) 1017 (ii).
Horse Island, Georgian Bay, Sale (Ans.) 590 (i).
House of Commons Act Amt. B. 108 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 785 (i).
Hudson's Bay Ry. and Man. repudiation (Ans.) 1628.
Indian Annuities, Arrears, on M. for Cor., 938 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 139 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1397 (ii).
I.C.R., Capital Account, expenditure (Ans.) 676 (i).
——— Dining Rooms at Stations, Tenders (Ans.) 428.
——— Macdonald, A. R., Superintendent, Pet. of Employés (Ans.) 249 (i).
——— Receipts and Expenditures from opening to date (Ans.) 427 (i).
——— Summer Freight Rates (remarks) 1330, 1535 (ii).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 29 (i).
Jesuits' Estates Act, Papers (presented) 701 (i).
——— day for discussion (Ans.) 740 (i).
——— on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 903 (ii).
——— Test of Legality (Ans.) 1328 (ii).
——— on Res. (Mr. *Ross*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1692 (ii).
Judges' Salaries, Legislation (Ans.) 1629 (ii).
King's Co., P. E. I. Representation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) challenging Seat, 169 (i).
Lake St. Louis Buoys and Lights (remarks) 1534 (ii).
Manufacturers' Life Insurance Co.'s Shareholders (explanation) 1098 (ii).
——— on M. for copies of Cor., 592 (i).
——— Return respecting (Ans.) 1017 (ii).
McDonald and Dowling's Gulches, Pile-driving (Ans.) 677 (i).
Members' Sessional Indemnity (remarks) 1710 (ii).
Mennonite Immigrants Loan B. 138 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for 1°, 1268 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 29, 322 (i).
Military College, Commandant's Residence (remarks) 1534 (ii).
Milk Adulteration, prevention of Fraud B. 16 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 259 (i).
Ministerial Changes (explanation) 24 (i).
Modus Vivendi (remarks) 811 (ii).
Mounted Police Act Amt. (B. 146, 1°*) 1572; 2° m., 1709 (ii).
——— Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 169 (i)
——— Pensions (prop. Res.) 469; in Com., 769 (i);

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—*Continued.*
(B.118) 2° m., 1269; on Ques. of Order, 1271; in Com., 1277 (ii).
—— Punishment of Constables, &c., on M. for Ret., 430 (i).
Northern and North-Western Ry. (Ans.) 248 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. (Ans.) 105 (ii).
Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1°*) 2 (i).
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B. C. and Australia) on prop. Res., 1329; in Com., 1373, 1377 (ii).
Ont. Loan and Debenture Co.'s Consolidation B. 48 (Mr. *Moncrieff*) on M. for 2°, 299 (i).
Orange Order incorp., Legislation (Ans.) 1082 (ii).
Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Girouard*) on M. for 2°, 170 (i).
Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., total Length (Ans.), 529.
Pagans in Joliette County (Ans.) 1710 (ii).
Pictou Branch Ry., total Cost (Ans.) 302; Length, 348 (i).
Pontiac and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (prop. Res.) 1600 (ii).
Pope, late Hon. J. H. (remarks) 943, 1017 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1131; in Com. on B., 1134 (ii).
Printing, Joint Com. (M.) 19 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Flynn*) *re* Informer Le Caron, 97 (i).
Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Ry. Co. (prop. Res.) 1572; M. for Com., 1706 (ii).
Queen's College (Kingston) B. 46 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 300 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 1284 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Ans.) 1181.
—— Lake St. John (Ans.) 427 (i).
Returns in hands of Members (remarks) 1573 (ii).
Rideau Hall Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 916 (ii).
Rimouski Wharf, Repairs, Contractors, &c. (Ans.) 302 (i).
Rock Lake Dam, damages caused by, on M. for Reps. of Engineers, &c., 937 (ii).
Rocky Mountains Park Amt. (B. 141, 1°*) 1363; wthdn., 1629 (ii).
St. Charles Branch Ry., total Cost (Ans.) 302 (i).
St. George's Bridge, Structural Defects (Ans.) 1081.
Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1589 (ii).
Select Standing Committees (M.) 2 (i).
—— (M.) for Com. to prepare lists, 17 (i).
—— (Lists presented) 18 (i).
—— (Ms.) to add names 169, 269 (i).
Senator for Shawinigan District (Ans.) 1628 (ii).
Short Line Ry. (prop. Res.) 1424; in Com. on Res., 1658; on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1681; (B. 149, 1°*) and in Com., 1683 (ii).
—— (Harvey to Salisbury) Survey (Ans.) 1498 (ii).
—— Amount paid International Ry. Co. or C.P.R. (Ans.) 769 (i).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—*Continued.*
Short Line Ry., on M. for Ret., objection (Mr. *Laurier*) to handing in documents to Reporters, 546 (i).
—— on personal explanation (Mr. *Jones*) 741 (i).
Simms & Slater, return of Deposits to Sureties (Ans.) 677 (i).
Sittings of the House, Mr. Charlton's Res. (remarks) 432 (i).
—— on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) not to sit after 12 o'clock, 527 (i).
Smyth, Henry, of Chatham, employment of by Govt. (Ans.) 224 (i).
Speech from the Throne (M. for consdn.) 2 (i).
Subsidies (land) to Rys. (prop. Res.) 1572; B. 152 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1714, 1720 (ii).
—— (money) to Rys. (B. 148) in Com. on 1st Res., 1499; M. to conc. in Res, 1535; 2nd Res., 1572; in Com. on Res., 1616, 1629; M. to conc. in Res., 1652; in Com. on B., 1686 (ii).
SUPPLY, on Ques. of Procedure (remarks) 48 (i):
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Dairy Interest) 1513 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Cornwall) 1205; (Lachine) 1205; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1205; (Trent Riv. Nav.) 1209; (Williamsburg) 1206. *Income* (Lachine) 1514; (Welland) 1516 (ii).
Civil Government (Contingencies) 160, 165; (Mounted Police) 152 (i); (Privy Council) 1501; (Railways and Canals) 1501.
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Repairs, &c.) 1212 (ii).
Immigration (Agents) 961 (ii).
Indians (Oka Indians, removal) 1171; (Relief of Distress, Que.) 1169; (Schools) 1170 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Printing) 272.
Miscellaneous (American Association) 1698; (Banff: Roads and Bridges, &c.) 1215; (Labor Commission) conc., 1614 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1212 (ii).
Pensions (Rebellion, N.W.T.) 792 (i)
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1695; (Repairs, Furniture, &c.) 916 (ii).
Railways—Capital: C.P.R. (construction) 1047. Cape Breton (construction) 1069. I.C.R. (accommodation at Halifax) 1049; (City front of St. John) 1063; (Rolling Stock) 1614. Oxford and New Glasgow (construction) 1073 (ii).
Superannuation: Railways (Mr. Wallace) 1597 (ii).
Temiscouata Ry. Subsidy, Amount paid (Ans.) 676 (i).
Timber and Lumber Inspection Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 669 (i).
Todd's Parliamentary Govt., distribution to Members, 1601 (ii).
Tolls and Dues, Collection (B. 122, 1°*) 811 (i).
Tracey, A. R., Seizure of Goods at Medicine Hat (Ans.) 1016 (ii).
Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. for 2°, 1100; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1104 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 20, 676 (i), 872 (ii).
U. S., Invitation to Members to Visit (Ans.) 34 (i).
Victoria Bridge, Cost of maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 1081.
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 253 (i).
York-Simcoe Battalion Kit Allowance, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 85; (remarks) 428 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. P., *East Huron.*
Fisheries and Trade Relations with U.S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. to Sup., 385 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1002 (ii).
Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 947 (ii).
Mail Carriage in Brussels, Ont. (Ques.) 249 (i).
Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 773 (i); on Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1275 (ii).
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B. C. and Australia) B. 144 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 1379 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to prop. Res., 260 (i).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (Agents) 947, 951 (ii).

Macdowall, Mr. D. H., *Saskatchewan.*
C. P. R., Maps, Land and Money Subsidies (Ques.) 935.
Engineers (stationary) Examination and Licensing B. 8 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 1110 (ii).
Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 948 (ii).
——— Pamphlets, in Com. of Sup., 277.
Intoxicating Liquors in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1338 (ii).
Lake, James P., payment for Wire Rope (Ques.) 1628.
Legislative Assembly in N. W. T., Memorials, on M. for copies, 374 (i).
Moose Jaw, Battleford and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 85, 1°*) 369 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1°, 1262 (ii).
Ont., Manitoba and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 83, 1°*) 346 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c, Ry. and Steamboat Co.'s B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1707 (ii).
Supplies, Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands, 1254. Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1240 (ii).
Immigration (Agents) 948 (ii).
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 1173, 1596; (Schools) 1170 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper and Binding) 277.
Miscellaneous (St. Catharines Milling Co., Costs) 1457 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1452 (ii).
Title and Mortgage Guarantee Co.'s incorp. (B. 114, 1°) 676 (i).
Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s (B. 107, 1°*) 589 (i).

Mackenzie, Hon. A., *East York.*
Ont. Loan and Debenture Co.'s Consolidation B. 48 (Mr. *Moncrieff*) on M. for 2°, 299 (i).
Rideau Hall Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 917 (ii).
Sittings of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) not to sit after 12 o'clock, 528 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners) 203 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Repairs, Furniture, &c.) 917 (ii).

Mackenzie, Hon. A.—*Continued.*
Wrecking, &c., in Can. Waters B. 7 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) on M. to adjn. deb., 259 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. D., *North Simcoe.*
Jesuits' Estates Act, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 842 (ii).
Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s incorp. (B. 86, 1°*) 369 (i).
Wrecking, &c., in Can. Waters B. 7 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2° (M. to adjn. deb.) 258 (i).

McCulla, Mr. W. A., *Peel.*
Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 1444 (ii).

McDonald, Mr. J. A., *Victoria, N.S.*
Cape Breton Ry., payment of Laborers (Ques.) 871 (ii)
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 673 (i).
James, Mr. Justice, leave of absence (Ques.) 525 (i).
SUPPLY:
Miscellaneous (Griffin, Mr., gratuity) 1453 (ii).

McDougald, Mr. J., *Pictou.*
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 130 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 807 (i).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., *Cape Breton.*
Cape Breton Ry., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flynn*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1190 (ii).
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 643 (i).

McGreevy, Hon. T., *West Quebec.*
Quebec Board of Trade incorp. Act Amt. (B. 87, 1°*) 369 (i).

McIntyre, Mr. P. A., *King's, P. E. I.*
Fishery Bounty, Claims made and rejected in P.E.I. (M. for Ret.) 434 (i).
Mount Stewart Pier, in Com. of Sup., 922 (ii).
Naufrage Harbor, P.E.I., Engineer's Rep. (M. for copy) 33 (i.)
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 922 (ii).

McKay, Mr. A., *Hamilton.*
Artisans, Importation, attention called to Advertisement, 1668 (ii).
Hamilton Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 39, 1°*) 194 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1132; in Com. on B. 1137 (ii).
Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1039 (ii).
Subsidies to Rys. (money) B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1633 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, printing) 272 (i).

McKeen, Mr. D., *Cape Breton.*

Cape Breton Ry., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flynn*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).

Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 121 (i).

McMillan, Mr. J., *South Huron.*

Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 107 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 768 (i).

Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Cost (Ques.) 225 (i).

——— (M. for Ret.*) 235 (i).

——— expenditure (M. for Stmnt.*) 436 (i).

Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 40 (i).

Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 684 (i).

Ocean Steamship Subsidies (B. C. and Australia) on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1376 (ii).

——— (Can. and United Kingdom) on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1418 (ii).

Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 646 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 288, 294.

McMullen, Mr. J., *North Wellington.*

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) on M. for 3°, 285 (i).

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 778 (i).

Chipman, C. C., in Com. of Sup., 201 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 670 (i).

Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 1441; on Sen. Amts., 1691 (ii).

Concurrence, 1598, 1609, 1614 (ii).

Convict Labor, in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).

Defence of Indian charged with Shooting (Ques.) 935.

Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1240 (ii).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 989; in Com., 1015 (ii).

Frauds upon Farmers, on M. (Mr. *Brown*) for Sp. Com., 16 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. *Brown*) to reduce quorum 223 (i).

Homestead Inspectors in Man. and N. W. T. (remarks) 29 (i); Reps. (M. for copies) 22 (i).

House of Commons Act Amt. B. 108 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 786 (i).

Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 947, 1319 (ii).

Interest, computing, in Com. of Sup., 155 (i).

Jesuits' Estates Act, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).

——— on Res. (Mr. *Ross*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1693 (ii).

Land Board, Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 59, 64 (i).

Legislative Assembly in N.W.T., Memorials, on M. for copies, 378 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

Majors' Hill Park, in Com. of Sup., 1449 (ii).

Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1709 (ii).

Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 771 (i); on Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1276 (ii).

Ocean Steamship Subsidies (B. C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1375 (ii).

——— (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1419, 1437 (ii).

O'Connor, D., Account for Law Cases, Fees, &c. (M. for Ret.) 31 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 1229 (ii).

Ottawa Public Roads, Improvements, amount paid (M. for Ret.*) 303 (i).

Pictou Branch Ry., total Cost (Ques.) 302; Length, 348 (i).

Pope, Mr. (Dep. Com. of Patents) in Com. of Sup., 71.

Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 1°, 370 (i).

Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 232 (i).

Printing Bureau, cost of building, plant, &c. (Ques.) 1363 (ii).

Pub. Accts. Com., meeting (remarks) 501 (i).

——— Papers from Militia Dept. (remarks) 470 (i).

Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 516, 523 (i).

Returns (enquiry) 621 (i).

Rideau Hall Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 914 (ii).

Rolling Stock, I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1066 (ii).

St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Co. *vs.* Queen, Law Costs, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 33 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1146 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 49, 52 (i), 1455 (ii).

——— original Cheques (M. for Ret.*) 943 (ii).

St. Charles Branch Ry., entire Cost (M. for Ret.*) 943 (ii).

——— total Cost (Ques.) 302 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 304 (i).

Scott, Capt., Superannuation, in Com. of Sup., 146 (i).

Short Line Ry., &c., on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1679 (ii).

Smyth, Henry, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 224 (i).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1501, 1621, 1634 (ii).

Supplies, Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1451 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Dairy Interest) 1513 (ii); (Experimental Farms) 297 (i).

Civil Government (Agriculture) 71; (Contingencies) 155; (High Commissioner's Office) 199; (Indian Affairs) 66; (Inland Revenue) 63; (Interior) 59, 64; (Justice) 49; (Marine) 146 (i), conc., 1614 (ii); (Militia and Defence) 55; (Postmaster General) 70 (i); (P.O. and Finance Depts., contingencies) 1503; (Privy Council) 1501; (Railways and Canals) 1504 (ii); (Sec. of State) 57 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Collection of Revenues (Adulteration of Food) 1227. Customs (Salaries, &c.) 1219. Dom. Lands, 1240, 1249, 1257; conc., 1609. Minor Revenues, 1229. Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1234, 1596. Public Works (Slides and Booms) 1231. Railways (I.C.R.) 1496. Weights and Measures, 1226, 1496 (ii).

Immigration (Agents) 947, 952, 1319 (ii).

Indians (Dingman, A., services) 1172, 1451; (Man. and N.W.T.) 1174, 1595; (Schools) 1170 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Franchise Act) 1511 (ii). Senate (Salaries and Contingencies) 207 (i).

Miscellaneous (Banff: Roads, Bridges, &c.) 1180, 1215; (Lands, C.P.R. Belt) 1570 (ii).

Militia (Drill Sheds, &c.) 795; (Permanent Forces, &c.) 799 (i).

Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c.) 1180; (Inspector, Registrars, &c., N.W.T.) 1180; (Jukes, Dr., services) 1571; (Printing Bureau) 1571; (St. Catharines Milling Co., Costs) 1455 (ii).

Mounted Police, 1213, 1451, 1497 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Kingston) 211 (i); 1510; (Man.) 217 (i), 1508; conc., 1598; (St. Vincent de Paul) 1319 (ii).

Pensions (Compensation in lieu of Land) 789; (Mrs. Gowanlock) 792 (i).

Public Works—Capital: Buildings (additional, Ottawa) 800 (i); Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) conc., 1599. *Income:* Buildings (Ont.) 1521, 1693; (Repairs, Furniture, &c.) 914, conc., 1599; Experimental Farm (Buildings, &c) 971. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 929. Roads and Bridges, 971; (Ottawa City and River) 1449 (ii).

Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Repair Shed at Richmond) 1066 (ii).

Superannuation: Railways (W. Wallace) 1297 (ii).

Toronto School of Infantry, Bread Supply, Tenders (Ques.) 1082 (ii).

Trade Commissioner to South America (Ques.) 30 (i).

Webster, W, A., employment by Govt. (Ques) 979 (ii).

McNeill, Mr. A., *North Bruce.*

Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 690 (i).

Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 951 (ii).

Jesuits' Estate Act, Disallowance, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 869 (ii).

Ocean Steamship Subsidies (B.C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1334 (ii).

——— (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1418 (ii).

Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1039 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Immigration, 951 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures, 1227 (ii).

Madill, Mr. E., *North Ontario.*

Deschenes, Ludger Miville, Amounts paid for Surveys in N.W.T. (Ques.) 1327 (ii).

Elevators and Hoists Safety (B. 13, 1°*) 29 (i).

Fishing Licenses in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 84 (i).

Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 713 (i).

Mara, Mr. J. A., *Yale.*

County Court Judges for B. C., appointment (Ques.) 80 (i).

Division List (correction) 1330 (ii).

Mara, Mr. J. A.—*Continued.*

Kootenay and Athabasca Ry. Co's. (B. 15, 1°*) 30; in Com., 238 (i).

Mining in Ry. Belt, B. C. (remarks) 980 (ii).

Mining Laws, B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1540 (ii).

Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B. C. and China, &c.) on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to conc. in Res., 1430 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1629 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues: Public Works (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1232 (ii).

Immigration (Agents) 957 (ii).

Marshall, Mr. J. H., *East Middlesex.*

London Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 50, 1°*) 222 (i).

Masson, Mr. J., *North Grey.*

Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 109 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1144.

Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 254; in Com., 618 (i).

Mills, Mr. J. B., *Annapolis.*

Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 535 (i).

Mills, Hon. D., *Bothwell.*

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) in Com., 235; on M. for 3°, 284 (i).

Behring's Sea Seizures, paragraph in *Empire* newspaper (Ques.) 287 (i).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1582 (ii).

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 194 (i).

——— on M. for Com., 775; in Com., 781 (i).

Boundaries of Ont., on prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1329; on M. for Com. on Res., 1654 (ii).

Breslayor Half-breeds, compensation for Losses (Ques.) 348 (i).

Cab hire, in Com. of Sup., 161, 167 (i).

C.P.R. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 1061, 1096 (ii).

Chipman, C. C., in Com. of Sup., 147, 201 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 671; in Com. on Res., 675 (i).

Civil Service, Assessment of Salaries authorisation B. 18 (Mr. *Ellis*) on objection to 2°, 367 (i).

Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 1115; on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) for Com., 1437, in Com., 1446; on Sen. Amts., 1689 (ii).

Concurrence, 1608 (ii).

Controverted Elections, date of receipt by Speaker of certificates from Judges (M. for Ret.*) 303 (i).

Corrupt Practices in Municipal Affairs B. 71 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 502 (i).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*

Cruelty to Animals Prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m.h., to M. for 2°, 247; on M. that Com. rise, 359 (i).

Copyright Act Amt. B. 101 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. to recom., 1466 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1527 (ii).

Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1246 (ii).

Dresden Turning Ground Improvements, in Com. of Sup., 151 (i).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 109 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 787 (i).

Exports to Great Britain *vid* United States (Ques.) 428 (i).

Expropriation of Lands B. 131 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1266 (ii).

Extradition, extension of provisions B. 84, on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to trnsfr. to Govt. Orders, 1395 (ii).

Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 46 (i).

Fisheries and Trade Relations with U.S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 332 (i).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 983; in Com., 1008, 1019, 1125; on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) 1281 (ii).

Good Friday, adjnmt. (remarks) 1285 (ii).

House of Commons Act Amt. B. 103 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 785 (i).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 139 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1397 (ii).

Jesuits' Estates Act, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 872 (ii).

Judges' (Provincial) Salaries B. 150 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1688 (ii).

Land Commissioner's Office, Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 64 (i).

Lands in B.C., conveyance B. 128 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1043 (ii).

Legal Fees and Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 51 (i).

Legislative Economy, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) for Joint Com., 782 (i).

Liquor Permits in N.W.T., on M. for copies of Cor., &c, 555 (i).

Massawippi Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2°, 239 (i).

Mennonite Immigrants Loan B. 138 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for 1°, 1268 (ii).

Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 770 (i); on Ques. of Order, 1270; on Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1271 (ii).

N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1°, 1262 (ii).

Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B.C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1374 (ii).

Pope, Mr. (Dep. Com. of Patents) in Com. of Sup., 72, 76, 78 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com., 1135 (ii).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*

Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 230 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Trow*) Member leaving Seat during Vote, 249 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors (Amt. to Amt.) to prop. Res., 261; neg. (Y. 35, N. 128) 267 (i).

Public Accts. Com., Printing of Evidence (remarks) 1366 (ii).

Public Depts. reorganisation Repeal (B. 110, 1°) 589.

Queen's College (Kingston) B. 46 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 300, 602 (i); on Sen. Amts., 855, (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 1284.

Rideau Hall Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 914 (ii).

St. Catharines Milling Co., Legal Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 51 (i).

Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1587 (ii).

Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) B. 149 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1684 (ii).

Sittings of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) not to sit after 12 o'clock, 528 (i).

Speedy Trials of Indictable Offences B. 17 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 470 (i).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1616, 1627, 1632, 1642; in Com. on B., 1686 (ii).

SUPPLY (Ques. of Procedure) on M. for Com., 48 (i):
Administration of Justice (Supreme Court) 206; (Vice-Admiralty Court) 205 (i).
Canals—Income (Welland) 1515 (ii).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 72; (Civil Service Examiners) 203; (Contingencies) 161; (High Commissioner's Office) 201; (Indian Affairs) 65 (i), 1503 (ii); (Interior) 58, 64; (Justice) 51; (Mounted Police) 62 (i); (Privy Council) 1502 (ii); (Public Works) 150 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Dom. Lands) 1246, 1255; conc., 1603 (ii).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 1174, 1595 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Franchise Act) 1511 (ii). Senate (Salaries and Contingencies) 207 (i).
Miscellaneous (St. Catharines Milling Co.'s Costs) 1459 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Repairs, Furniture, &c.) 915. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 926; (Ont.) 927, 1448 (ii); Roads and Bridges (Ottawa City and River) 1448 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 211; (Man.) 219 (i).
Pensions (Compensation in lieu of Land) 790 (i).
Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (construction) 1047. Cape Breton (construction) 1069 (ii).

Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1106 (ii).

Timber and Lumber Inspection Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 667 (i).

Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 620 (i).

Wrecking, &c., in Can. Waters B. 7 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 257 (i).

Mitchell, Hon. P., *Northumberland.*

Adams, A. & J., Claims for loss of *Carrier Dove* (M. for Cor.*) 1182 (ii).

Adams, Seizure of, Papers, &c. (remarks) on adjnmt., 1462, 1463 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—*Continued.*

Adjnmt. of House (remarks) *re* Notices on Order Paper, 699 (i).
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) in Com., 237 (i).
American Law Reps., in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).
Behring's Sea Fisheries, Proclamation of American Govt. (remarks) 811 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 775 (i).
Bills, Second Readings (protest) 357 (i).
Business of the House (remarks) 270 (i).
C. P. R. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 1063, 1097 (ii).
Canal Works, Tenders, on M. for Ret., 594 (i).
Chignecto Ship Ry., Prospectus (Ques.) 1423 (ii).
Chipman, C. C., in Com. of Sup., 139, 196 (i).
Concurrence, 1598 (ii).
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 117 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. House, 120 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 764 (i).
Customs Seizures, in Com. of Sup., 68 (i).
Cullers Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for Com. on Res, 1364 (ii).
Derby Branch Ry. and Northern and Western Ry. (M. for Cor., &c.*) 1182 (ii).
——— Claims for Land Damages (remarks) 749 (i).
——— Subsidy (Ques.) 854 (ii).
——— Extension (Ques.) 871 (ii).
Expropriation of Lands B. 131 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 944 (ii).
Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1477 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 6 m. h., 1118; on M. to adjn. deb., 1122 (ii).
Fisheries and Trade Relations with U. S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 397 (i).
Fishing Regulations in Berthier, on M. for copies of Cor., 747 (i).
Flour and Pork Duties (remarks) on adjnmt., 1723 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 987; in Com., 1014 (ii).
Good Friday, adjnmt. (remarks) 1285 (ii).
——— on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1330 (ii).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to take in Thursday, 423 (i).
——— Wednesday, 653 (i).
——— Monday, 1182 (ii).
Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 949 (ii).
Intoxicating Liquors in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1342 (ii).
Jesuits' Estates Act Disallowance, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 839 (ii).
Judges' Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 206 (i).
——— on personal explanation (Mr. *Curran*) 1498 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—*Continued.*

Kootenay and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s B. 15 (Mr. *Mara*) in Com., 238 (i).
Laborers Protection B. 53 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 1°, 223 (i).
Lake St. Louis Buoys and Lights (remarks) 1574, 1652 (ii).
——— (telegram read) 1534 (ii).
Land Damages, I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1065 (ii).
Legislative Economy, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) for Joint Com., 784 (i).
Map of Canada in Chamber (remarks) 470 (i).
Ministerial Changes, on M. to adjn. House, 28 (i).
Montreal Harbor Commissioners' Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 774 (i).
Montreal Harbor Police (remarks) 1687 (ii).
Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 772 (i).
Northern and North-Western Ry. (Ques.) 248 (i).
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B. C. and China, &c.) on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to conc. in Res., 1433 (ii).
Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Girouard*) on M. for 2°, 169, on Order for 2°, 425 (i).
Parker, Geo. R., Claims for damages *re* Derby Branch Ry. (M. for Cor.*) 1182 (ii).
Pope, late Hon. J. H. (remarks) 943 (ii).
Pope, Mr. (Dep. Com. of Patents) in Com. of Sup., 74.
Postage Rates, Can. and U.S., in Com. of Sup. 70 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1131 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Trow*) Member leaving Seat during Vote, 250 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Ry. and Steamboat Co.'s B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1707 (ii).
Railway Employés protection B. 53 (Mr. *Purcell*) 1462 (ii).
St. Catharines Milling Co.'s Legal Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 49 (i).
Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1591 (ii).
Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1030; in Com., 1032 (ii).
Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) B. 149 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1662; on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1681 (ii).
Sittings of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) not to sit after 12 o'clock, 527 (i).
Smelt Fishing in the Miramichi, in Com. of Sup., 140.
Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 152 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1720 (ii.)
——— (money) to Rys., B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1639 (ii).
Supplies, Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Supreme Court) 205; (Vice-Admiralty Court) 206 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) conc., 1598 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Civil Government (Agriculture) 74; (Customs) 68; (High Commissioner's Office) 196 (i); Indian Affairs) 1502; (Interior) 1502 (ii); (Justice) 49; (Marine) 139; (Militia and Defence) 55; (Postmaster General) 69 (i); (Privy Council) 1502; (Railways and Canals) 1504 (ii); (Secretary of State) 57 (i).

Immigration (Agents) 950 (ii).

Indians (Relief of Distress, Que.) 1169; (Schools) 1170 (ii)

Legislation: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 270 (i).

Marine Hospitals (Marine and Immigrant, Que.) 977; (Que., N.S., P.E.I., N.B. and B.C.) 979 (ii).

Miscellaneous (American Association) 1697; (Le Dictionnaire Généalogique des Familles Françaises) 1453; (St. Catherines Milling Co.'s Costs) 1456 (ii).

Mounted Police, 1453 (ii).

Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 1318 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Buildings (N.B.) conc., 1599. *Income:* (Ont.) 1532, 1696. Dredging (new plant) 1448. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1447. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa City and River) 1449 (ii).

Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (accommodation at Halifax) 1048; (repair sheds at Richmond) 1065 (ii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts, in Com. of Sup., 49 (i).

Toronto School of Infantry Bread Supply, Tenders (Ques.) 1082 (ii).

Wright, Allan, Claim for Damages, Indiantown Branch, I. C. R. (M. for Cor.*) 1094 (ii).

Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 603, 610, 616; on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to M. for 5°, 761 (i).

Moncrieff, Mr. G., *East Lambton.*

Ont. Loan and Debenture Co.'s (B. 48, 1°*) 194 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 267; (Amt. to Amt.) ruled out of Order, 268 (i).

St. Clair River, Stag Island Lighthouse (Ques.) 224 (i).

Mulock, Mr. W., *North York.*

C. P. R. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 1097 (ii).

Canal Works, Tenders (on M. for Ret.) 595 (i).

Chipman, C. C., in Com. of Sup., 199 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 1°, 523 (i).

Cobourg, Town, Relief B. 153, in Com. on Res., 1721.

Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 1440; on Sen. Amts., 1689 (ii).

Copyright Act Amt. B. 101 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1401 (ii).

Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on M. that Com. rise, 360 (i).

Debates, Official, delay in printing (remarks) 945 (ii).

Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com. 1473 (ii).

Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty (Res.) 37 (i).

Flour Duties, Increase (Ques.) 1145 (ii).

Flour and Pork Duties (remarks) on adjnmt., 1721 (ii).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1002; in Com., 1014, 1021, 1029 (ii).

Fraudulent Practices Com., on M. (Mr. *Brown*) to reduce quorum, 223 (i).

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*

Free List, Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 686 (i).

Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 958 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 139 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1397 (ii).

Jesuits' Estates Act Disallowance, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 892 (ii).

Judges' Salaries, in Com. of Sup, 206 (i).

Kyle, convict, in Com. of Sup., 216 (i).

Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1165 (ii).

Lowry, W. G., Relief B. 119 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 994 (ii).

Members' Sessional Indemnity (remarks) 1711 (ii).

Militia Clothing (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1542; Amt. neg. (Y. 54, N. 95) 1570 (ii).

Montreal Harbor Police (remarks) 1687 (ii).

Mounted Police, punishment of Constables, &c., on M. for Ret., 431 (i).

Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B. C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1385 (ii).

——— (B. C. and China, &c.) in Com. on Res., 1387.

——— (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1419 (ii).

Ont. Loan and Debenture Co.'s Consolidation B. 48 (Mr. *Moncrieff*) on M. for 2°, 299 (i).

Pope, Mr. (Dep. Com. of Patents) in Com. of Sup., 77.

Public Accts. Com., meeting (remarks) 501 (i).

——— Papers from Militia Dept. (remarks) 470 (i).

——— Printing of Evidence (remarks) 1368, 1394, 1668 (ii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Ry. and Steamboat Co.'s B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1707 (ii).

Returns in hands of Members (remarks) 1573 (ii).

St. George's Bridge, Structural Defects (Ques.) 1081.

Scrip (Land) Outstanding (Ques.) 347, 525 (i).

Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1036 (ii).

Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1675 (ii).

Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 152 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1719 (ii).

——— (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1639 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (Vice-Admiralty Court) 206 (i).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 290 (i); (Indian and Colonial Exhibition) 1513 (ii).

Canals—Income (Welland) 1516 (ii).

Civil Government (Agriculture) 77; (High Commissioner's Office) 193; (Interior) 58; (Militia and Defence) 56 (i); (Railways and Canals) 1505 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Canals (Trent) 1495. Railways (I. C. R.) 1496 (ii).

Immigration (Agents) 954 (ii).

Indians (Oka Indians, removal) 1171; (Schools) 1170 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Franchise Act) 1511 (ii); (Printing, Paper and Binding) 273 (i).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and West Indies, &c.) 1703 (ii).

Marine Hospitals (Que., N.S., P.E.I., N.B. and P.E.I.) 978.

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Miscellaneous (Griffin, Mr., gratuity) 1454; (Printing Bureau) 1571; (St. Catharines Milling Co.'s Costs) 1458 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Kingston) 216 (i), 1510 (ii); (Man.) 219 (i), 1508 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Kingston Graving Dock) 801 (i). *Income:* Buildings (N. S.) 1519; (Ont.) 1519, 1697. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1448 (ii).

Territorial Accounts (Rebellion in N.W.T.) 1461 (ii).

Title and Mortgage Guarantee Co.'s incorp. B. 114 (Mr. *Macdowall*) on M. for 2°, 676 (i).

Ways and Means (remarks) *re* Millers of Ont., 1711.

Webster, Mr., Immigration Agent in N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 278 (i).

Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 611 (i).

York-Simcoe Battalion, Kit Allowance (prop. Res.) 85.

——— (remarks) 428 (i).

Neveu, Mr. H., *Joliette.*

Joliette Mail Service, Contract (Ques.) 762 (i).

Ste. Beatrix Post Office, Location (Ques.) 590 (i).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1616 (ii).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., *Muskoka.*

Fishing Licenses in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 83.

Indian Annuities, Arrears (M. for Cor.) 937 (ii).

Jesuits' Estates Act (notice of prop. Res.) 384 (i).

——— on fixing day for deb. (remarks) 675 (i).

——— (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 811; neg. (Y. 13, N. 188) 910 (ii).

Militia Clothing, in Com. of Sup., 1352 (ii).

Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1405 (ii).

Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1586 (ii).

Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1038 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1500 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (Supreme Court Reps., Printing, &c.) 205 (i).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 290 (i).

Indians (Oka Indians, removal) 1171 (ii).

Militia (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1352 (ii); (Rifled Ordnance) 795 (i).

Pensions (Compensations in lieu of Land) 791 (i).

Paterson, Mr. W., *South Brant.*

Belleville Drill Shed, construction, &c., on M. for Cor., 700 (i).

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 776 (i).

Customs Seizures, on Res. (Mr. *Holton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1309 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 763 (i); in Com. on B., 1138; on M. to recom., 1330 (ii).

Paterson, Mr. W.—*Continued.*

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 996; in Com., 1010, 1126 (ii).

Imports and Exports, condensed Tables, in Com. of Sup., 152 (i).

Independent Order of Forresters incorp. B. 74 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 754 (i).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 139 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1398 (ii).

Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1156 (ii).

Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1274; in Com., 1277 (ii).

Ocean Steamship Subsidies (B. C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1380 (ii).

——— (B. C. and China, &c.) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1387; on M. to conc. in Res., 1431 (ii).

——— (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1414, 1416 (ii).

Pope, Mr. (Dep. Com. of Patents) in Com. of Sup., 73, 77 (i).

Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 723 (i).

Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1494 (ii).

Sittings of the House, Mr. Charlton's Res., 433 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Agriculture) 73; (Customs) 152, 155; (Contingencies) 155, 160; (Indian Affairs) 65; (Mounted Police) 62, 151 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Canals (Trent) 1495. Customs (Salaries, &c.) 1219 (ii).

Immigration (Agents) 962, 1326 (ii).

Indians (Schools) 1170 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Banff: Roads, Bridges, &c.) 1215; (St. Catharines Milling Co.'s Costs) 1457 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Experimental Farm (Buildings, &c.) 972. Harbors and Rivers (B.C.) 967 (ii).

Railways—Capital (I. C. R.) 1498 (ii)

Patterson, Mr. J. C., *North Essex.*

Mounted Police, punishment of Constables, &c., on M. for Ret., 432 (i).

Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 252; (Amt.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 255; wthdn., 256; in Com., 620 (i).

Wrecking, &c., in Can. Waters (B. 7, 1°) 15; 2° m. 256; on M. to adjn. deb., 258 (i); wthdn., 1107 (ii).

Perley, Mr. W. G., *Ottawa City.*

Majors' Hill Park, in Com. of Sup., 1449 (ii).

Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1590 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Roads and Bridges (Ottawa City and River) 1449 (ii).

Telephone, Telegraph and Electric Light Co.'s Wires (B. 112, 1°*) 620 (i).

Timber and Lumber Inspection Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 667 (i).

Perry, Mr. S. F., *Prince, P.E.I.*
Baltic Post Office, establishment (Ques.) 1423 (ii).
Campbell, Capt. R., dismissal, Cor., &c. (M. for Ret.) 741 (i).
Cascampeque Harbor, dismissal of Blasting Foreman (Ques.) 348 (i).
Confederation and P.E.I., Claims against Govt. (Ques.) 525 (i).
Dredge *Prince Edward*, payment to Captain (Ques.) 30.
——— Repairs, Cost, &c. (M. for Ret.) 31 (i).
——— Repairs and Costs (Ques.) 302 (i).
Fifteen Point Breakwater, Survey (Ques.)1423 (ii).
Fishery Bounty, Claims made and rejected in P. E. I., on M. for Ret., 436 (i).
Fishery Commissioner (Assistant) P.E.I., Appointment (Ques.) 171 (i).
Lobster and Oyster Commission, in Com. of Sup., 159(i)
Lobster Factories, in P.E.I., number, &c. (M. for Ret.) 31 (i).
Miminegash Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1146, 1423 (ii).
Piers and Wharves in Com. of Sup., 149 (i) 923 (ii).
Preventive Officers in P.E.I. (Ques.) 15 (i).
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 577 (i)
Returns (enquiry) 524 (i).
Subway, Straits of Northumberland (Ques.) 16 (i).
Subsidy to P.E.I. (Ques.) 15 (i).
Summerside Harbor and Breakwater Survey (Ques.) 303 (i), 1423 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Contingencies) 159; (Public Works) 149 (i).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (P. E. I.) 923 (ii.)
Tignish Breakwater, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1222 (ii).
——— Repairs (Ques.) 1146 (ii).
West Point Wharf, Repairs (Ques.) 1498 (ii).

Platt, Mr. J. M., *Prince Edward.*
Concurrence, 1615 (ii).
Corrupt Practices Trials, Counsel's Instructions (Ques.) 427 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1006; in Com., 1020, 1127 (ii).
Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) prop. Res., 684, 689 (i).
Military College, Commandant's House (Ques.) 34 (i).
Ocean Steamship Subsidies (B.C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1379 (ii).
——— (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1406 (ii).
Pope, Mr. (Dep. Com. of Patents) in Com. of Sup., 74 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1632, 1637 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Agriculture) 74 (i).
Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1077 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Franchise Act) conc., 1615 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1531 (ii).
Tête du Pont Barracks, Sale (Ques.) 427 (i).

Porter, Mr. R., *West Huron.*
Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 228 (i).
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 510.

Préfontaine, Mr. R., *Chambly.*
Chambly–Longueuil Canal, Construction (Ques.) 80 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1013 (ii).
Great Eastern Ry. Subsidy, on M. for Pets., &c., 22 (i).
Longueuil Postal Service (Ques.) 80 (i).
——— Wharves, Completion (Ques.) 80 (i).
St. Louis Lake, Construction of Piers (Ques.) 80 (i).

Prior, Mr. E. G., *Victoria, B. C.*
Ammunition manufactured at Que. (remarks) 1222.
Behring's Sea Fisheries, Proclamation of U. S. Govt. (Ques.) 871 (ii).
——— Seizures, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1575 (ii).
Fortifications at Esquimalt, Col. O'Brien's Rep. (Ques.) 1146 (ii).
Militia Clothing, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1569 (ii).
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B. C. and China, &c.) in Com. on Res., 1388; on conc., 1431 (ii).
Pacific Mail Subsidy (Ques.) 34 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1239 (ii).
Militia (Armories, care of Arms, &c.) 794; (Permanent Forces, &c.) 797 (i).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (B.C.) 966 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (Meteorological Service) 976 (ii).
Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Ry. Co.'s (B. 32, 1°*) 138 (i).

Purcell, Mr. P., *Glengarry.*
Cape Breton Ry., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flynn*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1202 (ii).
Laborers Protection (B. 53, 1°) 223 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 1205 (ii).

Putnam, Mr. A., *Hants.*
Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 537 (i).

Rinfret, Mr. C. I., *Lotbinière.*
Atlantic Mail Service (Ques.) 224 (i).
Great Eastern Ry. Subsidy, Pets., Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 20 (i).
Lake St. Peter, Floating Light (Ques.) 979 (ii).
Salmon Rivers in Quebec, Leases, &c. (Ques.) 224 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public—Works Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Quebec) 1517.
Whiskey, Illicit Manufacture, Costs of Suits (Ques.) 935 (ii).

Riopel, Mr. L. J., *Bonaventure.*
Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1041 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1644 (ii).
Three Rivers and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 99, 1°*) 468 (i).

Robertson, Mr. J. E., *King's, P. E. I.*
Bounties to Fishermen, in Com. of Sup., 1076 (ii).
Fishery Bounty, Claims made and rejected in P.E.I., on M. for Ret., 436 (i).
Mount Stewart Wharf, Construction (Ques.) 171 (i).
Murray Harbor South and Montague Mail Service (Ques.) 468 (i).
Piers and Harbors in P.E.I. (M. for Cor.*) 942 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup.. 920 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Salaries, &c.) 1217 (ii).
Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1076 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lights, Fog-whistles, &c.) 976 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Magdalen Islands) 1450; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 1261 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Dredging (N.S., P.E.I. and N.B.) 969. Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 920, 1530 (ii).

Robillard, Mr. H., *Ottawa City.*
Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1491 (ii).

Roome, Mr. W. F., *West Middlesex.*
Can. Temp. Act, distribution of Fines (Ques.) 80 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1129 (ii).
Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 228 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to prop. Res., 92 (i).

Ross, Mr. A. W., *Lisgar.*
Assiniboine Water Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 67, 1°*) 269 (i).
Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 152 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1718 (ii).
——— prop. Res. in Amt. to Com of Sup., 1692 (ii).

Rowand, Mr. J., *West Bruce.*
Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 688 (i).

Rykert, Mr. J. C., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Civil Service, Assessment of Salaries authorisation B. 18 (Mr. *Ellis*) on M. for 2° (objection) 366 (i).
Jesuits' Estates Act, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 816 (ii).
Pub. Accts. (M. to ref. to Com.) 47 (i).
——— (M.) summoning Senator Sanford, 620 (i).
Sunday Traffic on Canals (M. for Cor., &c.*) 304 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Welland) 1515 (ii).
Welland Canal Water Power, Reps. of Engineers, &c. (M. for copies*) 304 (i).

Ste. Marie, Mr. L., *Napierville.*
C.P.R., Sale of $15,000,000 Bonds (Ques.) 841, 1363.
——— Receipts from Sale (M. for Ret.*) 436 (i).

Scarth, Mr. W. B., *Winnipeg.*
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands, 1253 (ii).
Immigration (Agents) 954 (ii).

Scriver, Mr. J., *Huntingdon.*
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 135 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 764 (i), 1330 (ii).
Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 687 (i).
Jesuits' Estates Act, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 893 (ii).
——— on Res. (Mr. *Ross*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1693 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1133 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 264 (i).
SUPPLY:
Indians (Dingman, Inspector, payment) 1451 (ii).

Semple, Mr. A., *Centre Wellington.*
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 718.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 295 (i).

Shanly, Mr. W., *South Grenville.*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. (B. 14, 1°*) 30; in Com., 235; on 3°, 283, 298 (i).
G. T. R., Pets. from Shareholders *re* Subsidies to Rys. (Ques.) 1081 (ii).
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) B. 144 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 1417 (ii).
Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) in Com. on B., 1683 (ii).
Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 152 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1715 (ii).
——— (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1633 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Lachine) 1205; (Williamsburg) 1206 (ii).

Skinner, Mr. C. N., *St. John, N. B., City and County.*
Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1470; in Com., 1472.
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 657 (i).
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1404 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons (Sessional Indemnity) Amt. (B. 111, 1°) 590 (i).
Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) in Com. on Res., 1665; on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1681 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies (Halifax, &c., and West Indies, &c.) 1703 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (N. B.) 1447 (ii).

Small, Mr. J., *East Toronto.*
Lowry, W. G., Relief (B. 119, 1°*) 871 ; 2° m., 992; neg. (Y. 79, N. 80) 995; (M.) to restore B. to Order Paper, 1016; on M. for Com., 1264 (ii).
Middleton, Wm., Relief (B. 125, 1°*) 871; 2° m., 1098.
Ont. and Que. Ry. Co. and Land Security Co. Ratification (B. 66, 1°*) 269 (i).
Telephone, Telegraph and Electric Light Co.'s Wires (B. 78, 1°*) 322 (i).
Toronto Board of Trade (B. 135) M. to suspend Rules and 1°*, 1262 (ii).
Wand, Arthur, Relief (B. 124, 1°*) 871 (ii).

Smith, Sir Donald A., K.C.M.G., *West Montreal.*
Intoxicating Liquors in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1344 (ii).
Marine Hospitals (Ques.) 934 (ii).
Sick and Distressed Mariners Fund (Ques.) 1710 (ii).
Title and Mortgage Insurance Co. (M.) to ref. back to Com., 620 (i).
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 3°, 760 (i).

Smith, Mr. W., *South Ontario.*
Deschenes, Ludger Miville, Amounts paid for Surveys in N.W.T. (Ques.) 1327 (ii).
Pauper Immigration (children) in Com. of Sup., 965.
Wheat and Flour Importations from U.S. (M. for Ret.*) 33 (i).

Somerville, Mr. J., *North Brant.*
Cab-hire, in Com. of Sup., 160 (i).
Chipman, C. C., in Com. of Sup., 200 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 674 (i).
Concurrence, 1611 (ii).
Debates, Official, delay in printing French Edition, 655, 944 (i).
Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1248 (ii).
Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 685 (i).
Govt. Advertising, in Com. of Sup., 1236 (ii).
Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 900 (ii).
—— Pamphlets, in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).
—— Salaries, &c. (Amt.) to M. to conc. in Res. rep. from Com. of Sup., 1613 (ii).
Montreal Flood Commission, Printing Rep. (remarks) 1687 (ii).
Pub. Accts. Com., meeting (remarks) 591 (i).
—— Printing of Evidence, 1366, 1600, 1638 (ii).
Returns in hands of Members (remarks) 1573 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Income (Welland) 1514 (ii).
Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners) 203; (Contingencies) 157, 160, 163; (High Commissioner's Office) 200; (Marine) 1502; (Printing and Stationery) 1503 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands, 1248, 1253. Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1236 (ii).
Immigration (Agents) 959; (Salaries, &c.) conc., 1611; (Amt.) 1613 (ii).

Somerville, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Legislation: House of Commons (Franchise Act) 1512 (ii); (Voters' Lists, Printing) 271; (Printing, Paper and Binding) 272 (i).
Miscellaneous (American Association) 1698 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 215; (Man.) 217 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1524 (ii).
Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 157, 163 (i.)

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. JOSEPH ALDRIC OUIMET) *Laval.*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) objection (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to Amt. to M. for 3° sustained, 283 (i).
Assiniboia (East) Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
Bills, Royal Assent, communications from Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 719 (i) 1262 (ii).
Bills, Second Readings, remarks on protest (Mr. *Mitchell*) 357 (i).
Cape Breton Ry. (remarks) 1574 (ii).
Cardwell, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
Cariboo, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
Civil Service, Assessment of Salaries, authorisation B. 18 (Mr. *Ellis*) on objection to 2° (Ruling) 367 (i).
Colchester, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to ref. to Com. on Banking, &c., 1116 (ii).
Controverted Elections, 1, 2 (i).
Cruelty to Animals B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on M. to restore to Order Paper (Ruling) 368 (i).
Cumberland, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., Amt. (Mr. *Choquette*) ruled out of Order, 934 (ii).
Expropriation of Lands B. 131 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 944 (ii).
Fisheries and Trade Relations with U. S. Members checked, 388 (i).
Halton, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
Jesuits' Estates Act, on notice of prop. Res., 384 (i).
Joliette, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
Lanark (South) Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
Legislative Economy, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Laurier*) Ruling, 783 (i).
Library, Rep. of Joint Librarians (presented) 2 (i).
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 29, 30, 323 (i), 1018, 1467, 1627 (ii).
Mining in Ry. Belt, B. C., remarks declared out of Order, 980 (ii).
Ministerial Changes, irregularity of deb., remarks on, 27 (i).
Montreal (East) Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) remarks on Ques. of Order, 1270 (ii).
New Members, notification of Ret., 1 (i).
Nicolet, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
Northumberland (East) Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
Picton, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret, 229 (i).
Prorogation, communication from Gov. Genl.'s Sec. (read) 1711 (ii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Trow*) Member leaving Seat during Vote, 249 (i).
Procedure, Ques. of (Mr. *Mills*) Ruling, 43 (i).
Provencher, Ret. of Member Elect, 2 (i).
Pub. Accts. Com., meeting, deb. ruled irregular, 501.
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Somerville*) Evidence *re* Mr. Smyth's Account, 1600 (ii).
Shelburne, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
Speech from the Throne (rep.) 2 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Committees, Extra Sess. Clerks, &c.) 271; (Salaries, Clerk's Estimate) 270 (i).
Tenders, Translation of Forms (remarks) 1535 (ii).
Vacancies, notification, 1 (i).
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on prop. M. to ref. B. to Sel. Com., 253 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) in Com., 237; on M. for 3°, 283 (i).
Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to Ref. to Com. on Banking, &c., 1116; on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) for Com., 1442 (ii).
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 128 (i).
Debates, Official, delay in printing (remarks) 945 (ii).
Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 41 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1013, 1022 (ii).
Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 687 (i).
Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 949 (ii).
——— Pamphlets, in Com. of Sup., 276 (i).
Intoxicating Liquors in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1351 (ii).
Lard Adulteration, Imports from U. S. (Ques.) 763 (i).
Lowry, W. G., Relief (B.) Rep. of Com. (presented) 1221 (ii).
Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Girouard*) on M. for 2°, 170 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1282 (ii).
Post Offices built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 232 (i).
Prescott County Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 33 (Mr. *Edwards*) on M. for 2°, 239 (i).
Ry. Act. Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 363 (i).
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 637 (i).
Saw Logs, Export Duty (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1484 (ii).
Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1031 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1637 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Railways and Canals) 1506 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Immigration (Agents) 949 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper and Binding) 276 (i).
Miscellaneous (Griffin, Mr., gratuity) 1454; (St. Catharines Milling Co.'s Costs) 1457 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 220 (i).
Quarantine (Public Health) 933 (ii).
Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1106 (ii).
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 619 (i).

Sutherland, Mr. J., *North Oxford.*
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 779 (i).
Jesuits' Estates Act, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 895 (ii).
Militia Clothing, in Com. of Sup., 1352 (ii).
Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) Survey (Ques.) 1498 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1633 (ii).
South Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 59, 1°*) 269 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1352 (ii).

Stevenson, Mr. J., *West Peterborough.*
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Trent River Nav.) 1208 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Trent) 1495 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1523 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*
Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 687 (i).
Intoxicating Liquors in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1346 (ii).
Jones' Creek, Township of Young, Pets., &c. (M. for Ret.) 540 (i).
King's Co., P. E. I., Representation (prop. Res.) challenging Seat, 169 (i).
Members' Sessional Indemnity (remarks) 1711 (ii).
Montreal Flood Commission, printing Rep. (remarks) 1687 (ii).
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B. C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1383 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Res. (Amt. to Amt.) 89; on M. to adjn., 90; Amt. to Amt. neg. (Y. 58, N. 86) 261; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 263 (i).
Pub. Accts. Com., Printing of Evidence (remarks) 1367 (ii).
Registered Letters, compensation for Loss (Ques.) 525.
St. Lawrence River, Sale of Islands (Ques.) 34 (i).
Sick and Distressed Mariners Fund (Ques.) 1710 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1641 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 294 (i).
Immigration (Agents) 960 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Young and front of Essex Townships, Pets., &c., *re* disallowing Union Act of Ont. Legislature (M. for copies*) 436 (i).

Temple, Mr. T., *York, N. B.*
Fishing Licenses, in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 85 (i).
Short Line Ry., St. Andrews, &c., *vid* Mattawamkeag, &c., on M. for Ret. 549 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1621 (ii).

Thérien, Mr. O., *Montcalm.*
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1280 (ii).
Joliette District Judge, Appointment (Ques.) 170 (i).
Postage Rates, Reduction (Ques.) 34 (i).
Post Offices in Montcalm County (Ques.) 1082 (ii).
Sawdust in Rivers, prevention (Ques.) 1082 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir John S. D., K. C. M. G., *Antigonish.*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) in Com., 235 (i).
Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 538 (ii).
Atlantic and North-West Ry. Co.'s B. 65 (Mr. *Hall*) in Com., 754 (i).
Bagwell, G. McD., Relief B. 123 (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) in Com., 1234 (ii).
Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1582.
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., (B. 5, 1°) 14; 2° m., 194; M. for Com., 775; in Com., 778 (i); wthdn., 1629 (ii).
Bills of Lading (B. 92, 1°*) 369 (i); 2° m., 1691 (ii).
C. P. R. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 1097 (ii).
——— Rys. Crossing in Man., Validity of Act (Ans.) 20 (i).
Can. Temp. Act, distribution of Fines (Ans.) 80 (i), 1533 (ii).
Channel Subway Co.'s Act, disallowance (Ans.) 1628.
Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. *Wallace*) M. to trnsfr. to Govt. Orders, 1328; M. for Com., 1437; in Com., 1446; on M. for 3°, 1468; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1689 (ii).
Commercial Laws of Dom., Codification (Ans.) 194 (i)
Concurrence, 1615 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. (Ans.) 224 (i).
Corrupt Practices in Municipal Affairs (B. 71, 1°*) 303; 2° m., 502; in Com., 503 (i).
Corrupt Practices Trials, Counsel's Instructions (Ans.) 427 (i).
Copyright Act Amt. (B. 101, 1°) 524; 2° m., 1399; in Com., 1401; on M. for 3°, 1463; M. to ref. back to Com., 1465, 1466; in Com., 1467 (ii).
County Court Judges for B. C., Appointment (Ans.) 80 (i).

Thompson, Hon. Sir John S. D.—*Continued.*
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 246; on M. that Com. rise, 359 (i).
Cullers Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. *Costigan*) 2° m. and in Com., 1536 (ii).
Defence of Indian charged with Shooting (Ans.) 935 (ii).
Dom. Police, Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 3 (i).
Escapes and Rescues Act Amt. (B. 140, 1°*) 1363 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act Amt. (B. 109, 1°) 589; in Com., 787 (i).
Expropriation of Lands (B. 131, 1°) 943; in Com., 1266, 1331 (ii).
Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84, M. to trnsfr. to Govt. Orders, 1395; 2° m., 1468; in Com., 1480 (ii).
First Offenders Conditional Release (B. 91, 1°*) 369; 2° m., 504 (i).
Fisheries and Trade Relations with U.S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 411 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. (B. 4, 1°) 14 (i); on M. for 2°, 980; in Com., 1008, 1019, 1125; on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) 1281 (ii).
Gowan, Hon. J. R., Senator, Pension (Ans.) 676 (i).
House of Commons Act Amt. (B. 108, 1°) 589, in Com., 785 (i).
Interest Act Amt. (B. 132, 1°*) 979; 2° m., 1130; in Com., 1331 (ii).
Intoxicating Liquors in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1336 (ii).
James, Mr. Justice, leave of Absence (Ans.) 526 (i).
Joliette District Judge, Appointment (Ans.) 170 (i).
Jesuits' Estates Act (Ans.) 79 (i).
——— on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 856 (ii).
Judges' (Provincial) Salaries (prop. Res.) 557 (i); M. for Com., 1687 (ii).
Kootenay and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s B. 15 (Mr. *Mara*) in Com., 238 (i).
Laborers Protection B. 53 (Mr. *Purcell*) on 2° being called (remarks) 384 (i).
L'Ardoise Breakwater, on M. for copies of Surveys, &c., 696 (i).
Larue, Casgrain, Angers & Hamel, Law Fees paid (Ans.) 347 (i).
Lebourdais Bros., Cor. *re* Trial (Ans.) 16 (i).
Legal Fees and Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 49, 52 (i).
Legislation Expenses (prop. Res.) 701 (i).
Liquor Permits in N. W. T., on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 556 (i).
Loan (3 per cent.) of 1883, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to. Com. of Sup., 1163 (ii).
Lowry, W. G., Relief B. 119 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 992, 1160; on M. for Com., 1264; (Amt.) 6 m. h., (neg. Y. 55, N. 69) 1265 (ii).
Massawippi Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2°, 239 (i).
Mennonite Immigrants Loan B. 138 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1399 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir John S. D.—*Continued.*
Milk (Adulteration) prevention of Fraud B. 16 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 259 (i).
Mining in Ry. Belt., B. C. (remarks) 980 (ii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1°, 1262 (ii).
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B. C. and China, &c.) on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) to conc. in Res., 1432 (ii)
Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 169 (i).
Protection of Fishermen (remarks) 1575 (ii).
Public Matters (enquiries) further provision (B. 72, 1°*) 303; 2° m., 504 (i).
Queen's College (Kingston) Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 605 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 365 (i); on M. for Com. (Amt.) 6 m. h. agreed to on a div., 1100 (ii).
Ry. Employés protection B. 53 (Mr. *Purcell*) 1462 (ii).
Rules of Court, Criminal Matters (B. 55, 1°*) 247; in Com., 502 (i).
St. Catharines Milling Co., Legal Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 52 (i).
Scugog River (Ans.) 1533 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons (Sessional Allowances) Act Amt. (B. 120) in Com. on Res. and 1°* of B., 787 (i); in Com., 911 (ii).
Speedy Trials Act (Indictable Offences) Amt. (B. 17, 1°) 33; 2° m., 195; in Com., 470 (i).
Summary Convictions Act Amt. (B. 126, 1°*) 1081; in Com., 1266 (ii).
——— Trials Act Amt. (B. 121, 1°*) 811; in Com., 912 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Exchequer Court) 205; (Miscellaneous Expenditure in N. W. T.) 205; (Supreme Court) 205; (Vice-Admiralty Court) 206 (i).
Charges of Management (Brokerage and Commission) 204 (i).
Civil Government (Justice) 49; (Penitentiaries Branch) 54 (i).
Dominion Police, 211 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Franchise Act) 1511 (ii).
Miscellaneous: (Labor Commission) 1497; (St. Catharines Milling Co.'s Costs) 1455 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 222 (i); (Dorchester) 1507 (ii); (Kingston) 211 (i), 1509, conc., 1615 (ii); (Man.) 217 (i), 1507 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 1315, 1510 (ii).
Public Works — Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1527 (i); (Que.) 806 (i).
Supreme and Exchequer Court Act Amt. (B. 105, 1°) 556; 2° m., 787 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 50 (i).
Tolls and Dues Act Amt. (B. 122) 2° m., 912 (ii).
Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1102 (ii).
Western Counties Ry. (B. 127, 1°) 871; 2° m., 1043.
Whiskey, Illicit Manufacture, Costs of Suit (Ans.) 935.
Winding-up Act Amt. (B. 98, 1°) 424; in Com., 660.

Tisdale, Mr. D., *South Norfolk.*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) in Com., 236 (i).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry. Subsidy and G. T. R., on M. for Cor., 87 (i).

Tisdale, Mr. D.—*Continued.*
Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Sir *John Thompson*) 1368, in Com., 1446 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals Prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 6 m. h., 242; neg. (Y. 71, N. 72) 247; in Com., 357; (M. that Com. rise) 359; agreed to, 362; on M. to restore to Order Paper (Amt.) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 91, N. 92) 368; M. that Com. rise, 607 (i).
Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1473 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1020, 1022 (ii).
Lowry, W. G., Relief B. 119 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 994 (ii).
Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Girouard*) on M. for 2°, 170 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 364 (i).
Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1591 (ii).

Trow, Mr. J., *South Perth.*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) in Com., 235; on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to M. for 3°, 283 (i).
Annunciation Day, on M. for adjnmt., 782 (i).
Cascumpeque Harbor, dismissal of Blasting Foreman (Ques.) 348 (i).
Cornwall and Galops Canals, enlargement, Tenders (M. for copies*) 943 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on M to restore to Order Paper (Ques. of Procedure) 368 (i).
Debates, Official, delay in printing (remarks) 946 (ii).
Dom. Life Assurance Co.'s (B. 24, 1°*) 47 (i).
Exports of Manufactures to Australia (Ques.) 1423 (ii).
Fishing Licenses in River Natashquan (Ques.) 1627.
Gannon Narrows Floating Bridge (Ques.) 1627 (ii).
Gowan, Hon. J. R., Senator, Pension (Ques.) 676 (i).
Grazing Leases cancelled in Alberta (Ques.) 935 (ii).
I. C. R., Macdonald, A. R., Superintendent, Pet. of Employés (Ques.) 248 (i).
Lake St. John Mail Service (Ques.) 1628 (ii).
Logan, Wm., Mail Contractor at Pickering Village, Sureties (Ques.) 677 (i).
Members' Sessional Indemnity (remarks) 1710 (ii).
Montreal Flood Commission, printing Rep. (remarks) 1687 (ii).
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1391 (ii).
Pagans in Joliette County (Ques.) 1710 (ii).
Pairs (personal explanation) 1574 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 1°, 369 (i).
——— Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 233 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) Rules of the House, 249 (i).
Prorogation (closing remarks) 1724 (ii).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Ry. and Steamboat Co.'s B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1707 (ii).

Trow, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Repatriation of French Canadians (Ques.) 677 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Tenders for construction (M. for copies*) 943 (ii).
Sawdust, &c., in Ottawa River, Rep. of Engineer (Ques.) 370 (i).
Senator for Shawinigan District (Ques.) 1628 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1236 (ii).
Immigration (Agents) 958 (ii).
Militia (Armories, care of Arms, &c.) 794; Drill Sheds, &c.) 795 (i).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 222; (Kingston) 214 (i).
Title and Mortgage Guarantee Co.'s incorp. B. 114 (Mr. *Macdowall*) on M. for 2°, 676 (i).

Tupper, Hon. C. H., *Pictou.*
Adams, Seizure of, Papers, &c., respecting (remarks) 1463 (ii).
Arthabaska Fishery Overseer, Appointment (Ans.) (302) (i).
Bass Fishing Permits, Lake Erie (Ans.) 1081 (ii).
Behring's Sea Seizures, paragraph in *Empire* 287 (i).
Belleville Harbor (B. 116, 1°) 762 (i); in Com., 1043.
Bounties to Fishermen, distribution, in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
Campbell, Capt. R., dismissal, on M. for Cor., &c., 742.
Cape Enragé Lighthouse, change of Keeper (Ans.) 841 (ii).
Chipman, C. C., in Com. of Sup., 140, 143, 145, 196 (i).
Concurrence, 1607 (ii).
Cruiser, Govt. Steamer, Engineer's Certificate (Ans.) 739 (i).
Engineers (stationery) Examination and Licensing B. 8 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 1103; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 1109 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 129, 1°) 911; in Com, 1045; on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 6 m. h., 1119; on M. to adjn. deb., 1124 (ii).
Fisheries, deptl. Rep. (presented) 1150 (ii).
——— in Lunenburg County, on M. for Cor., 941 (ii).
——— and *Modus Vivendi* (Ans.) 30 (i).
Fishery Bounty, Claims made and rejected in P. E. I., on M. for Ret. 435 (i).
——— Commissioner (Assistant) P.E.I., appointment (Ans.) 171 (i).
——— Overseer, Arthabaska, Revenue, Salary, Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 80 (i),
Fishing Licenses in River Natashquan (Ans.) 1627 (ii).
——— River Matane (Ans.) 171, 469 (i).
——— Inland Waters, Ont., on M. for Ret., 84 (i).
——— Regulations in Berthier, &c., on M. for copies of Cor., 746 (i).
Fish Propagation in N. W. T. (Ans.) 740 (i).
Hospital Dues on Ships, collection (Ans.) 302 (i).
Lake St. John, Buoys and Lights (Ans.) 1146 (ii).
Lake St. Louis, Buoys and Lights (remarks) 1574, 1652.
Lake St. Peter, Floating Light (Ans.) 979 (ii).
Lobster Factories in P. E. I., number, &c., on M. for Ret., 31 (i).

Tupper, Hon. C. H.—*Continued.*
Marine, deptl. Rep. (presented) 2 (i).
——— Hospitals (Ans.) 934 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. (B. 26, 1°) 79; 2° m., 195 (i); in Com., 655; on Sen. Amts., 1029.
Montreal Harbor Commissioners' Act Amt. (B. 103, 1°) 524; 2° m., 774 (i).
——— Police (Ans.) 1423; (remarks) 1574, 1687 (ii).
Pilots, average Amounts received (Ans.) 1146 (ii).
Pope, Mr. (Dep. Com. of Patents) in Com. of Sup., 73, 75 (i).
Protection of Fishermen (remarks) 1575 (ii)
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 472.
Saguenay River Buoys and Lights, (Ans.) 1422, 1446.
Salmon Rivers in Que., Leases, &c. (Ans.) 224.
Sawdust in Canadian Rivers, Fines for violation of Law (Ans.) 591 (i).
——— in Ottawa River (Ans.) 223 (i).
——— prevention (Ans.) 1082 (ii).
Scott, Capt., Superannuation, in Com. of Sup., 146. (i).
Seamen Shipping in U. S. Vessels, Instructions to Shipping-masters (Ans.) 469 (i).
Ships' Safety Act Amt. (B. 54, 1°) 223 (i); 2° m., 1029; in Com., 1032 (ii).
Sick and Distressed Mariners Fund (Ans.) 1710 (ii).
Smelt Fishing, in Com. of Sup., 141 (i).
St. Clair River, Stag Island Lighthouse (Ans.) 224 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 130, 1°) 911; in Com., 1044 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1625 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Agriculture) 73; (High Commissioner's, Office) 196 (i); (Marine) 138, 142 (i).
Fisheries (Salaries) 1074; conc., 1607 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lights, Fog-whistles, &c.) 975, 1361, 1450 (ii).
Marine Hospitals (Marine and Immigrant, Que.) 976; (Que., N.S., P.E.I. and B.C.) 977 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Litigation) 1460 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers) 974; (River and Water Police) 975; (Wrecks and Shipping Disasters) 975 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 808 (i), 912 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (Meteorological Service) 976 (ii).

Turcot, Mr. G., *Megantic.*
Arthabaska Fishery Overseer, Appointment (Ques.) 302.
Fishery Overseer, Arthabaska, Revenue, Salary, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 80 (i).
Larue, Casgrain, Angers & Hamel, Law Fees paid (Ques.) 347 (i).
Letter Postage, Reduction of Rates (Ques.) 80 (i).
Lourdes and Somerset Mail Service (M. for Cor.) 751.
Mail Carriage, Bécancour Station and Ste Julie de Somerset, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 304 (i).

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., *South Simcoe.*
Militia Clothing, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1568 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration, 951 (i).
Indians (Oka Indians, removal) 1172 (ii).

Vanasse, Mr. F., *Yamaska.*
Cheese Exports to Eng. (Ques.) 1180 (ii).
Manuscripts respecting Can. Copying (Ques.) 1363.
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1634 (ii).
Volunteers' (9th Battalion) discipline (Ques.) 1327 (i).

Waldie, Mr. J., *Halton.*
Franchise, Electoral, Act. Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1005; in Com., 1014, 1023 (ii).
Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, on prop. Res (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1162 (ii).
Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1493 (ii).
Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1031; in Com., 1035 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Marine) 144 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Public Works (Slides and Booms) 1231 (ii).
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 254; in Com., 612.

Wallace, Mr. N. C., *West York, Ont.*
Business of the House, on adjnmt. (remarks) 762 (i).
Combinations in Trade (B. 11, 1°) 19; Order for 2° read (remarks) 382 (i); 2° m., 1111; on M. to ref. to Com. on Banking, &c., 1115; on M. for Com., 1440; in Com., 1446; on Sen. Amts., 1689 (ii).
Jesuits' Estates Act, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 834 (ii).
Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Denison*) M. to ref. back to Standing Com., 754 (i).

Watson, Mr. R., *Marquette.*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) on M. for 3°, 282; (Amt.) to recom., 298; neg. (Y. 49, N. 97) 299 (i).
Bedson, S. L., Appointment in Militia Force (Ques.) 1328 (ii).
——— Appointment as A.D.C., in Com. of Sup., 1507.
Bresaylor Half-breeds, Claims for Losses (Ques.) 1082.
Concurrence, 1607, 1609 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1537 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1252 (ii).
Engineers (stationary) Examination and Licensing B. 8 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 1109 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 999; in Com., 1014; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1281 (ii)
Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 955, 1324 (ii).
——— Pamphlets, in Com. of Sup., 276 (i).
Lake Manitoba Ry. and Canal Co.'s incorp. (B. 62, 1°*) 269 (i).
Land Board, Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 61 (i).
Legislative Assembly in N. W. T., Memorials, on M. for copies, 375 (i).

Watson, Mr. R.—*Continued.*
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1417 (ii).
Mennonite Immigrants Loan B. 138 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com. on Res., 1268 (ii).
Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1273 (ii).
——— punishment of Constables, &c., on M. for Ret., 431 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com., 1135; on M. for 3° (Amt.) neg. on a div., 1283 (ii).
Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 233 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Ry. and Steamboat Co.'s B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1708 (ii).
Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 152 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1713; in Com. on B., 1721 (ii).
——— (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1640 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 293 (i).
Civil Government (Interior) 61, 65; (Mounted Police) 153 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Dom. Lands) 1252, 1254, conc., 1609; (Post Office) 1461 (ii).
Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1078, conc., 1607 (ii).
Geological Survey, 1080 (ii).
Immigration (Agents) 955, 1324 (ii).
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 1175, 1595; (Industrial Schools) 1177 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper and Binding) 276 (i).
Militia (Military College) 1361 (ii).
Miscellaneous (American Association) 1699; (Banff: Roads, Bridges, &c.) 1216; (Commercial Agencies) 1180; (Half-breeds, relief) 1461; (Lands, C. P. R. Belt) 1571; (St. Catharines Milling Co.'s Costs) 1457 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Manitoba) 1507 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Dredging (Lake Man.) 970. Harbors and Rivers (Man.) 931. Roads and Bridges, 971, 1532 (ii).
Winnipeg and Assinboine Water Power (B. 63, 1°*) 269 (i).

Weldon, Mr. C. W., *St. John, N.B., City and County.*
Albert Ry. Co., Balance of Grant (Ques.) 348 (i).
American Fishing Vessels, authority to Enter and Clear (Ques.) 348 (i).
Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1580.
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 776; in Com., 778 (i).
Bills of Lading B. 92 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1691 (ii)
Business of the House (remarks) on adjnmt., 761 (i).
Cape Enragé Lighthouse, change of Keeper (Ques.) 841 (ii).
Civil Service, Assessment of Salaries, authorisation B. 18 (Mr. *Ellis*) on objection to 2°, 366 (i).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 101 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1401 (ii).
Corrupt Practices in Municipal Affairs B. 71 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 504 (i).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on M. that Com. rise, 360 (i).

Weldon, Mr. C. W.—*Continued.*

Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1142.
Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1470; in Com., 1471.
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1046; on M. for 3°, 1117; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 1118; neg. (Y. 72, N. 108) 1125 (ii).
Fishing Licenses in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 83 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 989; in Com., 1009, 1020, 1126 (ii).
Interior Dept., Clerks employed (Ques.) 1328 (ii).
Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. for Sup., 1160 (ii).
Lowry, W. G., Relief B. 119 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 994 (ii).
Lumber Shipments from N. B. to U. S. (Ques.) 935.
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 659 (i).
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1402, 1413 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1131; in Com. on B., 1136 (ii).
Queen's College (Kingston) Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 301, 605 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 316 (i).
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 735 (i).
Rolling Stock, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1054 (ii).
St. John Harbor, Rep. of H. F. Perley (M. for Ret.*) 304 (i).
Saw Logs, &c., Exported and Duty collected (M. for Ret.*) 304 (i).
Seamen, Shipping in U. S. Vessels, Instructions to Shipping-masters (Ques.) 468 (i).
Seizure of British Schooner by U. S. Cutter *Woodbine*, despatch respecting (read) 510 (i).
Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) in Com. on Res., 1660; on M. to conc. in Res., 1669; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 34, N. 70) 1678; in Com. on B., 1685 (ii).
Speedy Trials of Indictable Offences B. 17 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 472 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1500, 1619, 1650; in Com. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 27, N. 48) 1636 (ii).
Summary Convictions Act Amt. B. 126 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1266 (ii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 105 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 787 (i).
Supreme Court (B. 95, 1°*) 370 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Supreme Court Reps., Printing, &c.) 205 (i).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Colonial and Indian Exhibition) 1512 (ii).
Civil Government (Marine) 147; (Railways and Canals) 1504 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Excise, 1223; (Preventive Service) 1225. Customs (Miscellaneous) 1461. Minor Revenues, 1495. Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1239, 1596 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Magdalen Islands) 1261 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. C. W.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Marine Hospitals (Que., N.S., N.B. and P. E. I.) 978 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1214 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (additional, Ottawa) 800 (i); (B. C.) 1528 (ii): (N. B.) 806 (i). Dredging (N. S., P, E. I. and N. B.) 969. Harbors and Rivers (N. B.) 924, 1447, 1530 (ii).
Railways—Capital (I.C.R.) 1597; (accommodation at Moncton) 1049; (Rolling Stock) 1054 (ii).
Winding-up Act Amt. B. 98 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 660 (i).
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters, B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 614 (i).

Weldon, Mr. R. C., *Albert.*

Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on M. to restore to Order Paper, 368 (i).
Extradition Act, extension of provisions (B. 84, 1°) 346 (i); on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) for 2°, 1469; in Com., 1471, 1476, 1479 (ii).
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1414, 1417 (ii).
Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1593 (ii).
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters, B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 615, 618 (i).

Welsh, Mr. W., *Queen's, P.E.I.*

China Point Piers, Repairs, &c. (Ques) 621 (i).
Dredge *Prince Edward*, Repairs, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 31 (i).
Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 44 (i).
Hickey Wharf, Repairs (Ques.) 621 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 656, 658 (i).
New London Breakwater, Repairs (Ques.) 620 (i).
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1389, 1393, 1413 (ii).
Piers and Wharves in P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 148 (i)
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 921, 1222 (ii).
Pinette and Wood Island Harbor, Surveys (Ques.) 621.
Returns (enquiry) 621 (i).
Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1034 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Marine) 147; (Public Works) 148 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers) 974 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Cape Tormentine) 802; (Kingston Graving Dock) 801 (i). *Income:* Buildings (P. E. I.) 1519. Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 920, 926 (ii).

White, Mr. P., *North Renfrew.*

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) in Com., 235 (i).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 779 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 669 (i).
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 125 (i).

White, Mr. P.—*Continued.*
Cullers Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res. 1366; in Com. on B., 1536 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 982 (ii).
Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888 on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. on Sup., 1167 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1130; in Com. on B., 1134; on M. for 3° (Amt.) neg. (Y. 55, N. 85) 1281 (ii).
Public Accts. Com., Printing of Evidence (remarks) 1368 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. (B. 115, 1°*) 782 (i).
——— B. 115 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 1283 (ii).
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 495.
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1631, 1685 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Public Works (Slides and Booms) 1230.
Immigration, 952 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Roads and Bridges (Ottawa City and River) 1449 (ii).
Timber and Lumber Inspection Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 662, 666 (i).
Union Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 79, 1°*) 322; on Amt. (Mr. *Bryson*) to M. for 3°, 855 (ii).

White, Mr. R. S., *Cardwell.*
Address, The (moved) 3 (i).
Montreal Harbor Police (Ques.) 1423 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. J. C., *Argenteuil.*
Engineers (stationary) Examination and Licensing B. 8 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 1109 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. J. H., *East Elgin.*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) on M for 3°, 286 (i).
Cab-hire, in Com. of Sup., 160, 168.
Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Sen. Amts., 1690 (ii).
Cosgrove, John, of Buckingham, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 224 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 991 996, (ii).
——— in Com., 1019, 1025 (ii).
Grosse, John A., employment by Govt. (Ques.) 171 (i).
Immigration Pamphlets, in Com. of Sup., 276 (i).
Independent Order of Foresters B. 74 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 755 (i).
Inspectors of Hulls, Names, &c., of Commissioners (M. for Ret.*) 943 (ii).
Labor Commission, Legislation (Ques.) 1422 (ii).
Middleton, W. H., Relief B. 125 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 1098 (ii).
Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 772 (i).
Permanent Forces, Expenditure for Repairs on Works (Ques.) 171 (i).

Wilson, Mr. J. H.—*Continued.*
Pork Duties, Increase (Ques.) 1146 (ii).
Repatriation of French Canadians (Ques.) 677 (i).
Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1038 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1620, 1633 (ii).
Sultana Island, Lake of the Woods, Sale (Ques.) 426.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Health Statistics) 287 (i);
Charges of Management (Printing Dom. Notes) 205 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 71; (Contingencies) 156, 158, 160, 168; (Militia and Defence) 55 (i); (Railways and Canals) 1505 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Salaries, &c.) 1230. Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1234. Weights and Measures, 1496 (ii).
Immigration (Agents) 957, 1324 (ii).
Indians (Industrial Schools) 1178 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Returning Officers) 1362, 1511; (Printing, Paper and Binding) 276 (i).
Miscellaneous (Banff: Roads, Bridges, &c.) 1215; (Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c.) 1179; (Jukes, Dr., services) 1571 (ii).
Militia (Permanent Forces, &c.) 799 (i).
Mounted Police, 1213 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 211; (Man.) 220 (i), 1508 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 1510 (ii).
Pensions (Rebellion, N.W.T.) 791 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 1528; (Ont.) 1520. Dredging (N. S., P. E. I. and N. B.) 969. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 929 (ii).
Quarantine (Public Health) 932 (ii).
Threats, Intimidations, &c., Amt. (B. 102, 1°) 524 (i).
Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 156 (i).
Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1102 (ii).

Wood, Mr. J. F., *Brockville.*
Electoral, Franchise, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1021 (ii).
Private Bills Pets. (M. to extend time) 30 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors (Amt.) to prop. Res., 89; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 264; Amt. agreed to (Y. 99, N. 59) 269 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 793 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Public Works (Esquimalt and Lévis Graving Docks) 1232 (ii).
Wrecking, &c., in Can. Waters B. 7 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 257 (i).

Wood, Mr. J., *Westmoreland.*
Corn, Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 129 (i).
N. B. and P. E. I. Ry. Co.'s (B. 21, 1°*) 47 (i).
Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdon) in Com. on Res., 1411 (ii).
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 621.
Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1672 (ii).

Yeo, Mr. J., *Prince, P.E.I.*
Campbell, Capt. R., dismissal, on M. for Cor., &c., 743.

INDEX-PART II.

SUBJECTS[1]

ADAMS, A. & J., CLAIMS FOR LOSS OF "CARRIER DOVE": M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1182 (ii).

"ADAMS," SEIZURE OF, PAPERS, &c.: Remarks on adjumt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1402 (ii).

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EX'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 3; seconded (Mr. *Lépine*) 6 (i).

——— His Ex.'s Reply, 323 (i).

AIRD, W. B., JR., NAMES OF SURETIES FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 1017 (ii).

ADJOURNMENT, ANNUNCIATION DAY: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 782 (i).

——— ASH WEDNESDAY: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*)) 436.

——— GOOD FRIDAY: Remarks, 1235; M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1330 (ii).

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 205 (i), 1362.

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 2; *pro forma.*

ADULTERATION OF FOOD: in Com. of Sup., 1227 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION:

- ARTISANS, IMPORTATION: attention of Govt. called to advertisement (Mr. *McKay*) 1668 (ii).
- EXPERIMENTAL FARM, CENTRAL, EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 436 (i).
- ——— COST, &c.: Ques (Mr *McMillan, Huron*) 225 (i).
- ——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 235 (i).
- ——— EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 428, 525 (i).
- IMMIGRANTS, ARRIVALS FROM '67 to '89, NUMBER, &c: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Brien*) 304 (i).
- MANUSCRIPTS RESPECTING CANADA, COPYING: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 1363 (ii).
- POPE, MR. (Dep. Com. of Patents): in Com. of Sup., 71-78 (i).
- POPULATION OF DOM. BY PROVINCES: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 170 (i).
- SEED WHEAT, PAYMENT BY SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr *La Rivière*) 580 (i).
- SMYTH, HENRY, OF CHATHAM, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 224 (ii).
- WEBSTER, W. A., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT., AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 979 (i).
- STEIN, LEONCE, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1533 (ii)
- ——— SUMS PAID FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 303; M. for Ret.,* 303 (i).

Alberta and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s B. No. 49 (Mr. *Davies*). 1°*, 232; 2°*, 397; in Com. and 3°*, 754 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1056 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 65.)

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. B. No. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*). 1°*, 30; 2°*, 33; in Com., 235; 3° m., 282; agreed to (Y. 49, N. 37) 299 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 50.)

ALBERT RY. CO., BALANCE OF GRANT: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 348 (i).

ALBERT SOUTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396; in Com., 1500 (ii).

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCIENCE: in Com. of Sup., 1697.

AMERICAN FI-HING VESSELS, AUTHORITY TO ENTER AND CLEAR: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 348 (i).

AMHERSTBURG, LAKE SHORE AND BLENHEIN RY. CO'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1643 (ii).

AMMUNITION, CLOTHING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 793 (i), 1352.

AMMUNITION MANUFACTURED AT QUEBEC: Remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1222 (ii).

ANGERS.: *See* "Larue."

ANNAPOLIS AND LIVERPOOL RY. SURVEY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 943 (ii).

ANNUITIES TO INDIANS UNDER ROBINSON TREATY: in Com. of Sup., 1171 (ii).

——— ARREARS: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 937 (ii).

ANNUNCIATION DAY, ADJMNT.: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 782 (i).

ARCHIBALD, SIR ADAMS G., MEMBER FOR COLCHESTER: introduced, 1 (i).

ARICHAT WEST, BREAKWATER: Ques. (Gen. *Laurie*)841 (ii).

ARMORIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 793 (i).

ATHABASKA FISHERY OVERSEER, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 302 (i).

ARTISANS, IMPORTATION: attention of Govt. called to advertisement (Mr. *McKay*) 1668 (ii).

ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 287 (i), 1512; conc., 1598 (ii).

ASH WEDNESDAY, ADJMNT.: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 436.

Assets and Debenture Co. of Can. incorp. B. No. 22 (Mr. *Edgar*). 1°*, 47; 2°*, 170; in Com. and 3°*, 509 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 90.)

ASSINIBOIA (EAST) RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

Assiniboia, Edmonton and Unjiga Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 19 (Mr. *Dawson*). 1°*, 47; 2°*, 170; 3°*, 357 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 53).

Assiniboine Water Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 67 (Mr. *Ross*). 1°*, 269; 2°*, 357; in Com. and 3°*, 921 (ii) (52 *Vic., c.* 88.)

Atlantic and North-West Ry. Co.'s B. No. 65 (Mr. *Hall*). 1°*, 269; 2°*, 357; in Com., 753; 3°*, 754 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 71.)

ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Que.*) 224 (i).

AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 66 (i).

——— REP.: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 13 (i).

Bagwell, Geo. McD. *See* "DIVORCE."

BAIE DES CHALEURS RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: 1st prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396; in Com., 1500 (ii).

——— 2nd prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1643 (ii).

BALLOT BOX, WADDELL'S PATENT: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Brown*) 24 (i).

——— M. (Mr. *Hesson*) to add names to Sel. Com., 105 (i).

BALLOT IN N.W.T., LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 525 (i).

BALTIC (P.E.I.) POST OFFICE, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1423 (ii).

BANFF: SURVEYS, ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com of Sup., 1180 (ii).

BANNERMAN, WM., LATE POSTMASTER AT CALGARY, DEFALCATION: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 677 (i).

Baptist Convention of Ont. and Que. B. No. 30 (Mr. *Denison*). 1°*, 138; 2°*, 239; in Com. and 3°*, 397 (i), (52 *Vic., c.* 105.)

BARNARD, FRANK S., ESQ., MEMBER FOR CARIBOO: introduced, 33 (i).

BAR OF QUEBEC, DISALLOWANCE OF ACT, O.C., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 303 (i).

BASS FISHING PERMITS, LAKE ERIE: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1081 (ii).

Bay of Quinté Bridge Co.'s B. No. 75 (Mr. *Corby*) 1°*, 322; 2°*, 397; in Com. and 3°*, 663 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 87.)

BEACH LOTS IN QUEBEC, O.C., COR., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 303 (i).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 34 (i).

——— OPENING OF NAV.: Telegram read (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1285 (ii).

——— REP. OF ENGINEER CRAWFORD, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 304 (i).

BEDSON, S. L., APPOINTMENT IN MILITIA FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 1328 (ii).

——— APPOINTMENT AS A. D. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1507 (ii)

BEEF SUPPLIES TO INDIANS IN N. W. T.: M. for Tenders* (Mr. *Edgar*) 942 (ii).

BEER (4 per cent.) IMPORTED INTO N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 525 (i).

BEHRING'S SEA FISHERIES, PROCLAMATION BY U. S. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 811 (ii).

——— PARAGRAPH IN "EMPIRE" NEWSPAPER: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 287 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 871 (ii).

——— SEIZURES: on M. for Com. of Sup., remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1582 (ii).

BELL CREEK (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 347 (i).

BELLE VALLÉE POST OFFICE, CHANGE OF LOCATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 943 (ii).

BELLEVILLE AND NORTH HASTINGS RY. SUBSIDY AND G. T. R.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Burdett*) 85 (i).

BELLEVILLE DRILL SHED, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 80 (i).

Belleville Harbor B. No 116 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 762; 2° and in Com., 1042; 3°*, 1043 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 35.)

BELLY RIVER BRIDGE AT LETHBRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 1532 (ii).

Benevolent Societies B. No. 94 (Mr. *Dickinson*). 1°*, 370 (i).

Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. *Bowman*). 1°*, 269; 2°*, 357; in Com, and 3°*, 663 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 75)

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald.*)

1°*, 2 (i); *pro forma.*

BILL (No. 2) to permit Foreign Vessels to Aid vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian Waters.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)

1°*, 13; 2° m., 250: 2° and M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 255; agreed to, 256; Rep. of Sel. Com. presented, 384; in Com. on B., 607; 3° m., 755; Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to recom., 757; neg. (Y. 56, N. 108) 761; 3°, 761 (i).

BILL (No. 3) To make further provision as to the prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and to amend Chap. 172 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, respecting Cruelty to Animals.—(Mr. *Brown.*)

1°, 13; 2° m., 240: Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., 242; neg. (Y. 71, N. 72) 247; 2°, 247; in Com., 357; M. to further consdr. B. in Com., 367; Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 91, N. 92) 368; further consdrn. agreed to (Y. 96, N. 92) 368; in Com. and M. that Com. rise agreed to, 607 (i).

BILL (No. 4) Further to amend the Revised Statutes, Chap. 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)

1°, 14 (i); 2° m., 930; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 986; further consdrn. rsmd. 996; Amt. neg. (Y. 75, N. 105) 1007; 2° and in Com., 1008, 1019, 1125; 3° m., 1278; Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1279; neg. (Y. 59, N. 88) 1280; Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 88) 1280; 3°*, 1281 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 9.)

BILL (No. 5) Relating to Bills of Exchange, Cheques and Promissory Notes —(Sir *John Thompson.*)

1°, 14; 2°, 194; M. for Com., 775; in Com., 778, 788, (i); wthdn., 1629 (ii).

BILL (No. 6) To prevent the practice of Fraud by Tree Peddlers and Commission Men in the Sale of Nursery Stock.—(Mr. *Boyle.*)

1°*, 13 (i); 2° m., 1100; Amt. (Mr. *Brown*) 6 m. h., neg. on a div., 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1102 (ii).

BILL (No. 7) To admit vessels registered in the United States of America to Wrecking, Towing and Coasting Privileges in Canadian Waters.—(Mr. *Patterson, Essex.*)

1°, 15; 2° m., 256; Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to adjn. deb., 258; agreed to, 259 (i); wthdn., 1107 (ii).

BILL (No. 8) To provide for the Examination and Licensing of all persons employed as Stationary Engineers, and

all persons having charge of Steam Boilers or other devices under pressure.—(Mr. *Cook.*)
1°, 17 (i); 2° m., 1107; Amt. (Mr. *Tupper*) 6 m. h., 1109; agreed to on a div., 1111 (ii).

BILL (No. 9) To amend The Railway Act.—(Mr. *Cook.*)
1°, 17; 2°, 362 (i); M. for Com, 1099; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., agreed to on a div., 1100 (ii).

BILL (No. 10) To amend Chapter 127 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled: An Act respecting Interest.—(Mr. *Landry*)
1°, 19 (i).

BILL (No. 11) For the Prevention and Suppression of Combinations formed in Restraint of Trade.—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°, 19; Order for 2° read, 382 (i); 2° m., 1111; 2°, 1117; Govt. Order (Sir *John Thompson*)—in Com., 1368; M. for Com., 1437; in Com., 1446; 3°, 1468; Sen. Amts. consdrd., 1689; conc. in, 1691 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 41.)

BILL (No. 12) To ensure regular crossing facilities between the City of Quebec and Town of Lévis.—(Mr. *Choquette.*)
1°*, 29 (i).

BILL (No. 13) To require the Owners of Elevators and Hoists to guard against Accidents.—(Mr. *Madill.*)
1°*, 29; 2°*, 260 (i).

BILL (No. 14) To incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Shanly.*)
1°*, 30; 2°*, 33; in Com., 235; 3° m., 282; agreed to (Y. 49, N. 97) 299 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 50)

BILL (No. 15) Respecting the Kootenay and Athabasca Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 30; 2°*, 33; in Com., 238; 3°*, 299 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 49.)

BILL (No. 16) To provide against Frauds in the supplying of Milk to Cheese and Butter Manufactories.—(Mr. *Burdett.*)
1°*, 30; 2°, 259; in Com. and 3°*, 755 (i); M. (Mr. *Bowell*) to trnsfr. consdn. of Sen. Amts. to Govt. Orders, 1397 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)

BILL (No. 17) To make further provision respecting the Speedy Trial of certain Indictable Offences.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 33; 2°, 195; in Com., 470; 3°*, 655 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 47.)

BILL (No. 18) To authorise the Assessment of the Salaries or Incomes of persons in the Service of Canada.—(Mr. *Ellis.*)
1°, 33; 2° m., 366; ruled out of order, 367 (i).

BILL (No. 19) To incorporate the Assiniboia, Edmonton and Unjiga Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dawson.*)
1°*, 47; 2°*, 170; in Com. and 3°*, 357 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 53.)

BILL (No. 20) To incorporate the Hawkesbury Lumber Company.—(Mr. *Labrosse.*)
1°*, 47; 2°*, 170; in Com. and 3°*, 397 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 98.)

BILL (No. 21) Respecting the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to The New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway Company.—(Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland.*)
1°*, 47; 2°*, 170; 3°*, 357 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 85.)

BILL (No. 22) To incorporate the Assets and Debenture Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Edgar.*)
1°*, 47; 2°*, 170; in Com. and 3°*, 509 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 90.)

BILL (No. 23) To incorporate the Ottawa and Montreal Boom Company.—(Mr. *Girouard.*)
1°, 47; 2° m., 169; Order for 2° read, 424; wthdn., 426 (i)

BILL (No. 24) To incorporate the Dominion Life Assurance Company—(Mr. *Trow.*)
1°*, 47; 2°*, 170; in Com. and 3°*, 397 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 95.)

BILL (No. 25) To amend the Act incorporating the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Brown.*)
1°*, 47; 2°*, 170; in Com. and 3°*, 397 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 97.)

BILL (No. 26) To amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships, Chapter 73 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 79; 2°, 195; in Com., 655; 3°*, 647 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1029 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 21.)

BILL (No. 27) To amend the Weights and Measures Act, Chapter 104 of the Revised Statutes. (*Mr. Costigan.*)
1°, 79; 2°, in Com., and 3°*, 195 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 17.)

BILL (No. 28) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, Chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. *Joncas.*)
1°, 79 (i).

Statutes, respecting the Militia and Defence of Canada:

BILL (No. 29) To amend Chapter 41 of the Revised—(Sir *Adolphe Caron.*)
1°, 105 (i); wthdn., 1629 (ii).

BILL (No. 30) Respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. *Denison.*)
1°*, 138; 2°*, 239; in Com. and 3°*, 397 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 105.)

BILL (No. 31) To incorporate the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 138; 2°*, 170; 3°*, 357 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 52.)

BILL (No. 32) To incorporate the Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Railway Company.—(Mr. *Prior.*)
1°*, 138; 2°*, 239; in Com. and 3°*, 424 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 48.)

BILL (No. 33) To amend the Act to incorporate the Prescott County Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *Edwards.*)
1°*, 138; 2° m., 239; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 80.)

BILL (No. 34) To incorporate the Canadian General Trusts Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 138; 2°*, 239; in Com. and 3°*, 509 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 92.)

BILL (No. 35) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Ferguson, Welland.*)
1°*, 138; 2°*, 170; 3°*, 357 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 86.)

BILL (No. 36) To incorporate the St. Helen's Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 138; 2°*, 299 (i).

BILL (No. 37) To amend the Act incorporating the Massawippi Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Colby.*)
1°*, 138; 2°*, 230 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 855 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 84.)

BILL (No. 38) To extend the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°*, 169 (i).

BILL (No. 39) Respecting the Hamilton Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *McKay.*)
1°*, 194; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 509 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 76.)

BILL (No. 40) Respecting the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Denison*)
1°*, 194; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 81.)

BILL (No. 41) To incorporate the Calgary, Alberta and Montana Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 194; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 51.)

BILL (No. 42) To amend the Act incorporating the Ontario Mutual Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Bowman.*)
1°*, 194; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 96.)

BILL (No. 43) To incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Hickey.*)
1°*, 194; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 509 (i).

BILL (No. 44) To incorporate the Canada Congregational Foreign Missionary Society.—(Mr. *Holton.*)
1°*, 194; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 602 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 106.)

BILL (No. 45) To revive and amend the Acts relating to the Saint Gabriel Levee and Railway Company.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 194; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 509 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 83.)

BILL (No. 46) To amend the Act respecting Queen's College at Kingston.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick*)
1°*, 194; 2°, 300; M. for Com., 602; in Com. and 3° agreed to (Y. 104, N. 35) 607 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 855 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 103.)

BILL (No. 47) To amend the Act incorporating the Kingston, Simth's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 194; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 509 (i). (52 *Vic*, *c.* 79.)

BILL (No. 48) To consolidate the borrowing powers of the Ontario Loan and Debenture Company, and to authorise them to issue Debenture Stock.—(Mr. *Moncrieff.*)
1°*, 194; 2° m., 299; 2°*, 357; 3°*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 94.)

BILL (No. 49) Respecting the Alberta and Athabasca Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 222; 2°*, 397 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 754; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1056 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 65.)

BILL (No. 50) To amend the Act incorporating the London Mutual Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. *Marshall.*)
1°*, 222; 2°*, 397 (i).

BILL (No. 51) Respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bryson.*)
1°*, 222; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 509 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 82.)

BILL (No. 52) To incorporate the Lac Seul Railway Company.—(Mr. *Daly.*)
1°*, 222; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 509 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 55.)

BILL (No. 53) For the protection of persons employed by contractors engaged in the construction of Railways under Acts passed by the Parliament of Canada.—(Mr. *Purcell.*)
1°, 223; Order for 2° read, 384 (i).

BILL (No. 54) To amend the Revised Statutes, Chapter 77, respecting the Safety of Ships.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 223 (i); 2° m., 1029; 2° and in Com., 1032; 3°*, 1042 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 22.)

BILL (No. 55) Respecting Rules of Court in relation to Criminal Matters.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 247; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 502 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 40.)

BILL (No. 56) To place on the Free List articles of merchandise, the production of which are controlled by Trusts and Combinations.—(Mr. *Edgar.*)
1°, 248 (i).

BILL (No. 57) To incorporate the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Guillet.*)
1°*, 269; 2°*, 357; in Com. and 3°*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 62.)

BILL (No. 58) Respecting the Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bowman.*)
1°*, 269; 2°*, 357; in Com. and 3°*, 663 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 75.)

BILL (No. 59) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Sutherland.*)
1°*, 269; 2°*, 357; in Com. and 3°*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 70.)

BILL (No. 60) Respecting Steam Vessels to be used in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 269; 2°*, 357; in Com. and 3°*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 73.)

BILL (No. 61) To incorporate the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *La Rivière.*)
1°*, 269; 2°*, 357; in Com. and 3°*, 510 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1159 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 60.)

BILL (No. 62) To incorporate the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. *Watson.*)
1°*, 269; 2°*, 357 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 855; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1160 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 57.)

BILL (No. 63) To enable the City of Winnipeg to utilise the Assiniboine River Water Power.—(Mr. *Watson*)
1°*, 269; 2°*, 357 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 855 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 89.)

BILL (No. 64) Respecting the St. Lawrence and Atlantic Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hall.*)
1°*, 269; 2°*, 357; in Com. and 3°*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 72.)

BILL (No. 65) Respecting the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hall.*)
1°*, 269; 2°*, 357; in Com., 753; 3°*, 754 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 71.)

BILL (No. 66) To ratify an Exchange of Land between the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company and the Land Security Company.—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 269; 2°*, 397; in Com. and 3°*, 663 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 74.)

BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the Assiniboine Water Power Company.—(Mr. *Ross.*)
1°*, 269; 2°*, 357 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 921 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 88.)

BILL (No. 68) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick*)
1°*, 269; 2°*, 357 (i); M. for Com., 855; in Com., 1056, 1094; 3°*, 1098 (ii).

BILL (No. 69) Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick*)
1°*, 269; 2°*, 397; in Com. and 3°*, 663 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 78.)

BILL (No. 70) To amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Mr. *Amyot.*)
1°*, 299 (i).

BILL (No. 71) Respecting corrupt practices in Municipal Affairs—(B) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 303; 2° and in Com., 502; 3°*, 504 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 42.)

BILL (No. 72) To make further provision respecting Enquiries concerning Public Matters—(A) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 303; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 504 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 33.)

BILL (No. 73) To incorporate the North-Western Junction and Lake of the Woods Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*)
1°*, 322; 2°*, 524; in Com. and 3°*, 755 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 59.)

BILL (No. 74) To incorporate the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters.—(Mr. *Jamieson.*)
1°*, 322; 2°*, 397; in Com., 754; 3°*, 792; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1233 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 104.)

BILL (No. 75) Respecting the Bay of Quinté Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Corby.*)
1°*, 322; 2°*, 397; in Com. and 3°*, 663 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 87.)

BILL (No. 76) To incorporate the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company.—(Mr. *Daly.*)
1°*, 322; 2°*, 510; in Com. and 3°*, 675 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)

BILL (No. 77) To further amend the Act incorporating the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Cockburn.*)
1°*, 322; 2°*, 397; in Com. and 3°*, 524 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 93.)

BILL (No. 78) Respecting the Wires of Telephone, Telegraph and Electric Light Companies in the City of Toronto.—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 322; 2°*, 397 (i).

BILL (No. 79) To incorporate the Union Railway Company.—(Mr. *White, Renfrew.*)
1°*, 322; 2°*, 510; in Com., 792 (i); 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Bryson*) to recom., neg. on a div., 854; 3°, 855; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1233 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 63.)

BILL (No. 80) to incorporate the Dominion Mineral Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick*)
1°*, 322: 2°*, 524 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 921 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 102.)

BILL (No. 81) To incorporate the Canadian Super-phosphate Company.—(Mr. *Colby.*)
1°*, 322; 2°*, 524 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 921 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 101.)

BILL (No. 82) To amend the Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and North Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergin.*)
1°*, 346; 2°*, 397; in Com. and 3°*, 663 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 68.)

BILL (No. 83) To incorporate the Ontario, Manitoba and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macdowall.*)
1°*, 346; 2°*, 510; in Com. and 3°*, 676 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 61.)

BILL (No. 84) To extend the provisions of the Extradition Act.—(Mr. *Weldon, Albert.*)
1°*, 346 (i); M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to trnsfr. to Govt. Orders, 1395; 2°*, 1468; in Com., 1470; 3°*, 1480 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 36.)

BILL (No. 85) To incorporate the Moose Jaw, Battleford and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 369; 2°*, 510 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 921 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 54.)

BILL (No. 86) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy*)
1°*, 369, 2°*, 510; M. for Com., and Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) to ref. back to Sel. Stand. Com., 754 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 921 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 56.)

BILL (No. 87) To amend the Act to incorporate the Quebec Board of Trade.—(Mr. *McGreevy.*)
1°*, 369; 2°*, 510 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 755 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 99.)

BILL (No. 88) To incorporate the Edmundston and Florenceville Railway Company.—(Mr. *Landry.*)
1°*, 369; 2°*, 510 (i).

BILL (No. 89) To amend the Charter of incorporation of the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Daly.*)
1°*, 369; 2°*, 510; in Com. and 3°*, 755 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 67.)

BILL (No. 90) Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, and the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bell.*)
1°*, 369; 2°*, 510; in Com. and 3°*, 755 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 77.)

BILL (No. 91) To permit the Conditional Release of First Offenders in certain cases—(E) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 369; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 504 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 44.)

BILL (No. 92) Relating to Bills of Lading—(C) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 369 (i); 2° m., 1691; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1692 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 30.)

BILL (No. 93) To amend the Post Office Act, Chapter 35 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. *Haggart.*)
1°, 369; Res prop., 439 (i); in Com., 1130; 2° of B. and in Com., 1133; 3°m., Amt. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 85) 1281; 3°*, 1283 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 20.)

BILL (No. 94) Respecting Benevolent Societies.—(Mr. *Dickinson.*)
1°*, 370 (i).

BILL (No. 95) Relating to the Supreme Court.—(Mr. *Weldon, St. John.*)
1°*, 370 (i).

BILL (No. 96) To incorporate the Prince Edward Island and Continental Railway and Ferry Company.—(Mr. *Landry.*)
1°, 384; 2°*, 524 (i).

BILL (No. 97) To amend Chapter 179 of the Revised Statutes, respecting Recognisances.—(*Mr. Davies, P.E.I.*)
1°, 384 (i).

BILL (No. 98) To amend the Winding-up Act, Chapter 129 of the Revised Statutes.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 424; 2° m., 659; 2° and in Com., 660; 3°*, 763 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 32.)

BILL (No. 99) To incorporate the Three Rivers and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Riopel.*)
1°*, 468; 2°*, 663 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 855 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 64.)

BILL (No. 100) Further to amend the Civil Service Act, Chapter 17 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Haggart.*)
Res. prop., 621; in Com., 672; 1° of B., 523; 2° m., 669; 2°, 672; 3° m, and Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to recom., neg. (Y. 65, N. 113) and 3°*, 763 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 12.)

BILL (No. 101) To amend the Copyright Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 524 (i); 2°, 1399; in Com., 1401; 3° m., 1463; recom. and 3°*, 1467 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 29.)

BILL (No. 102) To amend Chapter 173 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, respecting Threats, Intimidation and other Offences.—(Mr. *Wilson, Elgin.*)
1°, 524 (i).

BILL (No. 103) Further to amend the Act 36 Victoria, Chapter 61, respecting the Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 624; 2°, 774; in Com., 775; 3°*, 785 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 34.)

BILL (No. 104) To amend the Fisheries Act—(Mr. *Dickey.*)
1°*, 524 (i).

BILL (No. 105) Further to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 556; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 787 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 37.)

BILL (No. 106) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. *Cook.*)
1°, 557 (i).

BILL (No. 107) respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macdowall.*)
1°*, 589; 2°*, 663 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 921 (ii). (52 *Vic., c* 66.)

BILL (No. 108) to amend Chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the House of Commons.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 589; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 787 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 11.)

BILL (No. 109) To amend the law respecting the Exchequer Court of Canada.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 589; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 787 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 38.)

BILL (No. 110) To repeal certain Acts relating to the Public Departments.—(Mr. *Mills, Bothwell.*)
1°, 589 (i).

BILL (No. 111) To amend Chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes of Canada respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Skinner.*)
1°, 590 (i).

BILL (No. 112) Respecting the Wires of Telephone, Telegraph and Electric-Light Companies.—(Mr. *Perley.*)
1°*, 620 (i).

BILL (No. 113) Respecting the inspection of Timber and Lumber.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
Res prop., 469; in Com., 661; 1°* of B., 669 (i).

BILL (No. 114) To incorporate the Title and Mortgage Guarantee Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Macdowall.*)
1° and 2°, 676 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 992 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 91.)

BILL (No. 115) To amend the Railway Act—(D) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *White, Renfrew.*)
1°*, 782 (i); 2°, 1283 (ii).

BILL (No. 116) Respecting the Harbor of Belleville, in the Province of Ontario.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 762 (i); 2° and in Com., 1042; 3°*, 1043 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 35.)

BILL (No. 117) Further to amend the Customs Act, Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Bowell.*)
Res. prop., 469; in Com., 763; 1°* of B., 769 (i); 2° and in Com., 1138; recom. and 3°*, 1330 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 14.)

BILL (No. 118) To authorise the granting of Pensions to members of the North-West Mounted Police Force.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald.*)
Res. prop., 469; in Com., 769; 1°* of B., 774 (i); 2° m., 1269; Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1269; neg. (Y. 66, N. 106) 1277; 2° and in Com., 1267; 3°*, 1278 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 26.)

BILL (No. 119) For the relief of William Gordon Lowry—(G) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 871; 2° m., 992; 2° neg. (Y. 79, N. 80) 995; M. to restore 2° to Order Paper agreed to on a div., 1016; 2° on a div., 1160; M. for Com. and Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 1264; neg. (Y. 55, N. 69) and 3° on a div., 1265 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 108.)

BILL (No. 120) To amend Chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
Res. prop., in Com. and 1°* of B., 787 (i); 2°* and in Com., 911; 3°*, 912 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 10.)

BILL (No. 121) To amend the Summary Trials Act—(M) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 811; 2° and in Com., 912; 3°*, 1266 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 46.)

BILL (No. 122) Respecting the Collection of certain Tolls and Dues therein mentioned—(L) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 811; 2° and in Com., 912; 3°*, 1117 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 19.)

BILL (No. 123) For the relief of George McDonald Bagwell—(J) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Brown.*)
1°*, 871; 2° on a div., 1098; in Com. on a div., 1233; 3° on a div., 1264 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 107.)

BILL (No. 124) For the Relief of Arthur Wand—(I) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 871; 2° on a div., 1098; in Com. on a div., 1234; 3° on a div., 1264 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 110.)

BILL (No. 125) For the relief of William Henry Middleton—(F) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 871; 2° on a div., 1093; in Com. on a div., 1234; 3° on a div., 1264 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 109.)

BILL (No. 126) To amend the Summary Convictions Act, Chapter 178 of the Revised Statutes, and the Act amending the same—(O) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 1081; 2°*, 1130; in Com., 1266; 3°*, 1330 (ii). (52 *Vic*, *c.* 45.)

BILL (No. 127) In reference to the Western Counties Railway.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 871; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1043 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 8.)

BILL (No. 128) To provide for the conveyance of certain Lands to British Columbia.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°, 911; 2°*, in Com and 3°*, 1043 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 7.)

BILL (No. 129) To amend the Fisheries Act, Chapter 95 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 911; 2°* and in Com., 1045; 3°m., 1117; Amt. (Mr. *Ellis*) 6 m. h., 1117; neg. (Y. 72, N. 102) and 3°, 1125 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 24.)

BILL (No. 130) Further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, Chapter seventy-eight of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 911; 2°m, 1043; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1044 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 23.)

BILL (No. 131) Respecting Expropriation of Lands—(P) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 943; 2°* and in Com., 1266; 3°*, 1331 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)

BILL (No. 132) To amend the Revised Statutes respecting Interest—(N) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 979; 2°, 1130; in Com. and 3°*, 1330 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 31.)

BILL (No. 133) For better securing the Safety of certain Fishermen—(T) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Jones, Halifax.*)
1°*, 1180 (ii).

BILL (No. 134) To amend Chapter 148 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, respecting the improper use of Fire-Arms and other Weapons—(S) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Brown.*)
1°*, 1221 (ii).

BILL (No. 135) Further to amend the several Acts relating to the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto—(W) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Small.*)
Rule suspended, 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 1262 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 100.)

BILL (No. 136) To consolidate and amend the Act respecting the North-West Territories.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°, 1262; wthdn., 1498 (ii).

BILL (No. 137) Further to amend the General Inspection Act, Chapter 99 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°, 1236; 2°* and in Com., 1398; 3°*, 1399 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 16.)

BILL (No. 138) Respecting a Loan therein mentioned to certain Mennonite Immigrants.—(Mr. *Carling.*)
Res. prop., 1146; in Com., 1267; 1° of B., 1268; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1399 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c* 28)

BILL (No. 139) Further to amend the Inland Revenue Act, Chapter 34 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
Res. prop., 1221; in Com. and 1° of B., 1269; 2°* and in Com., 1397; 3°*, 1398 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)

BILL (No. 140) To amend the Revised Statute respecting Escapes and Rescues—(V) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 1363; 2°* and in Com., 1402 (ii).

BILL (No. 141) To amend the Act respecting the Rocky Mountains Park of Canada.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°*, 1363; wthdn., 1629 (ii).

BILL (No. 142) To amend The Cullers Act, Chapter 103 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
Res. prop., 1363; in Com., 1365; 1°* of B., 1366; 2°* and in Com., 1536; 3°*, 1537 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 18.)

BILL (No. 143) To authorise the conveyance to the Quebec Skating Club of certain Ordnance Lands in the City of Quebec.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°, 1194 (ii).

BILL (No. 144) Relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop. (*B. C. and Australia*) 1328; M. for Com., 1368; in Com., 1373; M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 1424; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 1425; neg (Y. 55, N. 77) 1426. Res. (*B. C. and China*) 1329; M. for Com., 1386; in Com., 1387; M. to conc., in Rep. of Com., 1426; Amt. (Mr. McMullen) neg. on a div., 1437. Res. (*Can. and United Kingdom*) 1329; in Com., 1389, 1402; rep., 1422; 1°* of B., 1437; 2° on a div., in Com., and 3°* 1629 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 2.)

BILL (No. 145) Further to amend The Dominion Lands Act—(X) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *Hector Langevin.*)
1°*, 1462; 2°* and in Com., 1537; 3°*, 1629 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 27.)

BILL (No. 146) To amend the Revised Statute respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force—(Y) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°*, 1572; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1709 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 25.)

BILL (No. 147) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the years ending respectively the

30th June, 1889, and the 30th June, 1890, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. conc. in, 1°*, 2°* and 3°* of B., 1712 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 1.)

BILL (No. 148) To authorise the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald.*)
Res. (1st) prop., 1396; in Com., 1499; conc. in, 1535; Res. (2nd) prop., 1572; in Com., 1615, 1629; on M. to conc. in 1st Res., Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) neg. (Y. 33, N. 65) 1653; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 33, N. 65) 1653; M. to conc. in 2nd Res. agreed to (Y. 66, N. 35) 1653; 1°* and 2°* of B., 1654; in Com., 1685; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) neg. (Y. 27, N. 48) and 3°*, 1686 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)

BILL (No. 149) To provide for the building and working of a line of railway from Harvey to Salisbury or Moncton in the Province of New Brunswick.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald.*)
Res. prop., 1424; in Com., 1658; M. to conc. in Res, 1669; Amt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1672; neg. (Y. 34, N. 70) 1678; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1679; neg on a div., Res. conc. in, 1°* and 2°* of B. and in Com., 1683; 3°*, 1685 (ii).

BILL (No. 150) To amend the Revised Statutes, Chapter 138, respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
Res. prop., 557 (i); M. for Com., 1687; in Com., 1°* and 2°* of B., 1688; in Com. and 3°*, 1689 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 39.)

BILL (No. 151) Respecting an agreement therein mentioned with the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald.*)
Res. prop., 1572; M. for Com., 1706; in Com. and 1°*, 2°* and in Com. on B., 1709; 3°*, 1711 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 5.)

BILL (No. 152) To authorise the granting of subsidies in land to certain Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
Res. prop., 1572; in Com., 1712, 1720; 1°*, 2°* and in Com., 1720; 3°*, 1721 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 4)

BILL (No. 153) For the relief of the Corporation of the Town of Cobourg.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop, 1572; in Com., 1°*, 2°*, in Com. on B. and 3°*, 1721 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 6.)

BILLS ASSENTED TO: 745, 1286, 1726 (ii).

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. No. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 14; 2°, 194; M. for Com., 775; in Com., 778, 788; (i); wthdn., 1629 (ii).

Bills of Lading B. No. 92 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 369 (i); 2°m., 1691; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1692 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 30.)

BILLS RELATING TO N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1147 (ii).

Boiler Inspection and Insurance Co. of Can. Act Amt. B. No. 25 (Mr. *Brown*). 1°*, 47; 2°*, 170; in Com. and 3°*, 397; (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 97.)

BOISVERT, FABIEN, MEMBER FOR NICOLET: introduced, 1 (i).

BOSWELL AND GOWAN, JUDGES (REFUND): in Com. of Sup., 1362 (ii).

BOUNDARIES OF ONT. AND QUE., COR. BETWEEN LOCAL GOVTS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 303 (i).
——— prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1329, 1423 (ii).
——— Telegram from Mr. Mowat read, 1363 (ii).

BOUNDARY BETWEEN ALASKA AND CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 426 (i).

BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN: in Com. of Sup., 139 (i), 1076 (ii).

BRESALYOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 1082 (ii).
——— COMPENSATION FOR LOSSES: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 348 (i).

"BRIDGEWATER," SEIZURE, CLAIMS FOR COMPENSATION: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 1423 (ii).
——— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Edgar*) 752 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA:
ALASKA AND CAN BOUNDARY: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 426 (i).
BEHRING'S SEA FISHERIES: PROCLAMATION BY U. S. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 871 (ii).
——— PARAGRAPH IN *Empire* NEWSPAPER: Ques. (Mr. *Mills Bothwell*) 287 (i).
——— REMARKS (Mr. *Mitchell*) 811 (ii).
——— SEIZURES: on M. for Com of Sup., 1582 (ii).
COUNTY COURT JUDGES' APPOINTMTNT: Ques. (Mr. *Mara*) 80 (i).
FORTIFICATIONS AT ESQUIMALT, COL. O'BRIEN'S REP: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1146 (ii).
MINING IN RAILWAY BELT: Remarks (Mr. *Mara*) 980 (ii).
MINING LAWS: Remarks (Mr. *Barnard*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1540
MINING MACHINERY AND FREE LIST: Ques (Mr. *Barnard*) 1265 (ii)
SICAMONS ON C. P. R., TO LAKE OKANAGAN RY., SUBSIDY: prop. Res., (Sir *John A Macdonald*) 1571; in Com., 1639 (ii).

B. C. Lands. *See* "LANDS."

BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1640 (ii).

BROKERAGE, &C., ON SINKING FUND: in Com. of Sup., 204 (i).

BROWN, CAPT., PENSION TO FAMILY: in Com. of Sup., 791 (ii).

BUDGET, THE (Mr. *Foster*) 436; Reply (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 456; (Amt.) 468 (i). *See* "RECIPROCITY."
——— FRENCH EDITION: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 171 (i).

BUDGET SPEECHES, COST OF ISSUING: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 20 (i).

BUILDINGS, PUBLIC, ERECTED SINCE 1867 to 1889: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 303 (i).

BUOYS, LIGHTS, FOG-WHISTLES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 97, 1361, 1450 (ii).
——— *See* "LAKE ST. JOHN," &c.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE: Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 269 (i), 761, 1721 (ii).

CAB HIRE: in Com. of Sup., 160 (i).

CAMPBELL, CAPT. R., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 741 (i).

Calgary, Alberta and Montana Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 41 (Mr. *Davis*). 1°*, 194; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic*, *c.* 51.)

CAN. AND UNITED KINGDOM STEAMSHIP SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr *Foster*) 1329; in Com 1389, 1402 (ii).

Can. Congregational Foreign Missionary Societies incorp. B. No. 44 (Mr. *Holton*). 1°*, 194; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 602 (i). (52 *Vic. c.* 106.)

CAN. TEMPERANCE ACT, DISTRIBUTION OF FINES: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1533 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Roome*) 80 (i).

CAN. TEMPERANCE ACT, Working of, and Home Govt: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 541 (i).

Can. General Trusts Co.'s incorp. B. No. 34 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 133; 2°*, 239; in Com. and 3°*, 509 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 92.)

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY:

ARBITRATION: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (ii).
EXAMINING LANDS IN RY. BELT: in Com. of Sup., 1570 (ii).
EXTENSION TO QUEBEC, AMOUNTS PAID AND TO WHOM: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 248 (i).
INTEREST ON $15,000,000 BONDS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 348 (i).
LAND AND MONEY SUBSIDIES: Ques. (Mr. *Macdowall*) 935 (ii).
RYS. CROSSING LINE IN MAN., VALIDITY OF ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 20 (i).
SALE OF $15,000,000 MORTGAGE BONDS, RECEIPTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Ste. Marie*) 436 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Ste. Marie*) 841, 1363, (ii).
—— Co. AND B. No. 68: Remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 701 (i).

C. P. R. Co.'s B. No. 68 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 269; 2°*, 357 (i); M. for Com., 855; in Com., 1056, 1091; 3°*, 1098 (ii).

C.P.R. Steam Vessels B. No. 60 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 1°*, 269; 2°*, 357; in Com. and 3°*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 73.)

Can. Super-phosphate Co.'s incorp. B. No. 81 (Mr. *Colby*). 1°*, 322; 2°*, 524 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 921 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 101.)

CANALS:

BEAUHARNOIS, OPENING OF NAV.: Telegram read (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1285 (ii).
—— REPORT OF ENGINEER CRAWFORD, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 304 (i).
CANAL WORKS, TENDERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casey*) 593 (i).
CHAMBLY-LONGUEUIL CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 80 (i).
CORNWALL AND GALOPS CANAL, TENDERS FOR ENLARGEMENT: M. for copies* (Mr. *Trow*) 943 (ii).
CORNWALL: in Com. of Sup., 1205 (ii).
—— PROP. LOCATION IN 1834, REPS., &c., OF ENGINEERS: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergin*) 595 677 (i).
—— RECENT BREAK, COR., &c: M. for copies* (Mr. *Bergin*) 303 (i).
LACHINE; in Com. of Sup., 1205 (ii).
MURRAY: conc., 1614 (ii)
REPAIRS AND WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1211, 1495 (ii).
RIDEAU: in Com. of Sup., 1211 (ii).
ROCK LAKE DAM, DAMAGES CAUSED THROUGH: M. for Reps., &c, of Engineers (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 936 (ii).
SAULT STE. MARIE: in Com. of Sup., 1202 (ii).
—— TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Trow*) 943.
—— TENDERS, &c: M. for copies* (Mr. *McMullen*) 304 (i).
SUNDAY TRAFFIC ON CANALS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Rykert*) 304.
TAY: in Com. of Sup., 1211 (ii).
TRENT RIVER NAV.: in Com. of Sup., 1207 (ii).
TRENT VALLEY CANAL COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 20, 655, 676 (i), 872 (ii).
WELLAND CANAL, WATER POWER, REPS. OF ENGINEERS, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Rykert*) 304 (i).
—— DEEPENING: in Com. of Sup., 1207 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1514 (ii).
WILLIAMSBURG: in Com. of Sup., 1205 (ii).

CAPE BRETON:

CAPE BRETON RY., CONTRACT FOR STATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Flynn*) 1327 (ii).
—— EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 702 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1069, (ii).
—— PAYMENT OF LABORERS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Vic.*) 871 (ii).
—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Flynn*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1183 (ii).
DREDGE "CAPE BRETON," COMPENSATION TO CAPTAIN AND LABORERS FOR LOSSES: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 427 (i).

CAPE BRETON—*Continued.*

DREDGE LOST IN STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND: Ques (Mr. *Cameron*) 469 (i).
GRAND NARROWS BRIDGE, C.B., PAPERS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Flynn*) 1266 (ii)
MACDONALD AND DOWLING'S GULCHES, DRIVING OF PILES: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 677 (i).
SIMMS & SLATER, RETURN OF DEPOSITS TO SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 677 (i).

CAPE ENRAGÉ LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 841 (ii).
CAPE TORMENTINE AND MURRAY BAY RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1641 (ii).
CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOR: in Com. of Sup., 802 (i).
CAPITAL ACCOUNT, I. C. R., EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 676 (i).
CAPE ROUGE AND ST. LAWRENCE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396; in Com., 1499 (ii).
CARBONNEAU, JOS., PAYMENT FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Desaulniers*) 1328 (ii).
CARDWELL, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1.
CARIBOO, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1.
CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com. of Sup., 793, 1352 (ii).
CARTRIDGE MANUFACTURE: in Com. of Sup., 1355 (ii).
CARTIER, LADY: in Com. of Sup., 423 (i).
CASCUMPEQUE HARBOR, DISMISSAL OF BLASTING FOREMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 348 (i).
CASGRAIN. See "LABUE."
CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS, ELECTION OF COUNCILLORS: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 427 (i).
—— SURVEY OF RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 468 (i).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Doyon*) 501 (i).
CAVALRY SCHOOLS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 796 (i).
—— TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 302.
CAYUGA POST OFFICE, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 303 (i).
CENSUS AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 298 (i); conc., 1598 (ii).
Central Counties Ry. Co. *See* "PRESCOTT COUNTY."
CENTRAL RY. FROM GRAND LAKE TO I. C R., SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396; in Com., 1500 (ii).
Certificates to Masters and Mates (*Chap. 78, Rev. Statutes*) **Act. Amt. B. No. 26** (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 79; 2°, 195; in Com., 655; 3°*, 657 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1029 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 21.)
CHAMBLY-LONGUEUIL CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 80 (i).
CHANNEL SUB-WAY CO.'S ACT, DISALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 1628 (ii).
CHAPLAINS IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Innes*) 24 (i).
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 48, 203 (i).
Chattel and Mortgage Guarantee Co. of Can. incorp. B. No. 114 (Mr. *Macdowall*). 1° and 2°, 676 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 992 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 91.)
CHEESE EXPORT TO ENGLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 1180 (ii).
CHESTER, QUE., POSTMASTER, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 468 (i).
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY COUNTIES, EXPENDITURE OF SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 427 (i).
CHIGNECTO SHIP RY., PROSPECTUS: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1423 (ii).

China Point Pier, P. E. I., &c., Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 621 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act, Administration: in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).

Chipman, Mr.: in Com. of Sup., 139, 196 (i); conc., 1614 (ii).

Cigars, Reduction of License Fees: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 171 (i).

Civil Govt.: in Com. of Sup., 49, 138, 196, 1502 (i); conc., 1604 (ii).

Civil Servants, Assessment of Salaries authorisation B. No. 18 (Mr. *Ellis*). 1°, 33; 2° m., 366; ruled out of Order, 367 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Cook*). 1°, 557 (i)

Civil Service Act (*Chap.* 17 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 100** (Mr. *Haggart*). Res. prop. 621; in Com. 672; 1° of B., 523; 2° m., 669; 2°, 672; 3° m. and Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to recom. neg. (Y. 68, N. 113) and 3°, 763 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 12.)

Civil Service Examiners: in Com. of Sup., 203 (i).

Clarke, Judge, Superannuation: in Com. of Sup., 1218 (ii)

Clothing, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 793 (i), 1352 (ii).

Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 57 (Mr. *Guillet*). 1°*, 269; 2°*, 357; in Com. and 3°*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic., c* 62.)

Cobourg Town Relief B. No. 153 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 1572; in Com., 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°* of B., 1721 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 6.)

Cochrane, Edward, Esq.: Member for East Northumberland introduced, 3 (i).

Colchester, Ret. of Member: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1.

Collector of Customs, Halifax, dismissal, Papers respecting: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 371 (i).

——— Three Rivers, Duty on Foreign Catalogues: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 739 (i).

Colonial and Indian Exhibition: in Com. of Sup., 1512 (ii)

Commandant's House, Kingston: in Com. of Sup, 1693; conc., 1705 (ii).

Combinations in Trade Prevention B. No. 11 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°, 19; Order for 2° read, 382 (i); 2° m., 1111; 2°, 1117; Govt. Order (Sir *John Thompson*) for Com., 1368; M. for Com., 1437; in Com., 1446; 3° 1468; Sen. Amts. consd., 1689; conc. in, 1691 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 41.)

Commercial Agencies: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).

Commercial Treaties with Foreign States: prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 172; neg. (Y 66, N. 94) 193.

Commercial Union with United States: Telegram *re* Hitt's Res. read (Mr. *Charlton*) 384 (i).

Commission Men, &c. *See* "Tree Peddlers."

COMMITTEES:

Ballot Box, Waddell's Patent: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Brown*) 24 (i).

Debates, Official: M. for Sp. Com. to supervise (Mr. *Bowell*) 3 (i).

Fraudulent Practices: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Brown*) 16 (i).

Freight Transit through Can.: prop. M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Ives*) 87 (i).

Legislative Economy, Joint Com.: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 782.

Library of Parliament: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 17 (i).

Printing: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 19 (i).

Select Standing: prop. M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 2 (i).

COMMITTEES—*Continued.*

Select Standing: M. for Com. to prepare Lists, 17 (i).

Telegraph Lines, acquisition by Govt.: prop. M. (Mr. *Denison*) for Sel. Com., 80, 87 (i).

Compensation in lieu of Land: in Com. of Sup., 788 (i).

Confederation and P.E.I. Claims: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 525 (i).

Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditures: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 24 (i).

Contingencies, Deptl.: in Com. of Sup., 155 (i).

Controverted Elections Act Amt.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 223 (i).

Controverted Elections, date of Receipt by Speaker of Judges' Certificates: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 303 (i).

Convict Labor: in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).

Copyright Act Amt. B. No. 101 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 524 (i); 2°, 1399; in Com., 1401; 3° m., 1463; recom. and 3°*, 1467 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 29.)

Corn Importations, Rebate of Duty: prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 92, 105 (i).

Deb. on Res. (Gen. *Laurie* and Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 107; (Mr. *Masson*) 109; (Mr. *Fisher*) 111; neg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 137; Amt to Amt. (Mr. *Fisher*) 112; deb. (Messrs. *Corby* and *Flynn*) 112; neg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 137 (i). Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) 112; deb. (Mr. *Casey*) 112; (Mr. *Gigault*) 114; (Mr. *Lister*) 115; (Gen. *Laurie*) 116; (Mr. *Campbell*) 116; (Messrs. *Bechard* and *Mitchell*) 117; (Mr. *Brown*) 119; on M. to adjn. House (Mr. *Mitchell*) 120; (Mr. *McKeen*) 121; (Mr. *Charlton*) 122; (Mr. *Hesson*) 123; (Messrs. *Brien* and *White, Renfrew*) 125; (Messrs. *Chisholm* and *Amyot*) 127; (Mr. *Sproule*) 128; (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 129; (Messrs. *Davin* and *McDougall, Pictou*) 130; (Mr. *Cargill*) 132; (Mr. *Bowell*) 134; (Mr. *Scriver*) 135; (Messrs. *Kirk* and *Laurier*) 136; neg. (Y. 70, N. 112) 136 (i).

Cornwall and Galops Canals, Tenders for Enlargement: M. for copies* (Mr. *Trow*) 943 (ii).

Cornwall Canal: in Com. of Sup., 1205 (ii).

——— prop. Location in 1834, Reps., &c., of Engineers: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergin*) 595 (i).

——— Recent Break, Cor., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Bergin*) 303 (i).

Cornwallis Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1631 (ii).

Corrupt Practices in Municipal Affairs B. No. 71 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 303; 2° and in Com., 502; 3°*, 504 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 42.)

Corrupt Practices Trials, Picton: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 427 (i).

Cosgrove, John, of Buckingham, Employment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 224 (i).

County Court Judges (B. C.) Appointment: Ques. (Mr. *Mara*) 80 (i).

County Savings Banks: in Com. of Sup., 203 (i).

Cranberry Head Breakwater, removal of Gravel: Ques. (Mr. *Lovitt*) 34 (i).

Criminal Law (escapes and rescues) B. No. 140 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 1363; 2°* and in Com., 1402 (ii).

Criminal Law (Extradition Act Amt, extension of provisions) B. No. 84 (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*). 1°*, 346 (i); M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to trnsfr. to Govt. Orders, 1395; 2°, 1468; in Com., 1470; 3°*, 1480 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 36.)

Criminal Law (first offenders, conditional release) B. No. 91 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 369; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 504 (i). (52 *Vic*, *c.* 44.)

Criminal Law (summary convictions, *Chap.* 178 *Rev. Statutes*) **B. No. 126** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 1081; 2°*, 1130; in Com., 1265; 3°*, 1330 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 45.)

Criminal Law (speedy trials of indictable offences) B. No. 17 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 33; 2°, 195; in Com., 470; 3°*, 655 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 47.)

Criminal Law (summary trials) B. No. 121 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 811; 2° and in Com., 912; 3°*, 1266 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 46.)

Criminal Law (threats, intimidations, &c., *Chap.* 173 *Rev. Statutes*) **B. No. 102** (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*). 1°, 524 (i).

Criminal Law (Recognisances Act Amt., *Chap.* 179 *Rev. Statutes*) **B. No. 97** (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*). 1°, 384 (i).

CRIMINAL LAWS FOR JUSTICES OF THE PEACE, DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bernier*) 171 (i).

Criminal Matters (rules of court) B. No. 55 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 247; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 502 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 40.)

Cruelty to Animals prevention Act (*Chap.* 172 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 3** (Mr. *Brown*). 1°, 13; 2°m., 240; Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., 242; neg. (Y. 71, N. 72) 247; 2°, 247; in Com., 357; M. to further consdr. B., in Com., 367; Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 91, N. 92) 368; further considn. agreed to (Y. 96, N. 92) 368; in Com. and M. that Com. rise agreed to, 607 (i).

"CRUISER," GOVT. STEAMER, ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATE: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 739 (i).

Cullers Act (*Chap.* 103 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 142** (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. prop., 1363; in Com., 1365; 1°* of B. 1366; 2°* and in Com., 1536; 3°*, 1537 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 18.)

CUMBERLAND, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

Customs Act Amt. (*Chap.* 32 *Rev. Statutes*) **B. No. 117** (Mr. *Bowell*). Res. prop., 469; in Com., 763; 1°* of B., 769 (i); 2° and in Com., 1138; recom. and 3°*, 1330 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 14.)

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE:

AIRD, W. B., JR., NAMES OF SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 1017 (ii).

APPRAISERS IN QUEBEC, APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 370 (i).

AMERICAN FISHING VESSELS, AUTHORITY TO ENTER AND CLEAR. Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 348 (i).

BUILDINGS IN CITIES AND TOWNS OF LESS THAN 20,000: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 303 (i).

CHEESE EXPORTS TO ENGLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 11 0 (ii).

CIGARS, REDUCTION OF LICENSE FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 171 (i).

COLLECTOR AT HALIFAX, DISMISSAL, PAPERS RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 371 (i).

COLLECTOR AT THREE RIVERS, DUTY ON FOREIGN CATALOGUES: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Que.*) 740 (i).

COMMERCIAL TREATIES: Remarks on adjmnt., 105, 168 (i).

COMMERCIAL TREATIES WITH FOREIGN STATES: prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 172; neg. (Y. 66, N. 94) 193 (i).

CORN IMPORTATIONS, REBATE OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 92, 105; neg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 137 (i).

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE—*Continued.*

COSGROVE, JOHN, OF BUCKINGHAM, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 224 (i).

SEIZURES AND OFFICERS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 67 (i).

—— prop Res. (Mr. *Holton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1290 (ii).

DRAWBACK ON GOODS MANUFACTURED FOR EXPORT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Ellis*) 943 (ii).

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 24 (i).

EXPORTS OF MANUFACTURES TO AUSTRALIA: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1423 (ii).

EXPORTS TO GREAT BRITAIN *viâ* U. S.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 428 (i).

FERTILISERS, ARTIFICIAL, REMOVAL OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 37; neg. (Y. 71, N. 101) 105 (i).

FISH, FOREIGN, CHANGE OF BONDING SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 224 (i).

FISH IMPORTED IN BOND FOR EXPORT: M. for Cor. (Gen. *Laurie*) 1082 (ii).

FISH IMPORTS IN BOND: Explanation (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 1099 (ii).

FLOUR DUTIES, INCREASE: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1145 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 1721 (ii).

FREE LIST, EXTENSION, GRAINS AND SEEDS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 684 (i).

FRUITS AND SEEDS, IMPORTED FROM THE U. S., VALUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyle*) 224 (i).

FRUIT BASKETS AND BOXES, AMOUNT OF DUTY COLLECTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 304 (i).

GROSSE, JOHN A., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 171 (i).

HIDE AND LEATHER INSPECTOR, MONTREAL: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Curran*) 23 (i).

LARD ADULTERATED, IMPORTS FROM U.S.: Ques (Mr. *Sproule*) 763 (i).

LUMBER SHIPMENTS FROM N.B. TO THE U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 935 (ii).

MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY INTO B.C.: M. for O.C. (Mr. *Edwards*) 942 (ii).

—— IN B. C., AND FREE LIST: Ques. (Mr. *Barnard*) 1265 (ii).

—— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1583 (ii).

NATIONAL POLICY, REF. TO IN DEB. ON CORN IMPORTATIONS, 112-136 (i).

NEW EDINBURGH AND GATINEAU FERRY, RENTAL AND ARREARAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 348 (i).

OILS, IMPORTATION INTO MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1533 (ii).

PREVENTIVE OFFICERS IN P.E.I: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 15 (i).

PORK DUTIES, INCREASE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 1146 (ii).

QUESNEL, JULES, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1145 (ii).

ROSS, HON. WILLIAM, DISMISSAL; M. for O.C., Reps., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 24 (i).

ROSS, JOSIAH, SEIZURE OF GOODS BY CUSTOMS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 428 (i).

SAW LOGS, &c., EXPORTED AND DUTY COLLECTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 304 (i).

—— EXPORTATION AND DUTY COLLECTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 33 (i).

—— EXPORT DUTY: Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1591 (ii).

—— IMPORTATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 33 (i).

TARIFF CHANGES: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1266 (ii).

—— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1221 (ii).

—— FRENCH EDITION: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 935.

TRACY, A. R., SEIZURE OF GOODS AT MEDICINE HAT: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1016 (ii).

TRADE COMMISSIONER TO SOUTH AMERICA, SUMS PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 30 (i).

VINCENT, JOSEPH F., AND CUSTOMS DEPT.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 935 (ii).

WAYS AND MEANS *re* MILLERS OF ONTARIO (Mr. *Mulock*) 1711 (ii).

WHEAT AND FLOUR IMPORTATIONS FROM U. S.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Smith, Ontario*) 33 (i).

WEST BAY, N. S., CUSTOM HOUSE OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 427 (i).

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE—*Continued.*

WHISKEY, ILLICIT MANUFACTURE, COST OF SUITS: Ques. (Mr. *Binet*) 935 (ii).

WRIGHT, F. P., REFUND OF DUTY ON MINING MACHINERY: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Edwards*) 942 (ii).

DAIRYING INTERESTS (DEVELOPMENT): in Com. of Sup., 1513 (ii).

DEAF AND DUMB INSTITUTE, BELLEVILLE: in Com. of Sup., 70 (i).

DEBATES: M. for Sp. Com. to supervise (Mr. *Bowell*) 3 (i).

——— M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to substitute Mr. Prior for Mr. Baker, 269 (i).

——— DELAY IN PRINTING FRENCH EDITION: Remarks, 654 (i), 944, 1462 (ii).

——— 1ST REP.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Desjardins*) 247 (i).

——— 2ND REP. OF COM.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Desjardins*) 871, 933 (ii).

DEFENCE OF INDIAN CHARGED WITH SHOOTING: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 935 (ii).

DELANEY, MRS.: in Com. of Sup., 739 (i).

DERBY BRANCH AND NORTHERN AND WESTERN RYS.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1182 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 854, 871 (ii).

——— CLAIMS FOR LAND DAMAGES: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 749 (i).

DESCHENES, LUDGER MIVILLE, AMOUNT PAID FOR SERVICES IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Ontario*) 1327 (ii).

DETECTIVE SERVICE (CUSTOMS): in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).

DEWDNEY, HON. EDGAR, MEMBER FOR EAST ASSINIBOIA: introduced, 1 (i).

DICKEY, ARTHUR R., ESQ., MEMBER FOR CUMBERLAND: introduced, 1 (i).

DICTIONNAIRE GÉNÉALOGIQUE DES FAMILLES FRANÇAISES: in Com. of Sup., 1543 (ii).

DINGMAN, A., PAYMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1172, 1451 (ii).

DISALLOWANCE, QUE. ACTS, O. C., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 303 (i).

DIVISION LIST: Correction (Mr. *Mara*) 1330 (ii).

DIVISIONS:

ALBERTA RY. AND COAL CO.'S B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) 298; neg. (Y. 49, N. 97) 299 (i).

CIVIL SERVICE ACT (Postmasters' Salaries) Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 68, N. 113) 764 (i).

COMMERCIAL TREATIES WITH FOREIGN STATES: prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 172; neg. (Y. 88, N. 94) 194 (i).

CORN IMPORTATIONS, REBATE OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 92; Amt. (Mr. *Fisher*) 112; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) 112; neg. (Y. 70, N. 112) 136; Amt. neg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 137; Res. neg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 137 (i).

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS PREVENTION B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*): Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., 243; neg (Y. 71, N. 72) 247; on M. for Com., Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h.; neg. (Y. 91, N. 92) 368; agreed to (Y. 96, N. 92) 368 (i).

CUSTOMS SEIZURES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Holton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1289; neg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 1314 (ii).

DIVORCE (W. G. LOWRY) B. 119 (Mr. *Small*): 2°; neg. (Y. 79, N. 80) 995; on M. for Com., Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 55, N. 69) 1265 (ii).

DOM. LANDS, COST OF MANAGEMENT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Flynn*) on conc., 1607; neg. (Y. 39, N. 71) 1610 (ii).

FERTILISERS, ARTIFICIAL, REMOVAL OF DUTY (Mr. *Mulock*): prop. Res., 93; neg. (Y. 71, N. 101) 105 (i).

FISHERIES ACT AMT. B. 129 (Mr. *Tupper*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Ellis*) 6 m. h., 1118; neg. (Y. 72, N. 108) 1125 (ii).

DIVISIONS—*Continued.*

FISHERIES AND TRADE RELATIONS WITH U.S.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 323; neg. (Y. 65, N. 108) 423.

FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, ACT AMT. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*): on M. for 2°, Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 986; neg. (Y. 75, N. 105) 1007; on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1279; neg. (Y. 59, N. 88) 1280; Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 88) 1280 (ii).

FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S BRIDGE CO.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) on conc., neg. (Y. 33, N. 65) 1653; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 33, N. 65) 1653; conc. in (Y. 66, N. 35) 1653 (ii).

IMMIGRATION (EMPLOYMENT OF MR. SMYTH): prop. Res. (Mr. *Somerville*) on conc., 1613; neg. (Y. 39, N. 71) 1613 (ii).

I.C.R. (WORKING EXPENSES AND REPAIRS): Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) on conc., 1605; neg. (Y. 39, N. 71) 1607 (ii).

INTOXICATING LIQUORS IN N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1331; neg. (Y. 53, N. 100) 1351 (ii).

JESUITS ESTATES' ACT, DISALLOWANCE: prop. Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 811; neg. (Y. 13, N. 188) 910 (ii).

LOAN (3 per cent.) OF 1888: prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1152; neg. (Y. 74, N. 117) 1169 (ii).

MARINE, DEPT. (C. C. CHIPMAN'S SALARY): prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) on conc., neg. (Y. 33, N. 65) 1614 (ii).

MILITIA CLOTHING: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1553; neg. (Y. 54, N. 95) 1570 (ii).

MOUNTED POLICE PENSIONS B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*): on M. for 2°, Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1271; neg. (Y. 66, N. 106) 1277 (ii).

OCEAN STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES (B.C. AND AUSTRALIA): on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. of Whole, Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1425; neg. (Y. 55, N. 77) 1426 (ii).

OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY.: Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on conc., 1604; neg. (Y. 39, N. 70) 1604 (ii).

PENITENTIARIES, REDUCTION OF VOTE: prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on conc., neg. (Y. 47, N. 73) 1598 (ii).

POST OFFICE ACT AMT. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 85) 1281 (ii).

PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: Amt. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) and Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) 89; neg. (Y. 58, N. 86) 261; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) neg. (Y. 35, N. 128) 267; Amt. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) agreed to (Y. 99, N. 59) 269 (i).

QUEEN'S COLLEGE (KINGSTON) B. 46 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*): M. for 3° agreed to (Y. 104, N. 37) 607 (i).

RAILWAYS AND CANALS, REDUCTION OF VOTE: prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on conc., neg. (Y. 40, N. 73) 1603 (ii).

RECIPROCITY (UNRESTRICTED) WITH U. S.: prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 468; neg. (Y. 77, N. 121) 739 (i).

SAW LOGS, EXPORT DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1585; neg. (Y. 54, N. 90) 1594 (ii).

SHAWANAKISKIC INDIANS, SURRENDER OF PINE LANDS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1488; (neg. (Y. 62, N. 91) 1494 (ii).

SHORT LINE RY. (HARVEY TO SALISBURY): prop. Res. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) on conc., 1671; neg. (Y. 34, N. 70) 1678 (ii).

SUBSIDIES (MONEY) TO RYS. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) neg. (Y. 27, N. 48) 1686 (ii).

WRECKING (FOREIGN VESSELS AID) B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) 759; neg. (Y. 56, N. 108) 761 (i).

Divorce (Bagwell, Geo. McD.) B. No. 123 (Mr. *Brown*). 1°*, 871; 2° on a div., 1098; in Com. on a div., 1233; 3° on a div., 1264 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 107.)

Divorce (Lowry, W. G.) B. No. 119 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 871; 2° m., 992; 2° neg. (Y. 79, N. 80) 995; M. to restore to Order Paper, agreed to on a div., 1016; 2° on a div., 1160; M. for Com. and Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 1264; neg. (Y. 55, N. 69) and 3° on a div., 1265 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 108.)

Divorce (Middleton, W.) B. No. 125 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 871; 2° on a div., 1098; in Com. on a div., 1234; M. for Com., 1264; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 1264; neg. (Y. 55, N. 69) and 3° on a div., 1265 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 109.)

Divorce (Wand, A.) B. No. 124 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 871; 2° on a div., 1098; in Com. on a div., 1234; 3° on a div., 1264 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 110.)

Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 70 (Mr. *Amyot*). 1°*, 299 (i).

Dom. Elections Act (*Chap. 8 Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 28** (Mr. *Joncas*). 1°, 79 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 145 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1°*, 1462; 2°* and in Com., 1537; 3°*, 1629 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 27.)

DOM. LANDS ACT AMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 34, 762 (ii).

DOM. LANDS: Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to reduce vote on conc., 1607 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 1240, 1258 (ii).

Dom. Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 24 (Mr. *Trow*). 1°*, 47; 2°*, 170; in Com. and 3°*, 397 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 95.)

DOM. LOANS REDUCED: in Com. of Sup., 204 (i).

Dom. Mineral Co.'s incorp. B. No. 80 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 322; 2°*, 524 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 921 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 102.)

DOM. POLICE, COMMISSIONER'S REP.: presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 3 (i).

—— in Com. in Sup., 211 (i).

DRAWBACK ON GOODS MANUFACTURED FOR EXPORT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Ellis*) 943 (ii).

DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 968; conc., 1448 1600 (ii).

DREDGE "CAPE BRETON," COMPENSATION TO CAPTAIN AND LABORERS FOR LOSSES: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 427 (i)

DREDGE LOST IN STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 469 (i).

DREDGE "PRINCE EDWARD," COST OF REPAIRS: M for Ret (Mr. *Perry*) 31 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 302 (i).

—— PAYMENT TO CAPTAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 30 (i).

DRESDEN TURNING GROUND, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup, 151 (i).

DRILL SHED AT BELLEVILLE, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Burdett*) 699 (i).

DRILL SHEDS, CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 795 (i).

DRILL PAY, MILITIA: conc., 1593 (ii).

DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1634 (ii).

DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMISED ROAD: M. for Cor, &c. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 34 (i).

—— SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1628 (ii).

Edmundston and Florenceville Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 88 (Mr. *Landry*). 1°*, 379; 2°*, 510. (i).

ELECTORAL LISTS, AMOUNT EXPENDED IN PREPAIRING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 30, 33 (i).

ELECTIONS:

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 223 (i).

ELECTIONS—*Continued.*

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, DATE OF RECEIPT BY SPEAKER OF JUDGES CERTIFICATES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 303 (i).

CUMBERLAND CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

HALDIMAND CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

HALTON CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

HASTINGS (EAST) CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

JOLIETTE CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

LAPRAIRIE CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

MASKINONGE CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

NORTHUMBERLAND (EAST) CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. (Mr *Speaker*) 1 (i).

RIMOUSKI CONTROVERTED: Supreme Court Judgment (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

SHELBURNE CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

SIMCOE (EAST) CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

Elevators and Hoists, prevention of Accidents B. No. 13 (Mr. *Madill*). 1°*, 29; 2°*, 260 (i).

EMPLOYÉS OF PROVINCIAL AND FEDERAL GOVTS, DUAL OFFICES: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 525 (i).

Engineers (stationary) Examination and Licensing B. No. 8 (Mr. *Cook*). 1°, 17 (i); 2° m., 1107; Amt. (Mr. *Tupper*) 6 m. h., 1109; agreed to on a div., 1111 (ii).

Enquiries concerning Public Matters further provision B. No. 72 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 303; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 504 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 33)

ESTIMATES, THE: presented, (Mr. *Foster*) 30 (i).

—— SUPPL.: presented, 1018, 1467, 1627 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1397 (ii).

ESQUIMALT AND LEVIS GRAVING DOCKS: in Com. of Sup., 1232 (ii).

ESQUIMAUX POINT TELEGRAPH LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 935.

EXCHEQUER COURT CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).

Exchequer Court of Can. Act Amt. B. No. 109 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 589; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 787 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 38.)

EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 12 3 (ii).

EXPERIMENTAL FARM, OTTAWA, EXPENDITURE: M. for Statmt. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 436 (i).

—— COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 225 (i); M. for Ret*., 235 (i).

—— EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 428, 525 (i).

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 288 (i), 971 (ii); conc., 1598 (ii).

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 24 (i).

EXPORTS TO GREAT BRITAIN *vid* U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 423 (i).

EXPORTS OF MANUFACTURES TO AUSTRALIA: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1423 (ii).

Expropriation. *See* "LANDS."

Extradition. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW."

FABRE, MR., SALARY AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 1179, 1361 (ii).

FARLEY, GUNNER, CLAIM FOR LOSS OF HORSE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fisher*) 433 (i).

FARMERS, FRAUDS UPON: M. for Sp. Com. (Mr. *Brown*) 16 (i).

FEES PAID LAW FIRMS IN QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 347.

FERGUSON, MR., LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 51 (i).

FERTILISERS, ARTIFICIAL, REMOVAL OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 37 (i).
Deb. (Mr. *Hall*) 38; (Mr. *Casey*) 39; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 40; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 40; (Mr. *Sproule*) 41; (Mr. *Fisher*) 42; (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 43; (Messrs. *Haggart, Welsh* and *Bain, Wentworth*) 44; (Mr. *Foster*) 45; (Mr. *Mills*) 46; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 93; (Mr. *Smith, Ont*) 96; (Mr. *Mulock*) 97; (Mr *Sproule*) 98; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 99; (Mr. *Carling*) 99; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 101; (Mr. *McMullen*) 101; (Mr. *Porter*) 102; (Mr. *Masson*) 103; (Mr. *Semple*) 104; neg. (Y. 71, N. 101) 105 (i).
FIFTEEN-POINT (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1423 (ii).
FINANCE AND TREASURY BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 66 (i).
FINANCE:
BUDGET SPEECHES, COST: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 20 (i).
BUDGET, THE: Annual Statement (Mr. *Foster*) 436 (i).
BUDGET SPEECH, PRINTING IN FRENCH: Ques (Mr. *Bergeron*) 171 (i).
C. P. R. CO.'S SALE OF $15,000,000 MORTGAGE BONDS, RECEIPTS FROM SALE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Ste. Marie*) 436 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Ste. Marie*) 841, 1363 (ii).
—— INTEREST DUE ON $15,000,000 BONDS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 348 (i).
CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 24 (i).
INTEREST ON SINKING FUND, AMOUNTS CHARGED AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1363 (ii).
LOAN (3 per cent.) OF 1888: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 944, 1044 (ii).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup., Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 946 (ii).
—— prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. 1147, 1160 (ii).
—— PAR. IN PROSPECTUS *re* SINKING FUND: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1328 (ii).
—— AMOUNTS RECEIVED ON ACCOUNT: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).
MENNONITE IMMIGRANTS LOAN: prop. Res. (Mr. *Carling*) 1146 (ii).
PUB. ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Rykert*) to ref. to Pub Accts. Com, 47 (i).
—— presented (Mr. *Foster*) 2 (i).
SUBSIDY TO P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 15 (i).
SUBWAY, STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 16 (i).
TRADE COMMISSIONER TO S. AMERICA: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 30 (i)
Fire-Arms, &c., Improper Use Act (*Chap.* 148 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 134** (Mr. *Brown*). 1°*, 1221 (ii).
First Offenders. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW."
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Dickey*). 1°*, 524.
Fisheries Act (*Chap.* 95 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 129** (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 911; 2°* and in Com, 1045; 3° m, 1117; Amt. (Mr. *Ellis*) 6 m. h., 1117; neg. (Y. 72, N. 102) and 3°, 1125 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 24.)
Fishermen (safety) better security B. No. 133 (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*). 1°*, 1180 (ii).
FISHERIES AND TRADE RELATIONS WITH U.S.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 323 (i).
Deb. on Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 329; (Mr *Mills, Bothwell*) 332; (Mr. *Foster*) 337; (Mr. *Edgar*) 342; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 385; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 390; (Mr. *Kenny*) 395; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 397; (Mr. *Casey*) 402; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 404; (Sir *John Thompson*) 411; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 419; Amt. neg. (Y. 65, N. 108) 423 (i).
FISHERIES:
"ADAMS," SEIZURE OF, PAPERS, &c: Remarks on adjnmt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1462, 1463 (ii).
ARTHABASKA, FISHERY OVERSEER, APPOINTMENT: (Ques.) (Mr. *Turcot*) 302 (i).
BASS FISHING PERMITS, LAKE ERIE: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1081 (ii).
BEHRING'S SEA FISHERIES, PROCLAMATION OF U. S. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 871 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 811 (ii).
FISHERIES—*Continued.*
BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN: in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
FISHERY BOUNTY CLAIMS IN P. E. I.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 434 (i).
—— COMMISSIONER (ASSISTANT) P. E I., APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 171 (i).
—— OVERSEER, IN ARTHABASKA, REVENUES, SALARY AND EXPENSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 80 (i).
FISH, FOREIGN, CHANGE IN BONDING SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 224 (i).
FISHING LICENSES ON THE NATASHQUAN: Ques. Mr. (*Fiset*) 1533, 1627 (ii).
—— ONT. INLAND WATERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dawson*) 82 (i).
—— RIVER MATANE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 171 (i).
FISH PROPAGATION IN N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 740 (i).
FISHING REGULATIONS IN BERTHIER: M. for copies (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 743 (i).
FISHING RIGHTS IN MATANE RIVER: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 938.
LOBSTER AND OYSTER COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 159 (i).
LOBSTER FACTORIES IN P.E.I., NUMBER, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry* 31 (i).
MATANE RIVER FISHING PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 469 (i).
Modus Vivendi: Remarks, 30 (i), 811 (ii).
SALMON RIVERS IN QUE., LEASES, &c., Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 224 (i).
SMELT FISHING IN THE MIRAMICHI: in Com. of Sup., 140 (i).
FISH IMPORTED IN BOND FOR EXPORT: M. for Cor. (Gen. *Laurie*) 1082 (ii).
FISH IMPORTS IN BOND, EXPLANATION: (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 1099 (ii).
FISHERIES IN LUNENBURG COUNTY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 940.
FLOUR DUTIES, INCREASE: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1145; remarks, 1721 (ii).
Foreign Vessels. *See* "WRECKING."
Foresters, Independent Order (Supreme Court) incorp. B. No. 74 (Mr. *Jamieson*). 1°*, 322; 2°*, 397; in Com., 754; 3°*, 792 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1233 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 104)
FORESTRY COMMISSIONER: in Com. of Sup., 1253 (ii).
FORTIFICATIONS AT ESQUIMALT, COL. O'BRIEN'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1146 (ii).
FRANCHISE ACT, AMOUNT EXPENDED FOR VARIOUS SERVICES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 303 (i).
—— EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1511; conc., 1615 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act (*Chap.* 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 4** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 14 (i); 2° m., 980; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 986; further consdrn. rsmd., 996; Amt. neg. (Y. 75, N. 105) 1007; 2° and in Com., 1008, 1019, 1125; 3° m., 1278; Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1279; neg. (Y. 59, N. 88) 1280; Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 88) 1280; 3°*, 1281 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 9.)
Deb. on M. for 2° (Messrs. *Laurier* and *Edgar*) 980; (Mr. *Charlton*) 981; (Messrs. *White, Renfrew* and *Colter*) 982; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 983; (Sir *John A. Macdonald* and Mr. *Laurier*) 985; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 986 (ii).
Deb. on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright* and Mr. *Mitchell*) 987; (Mr. *Weldon* [*St. John*] and *McMullen*) 989; (Mr. *Colter*) 1000; (Mr. *Daly*) 1001; (Messrs. *Macdonald* [*Huron*] and *Mulock*) 1002; (Messrs. *Denison* and *Waldie*) 1005; (Messrs. *Lavergne, Platt* and *Barron*) 1006; (Mr. *Campbell*) 1007; Amt. neg. (Y. 75, N. 105) 1008 (ii).
Frauds. *See* "MILK," "TREE PEDDLERS, &c."
FRAUDULENT PRACTICES COM.: M. (Mr. *Brown*) for Sp. Com., 10.
—— M. to reduce quorum, 222 (i)
Free List, Articles controlled by Combines B No. 56 (Mr. *Edgar*). 1°, 248 (i).

FREE LIST EXTENSION (GRAINS AND SEEDS): prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 684 (i)..

Deb. on Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 684; (Messrs. *Haggart, Charlton* and *Somerville*) 685; (Mr. *Mulock*) 686; (Mr. *Bowell*) 686, 692; (Messrs. *Taylor, Scriver* and *Sproule*) 687; (Messrs. *Rowand* and Gen. *Laurie*) 688; (Mr. *Platt*) 689; (Messrs. *Kirkpatrick* and *McNeill*) 690; (Messrs. *Casey, Landerkin* and *Hesson*) 691; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 692 (i).

FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1619 (ii).

FREIGHT RATES, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1064 (ii).

FREIGHT TRANSIT THROUGH CANADA: prop. M. (Mr. *Ives*) for Sel. Com., 87; Order read, 591 (i).

FRUITS AND SEEDS, IMPORTED FROM U.S., VALUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyle*) 224 (i).

FRUIT BASKETS AND BOXES, AMOUNT OF DUTY COLLECTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 304 (i).

FRUIT GROWING INTEREST (DEVELOPMENT): in Com. of Sup, 1513 (ii).

GANNON NARROWS FLOATING BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1627 (ii).

GAS (NATURAL) IN WESTERN ONT., MR. COSTE'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 468 (i).

General Inspection Act (*Chap. 99 Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 137** (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 1236; 2°* and in Com., 1398; 3°*, 1399 (ii). 52 (*Vic., c.* 17.)

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup, 58 (i), 1079 (ii).

GOOD FRIDAY, ADJMNT.: Remarks, 1235; M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1330 (ii).

GOVT. ADVERTISING: in Com. of Sup., 1236 (ii).

GOVT. BUSINESS: M. to take in Saturday (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1534 (ii).

——— Thursday (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 423 (i).

——— Wednesday (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 653 (i).

——— Monday (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1181 (ii).

GOVT. IN N. W. T. (EXPENSES): in Com. of Sup., 1179 (ii).

GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE, &C: in Com. of Sup., 974.

GOV. GEN.'S SECRETARY'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup, 49 (i).

GOWAN, HON. J. R., SENATOR, PENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 676 (i).

GOWANLOCK, MRS.: in Com. of Sup., 792 (i),

GRAND NARROWS BRIDGE (C. B.) PAPERS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Flynn*) 1266 (ii).

GRAND RIVER BRIDGE AT YORK: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 171 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Colter*) 304 (i).

G. T. R., PETITIONS FROM SHAREHOLDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Shanly*) 1081 (ii).

——— GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE ERIE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1637 (ii).

GRAVING DOCK, KINGSTON: in Com. of Sup., 801 (i).

GRAZING LEASES CANCELLED IN N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 935 (ii).

GREAT EASTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: M. for Pets, Reps., &c. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 20 (i).

——— prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1634 (ii).

GREAT NORTHERN RY., ENGINEER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 370 (i).

Great North-West Ry. Co. *See* "ALBERTA AND ATHABASCA."

Great North-West Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 89 (Mr. *Daly*). 1°*, 369; 2°*, 510; in Com. and 3°*, 755 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 67.)

GRIFFIN, W. H., EX DEP. P. M. G.: in Com of Sup., 1453 (ii).

GROSSE, JOHN A., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 171 (i).

GROVER J. M., POSTMASTER AT MORDEN, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Guay*) 943 (ii).

HAGGART HON. JOHN G., MEMBER FOR NORTH LANARK: introduced, 1 (i).

HALDIMAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

HALIFAX, ACCOMMODATION AT (I. C. R.): in Com. of Sup., 1048 (ii).

HALIFAX GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup, 801 (i).

HALTON, RET OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

HAMEL. *See* "Larue."

Hamilton Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 39 (Mr. *McKay*). 1°*, 191; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 509 (i). (52 *Vic., c* 76)

HARBORS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 807 (i), 913, 931, 1447, 1528; conc., 1579, 1615 (ii).

Harvey to Salisbury. *See* "SHORT LINE."

HASTINGS (EAST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

Hawkesbury Lumber Co.'s incorp. B. No. 20 (Mr. *Labrosse*). 1°*, 47; 2°*, 170; in Com. and 3°*, 397 (i), (52 *Vic., c.* 98)

HEALTH, PUBLIC, PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES: in Com. of Sup., 932 (ii)

HEALTH STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup, 287 (i); conc., 1598.

HEBEN RIVER TO YOUNG'S MILL RY SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1616 (ii).

HEREFORD RY. CO. AND PAYMENT OF EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Bernier*) 1017 (ii).

——— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com, 1638 (ii).

HICKEY WHARF (P. E I.) REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 621.

HIDE AND LEATHER INSPECTOR, MONTREAL: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Curran*) 23 (i).

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 151, 196 (i), 1503, 1597 (ii).

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND: Res. (Mr. *Cook*) allowed to stand, 304 (i).

HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Reps. (Mr. *McMullen*) 22, 29 (i).

HORSE ISLAND, GEORGIAN BAY, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 590 (i).

HOSPITAL DUES ON SHIPS, COLLECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 302; M. for Ret.*, 303 (i).

House of Commons Act (*Chap* 13 *Revised Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 108.** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 569; 2°* and in Com, 785; 3°*, 787 (i) (52 *Vic., c.* 11.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

ADDRESS IN ANS. TO SPEECH, 3: HIS EX.'S REPLY, 323 (i).

ASSINIBOINE (EAST) RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1.

BILLS ASSENTED TO, 745 (i), 1286, 1726, (ii).

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, COMMUNICATION FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC., 1262.

——— LETTER FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC. (Mr. *Speaker*) 739 (i).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE: Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 269 (i).

CARDWELL, RET. OF MEMBER; notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Continued.*
CARIBOO RET OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
COLCHESTER RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
CUMBERLAND, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr *Speaker*) 1 (i).
DEBATES, OFFICIAL. *See* general heading.
DIVISION LIST, CORRECTION (Mr. *Mara*) 1330 (ii).
HALDIMAND, RET OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
HALTON, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i)
IN COM. OF SUP.: 270 (i), 1362, 1511, 1615; conc, 1593 (i).
INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex., 29 (i).
JOLIETTE, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
KING'S Co, P.E.I, REPRESENTATION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) challenging Seat, 169 (i).
LANARK (SOUTH) RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
LEGISLATIVE ECONOMY, JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 782 (i).
—— REP. OF JOINT COM.: Ques. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 1669 (ii).
LIBRARY OF PARLT.: M. for Joint Com (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 17 (i).
—— REP. OF JOINT LIBRARIANS: presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 1, 3, 13, 29, 33 (i).
MEMBERS' SESSIONAL INDEMNITY: Remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1710.
MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY, 29, 332 (i), 1018, 1467, 1627 (ii).
MONTREAL (EAST) RET OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i)
NICOLET, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
NORTHUMBERLAND (EAST) RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i)
PAIRS: Personal explanation (Mr *Trow*) 1574 (ii).
PARLIAMENT: Opening, 1 (i); Prorogation, 1727 (ii).
PICTOU, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
PRINTING: M. for Joint Com (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 19 (i).
PRIVILEGE, QUES OF (Mr. *Trow*) MEMBER LEAVING SEAT DURING VOTE: remarks 249 (i).
PROROGATION, COMMUNICATION FROM GOV. GEN'S SEC., 1711 (ii).
PROVENCHER, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES. *See* general heading.
SHELBURNE, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) not to sit after 12 o'clock, 432, 526 (i).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
TODD'S PARLIAMENTARY GOVT., DISTRIBUTION TO MEMBERS (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1600 (ii).
VACANCIES: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

HUBERT, MISS ANNABELLA, COMPENSATION FOR EXPROPRIATION OF LAND: Ques. (Gen. *Laurie*) 841 (ii).

HUDSON'S BAY RY. AND MAN. REPUDIATION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1628 (ii).

HURON TRIBE OF LORETTE INDIANS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 33 (i).

IMMIGRATION. *See* "AGRICULTURE," "SUPPLY," &c.

INDIANS:
AGENT AT CAUGHNAWAGA, SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1264 (ii).
ANNUITIES TO INDIANS, ARREARS: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 937 (ii).
BEEF SUPPLIES, INDIAN AGENCIES, N. W. T.: M. for copies of Tenders (Mr. *Edgar*) 942 (ii).
BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS, CLAIMS FOR LOSSES: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 1082 (ii).
—— COMPENSATION FOR LOSSES: Ques (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 348
CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS, ELECTION OF COUNCILLORS: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 427 (i).
—— SURVEY OF RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 468 (i).
—— AGENTS' SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1265 (ii).
INDIAN AFFAIRS: deptl. Rep., presented (Mr. *Dewdney*) 29 (i).
LANDS, GRAND RIVER, CAYUGA, SALES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Colter*) 304 (i).
RESERVES, SALE OF PINE TIMBER: Ques. (Mr *Barron*) 20, 30 (i).
SHAWANAKISKIC INDIANS, SURRENDER OF PINE LANDS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1488; neg. (Y. 62, N 91) 1494 (ii).
TREATIES, ASSIGNMENT OF LAND: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 841 (ii).
ROSSEAU RIVER INDIAN RESERVE, CHANGE OF LOCATION: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 347 (i).
SIX NATION INDIANS, SALE OF LANDS: Ques. (Mr *Colter*) 428 (i).
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act (*Chap.* 34 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 139** (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. prop., 1221; in Com, 1269; 1° of B, 1269; 2°* and in Com., 1397; 3°*, 1398 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 15.)

INLAND REVENUE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 66 (i).
—— correction (Mr. *Costigan*) 17 (i).
—— Rep. presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 3 (i).
INSPECTORS OF HULLS, NAMES, &c., OF COMMISSIONERS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 943 (ii).
INSPECTORS, REGISTRARS' AND CLERKS' SALARIES, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 1180, 1215 (i).
INSURANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1361 (ii).

Interest Act Amt. B. No. 132 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 979; 2°, 1130; in Com and 3°*, 1330 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 31.)

Interest Act (*Chap.* 127 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 10** (Mr. *Landry*). 1°, 19 (i).

INTEREST ON SINKING FUND, AMOUNTS CHARGED AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1363 (ii).
INTERIOR DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 58 (i), 1502 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
CAPITAL ACCOUNT, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 676 (i).
DINING ROOMS AT STATIONS, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 428 (i).
FRENCH LANGUAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 29 (i).
INDIANTOWN BRANCH, CLAIM OF ALLAN WRIGHT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1094 (ii).
MCDONALD, A. R., SUPERINTENDENT, PET. FROM EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 248 (i).
NOEL, FORTIN, ACCIDENT TO: M. for Rep. (Mr. *Fiset*) 303.
—— M. for Ret., *304 (i).
PICTOU BRANCH RY., TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 302, 348 (i).
RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, FROM OPENING TO DATE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 427 (i).
REDUCTION OF VOTE: conc., 1604 (ii).
REPAIRS AND WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1074, 1496 (ii).
ROLLING STOCK: conc., 1614 (ii).
ST. CHARLES BRANCH RY., TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 302 (i).
—— ENTIRE COST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 943 (ii).
SUMMER FREIGHT RATES: Remarks, 1330, 1535 (ii).

INTERIOR:
BALLOT IN N.W.T., LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 525 (i).
BEER (4 per cent.) IMPORTED INTO N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 525.
CANTEEN AT REGINA BARRACKS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1082 (ii).
DESCHENES, LUDGER MIVILLE, AMOUNTS PAID FOR SURVEYS IN N.WT.: Ques. (Mr. *Midill*) 1327 (ii).
DOM LANDS ACT AMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 34, 762 (i).
GRAZING LEASES CANCELLED IN ALBERTA: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 935.
HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS, MAN. AND N. W. T.: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *McMullen*) 22, 29 (i).
HORSE ISLAND, GEORGIAN BAY, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 590 (i).
INDIAN TREATIES, SURRENDER OF LANDS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 841 (ii).
CLERKS EMPLOYED IN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1328 (ii).
LA CLOCHE ISLAND, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 428 (i).
—— PROVINCIAL CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1081 (ii).
LAND BOARD, WINNIPEG: in Com. of Sup., 59, 65 (i).
LIQUOR PERMITS IN N.W.T., COR., &c.: M. for copies (Mr *Jamieson*) 550 (i).
MORMON SETTLEMENT IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 980 (ii).
MOUNTED POLICE COMMISSIONER'S REP.: presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 169 (i).
—— DESERTIONS DURING TEN YEARS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 303 (i).
—— PUNISHMENT OF CONSTABLES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 429.

INTERIOR—*Continued.*
ORDNANCE LANDS, QUE., EXTENSION OF STREETS: M. for Pets., Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 943 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER ISLANDS, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 34 (i).
SCRIP (LAND) OUTSTANDING: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 347, 525 (i).
STEPHENSON, RUFUS, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 223.
SETTLERS (OLD) CLAIMS IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1533 (ii).
SULTANA ISLAND, LAKE OF THE WOODS, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 426 (i).
TOWN SITES, IN N.W.T., RECEIPTS FROM SALES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 29 (i).
INTERNATIONAL RY. CO. AND C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 769 (i).
——— Co.'s SUBSIDY, DISTRIBUTION: M. for O. C.'s, &c., (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 943 (i).
INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex., 29 (i).
INTOXICATING LIQUORS IN N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1331 (ii).
Deb. on Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1336; (Mr. *Macdowall*) 1338; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1340; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1342; (Mr. *Davin*) 1342; (Sir *Donald Smith*) 1344; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 1345; (Messrs. *Kirk, Taylor* and *Freeman*) 1346; (Messrs. *Armstrong* and *Dewdney*) 1347; (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1348; (Mr. *Jamieson*) 1350; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1351; neg. (Y. 53, N. 100) 1351 (ii).
——— *See* "PROHIBITION."
IRONDALE, BANCROFT AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396; in Com., 1500 (ii).
JAMES, MR. JUSTICE, LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Victoria*) 525 (i).
JESUITS' ESTATES ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 79 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *O'Brien*) 384 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) 436, 524 (i).
——— PAPERS RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 526 (i).
——— MR. O'BRIEN'S RES.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 675 (i).
——— PAPERS PRESENTED (Sir *John A. Macdonnld*) 701 (i).
——— DAY FOR DISCUSSION: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 740 (i).
——— TEST OF LEGALITY: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1327 (ii).
JESUITS' ESTATES ACT, DISALLOWANCE: prop. Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 811 (i).
Deb. on Res. (Mr. *Rykert*) 816; (Mr. *Barron*) 828; (Mr. *Wallace*) 834; (Mr. *Colby*) 836; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 839; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 842; (Sir *John Thompson*) 856; (Mr. *McNeill*) 869; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 872; (Mr. *Charlton*) 883; (Mr. *Mulock*) 892; (Mr. *Scriver*) 893; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 895; (Mr. *McMullen*) 896; (Mr. *Laurier*) 897; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 903; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 908; neg. (Y. 13, N. 188) 910 (ii).
JOLIETTE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
——— DISTRICT JUDGE, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 170 (i).
——— MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Neveu*) 762.
——— RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
JOBIN, ACHILLES, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 348 (i).
JONES' CREEK, LEEDS, ONT., PETS., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Taylor*) 540 (i).
JONES, SIMEON, SUMS PAID AS TRADE COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 30 (i).
JUDGES' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 206 (i).
——— LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 1629 (ii).
Judges' (Provincial) Salaries Act (*Chap.* 138 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 150** (Sir *John Thompson*). Res. prop., 557 (i); M. for Com., 1687; in Com., 1°* and 2°* of B., 1688; in Com. and 3°*, 1689 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 39.)
JUGEMENTS DU CONSEIL SOUVERAIN, VOL. IV: in Com. of Sup, 1453 (ii).
JUKES, DR., MEDICAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).
JUSTICE:
BAR OF QUEBEC, DISALLOWANCE OF ACT, O. C.'s., &c.: M. for copies,* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 303 (i).
C. P. R., RAILWAYS CROSSING IN MANITOBA, VALIDITY OF ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 20 (i).
CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, DISTRIBUTION OF FINES: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1533 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Roome*) 80 (i).
CORRUPT PRACTICES TRIALS, INSTRUCTIONS TO COUNSEL: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 427 (i).
COUNTY COURT JUDGES FOR B.-C., APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mara*) 80 (i).
CRIMINAL LAWS, DISTRIBUTION TO JUSTICES OF THE PEACE: Ques. (Mr. *Bernier*) 171 (i).
DEFENCE OF INDIAN CHARGED WITH SHOOTING: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 935 (ii).
DISALLOWANCE OF QUEBEC ACTS, O. C's., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 303 (i).
DOM. POLICE COMMISSIONER'S REP.: presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 3 (i).
GOWAN, HON. J. R, SENATOR, PENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 676 (i)
JAMES, MR. JUSTICE, LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Victoria*) 525 (i).
JESUITS' ESTATES ACT. *See* general heading.
JOLIETTE DISTRICT JUDGE, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 170 (i).
JUDGES' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup, 206 (i).
——— LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E I*) 1629 (ii).
LARUE, CASGRAIN, AUGER & HAMEL, LAW FEES PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 347 (i).
LEBOURDAIS BROS., COR. *re* TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 16 (i).
LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 49 (i), 1455, 1597 (ii).
MAGISTRATES, DISALLOWANCE OF ACT, O. C.'s, COR., &c.: (M. for copies) 303 (i).
O'CONNOR, D., AMOUNT PAID FOR LAW CASES, FEES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 31 (i).
ST. CATHARINES MILLING AND LUMBER CO. *vs.* QUEEN, ORIGINAL CHEQUES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 943 (ii)
——— COSTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1146 (ii).
——— LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 50 (i), 1455 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 33 (i).
SCUGOG RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1533 (ii).
SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS: in Com of Sup, 49 (i)
YOUNG AND FRONT OF ESSEX TOWNSHIPS, PETS., &c, TO GOVT TO DISALLOW UNION ACT OF ONT. LEGISLATURE: M. for copies* (Mr. *Taylor*) 436 (i).
KING, JAMES, COMPENSATION FOR CANCELLING CONTRACTS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (ii).
KING'S CO., P. E. I., REPRESENTATION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) challenging Seat, 169 (i).
Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 47 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 194; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 509 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 79.)
KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1632 (ii).
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. and Napanee Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. No. 90 (Mr. *Bell*). 1°*, 369; 2°*, 510; in Com. and 3°*, 755 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 77.)
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. No. 69. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 269; 2°*, 397; in Com. and 3°*, 663 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 78.)
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: conc., 1615 (ii).

Kootenay and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s B. No. 15 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 30; 2°*, 33; in Com., 238; 3°*, 299 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 49.)

KYLE, CONVICT: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. of Sup., 216 (i).

LABOR COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 1497; conc., 1614 (ii).

——— LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 1422 (ii).

——— REP.: presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 1285 (ii).

LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1205 (ii).

——— NEW BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 20 (i).

LA CLOCHE ISLAND, PROVINCIAL CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1081 (ii).

——— SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Fisher*) 428 (i).

Lac Seul Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 52 (Mr. *Daly*). 1°*, 222; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 509 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 55.)

LAKE, JAMES P., PAYMENT FOR WIRE ROPE: Ques. (Mr. *Macdowall*) 1628 (ii).

Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s incorp. B. No. 62 (Mr. *Watson*). 1°*, 269; 2°*, 357 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 855; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1160 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 57.)

LAKE MAN. RY. AND CANAL CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 1572; in Com., 1719 (ii).

Lake Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 40 (Mr. *Denison*). 1°*, 194; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 81.)

LAKE ST. JOHN BUOYS AND LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1146 (ii).

——— HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1146.

——— MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1628 (ii).

——— RY. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 979 (ii).

——— WHARVES, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1181.

LAKE ST. LOUIS BUOYS AND LIGHTS: Remarks 1534, 1574, 1652 (ii).

LAKE ST. PETER BUOYS: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 979 (ii).

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE COLONISATION AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1631 (ii).

LANARK (SOUTH) RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

LAND BOARD, WINNIPEG: in Com. of Sup., 59 (i).

LAND DAMAGES, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 1065, 1597 (ii).

Lands, Expropriation of, B. No. 131 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 943; 2°* and in Com., 1266; 3°*, 1331 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 13.)

Lands in B. C. (Conveyance) B. No. 128 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°, 911; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1043 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 7.)

LAPRAIRIE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

LAPRAIRIE VILLAGE, PROTECTION AGAINST ICE: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 427 (i).

LARD (ADULTERATED) IMPORTS FROM U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 763 (i).

L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, N.S., SURVEYS, COR., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Flynn*) 698 (i).

LA RIVIÈRE, ALPHONSE A. C., ESQ., MEMBER FOR PROVENCHER: introduced, 13 (i).

LARUE, CASGRAIN, ANGERS & HAMEL, LAW FEES PAID: Ques: (Mr. *Turcot*) 347 (i).

LAURIE, GEN., MEMBER FOR SHELBURNE: introduced, 29.

LAWS, PRINTING AND BINDING, &c.: in Com of Sup., 272 (i).

LEBOURDAIS BROS., COR. *re* TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 16.

LE CARON, THE INFORMER: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Flynn*) 93, 97.

——— Remarks (Mr. *Costigan*) 323 (i).

LEDUC, CHARLES, OF HULL, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 171 (i).

LEGAL FEES AND EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 49 (i), 1455, 1597 (ii).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF N.W.T., MEMORIALS TO: M. for copies (Mr. *Davin*) 348, 371 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Charlton*) 371; (Mr. *Macdowall*) 374; (Mr. *Watson*) 375; (Mr. *Daly*) 376; (Mr. *McMullen*) 378; (Mr. *Davis*) 380; (Mr. *Dewdney*) 382 (i).

LEGISLATIVE ECONOMY, JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 782 (i).

——— REP. OF JOINT COM.: Ques. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 1669.

LÈPINE, ALPHONSE T., ESQ, MEMBER FOR MONTREAL EAST: introduced, 1 (i).

LETTER POSTAGE, REDUCTION OF RATES: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 80 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 34 (i).

LÉVIS POST OFFICE, PETS., &c., FOR BUILDING: M. for copies (Mr. *Guay*) 433 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLT., REP. OF LIBRARIANS: presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

——— M. for Joint Com. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 17 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 272 (i).

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 975, 1361, 1450 (ii).

LIQUOR LICENSES IN ROCKY MOUNTAINS PARK: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 249 (i).

LIQUOR PERMITS IN N.W.T., COR., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Jamieson*) 550 (i).

LITIGATED MATTERS: in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).

LITTLE DOVER POST OFFICE AND CANSO MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 590 (i).

LOAN (3 PER CENT.) OF 1888, AMOUNTS RECEIVED ON ACCOUNT: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i)

——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 944 (ii).

——— Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 946 (ii).

——— prop. Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1147, 1160 (ii).

——— PAR. IN PROSPECTUS, *re* SINKING FUND: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1328 (ii).

——— MENNONITE IMMIGRANTS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Carling*) 1146 (ii). *See* B. 138.

LOBSTER AND OYSTER COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 159 (i).

LOBSTER FACTORIES IN P. E. I., NUMBER, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 31 (i).

LOGAN, WM., MAIL CONTRACTOR, PICKERING VILLAGE, SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 677 (i).

London and Can. Loan and Agency Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 77 (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1°*, 322; 2°*, 397; in Com. and 3°*, 524 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 93.)

London Mutual Fire Ins. Co. of Cana., incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 50 (Mr. *Marshall*). 1°*, 222; 2°*, 397 (i).

LONGUEUIL POSTAL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 80 (i).

——— WHARVES, COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 80.

LOURDES AND SOMERSET MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Turcott*) 751 (i).

Lowry, W. G. *See* "DIVORCE."

Lumber Inspection. *See* "TIMBER."

LUMBER SHIPMENTS FROM N. B. TO U. S., EXPORT DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 935 (ii).

LUNENBURG HARBOR, SURVEY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 749 (i).

——— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 591 (i).

MACDONALD AND DOWLING'S GULCHES, DRIVING OF PILES: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 677 (i).

MCCARTHY, MR., LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 52 (i).

MAGDALEN ISLANDS, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 1261, 1450 (ii).

MAGISTRATES, DISALLOWANCE OF ACT, O.C., COR., &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 303 (i).

MAIL CARRIAGE, BÉCANCOUR STATION AND STE. JULIE DE SOMERSET, &C.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Turcot*) 304 (i).

MAIL CARRIAGE AT BRUSSELS, ONT., CONTRACTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 249 (i).

MAIL SERVICE WITH ENGLAND: Remarks. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1574 (ii).

MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1261, 1450, 1532, 1701 (ii)

MAJORS' HILL PARK: in Com. of Sup., 1449; conc., 1599 (ii).

Man. and South-Eastern Ry. Co.'s. incorp. B. No. 61 (Mr. *La Rivière*). 1°*, 269; 2°*, 357; in Com. and 3°*, 510 (i). Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1159 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 60.)

MANITOBA:

- BEDSON, S. L., APPOINTMENT IN MILITIA FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 1328 (ii).
- ——— APPOINTMENT AS A.D.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1507 (ii).
- BRESALYOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 1082 (ii).
- ——— COMPENSATION FOR LOSSES: Ques. (*Mr. Mills, Bothwell*) 348.
- C.P.R., RYS. CROSSING LINE IN MAN., VALIDITY OF ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 20 (i).
- GROVER, J. M., POSTMASTER, MORDEN, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Guay*) 943 (ii).
- HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: M. for Reps. (Mr. *McMullen*) 22; remarks, 29 (i).
- HUDSON BAY RY. AND MAN. REPUDIATION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1628 (ii).
- LAKE MAN. RY. AND CANAL CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 1572; in Com., 1719 (ii).
- OILS, IMPORTS INTO MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1533 (ii).
- RED RIVER POSTAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1532 (ii).
- ROSSEAU RIVER INDIAN RESERVE, LOCATION: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 347 (ii).
- SEED WHEAT, PAYMENTS BY SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 590 (i).
- SETTLERS (OLD) CLAIMS IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1533 (ii).

MANUFACTURERS' LIFE INSURANCE CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) 1017 (ii).

——— Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1094, 1098 (ii).

——— STOCKHOLDERS, &C., COR.: M. for copies (Mr. *Lister*) 591 (i).

MANUSCRIPTS RESPECTING CANADA, COPYING: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 1363 (ii).

MAP OF CANADA IN CHAMBER: request (Mr. *Charlton*) 469 (i).

MARINE:

- ADAMS, A. & J., CLAIMS FOR LOSS OF "CARRIER DOVE": M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1182 (ii).
- "ADAMS" SEIZURE, PAPERS, &C.: Remarks on adjmnt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1402 (ii).
- "BRIDGEWATER" SEIZURE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Edgar*) 752 (i).
- ——— CLAIMS FOR COMPENSATION: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 1423 (ii).
- CAMPBELL, CAPT. R., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 741 (i).
- CAPE ENRAGE LIGHTHOUSE, CHANGE OF KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 841 (ii).
- "CRUISER," GOVT. STEAMER, ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATE: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 739 (i).
- HOSPITAL DUES ON SHIPS, COLLECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 312; M. for Ret.*, 303 (i).
- INSPECTORS OF HULLS, NAMES, &C., OF COMMISSIONERS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 943 (ii).
- LAKE ST. JOHN, BUOYS AND LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1146 (ii).
- LAKE ST. LOUIS, BUOYS AND LIGHTS: Remarks 1534, 1574, 1652 (ii).
- LAKE ST. PETER FLOATING LIGHT: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 979 (ii).
- MARINE AND IMMIGRANT HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 976 (ii).
- MARINE HOSPITALS: Ques. (Sir *Donald Smith*) 934 (ii).
- MONTREAL HARBOR POLICE: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 1423 (ii),
- OCEAN MAIL CONTRACT, EXTENSION WITH ALLAN LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1397 (ii).
- PILOTS, AMOUNTS RECEIVED: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1146 (ii).
- PILOTAGE DUES, CHANGE OF TARIFF: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 942 (ii).
- SAGUENAY RIVER, BUOYS AND LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1146 (ii).
- ——— TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1422 (ii).
- SAWDUST DEPOSITS IN OTTAWA RIVER, REP. OF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Edwards*) 370 (i).
- ——— Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 223 (i).
- ——— IN CANADIAN RIVERS, FINES FOR VIOLATING LAW: Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 591 (i).
- ——— Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 1082 (ii).
- SEIZURE OF BRITISH SCHOONER BY U.S. CUTTER "WOODBINE": Despatch respecting (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 510 (i).
- SHIPPING SEAMEN IN U.S. VESSELS, INSTRUCTIONS TO SHIPPING-MASTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 468 (i).
- SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS FUND: Ques. (Sir *Donald Smith*) 1710.
- STAG ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, RIVER ST. CLAIR: Ques. (Mr. *Moncrieff*) 224 (i).

Maritime Court of Ont. (extension of jurisdiction) B. No. 38 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 169 (i).

Massawippi Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 37 (Mr. *Colby*). 1°*, 138; 2°, 239 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 855 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 84.)

MASSAWIPPI JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1640 (ii).

MASKINONGE AND NIPISSING RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1632 (ii).

Masters and Mates. *See* "CERTIFICATES."

MATANE RIVER FISHING RIGHTS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 938 (ii).

MEMBERS, LIST OF, v (i).

——— OF THE GOVT., iii (i).

——— INTRODUCED, 1, 3, 13, 29, 33 (i).

MEMBERS' SESSIONAL INDEMNITY: Remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1710 (ii).

Mennonite Immigrants Loan B. No. 138 (Mr. *Carling*). Res. prop., 1146; in Com., 1267; 1° of B., 1268; in Com. and 3°*, 1399 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 28.)

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY:

- ADDRESS, THE, REPLY: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 322 (i).
- INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 29 (i).
- ESTIMATES, THE: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 30 (i).

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—*Continued.*
ESTIMATES, Suppl. for 1888-89, 1018 (ii).
—— 1889-90, 1467 (ii).
—— further Suppl. for 1889-90, 1627 (ii).
MESSENGER, SPECIAL: in Com. of Sup., 1503 (ii).
METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 976 (ii).
Middleton, W. *See* "DIVORCE."
Militia and Defence Act (*Chap.* 41 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 29** (Sir *Adolphe Caron*). 1°, 105 (i); withdn., 1629 (ii).
MILITIA CLOTHING: prop. Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1542 (ii).
Deb. on Amt. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1553; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1560; (Mr. *Kenny*) 1564; (Mr. *Lister*) 1565; (Mr. *Hesson*) 1566; (Mr. *Hickey*) 1567; (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 1568; (Mr. *Prior*) 1569; (Mr. *Denison*) 1569; neg. (Y. 54, N. 95) 1570 (ii).
MILITIA:
AMMUNITION MANUFACTURED AT QUEBEC: Remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1222 (ii).
BEDSON, S. L., APPOINTMENT IN MILITIA FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 1328; in Com. of Sup., 1507 (ii).
BONSECOURS MARKET HALL AND VOLUNTEERS: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 19 (i).
CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com. of Sup., 793 (i), 1352 (ii).
CAVALRY SCHOOL, TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 302 (i).
DEPTL. REP.: presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 13 (i).
DRILL SHED, BELLEVILLE, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 699 (i).
FARLEY, GUNNER, CLAIM FOR LOSS OF HORSE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fisher*) 433 (i).
LAKE, JAMES P., PAYMENT FOR WIRE ROPE: Ques. (Mr. *Macdowall*) 1628 (i).
MILITARY COLLEGE, COMMANDANT'S RESIDENCE: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1534 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 34 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup, 1357; conc, 1705 (ii).
MILITIA CLOTHING: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1542 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1352 (ii).
NATIONAL DEFENCE COM.: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 1423 (ii).
PERMANENT FORCES, EXPENDITURE FOR REPAIRS ON WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 171 (i).
REBELLION IN N.W.T.: Documents *re* 9th Battalion read (Mr. *Amyot*) 234 (i).
—— OFFICIAL COR. RESPECTING: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 304; withdn., 322 (i).
REGULATIONS AND ORDERS, FRENCH EDITION: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 171 (i).
TÊTE DU PONT BARRACKS, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 427 (i).
TORONTO SCHOOL OF INFANTRY, BREAD SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr *McMullen*) 1082 (ii).
VOLUNTEERS' (9TH BATTALION) DISCIPLINE: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 1327 (ii).
YORK-SIMCOE BATTALION, KIT ALLOWANCE; prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 85; remarks, 428 (i).
MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1146, 1423 (ii).
MINING IN RY. BELT, B. C.: Remarks (Mr. *Mara*) 980 (ii).
MINING LAWS, B. C.: Remarks (Mr. *Barnard*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1540 (ii).
MINING MACHINERY, DUTY ON: M. for O.C.*, &c. (Mr. *Edwards*) 942 (ii).
—— IN B.C. AND FREE LIST: Ques. (Mr. *Barnard*) 1265.
—— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1583 (ii).
MINISTERIAL CHANGES: Explanation (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 24 (i).
MINISTERS, LIST OF, iii (i).
MINOR REVENUES: in Com. of Sup., 1229, 1495 (ii).
Milk (Adulteration) prevention of Fraud B. No. 16 (Mr. *Burdett*). 1°*, 30; 2°, 259; in Com., and 3°*, 755; M. (Mr. *Bowell*) to trnsfr. consdrn. of Sen. Amts. to Govt. Orders, 1397 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 43.)
MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).
Modus Vivendi: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 811 (ii).
MONTREAL (EAST) RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
—— FLOOD COMMISSION, PRINTING REP.: M. (Mr. *Curran*) 1687.
Montreal Harbor Commissioners. *See* "TRINITY HOUSE."
MONTREAL HARBOR POLICE: Remarks, 1423, 1573, 1687 (ii).
MORMON SETTLEMENT IN N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 980.
MONCTON, ACCOMMODATION AT: in Com. of Sup., 1048 (ii).
MONEY ORDER OFFICES IN QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 468 (i).
MONTCALM POST OFFICES: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 1081 (ii).
Moose Jaw, Battleford and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 85 (Mr. *Davis*). 1°*, 368; 2°*, 510 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 921 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 54.)
Mounted Police Act Amt. B. No. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°*, 1572; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1709 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 25.)
Mounted Police Pensions authorisation B. No. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 469; in Com., 769; 1°* of B., 774 (i); 2° m., 1269; Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1269; neg. (Y. 66, N. 106) 1277; 2° and in Com., 1267; 3°*, 1278 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 26.)
MOUNTED POLICE COMMISSIONER'S REP.: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 169 (i).
—— DESERTIONS DURING TEN YEARS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 303 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 62, 151 (i), 1212, 1451, 1497.
—— PUNISHMENT OF CONSTABLES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 429 (ii).
MOUNT STEWART (P.E.I.) WHARF, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 621 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Robertson*) 171 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 921 (ii).
MURRAY CANAL: conc., 1614 (ii).
MURRAY HARBOR SOUTH AND MONTAGUE, P. E. I., MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson*) 468 (i).
Municipal Affairs. *See* "CORRUPT PRACTICES."
NATIONAL DEFENCE COM.: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 1423 (ii).
NATIONAL POLICY, REF. TO IN DEB. ON CORN IMPORTATIONS: 112-136 (i).
NAPANEE, TAMWORTH AND QUEBEC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1627 (ii).
NAUFRAGE HARBOR, P. E. I., ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy, (Mr. *McIntyre*) 33 (i).
NEVEU, HILAIRE, ESQ., MEMBER FOR JOLIETTE: introduced 1 (i).
N. B. and P. E. I. Ry. Co.'s B. No. 21 (Mr. *Wood Westmoreland*). 1°*, 47; 2°*, 170; 3°*, 357 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 85.)

NEW BRUNSWICK:
ADAMS, A. & J., CLAIMS FOR LOSS OF "CARRIER DOVE": M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1182 (ii).
ALBERT RY. CO., BALANCE OF GRANT: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 348 (i).
CAPE ENRAGE LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 841 (ii).
CENTRAL RY. FROM GRAND LAKE TO I. C. R. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1398 (ii).
CHIGNECTO SHIP RY., PROSPECTUS: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1423 (ii).
DERBY BRANCH RY. AND NORTHERN AND WESTERN: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 854, 871 (ii).
——— M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1182 (ii).
FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com, 1619 (ii).
INDIANTOWN BRANCH, CLAIM OF ALLAN WRIGHT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1094 (ii).
LUMBER SHIPMENTS FROM N. B. TO U. S., EXPORT DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 935 (ii).
NORTHERN AND NORTH-WESTERN RY., COMMUNICATION WITH: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 248 (i).
PARKER, GEO. R., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES *re* DERBY BRANCH RY.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1182 (ii).
ST. JOHN AND BASIN OF MINAS MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 1262 (ii).
ST. JOHN HARBOR, REP. OF H. F. PERLEY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 304 (i).
——— RIVER, BRIDGE AT FREDERICTON, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 526 (i).
WRIGHT, ALLAN, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1094 (ii).

NEW EDINBURGH AND GATINEAU FERRY, RENTAL AND ARREARAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 348 (i).

NEW LONDON BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 620 (i).

NICOLET, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. No. 35 (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*). 1°*, 138; 2°* 170; 3°*, 357 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 86.)

Nipissing and James' Bay, Ry. Co. *See* "LAKE NIPISSING."

NORTHERN AND NORTH-WESTERN RY., COMMUNICATION WITH: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 248 (i).

Northern Pacific and Man. Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 76 (Mr. *Daly*). 1°*, 322; 2°*, 510; in Com. and 3°*, 676 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 58.)

NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396; in Com., 1501 (ii).

NORTH SHORE RY., CONVEYANCE TO GOVT. BY G.T.R. &C.: M. for O.C.* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 943 (ii).

NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY. *See* "DERBY BRANCH."

NORTH-WESTERN COAL AND NAVIGATION CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 1572; in Com., 1712, 1717.

North-Western Junction and Lake of the Woods Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 73 (Mr. *Davis*). 1°*, 322; 2°*, 524; in Com. and 3°*, 755 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 59.)

NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO. OF CAN., SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 1572; in Com. 1717 (ii).

N.W.T. Act Amt. B. No. 136 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°, 1262; wthdn., 1498 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 105 (i).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:
BALLOT IN N.W.T., LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 525 (i).
BANNERMAN, WM., LATE POSTMASTER AT CALGARY: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 677 (i).
BEEF SUPPLIES TO INDIANS: M. for Tenders* (Mr. *Edgar*) 943 (ii).
BEER (4 PER CENT.) IMPORTED: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 525 (i).
BILLS RELATING TO N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1147 (ii).
DESCHENES, LUDGER MIVILLE, AMOUNT PAID FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Madill*) 1327 (ii).
DOM. LANDS ACT AMT.: Ques. (M. *Davin*) 762 (i).
FISH PROPAGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 740 (i).
GRAZING LEASES CANCELLED: Ques (Mr. *Edgar*) 935 (ii).
INTOXICATING LIQUORS: prop. Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Fisher*) 1361 (ii).
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, MEMORIALS TO: M. for copies (Mr. *Davin*) 348 (i).
LIQUOR LICENSES IN ROCKY MOUNTAINS PARK: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 249 (i).
——— PERMITS: Cor., &c., M. for copies (Mr. *Jamieson*) 550 (i).
MORMON SETTLEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 980 (ii).
MOUNTED POLICE, DESERTIONS DURING TEN YEARS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 303 (i).
——— PENSIONS: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 469 (i).
——— PUNISHMENT OF CONSTABLES, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 429 (i).
NORTH-WESTERN COAL AND NAVIGATION CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 1572; in Com., 1712 (ii).
N.W.T. ACT AMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 105 (i).
RED DEER VALLEY RY. AND COAL CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 1572; in Com., 1717 (ii).
REGINA BARRACKS CANTEEN: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1082 (ii).
SCRIP (LAND) OUTSTANDING: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 347, 525 (i).
TOWN SITES, RECEIPTS FROM SALES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 29 (i).
TRACEY, A. R., ARREST AND SEIZURE OF GOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1016 (ii).

NORTHUMBERLAND (EAST) CONTROVETED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

——— RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA:
ALBERT SOUTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396 (ii).
ANNAPOLIS AND LIVERPOOL RY. SURVEY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 943 (ii).
CORNWALLIS VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com, 1631 (ii).
CRANBERRY HEAD BREAKWATER, REMOVAL OF GRAVEL (Mr. *Lovitt*) 34 (i).
CUMBERLAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
FISHERIES IN LUNENBURG COUNTY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 940 (ii).
HEBEN RIVER TO YOUNG'S MILLS RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1616 (ii).
INTERNATIONAL RAILWAY CO. AND C. P. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 769 (i).
——— SUBSIDY, DISTRIBUTION: M. for O. C., &c.* (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 943 (ii).
L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, SURVEYS, &C.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Flynn*) 698 (i).
LITTLE DOVER POST OFFICE AND CANSO MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 590 (i).
LUNENBURG HARBOR, SURVEY, &C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 749 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 591 (i).
OYSTER PONDS' POSTMASTERSHIP, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 591 (i).
PICTOU BRANCH RY., TOTAL LENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 348 (i).
——— COST: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 302 (i).
PORT NATAL BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lovitt*) 34 (i).
ROSS, HON. WILLIAM, DISMISSAL: M. for O. C., Reps., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 24 (i).
SHELBURNE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Continued.*

TRURO TO NEWPORT RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396 (ii).

WEST BAY, CUSTOM HOUSE OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 427 (i).

WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.'S, COR., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Borden*) 529 (i).

Oaths of Office. *See* "ADMINISTRATION."

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 974 (ii).

OCEAN MAIL CONTRACT, EXTENSION WITH ALLAN LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1397 (ii).

Ocean Steamship Subsidies B. No. 144 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop. (*B. C. and Australia*) 1328; M. for Com., 1368; in Com., 1373; M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 1424; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1425; neg. (Y. 55, N. 77) 1426. Res. (*B. C. and China, &c.*) 1329; M. for Com., 1386; in Com., 1387; M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 1426; Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) neg. on a div., 1437. Res. (*Can. and United Kingdom*) 1329; in Com., 1389, 1402; rep., 1422; 1°* of B., 1437; 2° on a div., in Com. and 3°*, 1629 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 2.)

Deb. in Com. on Res.: *B. C. and Australia* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1372, 1377; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1373, 1376, 1384; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1373, 1377; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1374; (Messrs. *McMullen* and *Jones, Halifax*) 1375; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1377; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1376; (Mr. *Foster*) 1378, 1381; (Messrs. *Macdonald* [*Huron*] and *Platt*) 1379; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1380; (Messrs. *Hesson* and *Gillmor*) 1382; (Mr. *Taylor*) 1383; (Mr. *McNeill*) 1384; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1385 (ii).

Deb. in Com. on Res.: *Canada and United Kingdom*, (Mr. *Foster*) 1389; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1389; (Mr. *Welsh*) 1389, 1393, 1413; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1389; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1390, 1393; (Mr. *Trow*) 1391; (Mr. *Kenny*) 1391, 1394, 1413; (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1402, 1413; (Mr. *Skinner*) 1404; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1405; (Mr. *Platt*) 1406; (Mr. *Campbell*) 1407; (Messrs. *Gillmor* and *Ellis*) 1408; (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 1411; (Gen. *Laurie*) 1412; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1414, 1416; (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) 1414, 1417; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1415, 1434; (Mr. *Shanly*) 1417; (Mr. *Watson*) 1417; (Messrs. *McNeill* and *McMillan, Huron*) 1418; (Messrs. *Dawson, McMullen* and *Mulock*) 1419; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1420; (Mr. *Foster*) 1421; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1422 1427; (Mr. *Amyot*) 1437 (ii).

O'CONNOR, D., AMOUNT PAID FOR LAW CASES, FEES, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 31 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 51 (i), 1239 (ii).

OILS, IMPORTS INTO MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1533 (ii).

OKA INDIANS, REMOVAL: in Com. of Sup., 1171 (ii).

Ont. Loan and Debenture Co.'s (consolidation, &c.) B. No. 48 (Mr. *Moncrieff*). 1°*, 194; 2° m., 299; 2°*, 357; 3°*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 94.)

Ont., Man. and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 83 (Mr. *Macdowall*). 1°*, 346; 2°*, 510; in Com. and 3°*, 676 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 61.)

Ont. Mutual Life Ass. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 42 (Mr. *Bowman*). 1°*, 194; 2°*, 299; in Com and 3°*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 96.)

ONT. AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396, in Com., 1499 (ii).

Ont. and Que. Ry. Co. and Land Security Co (Exchange of Land) ratification B. No. 66 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 269; 2°*, 397; in Com. and 3°*, 663 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 74.)

ONTARIO:

AIRD, W. B., JR., NAMES OF SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 1017 (ii).

AMHERSTBURG, LAKE SHORE AND BLENHEIM RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1643 (ii).

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

BASS FISHING PERMITS, LAKE ERIE: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1081 (ii).

BELLEVILLE AND NORTH HASTINGS RY. SUBSIDY AND G. T. R.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Burdett*) 85 (i).

BOUNDARIES OF ONTARIO: prop Res., 1339, 1423 (ii).

——— Telegram from Mr. Mowat, 1363 (ii).

BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1640 (ii).

CAVALRY SCHOOL, TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 302 (i).

CAYUGA POST OFFICE, COST TO DATE: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 303 (i).

CORNWALL AND GALOPS CANALS, TENDERS FOR ENLARGEMENT: M. for copies* (Mr. *Trow*) 943 (ii).

CORNWALL CANAL, PROP. LOCATION IN 1834, REPS., &C., OF ENGINEERS: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergin*) 595, 677 (i).

——— RECENT BREAK, COR., &C: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergin*) 303 (i).

CORRUPT PRACTICES TRIALS, PICTON: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 427 (i).

DEFENCE OF INDIAN CHARGED WITH SHOOTING: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 935 (ii).

DRILL SHED AT BELLEVILLE, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 80 (i).

——— CONSTRUCTION: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Burdett*) 699 (i).

DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMISED ROAD: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 34 (i).

——— SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1628 (ii).

FISHING LICENSES IN INLAND WATERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dawson*) 82.

GANNON NARROWS FLOATING BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1627 (ii).

GAS (NATURAL) IN WESTERN ONT., MR. COSTE'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 468 (i).

GRAND RIVER, BRIDGE AT YORK VILLAGE, HALDIMAND: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Colter*) 304 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 171 (i).

GRAND TRUNK, GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE ERIE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1637 (ii).

GROSSE, JOHN A., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 171 (i).

HALDIMAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep (Mr. *Speaker*) 1.

HALTON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

HASTINGS (EAST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

HORSE ISLAND, GEORGIAN BAY, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 590 (i).

INDIAN LANDS, GRAND RIVER, CAYUGA, SALES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Colter*) 304 (i)

——— RESERVES, SALE OF PINE TIMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 30 (i).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) 1484 (ii).

IRONDALE, BANCROFT AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396 (ii).

JONES' CREEK, LEEDS, PETS., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Taylor*) 540.

KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1632 (ii).

LA CLOCHE ISLAND, PROVINCIAL CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1081.

——— SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Fisher*) 428 (i).

LOGAN, WM., MAIL CONTRACTOR, PICKERING VILLAGE, SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 677 (i).

MAIL CARRIAGE AT BRUSSELS, ONT., CONTRACTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 249 (i).

NAPANEE, TAMWORTH AND QUEBEC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1627 (ii).

NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396 (ii).

NORTHUMBERLAND (EAST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

ONTARIO AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396 (ii).

OTTAWA NEW DEPTL. BUILDINGS, TENDERS FOR PAINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1266 (ii).

——— PUBLIC ROADS, IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT PAID: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 303 (i).

PARRY SOUND COLONISATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396 (ii).

ROCK LAKE DAM, DAMAGES CAUSED BY: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 936 (ii).

ROSS, JOSIAH, SEIZURE OF PROPERTY BY CUSTOMS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 428 (i).

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

ST. CATHERINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1634 (ii).

ST. CATHARINES MILLING AND LUMBER CO. *vs.* QUEEN, ORIGINAL CHEQUES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 943 (ii).

——— COSTS, &c.; Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1146 (ii).

ST. CLAIR FRONTIER TUNNEL CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com, 1618 (ii).

——— RAPIDS, DREDGING AT POINT EDWARD: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 591 (i).

——— RIVER, LIGHTHOUSE ON STAG ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Moncrieff*) 224 (i).

ST. GEORGE'S BRIDGE, STRUCTURAL DEFECTS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1081 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, SALE OF ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 34 (i).

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, TENDERS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Trow*) 943-

——— (Mr. *McMullen*) 304 (i).

SAWDUST AND MILL REFUSE IN OTTAWA RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 370 (i); Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 223 (i).

SCUGOG RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1533 (ii).

SIMCOE (EAST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

SIX NATION INDIANS, SALE OF LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 428 (i).

SOUTH ONT. PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1632 (ii).

SULTANA ISLAND, LAKE OF THE WOODS, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 426 (i).

TÊTE DU PONT BARRACKS, SALE OR LEASE: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 427.

THOUSAND ISLAND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1641 (ii).

TRENT VALLEY CANAL, COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 20, 676 (i), 872 (ii).

WELLAND CANAL WATER POWER, REPS. OF ENGINEERS, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Rykert*) 304 (i).

YORK-SIMCOE BATTALION, KIT ALLOWANCE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 85; remarks, 428 (i).

YOUNG AND FRONT OF ESSEX TOWNSHIPS, PETS., &c., TO DISALLOW UNION ACT OF ONT. LEGISLATURE: M. for copies (Mr. *Taylor*) 436 (i).

ORANGE ORDER, INCORPORATION: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1082 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE:

ORDER:

ALBERTA RY. AND COAL CO.: on M. for 3° of B., objection taken by Sir *Hector Langevin* to prop. Amt. of Mr. *Watson*, no notice having been given; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) that notice of important Amts. must be given in writing, and entered in Votes and Proceedings, as required by Rule 67 of the House, 283 (i).

CAPE BRETON RY.: Attention of First Minister called to an answer given by him to a question asked by Mr. *Flynn*; Mr. *Speaker* ruled that the same was not a proper subject to bring up for discussion, 1574 (ii).

COMBINATIONS IN TRADE: on M. to ref. B. to Com. on Banking and Commerce, Member's argument on general merits of the B. arrested by Mr. *Speaker*, 1116 (ii).

COMMERCIAL UNION WITH U. S., &c.: Members checked in remarks after Orders of the Day are called (Mr. *Speaker*) 384 (i).

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS: on M. to restore B to Order Paper and Amt of Mr. *Tisdale* to consider same six months hence,—objection taken by Mr. *Trow* and ruling of Mr. *Speaker* asked on point whether Com. of Whole having rose without reporting B. the same is finally disposed of; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) M. and Amt. both in Order, 368 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL: on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., Amt. (Mr. *Choquette*) to ref. back *re* indemnity to dismissed Translators, ruled out of order by Mr. *Speaker*, a similar motion being on Order Paper, &c., 934 (ii).

DOMINION LANDS: on Minister reading Speech in Com. of Sup., objection (Mr. *Barron*) and Rule read, 1244 (ii).

FISHERIES AND TRADE RELATIONS WITH U. S.: Member requested by Mr. *Speaker* to confine his speech to subject-matter before the House, 388 (i).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—*Continued.*

ORDER—*Continued.*

MINISTERIAL CHANGES: Irregularity of debate, Member's remarks checked by Mr. *Speaker*, no motion being before the House, 27 (i).

MONTREAL FLOOD COMMISSION: On M. to ref. back part of a Rep., objection taken by Mr. *Somerville*, &c., as to regularity of motion and ruled out of Order by Mr. *Deputy Speaker*, 1687.

MOUNTED POLICE PENSIONS: on 2° of B., Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) as drawn, not in Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 1270 (ii).

PRESCOTT COUNTY RY. CO.: 2° objected to by Mr. *Bergin*, B. not being printed in both languages, 239 (i).

PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: on Amt. (Mr. *Moncrieff*) objection taken by Mr. *Mills* (*Bothwell*) and ruled out of Order by Mr. *Deputy Speaker*, amendment not being relevant to subject-matter before the House, 268 (i).

TENDERS, TRANSLATION OF FORMS: Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) not admissible, 1535 (ii).

WRECKING (FOREIGN VESSELS' AID) B. 2 IN CAN. WATERS: on M. for 2°, Amt. (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) to ref. to Sel. Com. ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, 253 (i).

PRIVILEGE:

JUDGES' SALARIES: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Curran*) *re* paragraph in Montreal *Herald*, 1498 (ii).

LE CARON, INFORMER: Cablegram in newspaper read (Mr. *Flynn*) 93, 97 (i).

MEMBERS LEAVING SEAT DURING VOTE: Authorities quoted (Mr. *Trow*) 249 (ii).

PAIRS: Explanation (Mr. *Trow*) 1574 (i).

PUB. ACCTS. COM., EVIDENCE TAKEN: Remarks (Mr. *Somerville*) on non-production of Rep., 1366, 1600 (ii).

OCEAN STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Amyot*) *re* speech of Mr. *Jones* (*Halifax*) as reported in *Hansard*, 1534 (ii).

SECRET SERVICE FUND AND INFORMER LE CARON: Remarks (Mr. *Costigan*) 323 (i).

PROCEDURE:

BILLS, SECOND READINGS: Objection taken by Mr. *Mitchell* to informal manner of passing Bills certain stages and printed only in one language, 357 (i).

CIVIL SERVICE, ASSESSMENT OF SALARIES: Objection taken by Mr. *Rykert* to 2°, the Bill involving a charge upon the people, and *Bourinot* quoted in support of same, 366; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) out of Order, and that said B. must originate in Com. of Whole and emanate from the Govt., 367 (i).

LEGISLATIVE ECONOMY: on M. for Joint Com., ruling of Mr. *Speaker* asked by Mr. *Laurier* as to constitutionality; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 783 (i).

SUPPLY: on M. for Com., objection taken by Mr. *Mills* (*Bothwell*) no motion having been made referring Estimates to the Com., and *Bourinot* quoted; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 48 (i).

Ordnance Lands in Quebec, authorisation of conveyance B. No. 143 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°, 1194 (ii).

ORDNANCE LANDS IN QUEBEC, EXTENSION OF STREETS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 942 (ii).

OTTAWA AND GATINEAU VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396; in Com., 1491 (ii).

Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s incorp. B. No. 23 (Mr. *Girouard*). 1°, 47; 2° m., 169; Order for 2° read, 424; wthdn., 426 (i).

Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 43 (Mr. *Hickey*). 1°*, 194; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 509 (i).

OTTAWA NEW DEPTL. BUILDINGS, TENDERS FOR PAINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1266 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 799 (i).

——— PUBLIC ROADS, IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNTS PAID: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 303 (i).

OTTAWA RIVER AND CITY BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (ii).

OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1073; conc., 1603 (ii).

OYSTER PONDS' POSTMASTERSHIP, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 591 (i).

PACIFIC MAIL SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 34 (i).

PAGANS IN JOLIETTE COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1710 (ii).

PAIRS DURING SESSION, viii (i).

PARKER, GEO. R., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES *re* DERBY BRANCH RY.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1182 (ii)

PARLIAMENT, OPENING, 1; PROROGATION, 1727 (ii).

PARRY SOUND COLONISATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396; in Com., 1499 (ii).

"PATENT RECORD:" conc., 1593 (ii).

PAUPER IMMIGRATION (CHILDREN): in Com. of Sup., 964 (ii).

PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 211 (i); 1315, 1507, 1615; conc., 1597 (ii).

——— REP.: presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 169 (i).

PERMANENT FORCES: in Com. of Sup., 796 (ii).

PICTOU BRANCH RY., TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 302 (i).

——— LENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 348 (i).

PICTOU, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

PIERS AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS IN P.E.I.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Robertson*) 942 (ii).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1222 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 148 (i), 919 (ii).

——— REPAIRS IN 1888: M. for Rets.* (Mr. *Welsh*) 942 (ii).

PILOTAGE DUES, QUEBEC HARBOR, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 942 (ii).

PILOTS, AMOUNTS RECEIVED: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1146 (ii).

PINETTE AND WOOD ISLAND HARBOR, SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 621 (i).

POLICE. *See* "Dominion," "Montreal," "Mounted."

PONTIAC AND RENFREW RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572 (ii).

Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co's B. No. 51 (Mr. *Bryson*). 1°*, 222; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 509 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 82.)

POPE, MR. (DEP. COM. OF PATENTS): in Com. of Sup, 71–78 (i).

POPE, LATE HON. J. H.: Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) &c., 943, 1017 (ii).

POPULATION OF DOM. BY PROVINCES: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 170 (i).

PORK DUTIES, INCREASE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 1146 (ii).

PORT ARTHUR HARBOR AND KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 801 (ii).

PORT MAITLAND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 150 (i).

PORT NATAL BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Lovitt*) 34 (i).

POSTAGE RATES, CAN. AND U. S.: in Com. of Sup., 70 (i).

——— REDUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 34 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 80 (i).

POSTMASTER AT THREE RIVERS, NEWSPAPER POSTAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 740 (i).

POSTMASTER GENERAL'S DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 68 (i).

——— REP.: presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 17 (i).

Post Office Act (*Chap.* 35 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 93** (Mr. *Haggart*). 1°, 369; Res. prop., 469 (i); in Com., 1130; 2° and in Com., 1133; 3°m., Amt. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 85) 1281; 3°*, 1283 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 20.)

POST OFFICE AND FINANCE DEPTS.: in Com. of Sup, 1503.

——— in Com. of Sup, 1234, 1461, 1596 (ii).

POST OFFICES BUILT SINCE 1878, REVENUES, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 225 (i).

Deb. (Messrs. *Cook* and *Casey*) 226; (Mr. *Lister*) 227 (Messrs *Roome* and *Porter*) 228 (Messrs. *Sutherland* and *Hesson*) 229; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 230; (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 231; (Messrs. *Sproule* and *McMullen*) 232; (Mr. *Watson*) 233; (Sir *Hector Langevin* and Mr. *Trow*) 233 (i).

POST OFFICE:

ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 224 (i).

BALTIC POST OFFICE ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1423 (ii).

BANNERMAN, WM., LATE POSTMASTER AT CALGARY, DEFALCATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 677 (i).

BELLE VALLÉE POST OFFICE, CHANGE OF LOCATION: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 943 (ii).

CARBONNEAU, JOSEPH, PAYMENT FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Desaulniers*) 1328 (ii).

CHESTER, QUE., COMPLAINTS AGAINST POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 468 (i).

GROVER, J. M., POSTMASTER AT MORDEN, MAN., DISMISSAL: M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Guay*) 942 (ii).

INSPECTOR, THREE RIVERS DIVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1181 (ii).

JOLIETTE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Neveu*) 762 (i).

LAKE ST. JOHN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1628 (ii).

LETTER POSTAGE, REDUCTION OF RATES: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 80 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 34 (i).

LÉVIS POST OFFICE, PETS., &C. FOR BUILDING: M. for copies (Mr. *Guay*) 433 (i).

LITTLE DOVER MAIL SERVICE AND CANSO MAIL SERVICE: Ans. (Mr. *Haggart*) 590 (i).

LOGAN, WM., MAIL CONTRACTOR, PICKERING VILLAGE, SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 677 (i).

LONGUEUIL POSTAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 80 (i).

LOURDES AND SOMERSET MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Turcot*) 751 (i).

MAIL CARRIAGE, BECANCOUR STATION AND STE. JULIE DE SOMERSET, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Turcot*) 304 (i)

——— IN BRUSSELS, ONT.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 249 (i).

MAIL SERVICE WITH ENGLAND: Remarks, 1574 (ii).

MONEY ORDER OFFICES, QUE.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 468 (i).

MURRAY HARBOR SOUTH AND MONTAGUE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson*) 468 (i).

OCEAN MAIL CONTRACT, EXTENSION WITH ALLAN LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1397 (ii).

OYSTER PONDS' POSTMASTER, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 591.

PACIFIC MAIL SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 34 (i).

POSTMASTER AT THREE RIVERS, NEWSPAPER POSTAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 740 (i).

POST OFFICES IN MONTCALM COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 1082 (ii).

RED RIVER POSTAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1533 (ii).

REGISTERED LETTERS, COMPENSATION FOR LOSS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 525 (i).

ST. BARTHELEMY POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 591 (i).

ST. BEATRIX POST OFFICE, LOCATION: Ques. (Mr. *Neveu*) 590 (i).

Prescott County Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 33 (Mr. *Edwards*). 1°*, 138; 2° m., 239; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 80.)

PREVENTIVE OFFICERS IN P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 15.

P. E. I. and Continental Ry. and Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. No. 96 (Mr. *Landry*). 1°, 384; 2°*, 524 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:
BALTIC POST OFFICE, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1423 (ii).
BELL CREEK BREAKWATER, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 347 (i).
CAMPBELL, CAPT. R., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 741.
CASCUMPEQUE HARBOR, DISMISSAL OF BLASTING FOREMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 348 (i).
CHINA POINT PIER, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 621 (i).
CONFEDERATION AND P. E. I., CLAIMS: Ques (Mr. *Perry*) 525 (i).
DREDGE "PRINCE EDWARD," COST OF REPAIRS: M. for Ret (Mr. *Perry*) 31, 302 (i).
—— PAYMENT TO CAPTAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 30 (i).
FIFTEEN-POINT BREAKWATER, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1423 (ii).
FISHERY BOUNTY, CLAIMS MADE AND REJECTED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mc Intyre*) 434 (i).
FISHERY COMMISSIONER (ASSISTANT) APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 171 (i).
HICKEY WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques (Mr. *Welsh*) 621 (i).
JOBIN, ACHILLES, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 348 (i).
KING'S CO., REPRESENTATION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) challenging Seat, 169 (i).
LOBSTER FACTORIES, NUMBER, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 31 (i).
MAIL SUBSIDY, P. E. I. AND MAINLAND: in Com. of Sup., 1261 (ii).
MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER, DAMAGES: Ques (Mr. *Perry*) 1146, 1423.
MOUNT STEWART WHARF, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson*) 171, 621 (i).
MURRAY HARBOR SOUTH AND MONTAGUE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson*) 468 (i).
NAUFRAGE HARBOR, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *McIntyre*) 33 (i).
NEW LONDON BREAKWATER REPAIRS, &c.: Ques (Mr. *Welsh*) 620 (i).
—— Ques (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 468 (i)
PIERS AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Robertson*) 942 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Welsh*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1222 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup, 148 (i).
—— REPAIRS IN 1888: M for Ret.* (Mr. *Welsh*) 942 (ii).
PINETTE AND WOOD ISLAND HARBOR, SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 621 (i).
PREVENTIVE OFFICERS IN P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 15 (i).
SUBSIDY TO P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 15 (i).
SUBWAY, STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 16 (i).
SUMMERSIDE, HARBOR AND BREAKWATER, SURVEY: Ques (Mr. *Perry*) 303 (i), 1423 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Perry*) on M. for Com of Sup, 1222 (ii).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1146 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Perry*) on M. for Com. of Sup, 1222 (ii).
WEST POINT WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1498 (ii).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT.: in Com. of Sup, 57 (i), 1503 (ii).
—— REP.: presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 346 (i).
PRINTING BUREAU AND BINDING: in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).
—— COST OF BUILDING, PLANT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 1363 (ii.)
—— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 428 (i).
PRINTING COMMITTEE: M. for Joint Com. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 19 (i).
—— M. to add names (Mr. *Bowell*) 346 (i).
PRINTING DOM. NOTES: in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).
PRINTING, PAPER AND BINDING: in Com. of Sup., 272 (i).
PRIVILEGE. *See* "ORDER," "PRIVILEGE," &c.
PRIVATE BILLS PETS.: M. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) to extend time, 30 (i).
—— REPS. FROM COM.: M. to extend time (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 556 (i), 841 (ii).
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 49 (i), 1501 (ii).
PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1224 (ii).
PROCEDURE. *See* "ORDER," "PRIVILEGE," &c.
PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 88; Amt. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) and Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) 89; deb. rsmd., 260; neg. (Y. 58, N. 86) 261; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 261; neg. (Y. 35, N. 108) 267; Amt. agreed to (Y. 99, N. 59) 269 (i).
Promissory Notes. *See* "BILLS OF EXCHANGE."
PROROGATION: Closing Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 1724 (ii).
—— Communication from Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 1711 (ii).
PROVENCHER, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
PUBLIC ACCTS. COM, PAPERS ORDERED: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 470 (i).
—— MEETING: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*, &c.) 500 (i).
—— REP.: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 2 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Rykert*) to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 47 (i).
Public Departments (certain Acts *re*) Repeal B. No. 110 (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*). 1°, 589 (i)
Public Matters. *See* "ENQUIRIES."
PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 148, 805 (i), 913, 927, 931, 1229, 1362, 1448, 1528, 1599 (ii).
—— REP.: presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 2 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS:
ARICHAT WEST BREAKWATER: Ques. (Gen. *Lauric*) 841 (ii).
BUILDINGS ERECTED SINCE 1867 TO 1889: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 303 (i).
CASCUMPEQUE HARBOR, DISMISSAL OF BLASTING FOREMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 348 (i).
CAYUGA POST OFFICE, COST TO DATE: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 303 (i).
CHINA POINT PIER, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 621 (i).
CUSTOMS BUILDINGS (CITIES AND TOWNS OF LESS THAN 20,000): M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 303 (i).
DREDGE "CAPE BRETON," COMPENSATION TO CAPTAIN AND LABORERS FOR LOSSES: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 427 (i).
DREDGE LOST IN NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 469 (i).
DREDGE "PRINCE EDWARD," PAYMENT TO CAPTAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 30 (i).
—— REPAIRS AND COST, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 31 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 302 (i).
DRESDEN TURNING GROUND, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 151 (i).
DRILL SHED AT BELLEVILLE, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 80 (i).
DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMISED ROAD: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 34 (i).
—— SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1628 (ii).
ESQUIMAUX POINT TELEGRAPH LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 935 (ii).
FIFTEEN POINT, P. E. I., BREAKWATER, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1423 (ii).
FORTIFICATIONS AT ESQUIMALT, COL. O'BRIEN'S REPORT: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1146 (ii).
GANNON NARROWS FLOATING BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1627 (ii).
GRAND NARROWS BRIDGE, C. B., PAPERS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Flynn*) 1266 (ii).
GRAND RIVER BRIDGE AT YORK, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 171; M. for Ret.,* 304 (i).
HICKEY WHARF, REPAIRS; Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 621 (i).
LACHINE CANAL, NEW BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 20 (i).
LAKE ST. LOUIS, CONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bernier*) 80 (i).
LAKE ST. JOHN, HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1146.
—— WHARVES, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1181 (ii).
LAPRAIRIE VILLAGE, PROTECTION AGAINST ICE; Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 427 (i).
L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, SURVEYS, &c., COE; M. for copies (Mr. *Flynn*) 698 (i).
LEDUC, CHARLES, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 171 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*

LUNENBURG HARBOR SURVEY, &c.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 749 (i).

—— REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 591 (i).

LONGUEUIL WHARVES, COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 80 (i).

MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1146, 1423.

MOUNT STEWART WHARF, P. E. I., CONSTRUCTION: (Ques. (Mr. *Robertson*) 171, 621 (i).

NAUFRAGE HARBOR, P. E. I., ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *McIntyre*) 33 (i).

NEW LONDON BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 620 (i).

—— SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 468 (i).

OTTAWA NEW DEPTL. BUILDING, TENDERS FOR PAINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1266 (ii).

—— PUBLIC ROADS, IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT PAID: M for Ret* (Mr. *McMullen*) 303 (i).

PIERS AND HARBORS IN P.E.I.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Robertson*) 942 (ii).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Welsh*) 942 (ii).

PINETTE AND WOOD ISLAND HARBOR, SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 621 (i).

PORT MAITLAND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 150 (i).

POST OFFICES BUILT SINCE 1878, REVENUES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 225 (i).

PRINTING BUREAU, COST OF BUILDING, PLANT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1363 (ii).

PUBLIC BUILDINGS ERECTED SINCE 1867 TO 1889: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 303 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS REP: presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 2 (i).

RICHELIEU RIVER, SURVEY AND SOUNDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Gigault*) 22, 29 (i).

RIMOUSKI WHARF, REPAIRS, CONTRACTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 302 (i).

ST. ALPHONSE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1181, 1363 (ii).

ST. ANNE DE CHICOUTIMI WHARF, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 525 (i).

STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 1265 (ii).

ST. CLAIR RAPIDS, DREDGING AT POINT EDWARD: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) (591 (i).

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER OVERFLOW, PREVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 591 (i).

ST. LAWRENCE TELEGRAPH SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1363 (ii).

ST. LOUIS RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 34 (i).

SUMMERSIDE, P. E. I., HARBOR AND BREAKWATER SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 303 (i), 1423 (ii).

TELEGRAPH LINES, ACQUISITION BY GOVT: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Denison*) 80 (i).

TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques (Mr. *Perry*) 1146 (ii).

VENTILATION OF CHAMBER: in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).

WEST POINT WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques (Mr. *Perry*) 1498 (ii).

YARMOUTH COUNTY, PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Lovitt*) 34 (i).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. No. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 1572; M. for Com., 1706; in Com. and 1°*, 2°*, and B. in Com., 1709; 3°*, 1711 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 5.)

QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 931 (ii).

Quebec and Lévis Ferry B. No. 12 (Mr. *Choquette*). 1°*, 29 (i).

Quebec Board of Trade incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 87 (Mr. *McGreevy*). 1°*, 369; 2°*, 510; in Com. and 3°*, 755 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 99.)

QUEBEC CONFERENCE, 1887: M. for copies of Res., &c. (Mr. *Edgar*) 20 (i).

Quebec Skating Club. *See* "ORDNANCE LANDS."

QUEBEC:

ARTHABASKA FISHERY OVERSEER, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 302 (i).

BAIE DES CHALEURS RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. (1st) Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396 (i).

—— prop. (2nd) Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1643 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

BAR OF QUEBEC, DISALLOWANCE OF ACT, O. C.'s, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 303 (i).

BEACH LOTS IN QUEBEC, O. C.'s, COR., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 303 (i).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 34 (i).

—— REP. OF ENGINEER CRAWFORD, &c.: M. for Ret* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 304 (i).

—— OPENING OF NAV.: Telegram read (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1285 (ii).

BELLE VALLÉE POST OFFICE, CHANGE OF LOCATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 943 (i).

C.P.R, EXTENSION TO QUEBEC, AMOUNT PAID AND TO WHOM: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 248 (i).

CAPE TORMENTINE AND MURRAY BAY RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1641 (ii)

CAP ROUGE AND ST. LAWRENCE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396 (ii).

CARBONNEAU, JOS., PAYMENT FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Desaulniers*) 1328 (ii).

CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS, ELECTION OF COUNCILLORS: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 427 (i).

—— AGENT'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1264 (ii).

—— SURVEY OF RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 468, 501 (i).

CHAMBLY-LONGUEUIL CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr *Préfontaine*) 80 (i).

CHESTER POSTMASTER, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 468 (i).

CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY COUNTIES, EXPENDITURE OF SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 427 (i).

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, THREE RIVERS, DUTY ON FOREIGN CATALOGUES: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 739 (i).

CUSTOMS APPRAISERS, APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 370 (i).

DISALLOWANCE OF QUEBEC ACTS, O. C.'s, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 303 (i).

DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1634 (ii).

ESQUIMAUX POINT TELEGRAPH LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 935 (ii).

FEES PAID LAW FIRMS IN QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 347 (i).

FISHERY OVERSEER, ARTHABASKA, REVENUE, SALARY, EXPENSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 80 (i).

FISHING LICENSES, RIVER MATANE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 171; (Mr. *Fiset*) 469 (i).

—— RIVER NATASHQUAN: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1533, 1627 (ii).

FISHING REGULATIONS IN BERTHIER: M. for copies (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 743 (i)

GREAT EASTERN RY. SUBSIDY: M. for Pets., Reps, &c. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 20 (i).

—— prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1634 (ii).

GREAT NORTHERN RY., ENGINEER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 370 (i).

HEREFORD RY. CO., AND PAYMENT OF EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Bernier*) 1017 (ii).

—— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1638 (ii).

HIDE AND LEATHER INSPECTOR, MONTREAL: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Curran*) 23 (i).

HOSPITAL DUES ON SHIPS, COLLECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 302; M. for Ret.,* 303 (i).

INDIANS, HURON TRIBE OF LORETTE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 33 (i).

I. C. R. *See* general heading.

JOLIETTE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1.

—— DISTRICT JUDGE, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 170 (i).

—— MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Neveu*) 762 (i).

LACHINE CANAL, NEW BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 20 (i).

LAKE ST. JOHN HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1146.

—— MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1628 (ii).

—— RY. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 979 (ii).

—— WHARVES, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1181 (ii).

LAKE ST. LOUIS BUOYS AND LIGHTS: Remarks, 1534, 1652 (ii).

LAKE ST. PETER BUOYS: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 979 (ii).

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE COLONISATION AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1631 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*
LAPRAIRIE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1.
LAPRAIRIE VILLAGE, PROTECTION AGAINST ICE: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 427 (i).
LARUE, CASGRAIN, ANGERS AND HAMEL, LAW FEES PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 347 (i).
LEDUC, CHARLES, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 171 (i).
LEBOURDAIS BROS., COR. *re* TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 16 (i).
LÉVIS POST OFFICE, PETS., &C., FOR BUILDING: M. for copies (Mr. *Guay*) 433 (i).
LONGUEUIL POSTAL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 80 (i).
—— WHARVES, COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 80 (i).
LOURDES AND SOMERSET MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Turcot*) 751 (i).
MAGISTRATES, DISALLOWANCE OF ACT, O.C.'s, COR. &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 303 (i).
MAIL CARRIAGE (BÉCANCOUR STATION AND STE. JULIE DE SOMERSET, &C.): M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Turcot*) 304 (i).
MASKINONGÉ AND NIPISSING RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1632 (ii).
MASKINONGÉ CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1
MASSAWIPPI JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1640 (ii).
MATANE RIVER, FISHING RIGHTS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 938 (ii).
MONEY ORDER OFFICES IN QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 468 (i).
MONTCALM POST OFFICES: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 1081 (ii.)
MONTREAL FLOOD COMMISSION, PRINTING OF REP.: M. (Mr. *Curran*) 1687 (ii).
MONTREAL HARBOR POLICE: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 1423 (ii).
—— Remarks, 1573, 1687 (ii).
NORTH SHORE RY., CONVEYANCE TO GOVT. BY G.T.R., &C.: M. for O.C.* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 943 (ii).
OTTAWA AND GATINEAU VALLEY RAILWAY CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396 (ii).
ORDNANCE LANDS IN QUEBEC, EXTENSION OF STREETS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 942 (ii).
PAGANS IN JOLIETTE COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1710 (ii).
PILOTAGE DUES, QUEBEC HARBOR, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 942 (ii).
PILOTS, AMOUNTS RECEIVED: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1146 (ii).
PONTIAC AND RENFREW RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572 (ii).
POSTMASTER AT THREE RIVERS, NEWSPAPER POSTAGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 740 (ii).
POST OFFICE INSPECTOR, THREE RIVERS DIVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1181 (ii).
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1637 (ii).
QUESNEL, JULES, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1145.
QUEBEC, MONTMORENCY AND CHARLEVOIX RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1619 (ii).
RY. SUBSIDIES FOR CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1181 (ii).
—— LAKE ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 427 (i).
RICHELIEU RIVER, SURVEY AND SOUNDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Gigault*) 22, 29 (i).
RIMOUSKI CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judgment of Supreme Court (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
RIMOUSKI WHARF REPAIRS, CONTRACTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 302 (i).
SAGUENAY RIVER, BUOYS AND LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1146 (ii).
—— TENDER: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1422 (ii).
STE. ANNE DE CHICOUTIMI WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 525 (i).
STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 1265 (ii).
STE. BEATRIX (JOLIETTE) POST OFFICE, LOCATION: Ques. (Mr. *Neveu*) 590 (i).
ST. ALPHONSE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques (Mr. *Couture*) 1181, 1363 (ii).
ST. ANDREWS TO C. P. R. AT OR EAST OF LACHUTE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396 (ii).
ST. BARTHÉLÉMY POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 591 (i).
ST. CÉSAIRE TO ST. PAUL D'ABBOTTSFORD RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1634 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER OVERFLOW, PREVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 591 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE TELEGRAH SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1363 (ii).
ST. LOUIS LAKE, BUOYS AND LIGHTS: Remarks, 1574 (ii).
—— CONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 80 (i).
ST. LOUIS RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 34 (i).
ST. ROCH DES AULNET'S WHARF, COR., REP., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Casgrain*) 529 (i).
SALMON RIVERS IN QUEBEC, LEASES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 224 (i).
SHAWINIGAN DISTRICT, SENATOR FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1628 (ii).
TÉMISCOUATA RY. CO., SHAREHOLDERS, SHARES AND AMOUNTS PAID: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 24 (i).
—— SUBSIDY, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 676 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Dessaint*) 943 (ii).
VICTORIA BRIDGE, COST OF MAINTENANCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1081 (ii).
WHISKEY, ILLICIT MANUFACTURE: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 935 (ii).

Queen's College (Kingston) Act Amt. B. No. 46 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 194; 2°, 300; M. for Com., 602; in Com. and 3° agreed to (Y. 104, N. 35) 607 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 855 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 103.)

QUESNEL, JULES, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1145 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. *Cook*). 1°, 17; 2°, 362 (i); M. for Com., 1099; Amt (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h, agreed to on a div., 1100 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 115 (Mr. *White, Renfrew*). 1°*, 782 (i); 2°, 1283 (ii).

Ry. Employés Protection B. No. 53 (Mr. *Purcell*). 1°, 223; Order for 2° read, 384 (i).

RAILWAYS. *See*
ALBERT SOUTHERN RY. CO.
ALBERTA AND ATHABASCA RY. CO.
ALBERTA RY. AND COAL CO.
ANNAPOLIS AND LIVERPOOL RY.
ASSINIBOIA, EDMONTON AND UNJIGA RY. CO.
ATLANTIC AND NORTH-WEST RY. CO.
BELLEVILLE AND NORTH HASTINGS RY. CO.
BERLIN AND CANADIAN PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.
CALGARY, ALBERTA AND MONTANA RY. CO.
CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.
CAPE BRETON RY.
CHIGNECTO SHIP RY. CO.
COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
EDMUNDSTON AND FLORENCEVILLE RY. CO.
GRAND TRUNK RY. CO.
GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO.
HAMILTON CENTRAL RY. CO.
INTERCOLONIAL RY.
INTERNATIONAL RY. CO.
KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE RY. CO.
KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE AND NAPANEE, TAMWORTH AND QUEBEC RY. CO.'S AGREEMENT.
KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
KOOTENAY AND ATHABASCA RY. CO.
LAC SEUL RY. CO.
LAKE MANITOBA RY. AND CANAL CO.
LAKE NIPISSING AND JAMES BAY RY. CO.
MANITOBA AND SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.
MASSAWIPPI JUNCTION RY. CO.
MOOSE JAW, BATTLEFORD AND EDMONTON RY. CO.
NEW BRUNSWICK AND PRINCE EDWARD RY. CO.
NORTHERN PACIFIC AND MANITOBA RY. CO.
NORTH SHORE RY.
NORTH-WESTERN JUNCTION AND LAKE OF THE WOODS RY. CO.
ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RY. CO.
ONTARIO, MANITOBA AND WESTERN RY. CO.
OTTAWA, MORRISBURG AND NEW YORK RY. CO.

RAILWAYS—*Continued.*
PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.
PRESCOTT COUNTY RY. CO.
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND CONTINENTAL RY. AND FERRY CO.
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY.
RED DEER VALLEY RY. AND COAL CO.
SHORT LINE RY., HARVEY TO SALISBURY.
SASKATCHEWAN RY. AND MINING CO.
SOUTH ONTARIO PACIFIC RY. CO.
ST. GABRIEL LEVEE AND RY. CO.
ST. LAWRENCE AND ATLANTIC JUNCTION RY. CO.
THREE RIVERS RY. CO.
TEMISCOUATA RY. CO.
UNION RY. CO.
WESTERN COUNTIES RY.
WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS RY.
WINNIPEG AND NORTH PACIFIC RY. CO.
WOOD MOUNTAIN AND QU'APPELLE RY. CO.
[*See* "SUBSIDIES."]

RAILWAYS AND CANALS, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 151 (i), 1504; conc., 1615 (ii).

—— REP.: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 250 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 1069, 1048, 1064, 1202, 1498, 1597, 1601; conc., 1615 (ii).

RY. SUBSIDIES, CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1181 (ii).

—— LAKE ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 427 (i).

REBELLION IN N. W. T., MILITIA EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).

—— 9TH BATTALION: Documents read (Mr. *Amyot*) 234.

—— OFFICIAL COR. *re* 9TH BATTALION: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 304–317 (i).

RECIPROCITY (UNRESTRICTED): Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 468; neg. (Y. 77, N. 121) 739 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Tupper*) 472; (Mr. *Charlton*) 479; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 495; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 504; (Mr. *Porter*) 510; (Mr. *McMullen*) 516; (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 557; (Mr. *Colter*) 563; (Mr. *Landry*) 566; (Mr. *Perry*) 577; (Mr. *Daly*) 580; (Mr. *Campbell*) 585; (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 621; (Mr. *Béchard*) 628; (Mr. *Gigault*) 631; (Mr. *Amyot*) 633; (Mr. *Sproule*) 637; (Mr. *McDougall, C. B.*) 643; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 646; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 701; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 705; (Mr. *Madill*) 713; (Mr. *Hudspeth*) 717; (Mr. *Semple*) 718; (Mr. *Haggart*) 720; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 723; (Mr. *Dickey*) 730; (Mr. *Weldon, St John*) 735 (i).

Recognisances. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW."

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. B. No. 31 (Mr. *Davis*). 1°*, 138; 2°*, 170; 3°*, 257 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 52.)

RED DEER VALLEY RY. AND COAL CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 1572; in Com., 1717 (ii).

RED RIVER POSTAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1533.

REGINA BARRACKS, CANTEEN: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1082 (ii).

REGISTERED LETTERS, COMPENSATION FOR LOSS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 525 (i).

REGULATIONS AND ORDERS, MILITIA, FRENCH EDITION: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 171 (i).

REPAIRS, FURNITURE, HEATING, &c.: conc., 1599 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 913.

REPATRIATION OF FRENCH CANADIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 677 (i).

REPORTS PRESENTED:
AUDITOR GENERAL: (Mr. *Foster*) 13 (i).
DOMINION POLICE: (Sir *John Thompson*) 3 (i).
INDIAN AFFAIRS: (Mr. *Dewdney*) 29 (i).
INLAND REVENUE: (Mr. *Costigan*) 3 (i).

REPORTS PRESENTED—*Continued.*
INTERIOR: (Mr. *Dewdney*) 436 (i).
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT: (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
LABOR COMMISSIONERS' REP.: (Mr. *Bowell*) 1285 (ii).
MARINE: (Mr. *Tupper*) 2 (i).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE: (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 13 (i).
MOUNTED POLICE COMMISSIONER'S REP.: (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 169.
PENITENTIARIES: (Sir *John Thompson*) 169 (i).
POSTMASTER GENERAL: (Mr. *Haggart*) 17 (i).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY: (Mr. *Bowell*) 346 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: (Mr. *Foster*) 2 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS: (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 2 (i).
RAILWAYS AND CANALS: (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 250 (i).
SECRETARY OF STATE: (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 33 (i).
TRADE AND NAVIGATION TABLES: (Mr. *Bowell*) 3 (i).

RETURNING OFFICERS (payments) in Com. of Sup., 1511 (ii).

RETURN *re* FIRE INSURANCE CO.'S.: Ques. (Mr. *Bowman*) 323.

RETURNS IN HANDS OF MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Somerville*). 1573, 1600, 1668 (ii).

RETURNS, PRODUCTION OF: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 621 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c., MOTIONS FOR:
ADAMS, A. & J., CLAIMS FOR LOSS OF "CARRIER DOVE"*: Mr. *Mitchell*, 1182 (ii).
ANNAPOLIS AND LIVERPOOL RY. SURVEY*: (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 943
ANNUITIES TO INDIANS, ARREARS: Mr. *O'Brien*, 937 (ii).
BAR OF QUEBEC, DISALLOWANCE OF ACT*: Mr. *Langelier* (*Montmorency*) 303 (i).
BEACH LOTS IN QUEBEC*: Mr. *Langelier* (*Montmorency*) 303 (i).
BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, REP. OF ENGINEER CRAWFORD*: Mr. *Bergeron*, 304 (i).
BEEF SUPPLIES (INDIAN) IN N.W.T.*: Mr. *Edgar*, 942 (ii).
BELLE VALLÉE POST OFFICE, LOCATION*: Mr. *Bourassa*, 943 (ii).
BELLEVILLE AND NORTH HASTINGS RY. SUBSIDY AND G. T. R.: Mr. *Burdett*, 85 (i).
BOUNDARIES OF ONT. AND QUE., COR. BETWEEN LOCAL GOVTS.*: Mr. *Langelier* (*Montmorency*) 303 (i).
"BRIDGEWATER," SEIZURE: Mr. *Edgar*, 752 (i).
BUDGET SPEECHES: Mr. *Landerkin*, 20 (i).
BUILDINGS (PUBLIC) ERECTED, 1867-1889*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 303 (i).
CAMPBELL, CAPT. R., DISMISSAL: Mr. *Perry*, 741 (i).
CANAL WORKS, TENDERS: Mr. *Casey*, 593 (i).
CANALS, OPENING FOR SUNDAY TRAFFIC*: Mr. *Rykert*, 304 (i).
CAN. TEMP. ACT, WORKING OF, AND HOME GOVT.: Mr. *Jamieson*, 541 (i).
"CARRIER DOVE," CLAIMS FOR LOSS*: Mr. *Mitchell*, 1182 (ii).
CHAPLAINS IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS*: Mr. *Innes*, 24 (i).
CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 24 (i).
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, DATE OF RECEIPT BY SPEAKER OF JUDGES' CERTIFICATES*: Mr. *Mills* (*Bothwell*) 303 (i).
CORNWALL AND GALOPS CANALS, ENLARGEMENT*: Mr. *Trow*, 943 (ii).
CORNWALL CANAL, PROP. LOCATION IN 1834: Mr. *Bergin*, 595, 677 (i).
CORNWALL CANAL, RECENT BREAK: Mr. *Bergin*, 303 (i).
CUSTOMS BUILDINGS, CITIES AND TOWNS OF LESS THAN 20,000*: Mr. *Casey*, 303 (i).
C. P. R. *See* general heading.
DREDGE "PRINCE EDWARD," REPAIRS, COST, &C.: Mr. *Perry*, 31 (i).
DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMISED ROAD: Mr. *Bain* (*Wentworth*) 34 (i).
DISALLOWANCE OF ACTS OF QUEBEC LEGISLATURE*: Mr. *Langelier* (*Montmorency*) 303 (i).
DRILL SHED AT BELLEVILLE, CONSTRUCTION: Mr. *Burdett*, 699 (i).
DRAWBACK ON GOODS MANUFACTURED FOR EXPORT*: Mr. *Ellis*, 943 (ii).
DERBY BRANCH AND NORTHERN AND WESTERN RYS.*: Mr. *Mitchell*, 1182 (ii).
ESSEX AND YOUNG TOWNSHIPS UNION ACT, PETS. *re* DISALLOWANCE: Mr. *Taylor*, 436 (i).
EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 24 (i).
EXPERIMENTAL FARM (OTTAWA) COST*: Mr. *McMillan* (*Huron*) 235; Expenditure, 436 (i).
FARLEY, GUNNER, CLAIM FOR LOSS OF HORSE: Mr. *Fisher*, 433 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

FISH IMPORTED IN BOND FOR EXPORT: Gen. *Laurie*, 1082 (ii).
FISHERY BOUNTY, CLAIMS MADE AND REJECTED IN P. E. I.: Mr. *McIntyre*, 434 (i)
FISHING REGULATIONS IN BERTHIER, &c.: Mr. *Beausoleil*, 743 (i).
FISHING LICENSES, INLAND WATERS: Mr. *Dawson*, 82 (i).
FLOUR AND WHEAT IMPORTATIONS FROM U S.*: Mr. *Smith* (*Ontario*) 33 (i).
FORTIN, NOEL, ACCIDENT TO ON I. C. R.*: Mr. *Fiset*, 303, 304 (i).
FRANCHISE ACT, AMOUNT EXPENDED FOR VARIOUS SERVICES*: Mr. *Charlton*, 303 (i).
FRUIT BASKETS AND BOXES, DUTY COLLECTED*: Mr. *Charlton*, 304 (i).
GRAND RIVER BRIDGE AT YORK VILLAGE, HALDIMAND*: Mr. *Colter*, 304 (i).
GREAT EASTERN RY. SUBSIDY: Mr. *Rinfret*, 20 (i).
GROVER, J. M., POSTMASTER AT MORDEN, MAN.*: Mr. *Guay*, 943 (ii).
HIDE AND LEATHER INSPECTOR, MONTREAL: Mr. *Curran*, 23 (i).
HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Mr. *McMullen*, 22 (i).
HOSPITAL DUES ON SHIPS, COLLECTION*: Mr. *Lépine*, 303 (i)
I. C. R. *See* general heading.
INDIANS, HURON TRIBE OF LORETTE*: Mr. *Langelier* (*Montmorency*) 33 (i).
INDIAN LANDS, GRAND RIVER, SALES, &c.*: Mr. *Colter*, 304 (i).
INSPECTORS OF HULLS, NAMES, &c., OF COMMISSIONERS*: Mr. *Wilson* (*Elgin*) 943 (ii).
INTERNATIONAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY*: Mr. *Jones* (*Halifax*), 943 (i).
JONES' CREEK, LEEDS, ONT, PETS, &c: Mr. *Taylor*, 540 (i).
L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, N. S, SURVEYS: Mr. *Flynn*) 693 (i).
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF N. W. T., MEMORIALS: Mr. *Davin*, 348, 371 (i).
LÉVIS POST OFFICE BUILDING: Mr. *Guay*, 433 (i).
LIQUOR PERMITS IN N. W. T.: Mr. *Jamieson*, 550 (i).
LOAN, RECENT, AMOUNTS RECEIVED ON ACCOUNT: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 30 (i).
LOBSTER FACTORIES IN P. E. I.: Mr. *Perry*, 31 (i).
LOURDES AND SOMERSET MAIL SERVICE: Mr. *Turcot*, 751 (i).
LUNENBURG HARBOR SURVEY: Mr. *Eisenhauer*, 749 (i).
——— COUNTY FISHERIES: (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 940 (ii).
MAGISTRATES, DISALLOWANCE OF ACT*: Mr. *Langelier* (*Montmorency*) 303 (i).
MAIL CARRIAGE, BEAUCOUR STATION AND STE JULIE DE SOMERSET*: Mr. *Turcot*, 304 (i).
MANUFACTURERS' INSURANCE CO.'S STOCKHOLDERS: Mr. *Lister*, 591.
MATANE RIVER FISHING RIGHTS; Mr. *Casgrain*, 938 (ii).
MINING MACHINERY, DUTY*: Mr. *Elgar*, 943 (ii).
MOUNTED POLICE, DESERTIONS DURING TEN YEARS*: Mr. *Davin*, 303 (i).
——— PUNISHMENT OF CONSTABLES, &c.: Mr. *Davin*, 429 (i).
NAUFRAGE HARBOR, P. E. I., ENGINEER'S REP.: Mr. *McIntyre*, 33 (i).
NORTH SHORE RY., CONVEYANCE TO GOVT*: Mr. *Langelier* (*Montmorency*) 943 (ii).
O'CONNOR, D., ACCOUNT FOR LAW CASES, FEES, &c.: Mr. *McMullen*, 31 (i).
ORDNANCE LANDS IN QUEBEC*: Mr. *Langelier* (*Quebec*), 942 (ii).
OTTAWA PUBLIC ROADS, IMPROVEMENTS*: Mr. *McMullen*, 303 (i).
PIERS, &c., IN P. E. I., REPAIRS IN 1888*: Mr. *Welsh*, 942 (ii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS IN P. E. I.*: Mr. *Robertson*, 942 (ii).
PILOTAGE DUES, QUEBEC HARBOR, &c.*: Mr. *Langelier* (*Montmorency*) 942 (i).
POST OFFICES BUILT SINCE 1878, REVENUES, &c.: Mr. *Burdett*, 225 (i).
PUBLIC BUILDINGS ERECTED, 1867-1889*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 303 (i).
QUEBEC CONFERENCE, 1887, RES, &c.: Mr. *Edgar*, 29 (i).
REBELLION, IN N. W. T, OFFICIAL COR. *re* 9TH BATTALION: Mr. *Amyot*, 304 (i).
ROCK LAKE DAM, DAMAGES BY: Mr. *Kirkpatrick*, 936 (ii).
ROSS, HON. WM., DISMISSAL: Mr. *Laurier*, 24 (i).
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, TENDERS*: Mr. *Trow*, 943 (ii).
——— Mr. *McMullen*, 304 (i).
SAW LOGS, IMPORTATION, &c.: Mr. *Charlton*, 33 (i).
——— EXPORTATION AND DUTY COLLECTED*: Mr. *Charlton*, 33, 304 (i).
SHORT LINE RY., ST. LAWRENCE, ST. ANDREWS, *viâ* SHERBROOKE, MATTAWAMKEAG, &c.: Mr. *Kenny*, 541 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

ST. CATHARINES MILLING AND LUMBERING CO. *vs.* QUEEN*: Mr. *McMullen* 33 (i).
——— ORIGINAL CHEQUES*: Mr. *McMullen*, 943 (ii).
ST. CHARLES BRANCH RY., COST*: Mr. *McMullen*, 943 (ii).
ST. JOHN, N.B., HARBOR, REP. OF H. F. PERLEY*: Mr *Weldon* (*St. John*), 304 (i).
ST. ROCH DES AULNETS WHARF: Mr. *Casgrain*, 529 (ii).
SUNDAY TRAFFIC ON CANALS*: Mr. *Rykert*, 304 (i).
TARIFF, FRENCH EDITION; Mr. *Langelier* (*Montmorency*) 935 (ii).
TEMISCOUATA RY. CO, SHAREHOLDERS, &c.*: Mr. *Dessaint*, 24 (i).
——— SUBSIDY*: Mr. *Dessaint*, 943 (ii).
TOWN SITES. N. W. T, RECEIPTS FROM SALES*: Mr. *Davin*, 29 (i).
TENDERS FOR CANAL WORKS: Mr. *Casey*, 593 (i).
WHEAT AND FLOUR IMPORTATIONS FROM U. S.*: Mr. *Smith* (*Ontario*) 33 (i).
WEBSTER, W. A., SUMS PAID FOR SERVICES*: Mr. *Colter* 303 (i).
WELLAND CANAL WATER POWER, ENGINEERS' REPS.*: Mr. *Rykert*, 304 (i)
WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS AND WESTERN COUNTIES RYS.: Mr. *Borden*, 529.
WRIGHT, E. P., DUTY ON MINING MACHINERY*: Mr. *Edwards*, 942.
WRIGHT, ALLAN, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES*: Mr. *Mitchell*, 1094.
YOUNG AND ESSEX TOWNSHIPS UNION ACT, PETS. *re* DISALLOWANCE*: Mr. *Taylor*, 436.

RICHELIEU RIVER, SURVEY AND SOUNDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Gigault*) 22, 29 (i).
RICHMOND REPAIR SHED FOR CARS: in Com. of Sup., 1064.
RIDEAU HALL: in Com. of Sup., 913 (ii).
RIFLED ORDNANCE, IMPROVED: in Com. of Sup., 794 (i).
RIMOUSKI WHARF, REPAIRS, CONTRACTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 302 (i).
RIVER AND WATER POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 974 (ii).
RIVER MATANE FISHING PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 469.
ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 970, 1449, 1532; conc., 1615 (ii).
ROBILLARD, HONORÉ, PURCHASE OF TIMBER ON INDIAN RESERVES: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 30 (i).
——— Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1484 (ii).
ROCK LAKE DAM, DAMAGES BY: M. for Cor., &c (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 936 (ii).
Rocky Mountains Park of Can. Act Amt. B. No. 141 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°*, 1363; withdn., 1629 (ii).
ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1066 (ii).
ROSS, HON. WM., DISMISSAL: M. for O.C., Reps., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 24 (i).
ROSS, JOSIAH, SEIZURE OF PROPERTY BY CUSTOMS DEPT.; Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 428 (i).
ROSSEAU RIVER (MAN.) INDIAN RESERVE, LOCATION: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 347 (i).
Rules of Court. *See* "CRIMINAL MATTERS."
STE. ANNE DE CHICOUTIMI WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 525.
STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIERE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. Mr. *Dessaint*) 1265 (ii).
STE. BEATRIX POST OFFICE, LOCATION: Ques. (Mr. *Neveu*) 590 (i).
ST. ALPHONSE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1181, 1363 (ii).
ST. ANDREWS TO C.P.R. AT OR EAST OF LACHUTE: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396; in Com., 1500 (ii).
ST. BARTHELEMY POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 591.
ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1634 (ii).

ST. CATHARINES MILLING AND LUMBER CO. *vs.* QUEEN, LAW COSTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 33 (i).
——— ORIGINAL CHEQUES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 943 (ii).
——— COSTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1146 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 431 (i), 1455 (ii).
ST. CÉSAIRE to ST. PAUL D'ABBOTTSORD RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1634 (ii).
ST. CHARLES BRANCH RY., TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 302 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 943 (ii).
ST. CLAIR FRONTIER TUNNEL CO.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1618 (ii).
ST. CLAIR RAPIDS, DREDGING AT POINT EDWARD: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 591 (i).
ST. CLAIR RIVER, STAG ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Moncrieff*) 224 (i).
St. Gabriel Levee Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 45 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 194; 2°*, 299; in Com. and 3°*, 509 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 83.)
ST. GEORGE'S BRIDGE, STRUCTURAL DEFECTS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1081 (ii).
St. Helen's Island Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 36 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 138; 2°*, 299 (i).
ST. JOHN AND BASIN OF MINAS MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 1262 (ii).
ST. JOHN, EXTENSION OF CITY FRONT, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1063 (ii).
ST. JOHN, N.B., HARBOR, REP. OF H. F. PERLEY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 304 (i).
ST. JOHN RIVER, BRIDGE AT FREDERICTON, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 526 (i).
St. Lawrence and Atlantic Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 64 (Mr. *Hall*). 1°*, 269; 2°*, 357; in Com. and 3°*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 72.)
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, OVERFLOW, PREVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 591 (i).
——— SALE OF ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 34 (i).
——— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1516 (ii).
——— SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).
——— TELEGRAPH SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1363 (ii).
ST. LOUIS LAKE, CONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 80 (i).
ST LOUIS RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 34 (i).
ST. ROCH DES AULNETS WHARF, COR., REP., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Casgrain*) 529 (i).
SAGUENAY RIVER BUOYS AND LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1146, 1424 (ii).
SALMON RIVERS IN QUEBEC, LEASES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 224 (i).
Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s incorp. B. No. 86 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°*, 369; 2°*, 510; M. for Com. and Amt (Mr. *Wallace*) to ref. to Sel. Stand. Com., 754 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 921 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 56.)
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1202 (ii).
——— TENDERS, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *McMullen*) 304 (i).
——— M. for copies* (Mr. *Trow*) 943 (ii).
SAVARY, CHARLES, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 427 (i).
SAWDUST AND MILL REFUSE IN OTTAWA RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 370 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 223 (i).
SAWDUST IN CANADIAN RIVERS, FINES FOR VIOLATING LAW: Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 591 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 1082 (ii).
SAW LOGS, EXPORTATION AND DUTY COLLECTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 33 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 304 (i).
——— EXPORT DUTY: Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1480, 1584, 1591 (ii).
——— IMPORTATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 33 (i).
SEAMEN SHIPPING IN U. S. VESSELS, INSTRUCTIONS TO SHIPPING-MASTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 468 (i).
SECRETARY OF STATE'S REP.: presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 33 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 57 (i).
SECRETARY OF STATE:
CAN. TEMP. ACT, DISTRIBUTION OF FINES: Ques. (Mr. *Roome*) 80.
——— WORKING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 541 (i).
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 224 (i).
——— DATE OF RECEIPT OF CERTIFICATES FROM JUDGES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 303 (i).
CRIMINAL LAWS FOR JUSTICES OF THE PEACE, DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bernier*) 171 (i).
FRANCHISE ACT, AMOUNT EXPENDED FOR ALL SERVICES IN CONNECTION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 303 (i).
LABOR COMMISSION, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 1422.
LIQUOR LICENSES, ROCKY MOUNTAINS PARK: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 249 (i).
MONTREAL FLOOD COMMISSION, PRINTING REPORT: M. (Mr. *Curran*) 1687 (ii).
PRINTING BUREAU, EXPENDITURE FOR PLANT, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 428 (i).
SAVARY, CHARLES, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 427 (i).
SECRETARY OF STATE'S REP.: presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 33.
VOTERS' LISTS, AMOUNT EXPENDED IN PREPARING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 30, 33 (i).
——— DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 15 (i).
SEED WHEAT, MAN., PAYMENT BY SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 590 (i).
SEIZURE OF BRITISH SCHOONER BY U. S. CUTTER "WOODBINE:" Despatch respecting read (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 510 (i).
SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) for Com. to prepare Lists, 2 (i).
——— Rep. presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 17 (i).
——— M. to conc. in Rep. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 18 (i).
——— M. to add names (Mr. *Laurier*) 169 (i).
——— M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to add names, 269 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act (*Chap.* 11 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 111** (Mr. *Skinner*). 1°, 590 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act (*Chap.* 11 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 120** (Sir *John Thompson*). Res. prop., in Com. and 1°* of B., 787 (i); 2°* and in Com., 911; 3°*, 912 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 10.)
SENATOR FOR SHAWINIGAN DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1628 (ii).
SENATE, SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 207 (i); conc., 1597 (ii).

SENATE, MESS. TO, SUMMONING SENATOR SANFORD BEFORE PUB. ACCTS. COM.: M. (Mr. *Rykert*) 620 (i).

SESSIONAL CLERKS, EXTRA: in Com. of Sup, 271 (i).

SETTLERS (OLD) CLAIMS IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1533 (ii).

SCHREIBER, MR, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 1504; conc, 1615 (ii).

SCOTT, CAPT.: in Com. of Sup., 146 (i).

SCRIP (LAND) OUTSTANDING: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 347, 525.

SOUGOG RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1533 (ii).

Ships' Safety Act (*Chap.* 77 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 54** (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 223 (i); 2° m., 1029; 2° and in Com., 1032; 3°*, 1042 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 22.)

Deb. in Com. (Messrs. *Davies* [*P. E. I.*] and *Mitchell*) 1032; (Mr. *Baird*) 1033; (Messrs. *Charlton, Gillmor* and *Welsh*) 1034; (Mr. *Waldie*) 1035; (Messrs. *Kenny* and *Mulock*) 1036; (Messrs. *Jones* [*Halifax*] and *Freeman*) 1037; (Messrs. *O'Brien* and *Wilson Elgin*) 1038; (Mr. *Dawson*) 1039; (Mr. *McNeill*) 1039; (Mr. *McKay*) 1039; (Mr. *Ellis*) 1040; (Mr. *Riopel*) 1041 (ii).

SHELBURNE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

SHELBURNE, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1.

SHORT LINE (HARVEY AND MONCTON): prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1424 (ii).

Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) B. No. 149 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 1424; in Com., 1658; M. to conc. in Res., 1669; Amt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1672; neg. (Y. 34, N. 70) 1678; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1679; neg. on a div., Res. conc. in, 1°*, 2°* of B. and in Com., 1683; 3°*, 1685 (ii).

Deb. on Amt. (Messrs. *Ellis* and *Wood, Westmoreland*) 1672; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1673; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1674; (Messrs *Colter* and *Mu'ock*) 1675; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1677; Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1678 (ii).

Deb. on Amt. to Amt (Mr. *McMullen*) 1679; (Messrs. *Davies*, [*P.E.I.*], *Skinner, Mitchell* and Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1681; (Messrs. *Jones* [*Halifax*], *Beausoleil* and *Armstrong*) 1684; (Mr. *Casey*) 1683 (ii).

SHORT LINE RY., DEFEAT OF B. IN SEN.: Remarks, 1724

——— AMOUNT PAID INTERNATIONAL RY. CO. OR C. P. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 769 (i).

——— OXFORD TO NEW GLASGOW, N. S., TOTAL LENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 529 (i).

——— PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 740 (i).

——— ST. LAWRENCE TO ST. ANDREWS, &c, *vid* SHERBROOKE, MATTAWAMKEAG, &c: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kenny*) 541.

SICAMONS ON C. P. R., TO LAKE OKANAGAN, RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1629 (ii).

SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS FUND: Ques. (Sir *Donald Smith*) 1710 (ii).

SIMCOE (EAST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

SIMMS & SLATER, CONTRACTORS FOR CAPE BRETON RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Victoria*) 871 (ii).

——— RETURN OF DEPOSIT TO SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 677 (i).

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: prop. Res. not to sit after 12 o'clock (Mr. *Charlton*) 432, 526 (i).

SIX NATION INDIANS, SALE OF LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 428 (i).

SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 970, 1229 (ii).

SMYTH, HENRY, OF CHATHAM, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 224 (i).

SMYTH AND WEBSTER, MESSRS, IMMIGRATION AGENTS: in Com. of Sup., 956 (ii).

SMELT FISHING IN THE MIRAMICHI: in Com. of Sup., 140 (i).

South Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 59 (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1°*, 269; 2°*, 357; in Com. and 3°*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 70.)

SOUTH ONT. PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com, 1632 (ii).

SPEAKER, DEPUTY (SALARY): in Com. of Sup., 270 (i).

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

STEIN, LEONCE, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1533 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection Act (*Chap.* 78 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 130** (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 911: 2° m, 1043; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1044 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 23.)

STEPHENSON, RUFUS, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 223 (i).

——— in Com of Sup., 1254 (ii).

Subsidies (land) to Rys. authorisation B. 152 (Mr. *Dewdney*). Res. prop., 1572; in Com., 1712, 1720; 1°*, 2°* and in Com. on B, 1720; 3°*, 1721 (ii). (52 *Vic*, *c.* 4)

Subsidies (money) to Rys. authorisation B. No. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). Res. (1st) prop., 1396; in Com., 1499; conc. in, 1535. Res. (2nd) prop., 1572; in Com., 1615, 1629; on M. to conc. in 1st Res., Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) neg. (Y. 33, N. 65) 1653; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 33, N. 65) 1653; M. to conc. in 2nd Res. agreed to (Y. 66, N. 35) 1653; 1°* and 2°* of B., 1654; in Com., 1685; 3° m., and Amt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) neg. (Y. 27, N. 48) and 3°*, 1686 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 3.)

SUBSIDIES. *See*

ALBERT SOUTHERN RY. CO.
AMHERSTBURG AND LAKE SHORE RY. CO.
BAIE DES CHALEURS RY. CO.
BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.
CAPE TORMENTINE TO MURRAY BAY RY.
CAP ROUGE AND ST. LAWRENCE RY. CO.
CENTRAL RY. FROM GRAND LAKE TO I.C.R.
CHICOUTIMI RY. CO.
CORNWALLIS VALLEY RY. CO.
DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. CO.
FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S BRIDGE CO.
GANANOQUE, PERTH AND JAMES' BAY RAILWAY CO. AND THOUSAND ISLANDS RY CO.
GRAND TRUNK, GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE ERIE RY. CO.
GREAT EASTERN RY. CO.
HEREFORD RY. CO.
IRONDALE, BANCROFT AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
JOGGINS RY. CO.
KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
LAKE MAN. RY. AND CANAL CO.
LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE RY. CO. (Mattawa to Long Sault).
MASKINONGÉ AND NIPISSING RY.

SUBSIDIES—*Continued.*

MASSAWIPPI JUNCTION RY. Co.
NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. Co.
NORTH-WESTERN COAL AND NAVIGATION Co.
NORTH-WESTERN RY. Co. OF CANADA.
NAPANEE, TAMWORTH AND QUEBEC RY. Co.
OCEAN STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.
ONTARIO AND PACIFIC RY. Co.
OTTAWA AND GATINEAU VALLEY RY. Co.
PARRY SOUND COLONISATION RY. Co.
PONTIAC AND RENFREW RY. Co.
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. Co.
QUEBEC, MONTMORENCY AND CHARLEVOIX RY.
QUEBEC AND MURRAY BAY RY.
RED DEER VALLEY RY. AND COAL Co.
ST. ANDREWS TO C.P.R. AT OR EAST OF LACHUTE RY.
SICAMONS ON C.P.R. TO LAKE OKANAGAN RY.
SOUTH ONTARIO PACIFIC RY. Co.
ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. Co.
ST. CÉSAIRE TO ST. PAUL D'ABBOTTSFORD RY.
ST. CLAIR FRONTIER TUNNEL Co.
SHUSWAP AND LAKE OKANAGAN RY.
TRURO TO NEWPORT RY.
THOUSAND ISLANDS RY. Co.

See "RAILWAYS," "SUPPLY," &c.

SUBSIDY TO P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 15 (i).

SUBWAY, STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 16 (i).

SULTANA ISLAND, LAKE OF THE WOODS, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 426 (i).

Summary Convictions. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW."

Summary Trials. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW."

SUMMERSIDE (P. E. I.) HARBOR, SURVEY AND BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 303 (i), 1423 (ii).

SUNDAY TRAFFIC ON CANALS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Rykert*) 304 (i).

Supply B. No. 147 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. conc. in, 1°*, 2°* and 3°* of B., 1712 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 1.)

SUPPLY:

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]

AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM.: Ques. of Procedure (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 48; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) Fisheries and Trade Relations with U. S., 323; deb. adjd., 346; rsmd., 385; neg. (Y. 65, N. 108) 423; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Unrestricted Reciprocity, 468; neg. (Y. 77, N. 121) 739 (i); Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) Jesuits' Estates Act, 813; neg. (Y. 13, N. 188) 910; Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Recent Loan, 946, 1044; Amt., 1147; neg. (Y. 74, N. 117) 1169; Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) Cape Breton Ry., 1182; Amt. (Mr. *Holton*) Customs Seizures, 1285; neg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 1314; Amt. Mr. *Fisher*) Intoxicants in N. W. T., 1331; neg (Y. 53, N. 100) 1351; Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*, &c.) Export Duty on Logs, 1480; Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) 1488; neg. (Y. 62, N. 91) 1494; Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) Militia Clothing, 1542; neg (Y. 54, N. 95) 1569; Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) Behring's Sea Seizures, 1575; Remarks (Mr. *Barnard*) Duty on Mining Machinery, 1583; Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) Duty on Saw Logs, 1585; neg. (Y. 54, N. 90) 1594; Amt (Mr. *Ross*) Man. Rys., 1692; neg. on a div, 1693; Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) Jesuits' Estates Act, 1692 (ii).

MESS. from His Ex., transmitting Estimates for 1889-90, 30 (i); Suppl. for 1888-89, 1018; Suppl. for 1889-90, 1467; further Suppl. for 1889-90, 1627 (ii).

RES. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com., 13; in Com., 48, 138, 196, 270, 287 423, 739, 788 (i), 912, 947, 1047, 1064, 1169, 1202, 1223, 1234, 1315, 1352, 1447, 1494, 1501, 1570, 1595.

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice. *See* "Justice."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

COMMITTEE—*Continued.*

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Census and Statistics, 298 (i); conc., 1598 (ii).
Colonial and Indian Exhibition, 1512 (ii).
Dairying Interests (development) 1513 (ii).
Experimental Farms, 288 (i); conc., 1598 (ii).
Fruit Growing Interest (development) 1513 (ii).
Health Statistics, 287 (i); conc., 1598 (ii).
Patent Record, conc., 1598.

Canals. See "Railways" and "Collection of Revenues."

Charges of Management:
Brokerage, &c., on Sinking Fund, 204 (i).
Country Savings Banks, 203 (i).
Dominion Loans reduced, 204 (i).
General Vote, 48 (i).
Printing Dominion Notes, 205 (i).

Civil Government:
Agriculture Dept., 71 (i).
Auditor General's Office, 66 (i).
Civil Service Examiners, 203 (i).
Contingencies, Departmental:
General Vote, 155 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 196 (i), 1503, 1597.
Post Office and Finance Depts., 1503 (ii).
Departments generally (special messenger), 1503.
Customs Dept., 67, 152, 155 (i).
Finance and Treasury Board, 66 (i).
Fisheries Dept., 148 (i).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 49 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, London, 151 (i).
Indian Affairs, Dept. of, 65 (i), 1502 (ii).
Inland Revenue Dept., 66 (i).
Interior, Dept. of, 58, 62, 63 (i), 1502 (ii).
Geological Survey, 58 (i).
Justice Dept., 49 (i).
Penitentiaries Branch, 54 (i).
Marine Dept., 138 (i); conc., 1614 (ii).
Militia and Defence, Dept. of, 54 (i).
Mounted Police, 62, 151, 152 (i).
Postmaster General's Dept, 68 (i).
Printing and Stationery Dept., 57 (i), 1503 (ii).
Privy Council Office 49 (i), 1501 (ii).
Public Works Dept., 148 (i).
Railways and Canals, Dept. of, 151 (i), 1504 (ii); conc., 1615 (ii).
Secretary of State's Dept., 57 (i).

Collection of Revenues:
Adulteration of Food, 1227 (ii).
Canals:
Repairs and Working Expenses, 1211, 1495 (ii).
Customs:
Chinese Immigration Act (administration) 1221.
Detective Service (outside) 1221 (ii).
Miscellaneous, 1461 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 1217 (ii).
Dominion Lands (Income) 1240; conc., 1607 (ii).
Forestry Commissioner's Salary, 1253 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Collection of Revenues—Continued.
Excise:
Officers and Inspectors (salaries) 1223 (ii).
Officers in Distilleries and Factories, 1225 (ii).
Preventive Service, 1224 (ii).
Minor Revenues, 1229, 1495 (ii).
Post Office, 1234, 1461, 1596 (ii).
Public Works:
Esquimault and Lévis Graving Docks, 1232 (ii).
Slide and Boom Dues (collection) 1229 (ii).
Telegraph, P.E.I., and Mainland, 1233 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, N.W.T., 1233 (ii).
Railways:
Intercolonial, Repairs and Working Expenses, 1074, 1496 (ii).
Weights and Measures:
Inspector's and Asst. Inspector's Salaries, 1226, 1496 (ii).
Customs. See "Collection of Revenues."
Dominion Lands. See "Collection of Revenues."
Dominion Police:
General Vote, 211 (i).
Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."
Fisheries:
General Vote, 1074 conc., 1607 (ii).
Geological Survey:
General Vote, 1079 (ii).
Government Steamers. See "Ocean and River Service."
Immigration:
Agent, Montreal, 947 (ii).
Assistant Agent, Victoria, B.C., 957 (ii).
Contingencies, Canadian Agency, 962 (ii).
Immigration and Immigration Expenses, 1319, 1498; conc., 1611 (ii).
Indians:
British Columbia, 1178 (ii).
Man. and N.W.T., 1173, 1595.
Man. (Industrial Schools) 1177 (ii).
Ont., Que., N.S. and N.B. generally:
Annuities under Robinson Treaty, 1171 (ii).
Dingman, A., payment *re* Dundee Lands, 1172, 1451 (i).
Quebec (relief of distress) 1169 (ii).
Removal of Indians from Oka to Gibson, 1171.
Schools, 1170 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 1173 (ii).
Insurance:
Superintendence, Expenses in connection, 1361 (ii).
Justice, Administration of:
Clerk, Exchequer Court, 205 (i).
Judges' Salaries, 207 (i).
Judges Boswell and Gowan (refund) 1362 (ii).
Miscellaneous, including N. W. T., 205 (i).
Printing, &c., Supreme Court Reports, 205 (i).
Supreme Court, Senior Messenger, 205 (i).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Committees, Extra Sessional Clerks, &c., 271 (i).
Contingencies, conc., 1593 (ii).
Deputy Speaker's Salary, 270 (i).
Elections (payment to J. Wilson as Returning Officer) 1362 (ii).
Franchise Act (expenses) 1511 (ii); conc., 1615 (ii).
Library of Parliament, 272 (i).
Laws: Printing, Binding, &c., 272 (i).
Printing, Paper and Binding, 272 (i).
Returning Officers (payments) 1511 (ii).
Salaries, Clerk's Estimate, 270 (i).
Voters' List, Printing, 271 (i).
Senate:
Salaries and Contingencies, 207 (i); conc., 1597.
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Buoys, Lights, Fog-Whistles, &c. (maintenance) 975, 1450 (ii).
Lighthouses and Fog Alarms (completion, &c.) 1361 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Halifax and St. John (either) and W. Indies and S. America (either) 1701 (ii).
King, Jas., compensation for cancelling Contract, 1451 (ii).
Magdalen Islands, 1261, 1450 (ii).
New Westminster and Victoria, 1532 (ii).
P. E. I. and Mainland, 1261 (ii).
St. John and Ports in Basin of Minas, 1262 (ii).
St. John, Digby and Annapolis, 1532 (ii).
Marine Hospitals:
Marine and Immigrant Hospital, Que., 976 (ii).
Hospitals in Que., N.S., N.B., P.E.I. and B.C., 977.
Meteorological Service. See "Scientific Institutions."
Militia:
Ammunition, Cartridge Factory, Clothing, &c., 793 (i), 1352 (ii).
Armories, care of Arms, &c., 793 (i).
Drill Sheds, Construction and Repairs, 795 (i).
Drill Pay, conc., 1598 (ii).
Military College, 1357 (ii).
Military College, House for Commandant, 1693; conc., 1705 (ii).
Permanent Forces, Cavalry, &c., Schools, 796 (i).
Rifled Ordnance, improved, 794 (i).
Miscellaneous:
American Association of Science, aid to entertaining, 1697 (ii).
Banff, Survey, Roads, Bridges, &c., 1180 (ii).
Costs in litigated matters, 1460 (ii).
Commercial Agencies, 1180 (ii).
Examining Lands in C.P.R. Belt, 1570 (ii).
Fabre, Mr., salary and contingencies, 1179, 1361(ii)
Govt. in N.W.T.; Printing, Roads, Bridges, Ferries, Schools, &c. (expenses) 1179 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Miscellaneous—Continued.
Griffin, W. H., Ex-Dep. P.M.G., 1453 (ii).
Jukes, Dr., Medical Services, 1571 (ii).
Jugements du Conseil Souverain, Vol. IV., 1453(ii).
Labor Commission, 1497; conc., 1614 (ii).
Le Dictionnaire Généalogique des Familles Françaises, 1543 (ii).
N.W.T., Inspectors', Registrars and Clerks Salaries, &c., 1180, 1215 (ii).
Printing Bureau and Binding, 1571 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Survey, 1461 (ii).
St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Co. *vs.* Queen, Costs, 1455 (ii).
Mounted Police:
General Vote, 1212 (ii).
Supplementary Vote, 1451, 1497 (ii).
Ocean and River Service:
Govt. Steamers, maintenance and repairs, 974 (ii).
River and Water Police, Mont. and Que., 974 (ii).
Wrecks and Shipping Disasters, 974 (ii).
Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 222 (i).
Dorchester, 1507 (ii).
Kingston, 211 (i), 1509; conc., 1615 (ii).
Manitoba, 216 (i), 1597; conc., 1597 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul, 1315, 1510 (ii).
Pensions:
Compensation in lieu of Land, 738 (i).
Delaney, Mrs., 739 (i).
Gowanlock, Mrs., 792 (i).
Lady Cartier, 423 (i).
Veterans of War of 1812, 788 (i).
Police. See "Dominion Police."
Post Office. See "Collection of Revenues."
Public Works—Capital:*
Cape Tormentine Harbor, N. B., 802 (i).
Kingston Graving Dock, 801 (ii).
Port Arthur Harbor and Kaministiquia River, 801 (i).
St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, 1516 (ii).
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia, 1528 (ii).
New Brunswick, 805 (i); conc., 1599 (ii).
Ontario, 806 (i), 1519 (ii).
Quebec 806 (i); 1362 (ii).
North-West Territories, 807 (i), 1527 (ii).
Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c.:
Dom. Immigration Buildings, 919 (ii).
Grounds, Public Buildings, Ottawa, 918 (ii).
Major's Hill Park, conc., 1599 (ii).
Rideau Hall, 913 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 1518 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 1519 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Public Works—Income—Continued.
Dredging:
Lake Manitoba, 970 (ii)
New Plant, 1448 (ii).
P. E. I. and N. B, 968; conc., 1600 (ii).
Experimental Farm, 971 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers:
British Columbia, 931 (ii).
Manitoba, 931 (ii).
Maritime Provinces generally, 910, 1448 (ii).
New Brunswick, 924, 1447, 1530; conc., 1615 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 807 (i), 913, 1447, 1528; conc., 1579 (ii).
Ontario, 928, 1531; conc., 1579 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 919, 1529 (ii).
Quebec, 927, 1448, 1531 (ii).
Miscellaneous: Surveys and Inspections, 1450.
Roads and Bridges, 970; conc., 1615 (ii).
Belly River Bridge at Lethbridge, 1532 (ii).
Ottawa River and City Bridges, 1449 (ii).
Slides and Booms, 970 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, 971, 1532 (ii).
Quarantine:
General Vote, 931 (ii).
Public Health, precautionary measures, 932 (ii).
Railways and Canals—Capital:*
Canals (conc., 1601) (ii):
Cornwall, 1205 (ii).
Lachine, 1205 (ii).
Murray, conc., 1614 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, 1202 (ii).
Tay, 1211 (ii).
Trent River Navigation, 1207 (ii).
Welland (deepening) 1207 (ii).
Williamsburg, 1205 (ii).
Railways conc., 1601 (ii):
Canadian Pacific (Arbitration) 1047 (ii).
Cape Breton Ry., 1069 (ii).
Intercolonial, conc., 1607 (ii):
Halifax, increased accommodation, 1048 (ii).
Land Damages, Legal Expenses, &c., 1597 (ii).
Moncton, increased accommodation, 1048 (ii).
Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., 1073; conc., 1603.
Richmond, Shed extension to repair Cars, 1064.
Rolling Stock, 1049; conc., 1614 (ii).
St. John, extension of City Front, 1068 (ii).
———, increased accommodation, 1063 (ii).
Supplementary Vote, 1498 (ii).
Railways and Canals—Income:*
Canals:
Rideau, 1211 (ii).
Welland, 1514 (ii).
Scientific Institutions:
Meteorological Service, 976 (ii).

* *See* "Collection of Revenues"

* For Repairs and Working Expenses, *see* "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Steamship Subventions. *See* "Mail Subsidies."
Superannuation:
Railways, allowance to W. Wallace, 1597 (ii).
Terirtorial Accounts;
Militia Expenses, *re* Rebellion in N. W. T., 1461, *Unprovided Items*, 1494 (ii).
CONCURRENCE:
Census and Statistics, 1598 (ii).
Dredging, P. E. I., N. S. and N. B., 1600 (ii).
Dominion Lands Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to reduce vote, 1607; neg. (Y. 39, N. 71) 1611 (ii).
Experimental Farms, 1598 (ii).
Fisheries, 1607 (ii).
Franchise Act, Dom., 1615 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers, Ont. and N. S., 1599; N. B., 1615.
Health Statistics, 1598 (ii).
House of Commons, Contingencies, 1598 (ii).
Intercolonial Ry., Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) to reduce Vote, 1604; neg. (Y. 39 N. 71) 1607 (ii).
Immigration, Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) to reduce Vote, 1611; neg. (Y. 39, N. 71) 1613 (ii).
I. C. R., Rolling Stock, 1614 (ii).
Kingston Penitentiary, 1615 (ii).
Labor Commission, 1614 (ii).
Marine Dept., Salaries, Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) *re* C. C. Chipman, neg. (Y. 33, N. 65) 1614 (ii).
Man. Penitentiaries, Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to reduce Vote, 1597; neg. (Y. 47, N. 73) 1598 (ii).
Militia (drill pay), 1598 (ii).
Military College, Commandant's House, 1705 (ii).
Murray Canal, 1614 (ii).
Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., construction, Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1603; neg. (Y. 39, N. 70) 1604 (ii).
Patent Record, 1598 (ii).
Public Buildings, N. B., 1599 (ii).
Railways and Canals, Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1601; neg. (Y. 40, N. 73) 1603.
Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c., 1599 (ii).
Rys. and Canals, Mr. Schreiber's Salary, 1615 (ii).
Roads and Bridges, 1615 (ii).
Senate, Salaries and Contingencies, 1597 (ii).
SUPPLIES, MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (ii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. No. 105 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 556; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 787 (i). (52 *Vic., c.* 37.)
SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS: in Com. of Sup., 49 (i).
Supreme Court B. No. 95 (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1°*, 370 (i).
SUPREME COURT REPORTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).
SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (ii).
TARIFF, FRENCH EDITION: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 935 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1266 (ii).
——— CHANGES: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1221 (ii).
TAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup. 1211 (ii).
TELEGRAPH LINES, ACQUISITION BY GOVT.: M. (Mr. *Denison*) for Sel. Com., 80 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 971, 1233, 1532 (ii).
Telephone, Telegraph, &c., Co.'s Wires (Toronto) B. No. 78 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 322; 2°*, 397 (i).
Telephone, Telegraph, &c., Wires B. No. 112 (Mr. *Perley*). 1°*, 620 (i).
TÉMISCOUATA RY. CO., SHAREHOLDERS, SHARES AND AMOUNTS PAID: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Dessaint*) 24 (i).
——— SUBSIDY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Dessaint*) 943 (ii).
——— AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 676 (i).
TENDERS FOR CANAL WORKS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casey*) 593.
TENDERS, TRANSLATION OF FORMS: Remarks, 1535 (ii).
TÊTE DU PONT BARRACKS, SALE OR LEASE: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 427 (i).
THOUSAND ISLAND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1641 (ii).
Threats, Intimidations, &c. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW."
Three Rivers and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 99 (Mr. *Riopel*). 1°*, 468; 2°*, 663 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 855 (ii). (52 *Vic*, *c.* 64.)
TIGNISH BREAKWATER: on M. for Com. of Sup., 1222 (ii).
——— REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1146 (ii).
Timber and Lumber Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 113 (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. prop., 469; in Com., 661; 1°* of B., 669 (i).
Deb. in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 661, 663; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 662; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 662, 666; (Mr. *Cook*) 663; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 662, 665; (Mr. *Kirk*) 661; (Messrs. *Ives* and *Charlton*) 665; (Messrs. *Perley* and *Mills, Bothwell*) 637; (Mr. *Edwards*) 668; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 669 (i).
TITLE AND MORTGAGE INSURANCE CO., REP. OF STANDING COM.: M. to ref. back (Sir *Donald A. Smith*) 620 (i).
TODD'S PARLIAMENTARY GOVT., DISTRIBUTION TO MEMBERS: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1600 (ii).
Tolls and Dues Collection B. No. 122 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 811; 2° and in Com., 912; 3°*, 1117 (ii). (52 *Vic*, *c.* 19.)
Toronto Board of Trade Acts Amt B. No. 135 (Mr. *Small*). Rule suspended, 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 1262 (ii). (52 *Vic. c.* 100.)
TORONTO SCHOOL OF INFANTRY, BREAD SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1082 (ii).
TOWN SITES IN N. W. T., RECEIPTS FROM SALES, &C: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 29 (i).
TRACY, A. R., ARREST AND SEIZURE OF GOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1016 (ii).
TRADE AND NAVIGATION TABLES: presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 3.
TRADE RELATIONS (AND FISHERIES) WITH U.S.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 323; neg. (Y. 65, N. 108) 423 (i).
TRADE COMMISSIONER TO SOUTH AMERICA, SUMS PAID: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 30 (i).
TRAVELLING EXPENSES AND CAB-HIRE: in Com. of Sup., 156, 168 (i).
TREATIES (COMMERCIAL) WITH FOREIGN STATES: prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 172; neg. (Y. 66, N. 94) 193.

Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. No. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*). 1°*, 13 (i); 2° m., 1100; Amt. (Mr. *Brown*) 6 m. h., neg. on a div., 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1102 (ii).

TRENT RIVER NAV.: in Com. of Sup., 1207 (ii).

TRENT VALLEY CANAL, COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 20, 655, 676 (i), 872 (ii).

Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal Act Amt. B. No. 103 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 524; 2°, 774; in Com., 775; 3°*, 785 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 34.)

TRURO TO NEWPORT RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396; in Com., 1501 (ii).

Trusts and Combinations. *See* "FREE LIST." "COMBINATIONS."

TUPPER, HON. CHAS. H., MEMBER FOR PICTOU: introduced, 1.

Union Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 79 (Mr. *White, Renfrew*). 1°*, 322; 2°*, 510; in Com., 792 (i); 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Bryson*) to recom., neg. on a div., 854; 3°, 855; Sen. Amts. COLC. in, 1233 (ii). (52 *Vic*, c. 63.)

U. S. AND COMMERCIAL UNION: Telegram *re* Hitt's Res. read (Mr. *Charlton*) 384 (i).

U. S., INVITATION TO MEMBERS TO VISIT: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 34 (i).

UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com of Sup., 1494 (ii).

UNRESTRICTED RECIPROCITY. *See* "RECIPROCITY."

VANANCIES: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

VALIQUETTE, SERGEANT, PENSION TO FAMILY: in Com. of Sup., 788 (i).

VENTILATION OF CHAMBER: in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).

VETERANS OF 1812: in Com. of Sup., 788 (i).

VICTORIA BRIDGE, COST OF MAINTENANCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1081 (ii).

Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 32 (Mr. *Prior*). 1°*, 138; 2°*, 239; in Com. and 3°*, 424 (i). (52 *Vic*, c. 48.)

VINCENT, JOSEPH E., AND FRENCH EDITION OF TARIFF: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 935 (ii)

VOLUNTEERS (9TH BATTALION) DISCIPLINE: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 1327 (ii).

VOTERS' LISTS, AMOUNT EXPENDED IN PREPARING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 30 (i).

——— DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 15 (i).

——— PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 271 (i).

WALDIE, JOHN, ESQ., MEMBER FOR HALTON: introduced, 13 (i).

WALLACE, W., PAYMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1597 (ii).

Wand, A. *See* "DIVORCE."

WAYS AND MEANS: prop. Res. for Com. (Mr. *Foster*) 13 (i).
——— Remarks *re* Millers of Ont. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1711 (ii).

WEBSTER, W. A., SUMS PAID FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 303; M. for Ret.,* 303 (i).

——— EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT. AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 979 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1320 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act (*Chap.* 104 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 27** (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 79; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 195 (i). (52 *Vic*, c. 17.)

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES: in Com. of Sup., 1226, 1496 (ii).

WELLAND CANAL, DEEPENING: in Com. of Sup., 1207, 1514 (ii).

——— WATER POWER, REP. OF ENGINEERS, &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Rykert*) 304 (i).

WEST BAY, N.S., CUSTOM HOUSE OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 427 (i).

Western Counties Ry. B. No. 127 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 871; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1043 (ii). (52 *Vic., c.* 8.)

WEST POINT WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1498 (ii),

WHEAT AND FLOUR IMPORTATIONS FROM U.S.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Smith, Ontario*) 33 (i).

WHISKEY, ILLICIT MANUFACTURE: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 935.

WHITE, ROBERT S., ESQ., MEMBER FOR CARDWELL: introduced, 1 (i).

WILLIAMSBURG CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1205 (ii).

WILSON, J., PAYMENT AS RETURNING OFFICER: in Com. of Sup., 1362 (ii).

WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.'S, COR., &C: M. for copies (Mr. *Borden*) 529 (i).
Deb. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 532; (Mr. *Kenny*) 534; (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 535; (Mr. *Jones, Digby*) 536; (Gen. *Laurie*) 536; (Mr. *Freeman*) 537; (Mr. *Putnam*) 537; (Mr. *Lovitt*) 538; (Sir *John Thompson*) 538; (Mr. *Borden*) 539 ( ).

Winnipeg and Assiniboia River Water Power B. No. 63 (Mr. *Watson*). 1°*, 269; 2°*, 357 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 855 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 89.)

Winding-Up Act (*Chap.* 129 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 98** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 424, 2° m., 659; 2° and in Com., 660; 3°*, 763 (i). (52 *Vic*, *c.* 32.)

Winnipeg and North Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 82 (Mr. *Bergin*). 1°*, 346; 2°*, 397; in Com. and 3°*, 663. (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 68.)

Wires. *See* "Telephone."

Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s B. No. 107 (Mr. *Macdowall*). 1°*, 589; 2°*, 663 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 921 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 66.)

Wrecking, &c., in Canadian Waters B. No. 7 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*). 1°, 15; 2° m., 256; Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to adjn. deb., 258; agreed to, 259 (i); wthdn, 1107 (ii).

Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. No. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 13; 2° m., 250; 2° and M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 255; agreed to, 256; Rep. of Sel. Com. (presented) 384; B., in Com. 607; 3° m., 755; Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to recom., 757; neg. (Y. 56, N. 108) 761; 3°, 761 (i). (52 *Vic.*, *c.* 1.)
Deb. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 607, 618; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 608, 614; (Mr. *Kenny*) 608, 610; (Mr. *Bowell*) 608; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 608, 610, 616; (Mr. *Charlton*) 608, 619; (Mr. *Labelle*) 611; (Mr. *Mulock*) 611; (Messrs. *Waldie* and *Curran*) 612; (Messrs. *Edgar, Dawson* and *Cook*) 613; (Mr. *Wellon, St. John*) 614; (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) 615, 618; (Mr. *Masson*) 618; (Mr. *Sproule* 619; (Messrs. *Mills* [*Bothwell*], *Patterson* [*Essex*] and *Hesson*) 620 (i).
Deb. on Amt. to M. for 3° (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 757; (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 759; (Messrs. *Casey* and Sir *Donald Smith*) 760; (Messrs. *Bowell, Labelle* and *Mitchell*) 761; neg. (Y. 56, N. 108) 761 (i).

WRECKS AND SHIPPING DISASTERS: in Com. of Sup., 974 (ii).

WRIGHT, ALLAN, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1094 (ii).

WRIGHT, E. P., REFUND OF DUTY ON MINING MACHINERY: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Edwards*) 942 (ii).

YARMOUTH CO., N. S., PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Lovitt*) 34 (i).

YORK-SIMCOE BATTALION, KIT ALLOWANCE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 85 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 428 (i).

YOUNG AND FRONT OF ESSEX TOWNSHIPS, PETS., &C., TO DISALLOW UNION ACT OF ONT. LEGISLATURE: M. for copies (Mr. *Taylor*) 426 (i).